



Local Government Commission

Mana Kāwanatanga ā Rohe

Submissions on option of a Golden Bay local board

1. The Local Government Commission received a total of 587 submissions in response to its consultation document 'Tasman District and local boards: Option of a Golden Bay local board. Two submissions were subsequently withdrawn leaving a total of **585** submissions of which:
 - (a) **371** supported either a Golden Bay local board (117) or a Golden Bay local board and boards elsewhere in Tasman District (254)
 - (b) **203** favoured retention of existing arrangements i.e. community boards (not local boards) in Golden Bay and Motueka
 - (c) **11** did not indicate a preferred option.
2. Submitters were from:
 - (a) Golden Bay Ward: 324
 - (b) Motueka Ward: 91
 - (c) Richmond Ward: 82
 - (d) Moutere-Waimea Ward: 62
 - (e) Lakes-Murchison Ward: 8
 - (f) Tasman District/did not identify area: 4
 - (g) Nelson: 16.
3. Of the 324 submissions from Golden Bay:
 - (a) 166 supported a Golden Bay local board/Golden Bay local board and boards elsewhere
 - (b) 149 favoured retention of existing arrangements
 - (c) 9 did not identify a preferred option.

No.	Support GB local board	Support GB local board & elsewhere	Support existing arrangements	No preferred option identified
1			Casey Port	
2			Bruce Moorehead	
3			Emma Gee	
4	Anneke van Laanen			
5	Teena Jelsma			
6			Jack Currie	
7	Anthony Opie			
8			Laurie Jarrett	
9			Louise Amitraro	
10			Brent Palmer	
11			Louis Draijer	
12		Gary Thorpe		
13			Chris Blythe	
14			Bryan Scoles	
15	Lethea Erz			
16			Joanna Cranness	
17	Chaz Packer			
18		Isobel Mosley		
19		Monika Walter		
20			Jennifer Hebbard	
21	Phillip Kennedy			
22			Jock Sutherland	
23	Barbara Anderson			
24	Natalie Patterson			
25	Dieter Proebst			
26			Steve Liddicoat	
27			Cherrie Chubb	
28			Pauline Watts	
29	Clark Ambrose			

30			Dick Brown	
31	Sue Gallagher			
32			Nicola Denmead	
33	Carolyn Simon			
34		Mike Rodwell		
35			Daryl Walsh	
36	KF Woller			
37	Elspeth Jean Kjestrup			
38	Anne Webb Page			
39			Wiremu Bartlett	
40		Fitz-William		
41	Gita Krenek			
42	Robert Zane Perry			
43	Jeanette Marsters			
44			Barry James Cashman	
45		Philip Saunders		
46			Josephine Westley	
47			Brian Win	
48	Janene Rush			
49	Carl Christiansen			
50			Kit Maling (councillor)	
51			Patrick Byrne	
52		Gisela & Alister Winter		
53			Susan Ayton Shaw	
54			Simon Lavery	
55	Frank Susko			
56	Peter Lucas			
57			Wendy Earle	
58	Shirley Marcussen			
59			Tony Reilly	
60		Tracey Sullivan		

61			Peter Wilks	
62	Lars Moeltgen			
63			Scott Starling	
64	Alesha Hobbs			
65			Wil. Darling	
66			John Palmer	
67			Grant Knowles	
68	Lou Franklin			
69			Kristin Russell	
70			Nancy Ward	
71		Kate Burness		
72	Michael P Ryan			
73	RA Bradley			
74	Judith Johnstone			
75	Reinhold Toechele			
76			Kate O'Byrne	
77			Ian Welsh	
78			Godfrey Watson	
79		Rhys Barrier		
80		Doris Lindegger		
81			David J Cook	
82		Tom Horn		
83	Pierre Mitchell			
84			Cherie Byrne	
85			Frank Bryne	
86		Melissa Dunnink		
87	Jane Hobday			
88			J Bruning	
89			Rex Heuvel	
90	Alexandra Purucker			
91	Stefan Waldner			

92	Elizabeth Smart			
93	John Snelgrove			
94		Julia & Franz Murbach		
95			Robyn Jones	
96			Kate Rodda	
97			Richard English	
98			Brian Hawthorne	
99	Martyn & Susan Fisher			
100			John Crocker	
101			John Clarke	
102			Pip Lynch	
103			Peter Talley	
104	Tom Veitch			
105			Suzanne Baker	
106			Patrick Mulcahy	
107	Suze Lord			
108	John Lee			
109			Noel Baigent	
110			Doris Symmons	
111		Stef Jongkind		
112	Halina Smolski			
113		Graham Rogers		
114	James Moreton			
115		Lis Pedersen		
116			Hagen Jurke	
117			Sue Clark	
118			Elizabeth Lee	
119			Linda Olivier	
120			Irene & Brian Bruning	
121			Larry Peterson	
122			Sue Hitchcock	

123			Keith Ballard	
124		Christopher Latham & Antonia Sanders-Latham		
125		Mike Patrick		
126		Richard Merrifield		
127	Sheryl Waterhouse			
128			J Hawthorne	
129		John Weston		
130		BE Halstead		
131				Kathleen Russell
132			Barry Dowler	
133	Peter Hunter			
134			Tracy Palmer	
135			Belinda Palmer	
136			Edward Voigt	
137			Maria Voigt	
138			Patricia Grace Lennon	
139			Neville Malcolm	
140			Belinda J Barnes	
141	Stephen & Jean Orr			
142		Rowan Miller		
143	Reginald Turner			
144			Trish Palmer	
145				Tasman District Council
146			Motueka Community Board	
147	<i>WITHDRAWN</i>			
148		Jim Vause		
149	Stephen Baxendale			
150	Joanne Johnson			

151			Dave Storer	
152			Joseph Martin & Sarah Jones	
153			Colin Bewden	
154			Mariea Coppard	
155			David Morgan	
156			Janet Morgan	
157	Lewis Martin			
158	Lisa Bodley			
159			Maryke Sieling	
160		Kevin Feast		
161			Philip Colclough	
162			Adrian Fleming	
163	Lelie Sise			
164			Margaret Ann Packard	
165			Charles Michael Lawson	
166		Alan Selwyn		
167		Carrie Frew		
168		Jack Santa Barbara		
169		Joanna Santa Barbara		
170		Rebecca Young		
171		Gillien Pollock		
172		Liam Wright		
173		Alison Pickford		
174		Steve Richards		
175		Marian Steele		
176		Roger May		
177		Neil Page		
178		Verena Gruner		
179		Basil Steele		
180		Harnold Dunnink		

181		Yachal Heslop Upson		
182		Stacie Pettersen		
183		John Cirne		
184		Rewan M Falleiros		
185		Nicky Clark		
186		Birgit Klihgebiel		
187		Nina Jefferies		
188		Josie Tucker		
189		Lee-Anne Jago		
190		Andrew McGowan		
191		Sam Pont		
192		Ian Junior		
193		Tanya O'Brien		
194		Carolyn October		
195	Joseph Vessels			
196		Kerry Hay		
197		Janet Jackson		
198		Kael Silk		
199		Goh Hadar Gane		
200		Darryl Gane		
201		Margot D'Hondt		
202		Anna Coad		
203	Steve Hand			
204		Samuel Piozin-Belloir		
205		Eugenie Piozin-Belloir		
206		John Noakes		
207		Sandra Parata-Hemopo		
208		Gavin Drummond		
209		Annabel Drummond		
210		Kate Everton		
211		Joanne King		

212		Jenny Klenner		
213		Judy Roper		
214		Joyce Wilson		
215		Michel D'Hondt		
216		Pauline Church		
217		WG Wood		
218		Gillian Wilde		
219		Dinah Earlam		
220		Lyn Russell		
221		Hannah Kremmer		
222		Carmel Kremmer		
223		Florence Ghod		
224		Joy Bell Pati		
225		Jud Charbeth		
226		Valorie Patrick		
227		Camilla Holmewood		
228		Sue Strawbridge		
229		Mike Karsten		
230		Christine Reiter		
231		Joe Jupiter		
232		MJ Ward		
233		K Ward		
234		Fifi Harris		
235		Di Hall		
236		K&T Brewer		
237		Susan Maynard		
238		Hazel Loetchfond		
239		Annette Katipa		
240		Richard Nicholls		
241		Rawina Koopu		
242		Dona Fergusson		

243		Te Wehi Ratana		
244		Renee Alleyne		
245		MP Achterbery		
246		Jan Heijs		
247		Sophie Paaki		
248		Moeke Paaki		
249		Jozef van Rene		
250		Joe Robough		
251		Diana Baumgart		
252		Ian Crowlesmith		
253		Lyn Crowlesmith		
254		Mael Beusseau		
255		Jodanne Aitken		
256		Ewan Cox		
257		Carol Noakes		
258		Tom Kennedy		
259		Alison Kennedy		
260		Ami Kennedy		
261		Aniquah Stevensen		
262		John-Paul Pochin		
263		Lyndy Wilkinson		
264		Esther Schuckard		
265	Rosemary Callaghan			
266			Sue Meredith	
267			Trevor Norriss	
268	Neil Wilson			
269			John Hutton	
270			John Mason	
271			Bevan Bennett	
272			Anita Hutchinson	
273	Dr Bruce Dooley			

274	Kyra Dooley			
275	Inna Shvyrkova			
276			John Smart	
277	<i>WITHDRAWN</i>			
278		Richard Clement		
279			Gerald & Judith O'Connor	
280				Paul Taylor
281			Philip & Rose Windle	
282			Provincial Executive of Golden Bay Rural Women	
283	Jan Morganti			
284	Nadine Bott			
285	Judith Rothstein			
286		Leigh Vickery		
287	Piers McLaren			
288	Paul Rooney			
289	Nigel Lloyd			
290			Nigel Harwood	
291			Jamie & Andrea Ward	
292			Jill Best	
293	Natasha Toon			
294		Dr Roland Toder		
295	Hazel Taylor			
296			John & Carolyn McLellan	
297			Matt McGlinchey	
298		Marlene Alach		
299			Leah Hauraki	
300		Sheryl Nalder		
301		Lori Godden		

302			Brian Beuke	
303			Philip Gaffney	
304	Roderick Baigent			
305		Silvia Schneider		
306		Christopher Rowse		
307	Henry Victor "Vic" Eastman 111			
308			Tania Belworthy	
309		Ursus Schwarz		
310			Gary Alex Giblin	
311			Lucinda Jean Joughin	
312		Lisa Condell		
313		Mrs LM Henderson		
314			Alan & Sandy Curnow	
315			William Curnow	
316			Joy & Brian Warren	
317			David Lester	
318			Sue Caldwell	
319			Kate Cobb	
320			Rory Cobb	
321			Julie Strange	
322	Teresa James			
323			Paul Winter	
324				Catherine Rose Barnes
325			Sara Chapman	
326			Golden Bay Shared Recreation Facility Inc.	
327			Shelley Grell	
328			Joyce Robinson	
329	Graham King			
330	Donna King			

331		Nigel John Ritson		
332			Hans & Carolyn Bauer	
333			Ina Holst	
334		Richard Womersley		
335		Joy Womersley		
336	Paul Marcussen			
337			Angela Ricker	
338	Rebecca Hayter			
339			John McKie	
340			Judith Hoch	
341	Karen Foley			
342		Alene Fleur Sherson & Bernardus Joseph Vanderlaan		
343		Martin Potter		
344			Laura Webster	
345			Thomas Hack	
346	Alison Menary			
347	Marcus Benecke			
348	John Allen			
349			Kris McAlinden	
350			Philip Woolf	
351			Joan Butts	
352			Maria Koch	
353			Manawhenua ki Mohua	
354			Amanda Tomlinson	
355			Rod Tomlinson	
356			Marion & Kelvin Riordan	
357	Richard Kempthorne			
358		Rolf Brouwer		
359	Rosemary Needham			

360			Mik Symmons	
361		Gaylene Wilkinson		
362	Judith Nicholls			
363				Marion Satherley
364		Dr Donald Mead		
365			Derry Kingston	
366	William Glen Wallis			
367			Celia Butler	
368	Sarah van Iddekinge			
369			Gerald Scales	
370				Golden Bay Community Board
371			John Byrne	
372			Deanna Pomeroy- Byrne	
373	Catriona Baillie			
374			Elva & David Harwood	
375				Hugh Cropp
376			LG & D Sixtus	
377			CC & RL Reynish	
378			Helen Dawn Couper	
379			Leon Max Couper	
380			Loretta Horton	
381			Michael Byrne	
382			Ngaire Byrne	
383			Rosie Riley	
384			Ian Betts	
385		David Benson		
386		Fiona Cameron		
387		David Burt		
388			LF & JE Etheredge	
389			Peter Driscoll	

390			Pat Ballard	
391			Penny Griffith	
392			Anne Gentleman	
393		Robin Schiff		
394		Victoria Davis		
395	Jonathan Lea			
396		Working Group for a Golden Bay Local Board		
397			Graeme Wilson	
398		Elaine Donovan		
399	Liza Eastman QSM			
400			Jane Thomas	
401	John Field			
402				Heather Wallace
403			Richard Cosslet	
404	Elizabeth McCarthy			
405		Peter Gay		
406			Barry Best	
407	Jennifer Maclaren			
408	Emma Lay			
409		Jill Pearson		
410			Roy Bensemman	
411		Kevin Durkan		
412			BN & PA Jones	
413		Graeme Wells		
414	Carol Price			
415	John & Suzy Hall			
416	John Black			
417	Deborah Pearson			
418		Lisa Savage		
419	David Ogilvie			

420	David Whiteford			
421			Marian Vlaar	
422			Jennifer Haldane	
423			Ina Perrson	
424	Bryan Graham			
425	Rose Hughes			
426			Allan Palmer	
427			Shelley Palmer	
428	Dr Edwina Howell			
429	Brian Wilson			
430	Alistair Hughes			
431		Hans Stoffregen		
432			Jenny Gray	
433			Kathryn Abrams	
434			Ben Webster	
435		Thora Blithe		
436		Averill Grant		
437	Pamela Nelson			
438			Anja van Holten	
439				Chris Hill
440			Krystle Bang	
441		Andrew Clark		
442		Charles Rushbrook		
443		Tessa Whiteman		
444		Laurie Healey		
445	John Weeber			
446			Tudor Burchill	
447	John Clere			
448			Golden Bay Province, Federated Farmers NZ	
449			Gillian Howard Connolly	

450		Richard Lamb		
451		Liz Thomas		
452	Duncan McKenzie			
453		Susan Dean		
454	Carol Sims			
455		Kelvin McKenney		
456			Karl Pratter	
457			Michael Steven	
458		Susan Sullivan		
459		Timothy Perring		
460		Michael Boland		
461	Wendy Drummond			
462		Sarah Hornibrooke		
463		Jean Wedderburn		
464			Sue Brown	
465	Beth Burdett			
466		Ian Alach		
467		Tony Lawton		
468		Hazel Pearson		
469		Mark Pearson		
470	Peter Greer			
471	S Gammelby			
472		Iona Jelf		
473		Steve Penny		
474	Mike Cunliffe			
475		Lisa Lewis		
476			Tony Hitchcock	
477			Madeline Pemberton	
478		John Campbell Earle		
479			Pat Riddett	

480	Larry Clifford Thompson			
481			Alan Cockman	
482			Dean Lund	
483			Gretchen Lund	
484		Peter Graham Finlayson		
485	RM Harvey-Smith			
486		Brett Stevens		
487		RN Hellyer		
488		Philippa Hellyer		
489			Garth Strange	
490			Graham Ball	
491	Charles Landon Carter			
492		DJ Faulkner		
493			Kenneth Leslie Wright	
494			Peter Besier	
495			Donald C. Riley	
496			Sally Gaffney	
497		Mala Om		
498		Robyn Fullerton		
499			Leslie Hambrook	
500			Baerbel Hack	
501	Peter Barker			
502		Franca Morani		
503		Giuliana Morani		
504		Adriana Foreman		
505		Thomas Hamilton		
506			Mary Soper	
507			Maryanne Soper	
508			Brian Nesbit	
509			Bev Boaz	

510			David Boaz	
511			David James	
512		Adrienne Thedens		
513		Helen & Phil Winter		
514		Anel McInnes		
515		Dean McInnes		
516		Lyn Guyton		
517		Dominic Ferretts		
518		Matthew Kerr		
519		Jason Quid		
520		Bronwyn Gale		
521		John Gill		
522		Pamela Gill		
523		Roger Griffiths		
524		Judith Ferris		
525		Jonny McKitrick		
526		Star Seaton		
527		Adam Hills		
528		Janette Oliver-Stobie		
529		Lorrain Clelland		
530		Debbie & Kieran Davies		
531		Graham Densholm		
532		Fin Bayne		
533		Jess McKay		
534		Janet Todd		
535		Mark Holley		
536		Jenny Walker		
537		Andrew Henderson		
538		Chelsea Haley		
539		Kirstyn Stedman		
540		Vicky Stedman		

541		Jemma Gamble		
542		Katherine Wickman & Lloyd Church		
543		Lloyd Churete		
544		Brian Matheson		
545		Colin Andrews		
546		Tennille Lamond		
547		Lucia Mitchell		
548		Kieran Davies		
549		Grace Harris		
550		Louis Adams		
551		Tony Hansen		
552		Mark Newcombe		
553		Joan Blanch		
554		Alwynne Macdonald		
555		Rachael Jayne Schepes		
556		Hamish Roborgh		
557		Godfrey Stocker		
558		Dean Clark		
559		Glenys Gillbank		
560		Judy Silke		
561		Bery Scott		
562		Alan Burden		
563		Peter Nixon		
564		Walter Phipps		
565		Sophie Hodge		
566		Lyn Thorn		
567		Sian Norriss		
568		Lisa McLeod		
569		Tim Did-Dell		
570		Paul Sullivan		

571		Sarah Sullivan		
572		Ann Faber		
573		PJ Faber		
574		K Belcher		
575		Tom Francis		
576		James Francis		
577		Allan James		
578	AA Gale			
579	Jennifer Morris			
580			Ewan & Valerie Crouch	
581			Shirley Preston	
582				Peter Fullerton
583	Graeme Meiklejohn			
584			Keith Langford	
585			Kristal Wells	
586			Abbie Langford	
587				Bruce Collings

Comments made by submitters

1. Costs involved regarding targeted rate to Golden Bay.
2. The advantages of a local board seem quite spurious. This is more about parochialism which seems to be rife in our area. On the flip side some of the disadvantages are quite real.
3. –
4. –
5. I received the information via the post – thank you. Having weighed up the cost of setting up a Golden Bay local board versus the frustration/ineffectiveness of current conditions as outlined in the application by the Working Group, I support the option of a Golden Bay local board. I do not live in Golden Bay, I live in Moutere, Tasman District.
6. Tasman District needs to address its horrendous debt level, so any costs extra to what is already spent on community boards is not an option. It appears a local board is going to require a lot of running requiring more staff, Golden Bay already has two council members paid to represent that area, if they do their job properly there should be no problems.
7. I support the option of a Golden Bay local board as there are sufficient people residing there and they need the ability to speak for themselves.
8. –
9. –
10. I believe the retention of the current system is best for all of our communities.
11. No more administrative arrangements which would require more buildings and would divide up the present TDC into small entities which will invariably increase the rates.
12. *Also supports local boards in: Motueka & Moutere.*
My reason for supporting the establishment of a Golden Bay local board is that TDC has been treating this area like a backwater in terms of support, and as a cash cow in terms of projects that have less than nothing to do with us – such as the Waimea dam. Our rates are some of the highest in the country while TDC panders to the desires of the councillors' personal friends. Golden Bay deserves to be recognised as having massive tourism potential with a wide variety of options and the residents deserve to be treated fairly. The TDC takes for themselves and their friends and gives only lip service in return.
13. I don't think this is a good value proposition; Extra rates for Golden Bay residents; Concern that the new board won't be able to achieve anything – rates set as a district not by local board; Potential conflicts between TDC councillors and local board; Two layers of governance – more hoops to jump through, more admin costs; Over representation of GB compared to Murchison (also remote from Richmond) or Waimea-Moutere (sparsely populated); Having several boards will be complex compared to the population of our region; GB has a 'fair share' of representation on council.
14. I see the establishment of a local board as an extra drain on the large amount of resources that already go over the hill from the wider Tasman District.
15. Lethea Erz (*See attached*)
16. If a local board was to happen it should be funded through a GB targeted rate.

17. Given its geographical features and the relative remoteness of Golden Bay, I consider more local decision-making is necessary to promote local community resilience and well-being now and in the future.
18. The current community board puts a lot of work in, but seems to have little actual influence on decision-making.
19. *Also supports local boards in: Motueka, Moutere-Waimea, Lakes Murchison.* Richmond is far too Nelson-centric to the extent that Tasman District is generally referred to as Nelson area. The needs of rural communities have been ignored by national and local governments.
20. –
21. People are more likely to volunteer to be on a local board than a community board as they may believe they are doing more than rubber stamping “head office” policy i.e. they have ‘more teeth’ or ‘more skin in the game’. Although we have ticked Option 1 we would support more local boards if the Golden Bay board proves successful.
22. –
23. –
24. –
25. I support the option of a Golden Bay local board. For me this would be a step in the right direction. Golden Bay constitutes a rather distinct bioregion. In terms of participatory democracy, a local board constitutes (eventually) an improvement over a community board (no teeth at all). It is important to intensify our resident/rate-payer participation over a triennial vote for our unitary authority. As one of the local residents I welcome this slightly more endowed option to participate in a more ongoing fashion to the social, economic, financial and political development of the Bay. Thank you for your attendance at the meeting at our Recreation Centre on the 16 July.
26. Given the estimated cost of \$315,040 of ratepayer funds to establish a Golden Bay local board, I think this is not a good option at all! I believe it would be better to have a dedicated staff member in the TDC who liaises with iwi, council and the existing Golden Bay community board to achieve proposed desired outcomes/purpose of a local board. I believe this is a much more cost-effective way of achieving matters and desired outcomes that a local board would attend to.
27. I do not support the proposal to establish a local board for Golden Bay for the following two reasons. My primary concern is over the cost involved in establishing and running a local board as well as the high risk of an escalation of costs as the reality of matching funding to maintaining current infrastructure competes with a wish list of pet projects and unforeseen events. My second concern is that decision making for this spending and for prioritising issues will rest with a very small group in a local board who may or may not be sufficiently diverse or have the skills and resources required to get the best outcomes for all sectors of our community. As such there is the real potential to exaggerate divisions that already exist within our community. I am happy with the current level of service we receive from TDC and feel that we are already well represented with two councillors and our current community board.

28. I feel that this is a mish mash of local government. I elected two councillors to do the job of representing this area. Why would I increase my already high rates to achieve the same thing? There is no real clarity over a budget and I can see them continually having to battle for this anyway. If this were to go ahead, it should be part of the overall system of local government and should be financed by them. The positives are chicken feed and do not present important enough issues to be paying this extra taxation for. I do not support it.
29. –
30. I support the retention of existing arrangements i.e. community boards (not local boards) in Golden Bay and Motueka. Comments: I believe the extra cost of a Golden Bay local board is not justified and I believe that many Golden Bay rate payers would object to having to pay an extra \$75 or even \$50 per annum. I also wonder if the low population of permanent residents can find an effective board. I also believe that the present community representation provides ample opportunity for the Golden Bay community to successfully advocate for their community needs. The community board could, with agreement with the TDC, take additional responsibilities to those presently allocated if that better meets the need of the Golden Bay community (the maintenance of halls for example). Thank you for the opportunity to make a submission.
31. –
32. –
33. The current model of community boards with no real agency nor any funding for local projects has not served Golden Bay well. Years (decades even) of divisive interaction with TDC has been the norm for GB residents and community groups. The model is flawed and disenfranchises GB ratepayers. A local board with decision-making power and funding for local issues will better serve our unique community and local environmental and cultural needs. We are an involved, interested and dynamic population with all the skills and creative intelligence needed to initiate, implement and oversee our own projects. Empowering a GB local board to give us stronger agency within our rohe in Tasman District will go some way to evening out the distorted and unfair level of representation and power held in Richmond over the rural communities of interest.
34. Richmond is the largest and fastest growing community within the TDC catchment without a community board. Our population must be heading for 20,000 and along with Nelson is the biggest community in New Zealand without any railway service. I no longer feel as safe on or near roads like I once did. With growing concern.
35. To change will add a stupid cost for ratepayers.
36. 1. Why – dishonest information to do with dam from TDC to ratepayers.
2. Any other highway would have been repaired, it's a disgrace how long Takaka Hill is taking. My Grandad and mates would have fixed it with shovels and wheelbarrows by now!!!
37. –
38. I lived in Golden Bay for 57 years and remember when they had a county council before amalgamating with Richmond. It was a much better system overall, so having a local board would address a lot of the present issues I believe.
39. Independent run, no influence from families, whanau, people in the Golden Bay area. It would be more transparent management. Oppose change.

40. I have been dissatisfied with TDC's decision-making and perhaps other areas in Tasman are also dissatisfied, maybe they would like the option of forming a local board.
41. Only Golden Bay can really understand and successfully deal with the interests of the people who live here.
42. –
43. A local board will be made up of local people who will have interests in the local people and district!
44. I have read the handout regarding the establishment of a local board for Takaka and I am concerned, as a former community board member of which I was deputy chairman and former Tasman District councillor for 2 terms, at the increased cost to our ratepayers many who are retired people on fixed incomes like myself and I must state I am now 81 years of age and have lived in Golden bay all my life. The costs that you have included are no surprise to me. Most of the problem in G.B. has come from people who have moved here and then needled the council with a continual barrage of dissatisfaction because they want a change. This has cost the ratepayers dearly in office time. One of the more recent chairmen who has now passed on was our biggest offender and I was privileged to see the file. I believe our community board elected members have done a good job this last and present term and the new board will be still controlled by the elected council of the day as to the budget at that time. There have been occasions where TDC have not performed in a manner that I could agree with but again this has been brought about by the agro of certain people in the community. I must mention that to the best of my knowledge three of the people driving this Healy, Lawton and Toder I believe are very little known by many ratepayers who have lived here for some years. These people often come pursue their belief (sic) and leave the district it has been built by a lot of hard work by our forebears. I hope this has helped clarify some things for you. Please be careful on your decision for a district that is quite special. I am including a precis of my service to our community for your information.
45. *Also supports local boards in: Tasman, West Coast.*
Local people in local areas with a good grasp of local issues promoting and making decisions based on local knowledge and for the good and betterment of their areas.
46. –
47. I feel that to support a local board would be a step backwards into the past and would create an increase in our rates to achieve the same results. Come on TDC show some bottle and get on and run the district as a whole as fairly as possible.
48. –
49. The geographic isolation of Golden Bay has made it a unique community. The people that live here have in the most part chosen to live here because of that uniqueness. The Golden Bay community want to be able to make their own decisions, so that they can retain and strengthen the style of community they desire to live in.
50. The community board has the ability to advocate on behalf of their community. They also have two councillors to represent them. There will be increased costs to ratepayers in both Golden Bay and the district for very little actual benefit to Golden Bay. We are already a high cost low income district and this is additional burden for ratepayers.

51. Don't do it. Stay as we are. And it is not for question non-residents should be asked (sic). When the bay needs funds, Tasman residents can rightly say NO, Golden Bay chose to turn away from Tasman, the bay can't have it both ways.
52. *Also supports local boards: in Motueka.*
We support the option of a local board for Golden Bay. The reason being we need representation here and the Golden Bay people know what we need. A board from outside Golden Bay cannot fairly represent our needs and does not necessarily understand them. Also a board from outside the area will be more likely to support their own needs first giving priority to the Richmond area. I feel that this is not fair representation. We would like a board representing Golden Bay!
53. –
54. Why add further cost and complexity to an already onerous system?
55. I feel the ratepayers in Golden Bay should have more say in how our rates are spent and how Golden Bay should be governed.
56. I support the option of a Golden Bay local board because Golden Bay is geographically separate from the rest of Tasman District due to being isolated by a mountain range. As a result of its isolation and unique climate it has developed its own culture and has specific needs and circumstances that can best be filled by the local residents having a higher degree of autonomy. As a ratepayer not in the Golden Bay area, I support some extra cost to provide for a local board in the Golden Bay area.
57. I believe that the present community board could fulfil a greater level of autonomy and be given greater powers by the TDC to allow it to have greater autonomy in decision-making for local projects and services e.g. community facilities and buildings e.g. library, playgrounds, community facilities and halls, local events and projects and some traffic and roading, signs and bus stops etc. Also have greater input into issues specifically related to Golden Bay and its isolated areas. This could be funded by TDC and extra funding raised for specific projects. TDC could benefit from leaving more decision-making to the community board and simply provide oversight in the planning stages and outcomes.
58. Local board to have more direct involvement in local issues. I would not like to see a large rate rise.
59. –
60. –
61. Too much fragmentation across the Nelson Region with two councils (Nelson City and Tasman District). Priority should be to MERGE the two existing councils and then review local board representation after the merger has taken place.
62. –
63. The population of Tasman District should be working together not trying to be separate. Creating a local board in Golden Bay is not something I support because it would mean higher costs to ratepayers – in Golden Bay and the rest of Tasman. It does not offer economies of scale.
64. I support a G.B. local board, due to G.B.'s unique geographical location and community. I think we have capable leaders within our community to fill these roles.
65. In my considered opinion 'we' should opt for no 'local boards' (retention of existing local government arrangements).

Resident-ratepayer discontent with perceived unsatisfactory administration will not be solved by semantics (changing names for various local advocacy groups) and loading the increasing costs back on the ratepayers, the solution is with the people themselves and effectively communicating to mitigate any 'grievance' over local autonomy and control. Rate revenues and expenditures should represent physical improvements not get swallowed up by administration and non-productive battle over words.

Historically, the Tasman District (Nelson Provincial Council?) is a well-defined region of co-dependant community catchments. Shared decision-making for the benefit of the greater/wider community is both desired and necessary. The governing 'body' of the Tasman District Council has that admin responsibility. It is the local ward councillors' role and responsibility to be an effective conduit to promote local ward community needs and plans. Consequentially, it is the councillor's role that should be clearly defined and made known pre-elections!

My recommendation to the Commission is that the existing local government arrangements be retained yet give the Ward councillors more visible management control (budgets and plans) over local ward activities. I foresee a more rigorous vetting of ward councillors at election time and improved candidate skill set to accept the councillor role and responsibilities, including local decision-making powers.

(I understand the Commission cannot consider options such as alterations to Tasman District boundaries, however, I should comment that there is possibly a stronger case to amalgamate Nelson City as a local board; the independent Republic of Golden Bay may succeed!! :))

66. I do not support the proposal and support retaining the existing community board. The LGC Option Paper is poorly prepared and unrealistic in its presentation and conclusions. The legal mandate and requirement of a local board are accurately set out. A community board COULD do many of these things if the community wanted them done. Once a local board is in place they are a requirement. To suggest that one officer could cover all of these very diverse and complex issues and prepare useful papers for board consideration is naive and grossly misleading. As a very experienced director, my rough assessment is that this is 2 or 3 times understated in cost. I am alarmed that the district should make a decision for the Golden Bay Community to then find that their local costs are far above their expectation, will harm rather than help community consultation. Or, the wider Tasman community are left with a cost that is unnecessary and divisive. Golden Bay is a special and distinct community. It is also a divided community amongst itself as highlighted by a number of recent issues. A well operating and more widely empowered community board to cover the distinct local issues, would be a useful first step.
67. Grant Knowles (*See attached*)
68. I perceive the TDC – a clumsy overpaid organisation – average staff rate \$20 grand more per person than general population. I can understand why G Bay wants independent representation. Kempthorne, King and other councillors have ostracised their communities. They have with their self-centred business cards and agricultural views and dams also divided the community here in Richmond – 400% rise in water rates over 10 years and doubling of general rates. All chasing the mighty dollar – this excessive development – e.g. Lower Queen St. – no thought of environment e.g. nitrate levels especially in Waimea Plains – and congestion of roads – not thinking of existing ratepayers – I'd love to shift to Golden Bay – a lot more in harmony with our land.

69. Listed under the advantages of a local board is the “effective response to the opportunities etc.” (p.14). The opposite is true. Those once elected to the local board will not have the checks and balances provided by TDC. In the statutory obligations (p.13) the diversity etc. could well be lost in bias and short-term decision-making. Having lived in GB since 1979 and witness first-hand the “old boys club” of the old county council. The formation of the local board will hark back to those days.
70. –
71. *Also supports local boards in: any other area where most of the population want one.* Golden Bay has its own unique situation and needs, quite different to other areas of Tasman, and the population here should be able to make their own decisions about local issues that aren’t relevant to other areas of Tasman. It’s not appropriate for Golden Bay to be dictated to and have decisions made for it by people who don’t live here and haven’t been elected by the people who do.
72. I owned a home near Takaka for 28 years before selling and retiring to Murchison recently. For many years, particularly through the 1990s, I was very active in Golden Bay through employment, Lions Club, G Bay Promotions, Main Street Business Assn and scouting. On many occasions we felt frustrated that the community board did not have the power to progress our ideas and suggestions more quickly and things seemed to ‘fall through the cracks’ often. Our two councillors, particularly for many years Paul Sangster, were listening to suggestions but once ideas went ‘over the hill’ they were lost. Over 20 years ago we argued for bike tracks to Pohara – it has only just happened for walk/cycleways from central (?) to Takaka – it was started at both ends but never properly linked. Ideas for the Rec Park, hospital and a host of other ideas, including control of freedom camping took years to move forward so I suggest the establishment of a ‘hands on’ local board.
73. –
74. I expect (hope) the outcome of a GB local board gives our community a feeling that our wishes/opinions are heard and acted on regards all issues in our district that matter to us – encouraging a more proactive community – more feeling of ownership and less of helplessness or frustration. Thank you for the opportunity.
75. Re local boards elsewhere in TD: I believe it is up to the residents there to submit for change. I would still support the idea e.g. paying a contribution through the rates I am paying. I was at the meeting at the Rec Park. Processing all the inputs through questions and answers. I came away with the following thoughts:
- To change to a local board is a good plan. It will be an even better plan if costs are kept down. Is it really necessary to employ a full-time senior officer as an adviser?
 - I see it as quite important that the new local board will be set up with decision-making power through allocation in as many fields as possible; it has to become visible to Golden bay residents that there is a change from the set-up with the community board.
 - In the meeting it became (to me) quite clear that real change is only achieved when the relationship between Golden Bay residents and community board/local board and TDC would move towards trust and respect. In the past there were too many events/interactions where this above-mentioned relationship was dominated by disrespect and distrust. I myself experienced behaviour on the side of TDC staff in various departments which can best be described as “bullying”. I doubted if those staff ever came across the expression “public servants”. There was no sign that they would see themselves as such.

It looks like that both GB councillors assured the audience that they are working hard to improve the relationship within council – there is hope that it eventually influences the culture of public serving towards a better outcome. One community board member pointed out that any change of behaviour might be only short term. There is some hope that through creating a local board with decision-making power through allocation that this creates a better starting point for improving relationships. It will still need a big change towards goodwill from both sides. Yes, I support the option of a Golden Bay local board.

76. –
77. The existing community board in Golden Bay functions perfectly well.
78. Things work fine now. Not worth the extra cost.
79. The best decisions/outcomes for local communities occur when they are part of the decision-making rather than having decisions imposed on them i.e. better outcomes generally occur from a “bottom-up” rather than “top-down” approach.
80. –
81. Costs will be higher than expected thus the rates will increase. They always do.
82. I advocate for decentralisation. Due to its topography and populations of the Tasman District are better served by local boards. It will better reflect those isolated communities needs and aspirations. Also, resilience will be fostered by local boards better than from Richmond. A good example where the current system is not working is the Waimea dam.
83. –
84. 1. This important decision should be put to the ratepayers by way of vote, as it is going to be a further burden on those people if it goes ahead. 2. A local board as outlined in the LGC document will have no further powers than our current community board. 3. The actual cost to ratepayers is not well reflected in the statements of this document. 4. Tasman District Council and our 2 elected councillors represent our community very well alongside the Golden Bay Community Board.
85. The current community board system has served Golden bay well and there is no reason to change in order to appease a very small minority. Also, to allow any Tom, Dick or Harry to submit on this proposal in my mind borders on corruption, period. It’s ratepayers who will possibly be burdened with this proposal therefore it is only ratepayers that should have input.
86. –
87. I think Golden Bay has particular local issues/concerns that stem from the physical location. I support the local board idea in terms of local decision-making. I am assuming and support the greater involvement of tangata whenua in local decisions which may be more inclusive. I’d also support other local boards if there was the interest in the community for this.
88. –
89. Not affordable! Current rates are costly enough for superannuitants – and there are a lot of superannuitants living in Golden Bay.
90. As Golden Bay is geographically not connected with the rest of the district it is important to have a Golden Bay local board which provides the insights to our community, crucial for decisions.

91. –
92. –
93. Golden Bay has a unique character. The factors that give the Bay this character are best enhanced by giving the residents greater autonomy. The standards of development applicable to Richmond are inappropriate for a rural area such as Golden Bay. The continued pressure from the TDC to impose Richmond standards on GB have resulted in antagonism and resentment on the part of GB residents.
94. *Also supports local boards in: Murchison because it seems quite isolated.*
95. Present GB councillors have good relationship with TDC. Local board would mean higher rates and more bureaucracy. Local board would be isolating. Much better to work all together efficiently.
96. I do not support a separate board for Golden Bay or anywhere else.
97. Increased bureaucracy and cost for little benefit. All that is required is a more co-operative and flexible attitude from TDC staff in Richmond.
98. –
99. In principle, we support the option of Golden Bay local board. In supporting this option, we wish to add the following comments:
1. With the clear benefits to the community of local decision making, we believe that the scope of local board decision making responsibilities should be maximized in line with the legislation that provides that decision making on local activities that are not “regulatory” in nature *should* be allocated to the local board.
 2. We have been Golden Bay property owners and ratepayers since 2007 and over that period we have grown increasingly concerned over the dysfunctional relationship between TDC and the local community, whereby TDC and its staff seem to both disregard the views and wishes of the local community on a range of issues, and also to resist any move toward meaningful local decision making. Given the high level of local distrust in the TDC, we are concerned, in the event of a local board being created, that TDC may seek to undermine its establishment by seeking to minimise the actual delegations made to the board, and by imposing a punitive level of cost allocations and targeted rates on the ratepayers of Golden Bay. Such actions would also serve to discourage other regions elsewhere in Tasman district from seeking to establish their own local boards.
 3. We are concerned that the final costs are not known at this point in time when the community is being asked to provide feedback on the proposal. The LGC has provided its own estimates of possible costs but it is possible that TDC determined costs may be materially different. While supporting the option of having a local board, we are not prepared to write a blank cheque to do so! We would therefore recommend that the LGC should take an active and ongoing role in reviewing TDC’s costings to ensure that they are fair and reasonable.
 4. Any business proposal should be subject to a cost/benefit analysis but in this case (a) the likely benefits of local decision making are uncertain as the proposal only lists “possible” local board decision making responsibilities rather than those that TDC is willing to delegate, and (b) the costs are too uncertain. Hence our support is “in principle”.

100. In support of the continuation of existing arrangements, I submit as follows:
1. The existing arrangements serve Golden Bay well. Ratepayers benefit from the community board being balanced by the wider Tasman District Council staff. While we may not always agree with council decisions, those decisions are made with wider considerations for Tasman District as a whole.
 2. Bluntly, I seriously question whether five people with sufficient common sense, balance and business acumen would be likely to put themselves forward for the cauldron which would become the lot of a local board. This may seem an arrogant comment, but in support I submit two examples of the effects of the extreme pressure.
 - (a) I was involved in the development of the integrated health facility, which opened here in 2012. Opponents of the scheme, who were a small but very vocal group, caused delays of up to two years and additional costs of somewhere well north of \$300,000. At no point did those opponents provide cogent reasons for their opposition – they seemed to create difficulties almost as a sport.
 - (b) The infamous grandstand issue, which caused so much community angst, was stirred by a similar group. If Heritage New Zealand declines to list a building because it lacks architectural merit (Nelson Mail, November 24, 2016) then it is not worth saving. However, the fight went on despite support in many quarters for demolition. I was told by a staunch grandstand supporter that their battle was not about the building, but “because process had not been followed”. This group became so feral that many people, myself included, simply stayed silent, such was the abuse directed at anyone indicating support for demolition. This was most evident on social media and caused hurt to a number of people. The end result is that the grandstand remains, a derelict and deteriorating building and an ever-increasing eyesore. My point is that a local board would come under immense pressure from small, often single-interest groups. This in turn will lead to few qualified people putting themselves up for election. Ultimately this will lead to a reduction in democracy, not more as is being claimed by proponents.
 3. According to the 2018 census only 3,756 people reside permanently in Golden Bay. This is just 8% of the population of Tasman District. I submit that setting up a local board for such a small population is neither warranted nor fair on the other 92% of the people of Tasman District. The total Golden Bay population, less children, further illustrates my point about a lack of candidates.
 4. In summary, I submit that because of the small population, more power delegated locally is likely to lead to less, not more, democracy for the majority of Golden Bay residents. The current level of service from TDC and our community board is more than adequate and the additional cost of a local board cannot be justified.

101. –

102. I support the retention of existing arrangements, i.e. community boards (not local boards) in Golden Bay and Motueka.
- My main concern in making this submission is that there is not enough evidence that the additional cost of local boards will be outweighed by additional benefits to ratepayers, especially those already struggling to pay bills. The costs would not only hit Golden Bay ratepayers - and be too much for some to cope with, no doubt - but will also hit the rest of us in the District. I do understand that frustration that some people have with local authority processes but cannot see enough benefit in the proposed local board structure to warrant the additional financial burden on households.
- A second concern is the fragmentation of decision making and doubling up of roles that seems to be included in the proposal. We used to have boroughs with their own councils and associated costs. This proposal seems to be taking us back to those days and I don't think that is sensible because the big issues we face now are beyond small communities to address. We need District-wide governance and management with local input, in my view.
- Finally, a less-costly alternative is to work on TDC's ability to really listen to what its communities are saying and to demonstrate that listening in its decisions and communication back to communities.
103. –
104. I strongly support the establishment of a Golden Bay local board.
- Whilst having only resided in Golden Bay for the past seven years, it has been clear that there has been considerable disenchantment in the local community with the performance of TDC with regard to Golden Bay matters for all of this time and clearly for a long time prior. There is a clear desire for improved local democracy and I believe a local board would enhance this. Whilst under the current community board regime, TDC may delegate decision-making responsibilities, however these may be revoked at any time. I understand that with a local board, responsibilities are agreed in the plan process and cannot be simply revoked.
105. –
106. –
107. Greetings, Commission members and many thanks to you all for coming to Collingwood to discuss the process for consideration of a local board for GB. The presentation was clear, fulsome, and gave clear signposts for the future.
- I am a resident of GB and wish to support the implementation of a local board. I'm keen to do this for several reasons:
- 1) Years of dissension and ill-feeling about TDC amongst our community suggest that overall we do not fit together well;
 - 2) A local board will enhance our decision-making power, even if this takes time to establish;
 - 3) The Auckland experience suggests the move towards local boards has been positive; and
 - 4) The young voice of GB tells us it's time for a change and we must look to the future - and I can't argue with that.
- Many thanks for adding this to the pile of submissions, and good luck with your deliberations.
108. John Lee (*See attached*)
109. I strongly support district wide cover of a community level tier of local governance.

110. I don't see any advantages. Also, the cost of a new board is too high. They will be restricted by government legislation.
111. *Also supports local boards in: Lakes-Murchison, Motueka, Moutere-Waimea.*
I feel higher autonomy for the different areas within the district will serve residents of those areas better. They know best what their needs are. Decentralisation, rather than centralised decision making will result in more effective and efficient use of funds and will cut back on bureaucracy.
112. I believe that by establishing a local board in Golden Bay it will give us a greater say in local community matters.
113. The local government reforms of 1989 have been in operation for 30 years. One generation later it is timely to review and revise. Democracy at local level was restricted – not enhanced – by rolling 2 boroughs and 3 counties into one unitary authority. The Golden Bay Community Board does its best under the limited delegations given by TDC. It is not much more than a conduit for Golden Bay residents to put ideas and concerns to the board and the 2 councillors for referral to 'head office' at Richmond. A local board will be better able to provide for the ideals of democracy – local representation and local decision-making by locals for locals. As for the cost – what price democracy?
I strongly support district-wide provision of a community-level tier of meaningful local government starting with a local board for Golden Bay. Other wards ought to have the same opportunity.
114. I am very supportive of a Golden Bay local board. Anything that improves local involvement and decision making will be a big step forward.
Golden Bay is a very special and unique place and our people are likewise unique and I would love that our people should be more involved with local decision making and the running of the Bay. Sadly, it seems that the Tasman council has a history of steamrolling various issues in the Bay without adequate consultation and against the Bay's consensus.
My hope for the future is that there be a local board in the Bay making many of the decisions. Also, it would be fantastic if we could form a more positive and happy relationship with the Tasman council.
115. *Also supports local boards in: Motueka, Murchison.*
I support the option of a Golden Bay local board only if other local boards are created elsewhere in Tasman District. I support other local boards in: Motueka, Murchison.
I was part of the 700 in Golden Bay who initially signed the petition for a local board. After attending your very informative meeting in Takaka, I have changed my mind, and do not see any cost to benefit for Golden Bay as your recommendations currently stand. However, I would strongly support District-wide coverage of a community level tier of local governance. I recognise this would require a complete re-organisation of Tasman District Council, staff and funding allocations.
Failing this becoming a reality, my reasons for now opposing a Local Board are as follows:
1. It would only work if TDC was willing to give the local board meaningful powers. This TDC has made quite clear they do not support or wish to do.
2. As the Commission stated at the public meeting, the existing community board could easily be in charge of the items you had identified as jobs TDC could hand over to a local board.

3. TDC have flagged the cost of a local board as being significantly higher than what the Commission estimated.

4. The very real risk of losing one of our councillors representing us at TDC if we get a local board.

5. The reality that the dysfunctional relationship between the community board and TDC will not magically disappear with a local board. It will still be the same people, the same history, the same tensions

The Commission has obviously spent a lot of time and thought on our situation. I thank you for that and wish you well as you continue seeking a workable and affordable way forward for us as you consider all the submissions.

116. This proposal will basically increase our rates without delivering any increased benefits and could be achieved for no cost by the community board with a better working relationship with the Tasman District Council.

The proposal by the 'Working Group for a Golden Bay Local Board' to the Local Government Commission included a petition with 650 signatures to "...request the Local Government Commission to investigate the possibility of a Golden Bay Local Board, ...". and a residents' survey of 100 persons, probably the same ones who signed the petition. This is no mandate for implementing a significant and costly change. With the publication of the LGC proposal, an exhaustive survey (referendum?) of Golden Bay residents now needs to be undertaken to ascertain the majority opinion on whether to go ahead with that proposal or not.

117. I believe decisions concerning development in G.B. are best left to TDC in the expectation that they will be fair minded. There are so many factions and varying opinions that local decision-making is problematic. We do not need another layer of bureaucracy. Rates in G.B. are already very high; we do not need another 'targeted rate increase' to pay for added report/planning paperwork.

118. I support the retention of the existing community board. The reasons are:

1. There would be very little increase in the power if we had a local board
2. Unknown cost involved
3. Undemocratic as there is no voting involved
4. Possibility that Golden Bay could lose one of the two councillors
5. The relationship of Golden Bay to the TDC will be even worse, we need to build and cooperate not fight.

119. The main reason I am against having a local board is because I cannot understand why it would have to cost a minimum of \$75 per household per year. Are we as Golden Bay at the moment not represented in our Tasman District? Or is it someone doing it without remuneration? Anyway, I do not understand why it has to cost so much extra compared to what it costs now.

120. –

121. Hell no! We'd end up with over enthusiastic board members who'd push for this or that and everything else for GB like the \$4.5 million new recreation centre. A great white elephant which we didn't need. One venue for all indeed! A flawed concept for a spread-out place like Golden Bay. And this local board thing is going to really cost. Of course!

122. It seems a TDC appointed and paid by TDC rep would be quite spineless and only add to our rates. The community board does very well but needs more power.

123. Local decision-making will lack the skills, resources and knowledge available at the local level. The areas available for local board decisions are of relatively limited importance. Given these limitations, the cost of a local board cannot be justified.
124. Motueka township is in urgent need of an upgrade and traffic lights to break traffic flow into 'parcels'. Traffic congestion mostly but not only in summer months with huge influx of tourists makes it challenging for locals to use facilities or cross roads safely. A creation of a centre – town central square much like European model would enhance the township and give it focus (much needed).
125. *Also supports local boards in: Motueka, Lakes-Murchison.*
Current TDC arrangements are too unwieldy and not particularly effective at times for Motueka. Too much focus on Richmond and the Waimea Plains area.
126. *Also supports local boards in: Mahana/Upper Moutere.*
The Waimea dam is becoming a cost blowout (I warned the council in submissions) and ratepayers who will get no benefit from this project and other projects that benefit a few, should not be paying for it. Local issues need local input, not from head office in Richmond who don't understand.
127. Who better to manage a local area than the residents living there. Obviously under the umbrella of TDC to ensure accountability and progress.
128. Change will result in big rate increases at a time when there's job losses and high unemployment. There is little difference between the two options to warrant change.
129. *Also supports local boards in: Moutere-Waimea, Lakes-Murchison.*
I support the devolution of decision-making and responsibility for it to be given to local rural residents who know their districts intimately, their problems, their needs and their wishes to challenge the demands of modern life, particularly with regard to climate change. I am also conscious of the important role rural districts have in the economy of the country and 'locals' should have a more important say in these matters.
130. Golden Bay has been 'divorced' by the council for some time. There are very capable people in the community who would make better managers of its resources and services. Its councillors in the past have had very little influence on local decisions and larger projects. I support the formation of local boards in Motueka and Richmond to challenge staff decisions and recommendations to full council.
131. The cost of this proposal will fall on the shoulders of a limited number of ratepayers. I remember the reason why Golden Bay County Council entered an agreement with the then Waimea council back in the late 1980s. It was becoming harder to keep the maintenance of all the services, roads, port and other amenities. We are part of Tasman District and we must look at the wider picture and work together on the same page.
132. The additional cost to ratepayers either by ward or by district is unacceptable when there is far more important day-to-day stuff to fund. Unfortunately, the word is that the LGC has not done a very good job of explaining the pros and cons of either having a local board or not. That is from several residents of Golden Bay who attended the meetings.
133. Tena koutou, I support this initiative to devolve democratic decision-making to this distinct remote community. Mauri ora
134. –
135. –

136. –
137. –
138. I object to a Golden Bay local board as our rates are too expensive as it and many ratepayers are retired with little money coming in for extra expenses. In the forty years I have lived and paid rates in Motueka we are still waiting on a roundabout at High Street, King Edward Street and Wharf Road intersection, traffic lights suggested in the town on High Street, footpaths upgraded and a bypass. Our rates go up continually and none of these things have been done. Finally, we all have the additional expense of the Lee Valley dam to pay for which will push up rates even higher.
139. Just another operational financial burden for ratepayers in Golden Bay. Another tier of local government. Less bureaucracy is better than more. When Golden Bay was joined with other local bodies we were told that 'bigger was better' and more efficient. Now it seems that may not be true – if we take what the LGC advises.
140. No indication of rates increase – this is an issue i.e. no plans – can't make a decision without all the information. The need for people to step up to stand for a board – I know how hard it is to find good volunteers with limited remuneration. This could be a negative to the process.
141. –
142. *Also supports local boards in: Murchison, Motueka.*
I dislike the current centralised bureaucracy (TDC) which has become a huge empire that burdens ratepayers to a larger extent than some other councils around the nation. While I like the idea of more autonomy for Golden Bay and feel the proposed local board will be well supported by locals, I do not trust that it'll slim down the hungry Richmond monster at all. I fear that the implementation of this board will just add another layer of cost onto our rates as a reluctant TDC administers yet another layer of management.
143. Golden Bay, being a unique and special ward divorced by geographic land called the Takaka Hill from the Tasman District H.Q., is isolated from the greater district. We want, and need control of our ward, and influence by greater democratic autonomy. A local board has more decision-making power than a community board.
144. Thank you for giving your time and consideration to the call for a local board for Golden Bay. I note that since this was announced, the media have reported that Tapawera, Motueka, and Richmond have all indicated that they would like to follow this path also.
Being a person whose family culture supports empowerment for local communities. I was initially in favour of this proposal, but further reflection has resulted in a change of view. It is clear from issues arising within the Tasman DC area over the past six years that communities are feeling bulldozed, ignored, and powerless in the face of TDC decisions. Examples are the grandstand debacle in Golden Bay, the Waimea dam, river works/flood control, land development, and many more. In almost all cases, communication has been the core issue. The current annual plan process further disengages the community, as we are unable to eyeball the receiver, and have no way of knowing if councillors have heard us or understand the issues. We certainly have no way of hearing or responding to any staff counter-comment, which makes the process feel remote and a waste of time.

If TDC was communicating well with the communities and showing they were listening/understanding, this proposal would not be necessary. Any return to self-governing through local boards encourages parochialism, without the helicopter view, and is costly; money better spent on uniting the Tasman district for the betterment of all of us. For this reason, I ask you to please reject the proposal, but with strong recommendations to TDC about communication, as the current methods are clearly not working for elements of the community.

145. Tasman District Council (*See attached*)

146. Motueka Community Board (*See attached*)

147. –

148. *Also supports local boards in: Mapua, Moutere, Motueka, Richmond.*

Clearly there needs to be local knowledge at the governance level of the regional council. There is no assurance under current governance structure that this will occur.

149. –

150. –

151. I cannot understand why the council is considering another level of bureaucracy that is going to cost the ratepayers x number of dollars per year for what? Unless the council is not doing their elected duty of improving Tasman District infrastructure e.g. roads/water. This board is only going to rubber stamp what the council is doing. If the council has extra money they must pay off debt and not waste more money on more committees.

152. In the current economic situation, I don't believe the increase in rates is worth it to go ahead with a local board. They will still have to report to the council. More information is required as to what benefits/advantages the local board would have over a community board.

153. Unnecessary.

154. Having lived in Collingwood for 4.5 years now, I relocated after a 6-year fight with bureaucracy to get my earthquake damaged home repaired to no avail. I have read the LGC's booklet on the option of a Golden Bay Local Board along with attending the meeting held in Collingwood. I have found both forms of information grossly lacking in the crucial facts required for the average person to make an informed decision in this submission. Therefore, I have done as much homework as possible before making my decision, something I believe most people won't do. The booklet addresses the option for a local board with "what MIGHT a local board be Responsible For, Cost, Funded etc". The LGC meeting did not provide any further definitive information or answers to the numerous questions being put to representatives.

The Golden Bay region is not a high-income earner region and any further costs at a time when people have lost jobs through Covid-19 will not be welcomed. I myself fall into this category from earthquake injuries seeing me unable to work again and I do not wish to lose this home from an inability to pay bills. The costings of \$149.09 provided by LGC per rateable title has been severely underestimated, whereas TDC have indicated the costing to be between \$418.00 - \$420.00 per rateable property and this may well increase annually. Something I most certainly cannot afford to pay for a service that is already being provided at no extra cost. Having a local board may well disadvantage Golden Bay by way of representation on the council being reduced to

one councillor. I do not believe a local board will change the dynamics of the community to become more involved in local decision-making. In conclusion, many of the powers and functions that could possibly be allocated to a local board are already delegated to the community board at no extra cost to ratepayers. I do not support the option of a local board.

155. –

156. I support the retention of the existing community board in Golden Bay. The reason I do not wish to have a local board is that I can see no material advantage i.e. the proposed decision-making responsibilities do not outweigh the proposed additional costs. A culture change of cooperation rather than confrontation on the part of Tasman District Council staff would go a long way to improving decision-making for our community.

157. I support the establishment of a local board for the Golden Bay area. I have lived in Collingwood since February 2018, but I have visited Golden Bay frequently over the last 60 years, first as a child and then as an adult. I believe that the needs of Golden Bay residents will be better met by a local board than by the present community board.

1) The Golden Bay area is an unusually discrete geographical area, and it has many differences from the rest of the Tasman District.

2) There is a very strong feeling of community among the people who live in Golden Bay. I have seen numerous examples of the strength of this bond during my two years here.

3) This feeling of community has often manifested itself in opposition to the actions and intentions of the Tasman District Council. Two recent examples would be the long battle for the retention of the historic grandstand at the Takaka Showground and the vigorous opposition to the Lee Valley dam from many people in Golden Bay.

4) While I have experienced friendly and helpful service from front line staff of Tasman District Council, I have a strong sense that senior staff view Golden Bay as a headache.

Golden Bay has a long history of being managed by an independent local authority (Collingwood County 1877 – 1903; Collingwood County and Takaka County 1904 – 1955; Golden Bay County 1956 – 1988).

The relatively short period (1989 – 2020) being managed by Tasman District Council has not been a happy one, and a local board for Golden Bay could be a first step towards a more appropriate local government model for Golden Bay. I would prefer to see a local board set up in Golden Bay only at this time.

158. We are a unique community with initiatives and values not compatible with the current Tasman District Council.

159. –

160. *Also supports local boards in: Motueka, Richmond, Murchison.*

With the current district council system individuals and community bodies find it difficult to promote local concerns and aspirations for their communities. There is only a token involvement by council in seeking local community feelings towards their particular needs and situations. Few people ever feel their major concerns are ever properly considered by the elected council.

Having a stronger body such as the proposed local board, which could be more easily approached and consulted, may bring better results for the local residents and commercial interests.

My area, Motueka, has had serious main highway problems for many years, yet various “reports and consultations” have brought absolutely no action from council. Community wishes appear to have been ignored. Give us a local board to help.

161. The benefits are not in any way worth the additional costs. Local residents will not get value for money for the significant additional costs and charges on them. All this provides is ‘oversights’ rather than full devolved control of local services. In short, not worth the considerable additional costs.
162. I do not support a local board for Golden Bay or other areas of Tasman District.
163. –
164. I feel it would be a backward step for our community to change to a local board. We are fairly treated with our TDC as a lot of our amenities are paid for using rates from the whole TDC district as well as supporting necessary things ‘over the hill’. I also think there will be many hidden costs that will emerge in the near future!
165. I think rather than fragment the representation into small localised groups, the focus should be on amalgamation of councils focused on long term national interest. Surely these small boards will not have the same expertise, risk manipulation and self-interest able to gain a place on the board. I am concerned by the lack of Māori representation proposed and given the present almost total absence of power sharing or even a voice in the Tasman Region the direction should be for change with this at the forefront.
166. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere.*
I feel having a voice and opinion around direction for now and future generations is essential. I feel a group of councillors are not always entitled to make the best decisions for all.
167. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Moutere, Motueka.*
Having a voice and making council accountable for decisions – particularly around Richmond urban development, allow more movement and safe space, and deter from congested streets, allow for more sustainable housing options.
168. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond.*
Better representation and understanding of local priorities.
169. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere.*
I favour the devolution of decision-making power for local issues.
170. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere.*
More representation and advocacy of broader local opinion.
171. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere.*
Better access for local communities to communicate their wishes to council and hold council accountable.
172. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond.*
Citizens having a say through a local board means the council will better reflect the views of these citizens and their interests. To me this is a no-brainer.
173. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond.*
More community input into local council.

174. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka.*
Localised decision-making.
175. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond.*
We need better representation and more responsive local government.
176. *Also supports local boards in: Moutere-Waimea, Richmond.*
More accountability and responsive local government.
177. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond.*
Uphold bylaws – ‘cats and dogs’
178. *Also supports local boards in: Motueka, Richmond.*
I would like more involvement of the public in decision-making in areas where they are affected and accountability from local councils.
179. *Also supports local boards in: Moutere, Motueka, Richmond.*
Residents will have a stronger voice in local decisions.
180. Create a more democratic and locally orientated government and decision process.
181. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Moutere, Motueka.*
In many cases, good (if not great) policy exists locally, however the accountability for its implementation is lacking. This especially applies to action on climate change and environmental issues. Increased representation and governmental power will act to bring a more representative and fresh set of ideas and vision points to the council table.
182. *Also supports local boards in: Motueka.*
Support Māori wards at a local level.
183. *Also supports local boards in: Motueka, Richmond, Moutere.*
184. *Also supports local boards in: all Tasman.*
Support Māori wards
185. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere.*
186. *Also supports local boards in: all of Tasman.*
I support establishment of Māori wards
187. *Also supports local boards in: Motueka, Richmond, Moutere.*
Better local decision-making.
188. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka.*
It is time. Representation urgently needed. Protect and slow down damage to environment.
189. *Also supports local boards in: Motueka, Moutere.*
I support the Māori voice at local levels.
190. *Also supports local boards in: Moutere, Richmond, Motueka.*
More voice
191. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere.*
Better democracy, more local decision-making.
192. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere.*
More local decision-making power. Better democracy.
193. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Upper Moutere, Motueka.*
More voice to the local people.

194. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere.*
Housing. We need more housing.
195. –
196. *Also supports local boards in: Motueka, Richmond, Moutere.*
197. *Also supports local boards in: Motueka, Moutere, Richmond.*
I support Māori wards at a local level.
198. *Also supports local boards in: all of Tasman.*
I support the establishment of Māori wards.
199. *Also supports local boards in: Moutere, Richmond, Motueka.*
Better representation.
200. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Moutere, Motueka.*
Local direction making for local people.
201. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere.*
Local government is more efficient when it directly represents the area it is in!
Improved accountability for the representatives. Improved diversity in representation
– to truly reflect the people of the area – especially those that are not so good at representing themselves!
202. *Also supports local boards in: Moutere, Richmond, Motueka.*
Better democracy
203. –
204. *Also supports local boards in: Motueka, Richmond, Moutere.*
More local choice
205. *Also supports local boards in: Motueka, Richmond, Moutere.*
More local choice
206. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka*
207. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere*
208. *Also supports local boards in: all Tasman*
I support establishment of Māori wards
209. *Also supports local boards in: all Tasman*
In favour of establishment of Māori wards
210. *Also supports local boards in: Motueka, Richmond.*
More power to local people
211. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere.*
We support Māori wards at a local level
212. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka.*
More say for people
213. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere.*
More responsive and accountable local representation
214. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Upper Moutere, Motueka*
215. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka.*
216. *Also supports local boards in: Motueka, Moutere, Richmond.*
Based on my negative experience with fast track, unresponsive council. I think we need better representation.

217. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Moutere, Motueka.*
More responsive local government
218. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Moutere, Motueka.*
I/we want a more accountable and responsive local government.
219. *Also supports local boards in: Motueka, Moutere.*
Local people are controlled by a small group from a single sector.
220. *Also supports local boards in: Motueka, Richmond.*
More power to local people.
221. *Also supports local boards in: all wards.*
I demand the creation of a Maori ward to ensure Māori representation at the local governing level.
222. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere.*
We need more local input and opportunity to be part of decisions
223. *Also supports local boards in: Motueka, Richmond, Upper Moutere.*
We support Māori ward
224. *Also supports local boards in: Motueka, Richmond.*
We support Māori ward at a local level.
225. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere.*
I support.
226. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere.*
We support Māori wards at a local level.
227. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Upper Moutere.*
Support a Māori ward.
228. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka.*
More local input.
229. *Also supports local boards in: Motueka, Richmond.*
More input by locals.
230. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Moutere, Motueka.*
More power to the local people.
231. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka.*
We need competent leaders making fair and just calls for the betterment of our people and environment!
232. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Upper Moutere.*
More power to local people.
233. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Upper Moutere.*
More power to local people.
234. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Upper Moutere.*
More power to local people.
235. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Upper Moutere, Motueka.*
More power to local people.
236. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Upper Moutere, Motueka.*
More power to local people.
237. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Upper Moutere, Motueka.*
More power to local people.

238. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere.*
We support Māori wards.
239. *Also supports local boards in: Motueka, Richmond, Upper Moutere.*
So we can have more satisfactory voices.
240. *Also supports local boards in: all wards.*
241. I support the establishment of Māori wards.
242. *Also supports local boards in: all wards.*
Support Māori wards.
243. *Also supports local boards in all wards.*
I support the establishment of local boards as a way to give our community a stronger voice at a local level. I also demand the creation of Māori ward to ensure Māori representation at a local governance level.
244. *Also supports local boards in: Motueka.*
Māori wards – if we are committed to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi – then yes of course.
245. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka.*
We need Māori wards in Tasman and Golden Bay districts as well!!!
246. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka.*
247. *Also supports local boards in: Motueka, Richmond.*
248. *Also supports local boards in: Motueka, Richmond*
249. More and fairer representation in local government to improve air/water/soil quality, to improve our urbanisation sprawl, improve Pupu springs also, too many nitrates. A local board in Golden Bay will work towards this goal!
250. *Also supports local boards in: any area that hasn't one.*
In my view, a local board would have a better understanding of the needs of a community that its members are living in rather than living outside it.
251. *Also supports local boards in: Motueka, Richmond, Moutere.*
I think local boards are essential to ensure that decisions are made by and for the community. This will be a big improvement with local representation involved with the decision-making.
252. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere.*
I am particularly concerned about plans which could allow nitrates into the Pupu springs – a national treasure. A Golden Bay local board can be expected to take steps to prevent such an outcome.
253. *Also supports local boards in: Motueka, Richmond, Moutere.*
The Golden Bay local board would hopefully be able to influence the policy regarding maintaining the quality of Pupu springs. The more local representation the better. Māori representation is equally important.
254. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere.*
We need a better democracy that represents the local people.
255. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere.*
256. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere.*
To have more input from people living in the area, more accountability from Tasman District Council.

257. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Upper Moutere, Motueka.*
More information
258. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere.*
Live in Nelson but have grave concern about health of Waikoropupu Springs and its long-term survival. Democracies work better if local people have more say in what they wish for this local area. Centralised control has not worked e.g. collapse of Waikoropupu springs eco-system.
259. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere.*
I live in Nelson but believe the Waikoropupu springs are an international treasure. I am writing this because I believe that local boards would better protect precious resources such as Waikoropupu springs and other fresh water resources.
260. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere.*
There needs to be more Māori representation either on community boards or in Māori wards. Democracies work better if local people have more direct say in what happens to their local area. In particular I want to support more local involvement in relation to Waikoropupu valley and springs.
261. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere.*
I live in Nelson but support a local board in Golden Bay and other districts. I work in Richmond.
262. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka.*
I support the establishment of local boards to protect national treasures such as Waikoropupu springs.
263. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere.*
I am writing this to support the establishment of local boards. I think this is important because the Waikoropupu springs are a national treasure and a truly precious resource to be maintained in its natural state. Golden Bay will do a better job than TDC.
264. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere.*
Prevent collapse of Waikoropupu springs which are a national treasure. TDC has not done a good job taking care of them.
265. Local boards should make for more autonomy and priorities specific to our area. I think it will be important with climate emergency and the coming crisis that we can become more cohesive and self-reliant as a community.
266. I don't approve of the extra costs per house in the rates. I think the existing arrangement is working well.
267. I do not support this proposal as it is a costly addition for ratepayers who already heavily subsidise Golden Bay activities and infrastructure costs now. If the majority of Golden Bay ratepayers support this proposal and are prepared to pay all costs associated with this, then let them have it. Don't burden the rest of the district with extra costs. This proposal does not give the proposed board any more power than the existing community board.
If the board in its wisdom goes ahead with this costly proposal, I request that as the Golden Bay Ward does not fit the criteria for 2 councillors that, as you did in the Lakes-Murchison Ward several years ago, that you reduce that to one. I also request under the Official Information Act the total costs of this exercise and how these costs are funded.

268. Should this happen? Absobloodylutely

Does the LGC's suggested structure go far enough? Probably not

Would I live with a slightly watered-down prototype local board so we could have the concept introduced here, test-driven here and improved later? Yes

Rationale

The LGC has previously identified Golden Bay as a distinct community of interest. In 2006-7 the Commission came to town to hear why Golden Bay deserved to have more councillors than the Tasman District Council thought was necessary and fair. Council wanted to use the crude population/ratio equation but the LGC were convinced otherwise. As part of their deliberations at that time, the LGC suggested to TDC that increased delegations to the existing Golden Bay Community Board would be prudent and strategic. Those delegations have not eventuated to any meaningful extent. Murmurings from TDC at this late stage about potential delegations are very unconvincing.

Establishing a local board here is not an anti-TDC move in my view. It is a pro-Golden Bay move. Starting at a fairly trivial level (but not limiting itself there), it shifts the decision-making process closer to the community in which those decisions take effect. It will increase the engagement of Golden Bay voters in the democratic process. It will also attract more people to stand for election. I know of highly-engaged and well-qualified people who have dismissed the idea of standing for the community board because of the narrowness of its jurisdiction.

Being involved in formulating the Bay's three-year plan is more likely to attract these people to stand. The increased powers of the local board will also invite the scrutiny of the people who want to influence that planning process. I envisage a highly-skilled group of Golden Bay local board members being held to account by highly-engaged electors. What a brilliant expression of local democracy. And how different from the status quo.

I do not mean to criticise the people I have seen operating as community board members in the last 20 years. I have admired their tenacity and endurance in the face of the absence of delegated powers and limited community buy-in.

In 2017 Council commissioned researcher Amy Shattock to produce a report into the relationship between itself and Golden Bay and how that might be improved. All the council's ratepayers paid for that; it did not come out of some closed account named 'democracy in Golden Bay'. The results were not encouraging – either for TDC or for Golden Bay, especially given the lack of discernible action that ensued.

The Golden Bay Local Board will be the first in Aotearoa outside an externally-driven, district-wide and urban process. This is the time for bold action by the LGC and bold reaction by the Golden Bay community. Giving the new board real teeth and increased jurisdiction (aerodrome, port, camping grounds) would be bold.

Ngā mihi mahana ki a koutou

269. John Hutton (*See attached*)

270. I am submitting on the option to establish a Golden Bay Local Board. I am a Golden Bay resident and ratepayer.

Of the three options, I support the retention of existing arrangements i.e. community boards (not local boards) in Golden Bay and Motueka.

My reasons for this are as follows:

1. The list of responsibilities suggested for the proposed Golden Bay Local Board do not make its establishment worthwhile. I do not believe the Golden Bay community would

benefit significantly from the establishment of a local board to manage facilities such as the Takaka library, cemeteries, playgrounds and public toilets.

2. Management of facilities such as these are largely straightforward and there is no need for a separate bureaucracy.

3. Facilities, particularly such as the library, can probably provide a better level of service to the Golden Bay community by being integrated in a district- wide management structure. I see no advantage in establishing a separate management structure for Golden Bay.

4. The cost of establishing and maintaining the local board and associated management structure is unknown but will be in the form of a targeted rate on the Golden Bay ratepayers. The discussion and setting of this targeted rate is likely to be an ongoing source of friction between the Golden Bay community and TDC.

5. Therefore the establishment of a local board to manage the functions outlined in the options paper is likely to result in the Golden Bay community receiving a similar level of service as currently provided by TDC but at a greater cost to Golden Bay ratepayers.

6. To make a local board an attractive option a far greater range of responsibilities would need to be delegated to a Golden Bay Community Board.

271. –

272. –

273. I have been resident in Golden Bay for over 20 years and have increasingly observed the wishes of the majority of the people living here being ignored by Tasman District Council.

We are geographically remote from Richmond and often hold different views, desires, and need for our community.

I have friends and neighbours who have either been ignored or treated unfairly by TDC and it seems this is often accompanied by extravagant costs as well.

I am totally prepared and welcome an additional rate to be able to increase the level of governance here in Golden Bay.

274. We need local people making decisions as they truly represent and are accountable to the people of Golden Bay.

275. We are geographically isolated from Richmond and need a local elected body of residents who really have our best interests at heart. I and many of the locals feel neglected or ignored by TDC. Thank you!

276. I do not support local boards - the efficiency of larger organisations would be lost.

277. *SUBMISSION WITHDRAWN*

278. *Also supports local boards in: Moutere-Waimea, Lakes-Murchison.*

I believe a local board will deliver better value for money in Golden Bay & Lakes-Murchison Wards in particular. Golden Bay could be a test case in the Tasman District. Other wards could then assess whether it would benefit theirs by devolving some local decision-making & funding to the local level. Although the community association to which I belong has an excellent relationship with TDC it nevertheless concerns me that all decision-making lies within a tiny urban area remote from the district it governs in a conurbation with Nelson. I assume a high proportion of TDC staff live as well as work in or very close to Richmond.

It's only natural that plans & regulations etc are developed by people who are strongly influenced by urban & suburban needs. They can be entirely suitable to urban & suburban environments, but quite inappropriate in rural areas. This can result in unnecessary expense for council and or require developers to spend on irrelevant features instead of more appropriate rural-style enhancements. A classic example is TRMP resource consent requirements in Rural 3 housing developments for footpaths. They are essential in urban & many suburban areas but a complete waste in low density rural developments. They are very rarely if ever used, visually out of place & add to emissions (concrete etc production). Urban based planners are no more qualified to determine what is needed in a rural environment than rural planners deciding what's important in the urban setting.

Encouraging localised decisions & funding will surely deliver better value for money both locally & across a region. Additional cost is emphasised as a disadvantage of local boards, but I feel certain that a sizeable proportion of centralised costs could be reduced if decisions etc are devolved. Increased engagement with local communities will naturally lead to better outcomes & more positive attitudes.

- 279.
1. This proposal will add another level of bureaucracy on top of the existing system (TDC).
 2. Those pushing for this change all have a current or past grievance with TDC so therefore their objectivity is suspect.
 3. There is no guarantee that those elected will have the necessary qualifications to better administer the area than the existing Council.
 4. Additional cost of setting up such a board including salaries.
 5. There are not sufficient ratepayers in the Golden Bay area to support the infrastructural requirements to maintain the parks and reserves, community facilities, community relations, public health and safety, transport and roading, advocating on behalf of the community for numerous facilities and housing etc in the Bay, collaborative projects with existing council (TDC), public health and safety, coastal structures, solid waste and parks and reserves financial contributions.
 6. Rates are too high now and this proposed local board will cause rates to increase to meet the demand to fulfil the requirements which will be placed on the local board.
 7. Previous county council for Golden Bay closed down because they could not support or they did not have the finance or expertise, machinery and money to make the district work effectively.
 8. This board would cause duplication of manpower and resources.
 9. All that is needed here is for the current council (TDC) to become more aware and take greater responsibility for the needs of Golden Bay and other outlying areas.
 10. The establishment of a local board would create a situation where two bodies are doing the same things and this could cause confusion on whose responsible for what.
 11. The whole community needs to vote on this at the next local body elections - not by submissions as only those who support it will contribute and the silent majority will not bother.
 12. This is a dead duck - scrap it.

280. I hope that, before any change is made to the current governing structure of Golden Bay, that members of the Golden Bay community are first given an opportunity to vote on the proposed change.
- In my roles that bring me into contact with members of the Golden Bay community, I have heard from many that they are concerned that a local board would bring an additional layer of bureaucracy and associated costs without any tangible benefit in terms of local control. Many of these individuals do not feel that they have a 'submission' to make, but they still do have a view, and so, in the event that you believe it best to provide Golden Bay with a local board, I would encourage you to first provide a local referendum so that all members of the community have a say.
281. 1. This proposal will add another level of bureaucracy on top of the existing system.
 2. Those supporting this change all appear to have current or past grievance with TDC, so their objectivity is suspect.
 3. If these people are the brainwaves of the opposition to the Waimea dam and 'save the grandstand' at a price of \$930,000 and to be used half full for three hours a day a year, it is a straight out nonsense. If this is an example of what a local board would bring, it would hold up progress of our community, e.g. developing health services in the Bay.
 4. Addition costs to our rates.
 5. There are not sufficient ratepayers in the Golden Bay area to support the infrastructural requirements for the Bay.
 6. Rates are too high now.
 7. Previous county council for Golden Bay closed down because they could not support or did not have the finance or expertise, machinery and money to make the district work effectively.
 8. The whole community needs to vote on this at the next local body election.
282. Provincial Executive of Golden Bay Rural Women (*See attached*)
283. I strongly support the choice of a local board for Golden Board.
- In my 24 years in G.B. I have found that local residents have little real input into, or control of, our local affairs. The ward representatives do not truly represent our interests; rather, they dance to the tune of the Richmond worldview, often to the detriment of our expressed wishes. We pay for Tasman wide (mostly Richmond wide) benefits but get more costs than value. I also think that other Tasman districts should have the democratic opportunity to make their own choices.
284. The physical isolation of Golden Bay and our unique community supports the formation of a local board so our interests and our values and our culture can better be advocated for within the TDC processes.
285. Judith Rothstein (*See attached*)
286. *Also supports local boards in: Lakes-Murchison*
- I have lived on and off in Golden Bay since 1971. I support the option of a Golden Bay local board and a local board or boards elsewhere in Tasman District. The other areas I would also support is the Lakes Murchison area.
- Golden Bay is reasonably isolated and has unique challenges which requires locals to have more direct decision-making powers. The sudden and at times over whelming number of visitors descending on the bay requires an agile and informed board to respond to the growing social and environmental challenges. Golden Bay is a sort after living destination. Many of the residents now are highly educated with vast technical and social development expertise. These would be better utilized by a local board.

The Lakes Murchison area is extensive with minimal representation. It has similar challenges to Golden Bay and needs more local representation. This area is developing rapidly and requires informed local input.

287. Golden Bay has a different culture to that of Richmond. Urban versus rural. Well-intentioned TDC staff do not always understand our situation and needs. They are often ignorant of our geography.
- To give a personal example, I own a 400m hectare property on Barron's Flat, which is accessed by a 15km road from Upper Takaka. Although established by the old Golden Bay council, this road does not have an official TDC name because "if it was named they would have to maintain it" (as the TDC engineer told us). But TDC needed a name because every property has to be on a "street"! They chose to call it "Cobb Valley Road" because they were ignorant of the Baron's Flat region and thought it had to be somewhere in the vicinity of the Cobb Dam. In actual fact the real Cobb Valley Road is 700 metres below our road and is separated by a river.
- But our "street" address of "135 Cobb Valley Road" persists in official records, to the confusion of the police and others. This is a trivial example, but when multiplied by many others, it illustrates my point about a lack of understanding.
- Although – for now – the local board option would not give us many tangible benefits, over the longer term it could be useful. The extra cost is trivial.
288. Suggest: 3 x 3yr phased introduction, gradual transfer of governance and budget.
289. My concerns over any future LB/CB decision are directed at:
- The need for GB to have a clear standalone vision statement/plan for the future that is supported by an affordable 3-year resourced action plan which delegates specific and measurable initiatives that will benefit the GB community
 - The LGC defines specific LB outcomes/expectations that can be measured and that clear accountability processes are stipulated
 - A plan is put in place for a more effective programme of proactive engagement leading to an improved relationship between GB and TDC
 - TDC focus on 'costs' is matched by an independent consultant report on the benefits/intangibles.
290. I am a ratepayer and farm owner in Golden Bay. I live at Upper Takaka. I support the retention of existing community board in Golden Bay.
- I do not support the setting up of local boards in the Tasman District Council area. I think it is the addition of further unnecessary bureaucracy. The current structure with community boards allows the minorities to have their say and we can all contact our local councillors when necessary. The projected costs are a complete waste of money and would mean that we get to pay a significant amount of money each year for little benefit. I also object to the fact that as a large land-owning entity, I will be unfairly burdened with costs for an entity that will not add any value to my business.
291. –
292. I support the retention of existing arrangements in Golden Bay and Motueka. We own a property in Golden Bay and already pay enough in rates and DO NOT support the option of a local board. It will provide no additional benefit than the current system provides BUT will add significant additional charges. The current system works well with the community board looking after the interests of Golden Bay. Additional levels of management create extra costs and the only way to fund is to charge everybody more which no one wants.

293. –

294. Dr Roland Toder (*See attached*) Also supports local boards in: Motueka, Richmond, Mapua, Murchison

295. TDC has seemed unwilling to delegate even the small amount of decision-making authority to the current community board, so in order to have a reasonable democratic representation for our district, we need to be given more independence. I am concerned that, given TDC's track record over the years and their strong opposition to this proposal, that they will attempt to sabotage a local board by failing to provide adequate support and by general obstructiveness. It will be important for the Commission to make sure that does not happen. Better still, TDC could actively work to improve their relations with Golden Bay and demonstrate a willingness to understand and respect our unique needs. Overall, Golden Bay needs to be able to make its own determinations about the things that affect the residents here.

296. John & Carolyn McLellan (*See attached*)

297. You are using a sledgehammer to solve an issue that is as simple as a breakdown in communication. Get people talking, don't create another level of bureaucrats/politicians. Local Govt is complicated enough.

A local board in Golden Bay – seriously? There are so many councils in New Zealand that need to be amalgamated and you decide to spend money on this?!

Govt money needs to be spent in a prudent manner. Look at the ridiculous situation of councils in the Wairarapa and you focus on a few squeaky wheels in the Golden Bay. Goodness knows what precedent you set if this goes through. And you will pat yourself on the back and call it democracy.

What have you guys actually done since the Auckland amalgamation? Stuff around in Wellington for a while and achieve nothing except more work for local council staff. For goodness sake do something worthwhile and get that across the line. I imagine it was too hard.

16 pages and you leave page 3 half blank, page 5 could have fitted so much more – that is criminal. This could have been done in 8 pages if someone had tried. An 'in brief' section of 2 pages in a 16-page document!! Good lord have you no regard for how much you spend on this. I am appalled.

I would like to request more information as instructed in the document or lodge an OIA:

- What did the brochure cost, re printing, postage and mocking this up with a printing company? itemised by category please
- What contractors and/or consultants were used, company name, for how long and what each cost?
- What was the overall budget for this work? By year? I assume you would have this as a project so could pull this from your general ledger? What was the spend against the project budget to 30 June 2020?
- What were the internal staff costs spent on this project?
- How many staff hours does this represent?
- Please split this by job title.
- I would like to see a breakdown of how the \$75 targeted rate was calculated?
- How much was spent on staff travelling to the Tasman District, accommodation, travel, taxis? What they did on each trip?

- It talks of a \$190k average for indirect costs. Can this be broken down by year and itemised.
298. *Also supports local boards in: Motueka, Lakes, Richmond*
Our area is large and consists of the urban area closely associated with Nelson City where TDC headquarters are currently located. Other areas of the Tasman District are largely rural or centred around their local town. Golden Bay is isolated from the rest of the district by the Takaka Hill. It's community centres around the two townships and river valleys. This community has a rich history and pride in its area. Currently decisions are made in Richmond, many of which do not reflect the wishes of the Golden Bay community. We need more say in what happens in the Bay. The Nelson Lakes area is also very distinct from the rest of the region. It makes sense that we make decisions locally while still being under the umbrella of the Tasman District. Richmond urban area including Brightwater, Wakefield and Mapua have their own set of needs which are also vastly different from the isolated rural areas. Motueka is a distinct community and also needs to be making its own decisions. Currently there is a lot of ill-feeling towards the Tasman District Council and this needs to be changed because it's counterproductive. Allowing local areas to make their own decisions will bring the district together in harmony.
299. I do not wish to support probable additional rates to administer a local board for a small population of the Tasman District so that they feel they may be better represented as a community. The only way I would support this is if the Golden Bay community fully funded this local board from their own rates.
300. *Also supports local boards: best for people of that area to decide across the district*
There are more advantages than disadvantages. TDC community boards came in 1989 over that time it has been proved that in Golden Bay a better structure is required. Continual conflicts between community and TDC costing thousands in court costs. This is why Golden Bay enlisted input from LGC. To move now to a local board is a coming of age and a maturity of the system. I strongly support district-wide coverage of a community-level tier of governance.
301. –
302. I don't support local boards in Golden Bay or other communities of Tasman district. I believe change is needed to make governance of Tasman District more effective but local boards will be expensive and are not necessary.
My preference would be for all wards in Tasman District to have a community board, creating a culture of council working with the boards and using them to get effective consultation. Community boards should be supported by a dedicated staff member who is responsible for a lot of what the council does in the ward, being the person on the ground who is the eyes and ears for Richmond and cuts out a lot of the of inefficiency of running projects from a distance and the travel involved.
303. Philip Gaffney (*See attached*)
304. The construction of the Waimea dam was opposed by 83% of Golden Bay residents but rates have increased to cover its costs with absolutely no benefit to Golden Bay ratepayers. We need change and not to be controlled by an office two hours' drive away.
305. *Also supports local boards in: Motueka*
I strongly support district-wide coverage of a community level tier of local governance.

306. *Also supports local boards in: Motueka, Lakes-Murchison*
 A local board is needed to improve the current situation where the TDC make decisions opposed by many in Golden Bay e.g. the dam, the grandstand, Pakawau rock wall and many others. The costs seem exaggerated by TDC. Roles of the board need to be more extensive and maybe rolled out in two phases.
307. I feel that we have a reasonably good system in place now, but it is far from ideal. Changing to a local board system will force creative thinking and a "reinvention" of some governance mechanisms. A change may also enthuse residents/ratepayers to take a renewed interest in the governance of our region. While there will be costs changing the system and may be some increased costs to maintain it, these may be offset by more appropriate decision-making in the early stages of projects, thus, avoidance of costs correcting errors, which seem to occur regularly these days. Governance is always an evolving cultural entity. Recognition that ongoing change is a necessity, rather than a hinderance, is an indication of a healthy society.
308. I am not in favour of a local board for Golden Bay. I would like to retain the present board. Through the suggested development of a local board for Golden Bay I see no advantage. The possibility of our rates to be raised are obvious to enable 5 extra councillors to travel to meetings, paying for overnight stays, petrol costs, etc. The community board of Golden Bay has been and will be given more delegated powers and this will ensure more local decisions are made by locals. Without a true cost benefit analysis, we do not have enough details to make an informed decision. We are also trying to eliminate the impact on the environment and this will not happen with 5 extra board members.
309. Local decisions, from locals for locals!
310. –
311. I cannot justify the additional costs involved plus this will only increase in future.
312. There is no doubt in my mind that the community of Golden Bay would be better served by a local board with wider powers than that of the current community board. The cost of \$75 per year increase in rates works out to the equivalent of less than one cup of coffee per fortnight at one of our cafes, and I'm well prepared to pay this if it means greater self-determination. The issues affecting the residents here are often quite different to those in Richmond e.g. freedom camping, protecting the catchment of the Waikoropupu springs, the grandstand etc.
313. *Also supports local boards in: Motueka, Moutere-Waimea, Lakes-Murchison, Richmond*
 Each ward needs to decide whether they want to request a local board. More local decision-making in view of the fact that Golden Bay is a rural area with a scattered population and different needs from much of the rest of Tasman District because of its remoteness.
- Two ward councillors must remain
 - Chairperson of board to be elected by the local board
 - One full-time experienced local government adviser must live in Golden Bay and not be connected to Tasman District Council
 - Funding: needs to be fairness in apportioning costs between local board and indirect costs of council.

It concerns me that Tasman District Council has been so vocal about their opposition to a local board. Local Government Commission needs to be aware of the views of Tasman District Council (see above) and make sure that costs are allocated fairly. Governing body of council shares with local board not dictates. Before a final decision is made, we need to be given more details of costs involved, funding responsibilities.

314. –

315. –

316. I do not support a local board change as I do not think it would be a good change. The cost would be exorbitant for the ratepayers who are mostly low-income and retired people who live here. I don't think having a local board would be good value for money. I think the two councillors and community board do a good job.

317. Although there seems to be a sense of not being listened to by TDC and of being an outpost remote from decision-making processes, the convoluted bureaucracy and cost would not be justified. I support Andy Clark's notion of 'district-wide coverage of a community-level tier of local governance'.

318. –

319. I do not support the option of a Golden Bay local board. Golden Bay already has representation within TDC which should be adequate. If the system isn't working effectively then this should be addressed rather than spending huge amounts of money (coming from rates out of the area) creating a new system.

320. This sounds like an expensive option to cover up more of TDC's incompetence. They should focus on doing their jobs and providing better value for all ratepayers by listening to them and not pursuing their own loss-making vanity projects that the majority receive no benefit from and don't want.

321. I strongly oppose a Golden Bay local board because the benefits of change are little compared to the high rate increase. We already have TDC taking adequate care of the majority of facilities on pages 2 & 3 of the data sent to us.

Golden Bay is generally a low-income area with the current rates being a high proportion of income and I know of some on benefits who are extremely worried that this proposal be implemented. As a Rural Women NZ member and a local church member we find the local food bank is much in need and, thanks to other Golden Bay people for their generosity, help those in need with food.

I feel Golden Bay ratepayers have had too short a period to respond and a vote would surely be fairer. Our local Weekly News and Nelson Mail have had articles predicting a much higher cost than on this submission form.

I am happy with our community board and council members as is.

322. I support this opportunity to have much greater local input into local decisions. Golden Bay does have a special character and much talent living here, who would be excellent at progressing and caring for our small vibrant and diverse community. Thank you for all the work that has gone into producing this discussion document. I believe a slightly higher rates bill would be worth decisions being made well and in line with community aspirations and priorities/understandings. For example, a local board would almost certainly have handled the showground grandstand issue so much better than TDC has – saving much money, energy and angst on both sides.

323. If Tasman District Council would correctly carry out its democratic role in assessing and acting upon the wishes of the residents of the communities, there would be no need for separate local boards.

324. Feel the costs will far outweigh any benefits.
325. Sara Chapman (*See attached*)
326. We have a positive relationship with the current board. GBSRF represents a large group of sport and recreation clubs and groups who are users of Rec Park Centre. Rec Park centre is a council-community facility that is managed by GBSRF. The contract is legally binding. We hold responsibility for employment of our key staff. The users sit on a user council to work together. This is established by our constitution. GBSRF is an incorporated society/charity. The board has established a strong partnership with TDC Community Services and Parks & Reserves. We work directly with the Golden Bay Community Board, keeping them informed of developments and improvements. Golden Bay Community Board supports our recreation events and programmes.
327. There is such a wide range of staunch and extreme views here in Golden Bay and aging opinionated PhDs that I worry how successful and sustainable a local board will be in Golden Bay in the medium to long term.
Presently, it suits the mixed and eclectic community to adopt an "us and them" attitude when blaming those over the hill for not meeting expectations. But, within our small pond, views are far from collective and things can get quite heated and personal. I question how a local board would be able to deal with the more contentious issues (flooding, roading, development, industry, environment, etc) and worry that, if handled badly, the group may cost us more grief and expense than if it were left up to TDC to manage. Recent litigious issues have been draining on all accounts, and I question whether a local board could honestly achieve more fruitful outcomes.
Hindsight is a wonderful thing
Last but not least, the estimated hike in rates is a big concern (especially with Covid-19 and job losses in this tourist dependent region) and frankly they're plenty high enough. I fear this local board could end up being a needless doubling of effort for little tangible improvement.
328. I support communities having more autonomy in the decisions made for issues about their area. I believe those people personally involved with the issues, like residents of the area, are more knowledgeable about all the ramifications, thus more suited to make the decisions.
I feel other stand-alone areas, like Murchison, should also have similar independence about the decisions made for their area. But, ALL the wards should have the same rights and privileges, not just those deemed as "different". We should either ALL remain the same or All change over to local boards. I am AGAINST paying higher rates for the benefit of another area. Special privilege should be self-funded.
So, unless council comes up with the option of local boards of ALL areas, I vote for the status-quo.
329. TDC staff are not sympathetic to erosion issues in Golden Bay and are corrupt, we do not get a fair deal. A local board would hopefully be more realistic to all issues related to Golden Bay.
330. Golden Bay residents do not get a fair deal. A local board would hopefully be more realistic to all issues related to Golden Bay, especially erosion issues in Pakawau.
331. Nigel Ritson (*See attached*) Also supports local boards in: Motueka, Moutere-Waimea, Lakes-Murchison, Richmond
332. We support the retention of existing arrangements i.e. community boards (not local boards) in Golden Bay and Motueka.

333. - The cost is uncertain and likely to be high per household
 - the possibility to lose one of the two councillors reduces our decision-making
 - once the local board is in place, it cannot be removed
 - I am concerned about the quality of the LB members, very concerned!
 - increased administration cost
 - employee paid for and employed by council – not envisaged by original LB initiative
 - very limited additional powers given to local board
 - better to give community board more delegations and have an advocacy resident association to deal with bigger projects and lobby council
334. *Also supports local boards in: all areas that have a community board*
 Sick and tired of agreement being reached with council staff and lack of follow-up.
335. *Also supports local boards in: all areas with a community board*
 Personal experience: I had a meeting with the CEO and his sidekick regarding a local problem. It appeared to be a very productive meeting, their agreeing to solve the problem. Nothing was ever done. Not good enough. G Bay is ignored. We need to help ourselves.
336. 1. Since the beginning of community boards there has never been significant power or authority to act on our behalf
 2. A local board will enable our community to be significantly involved in the governance for the good of GB
 3. Currently we are stymied by TDC over large issues e.g. grandstand.
337. I support the retention of existing arrangements in Golden Bay and Motueka. It would be more disruptive to have two forms of governance throughout the district; there is no need to have a local board in Golden Bay when they have two representatives on the council. Golden Bay already receives more from the rest of the residents of Tasman District than they provide in rates, so everyone needs to be on an even playing field in terms of governance.
338. Thank you for the opportunity to submit on the local board issue. I want to see a local board in Golden Bay and am open to local boards in other parts of Tasman. Golden Bay and Tasman District Council have a difficult relationship, through a lack of engagement, understanding and a perception of "us and them". It is well recognised that the further in distance and diversity a council is from a region, the greater the misunderstandings. Richmond is a completely different vibe from Golden Bay, culturally, economically and in issues such as flooding, the need for footbridges, the port of Tarakohe and heavy trucks crossing a road that is vulnerable to extreme weather conditions. Golden Bay locals constantly feel frustrated that their needs are not understood or acknowledged.
 The grandstand was a prime example of TDC failing to understand the site in the first place and a huge amount of money wasted on legal fees, as well as the time wasted arguing rather than running the community. I think it's a pity the local board will incur extra cost on our rates but I believe that a lot of money will be saved in the reduction of arguments. I'm sure it won't be perfect, and Local Government Commission has warned there will be a settling in period, but I have a lot of confidence in LGC as a guiding role.
 What we have now is not working and is not going to improve. A local board is a step in the right direction.

My concern is that TDC will still have a lot of power, through the employee who would represent them in Golden Bay and through the department which would administer the requests of Golden Bay local board. However, I hope that TDC will be more accountable than it is at present.

339. –

340. –

341. –

342. We believe the needs of our unique community and environment will be better heard, taken seriously and served with a stronger democratic voice. The current community board seems to lack any real authority to prioritize the concerns of this area.

343. Martin Potter (*See attached*) Also supports local boards in: Moutere-Waimea, Lakes-Murchison, Motueka

344. 1. As the key staff of Rec Park Centre, we have confidence and trust in the elected representatives for the Golden Bay Ward of four community board members and two councillors.

2. Even though we expect changes in any election cycle, Rec Park Centre staff always ensure that the community board is kept up to date and made aware of the local clubs, community and corporate usage of the centre, office hours and 24 hour opening for cardholders.

3. Rec Park Centre is a shared council community facility that is proving to be a welcome and well used multi-purpose hub. There is a user council of member clubs who share in addressing operational issues. This is a democratic and proactive structure of management.

4. Our community board supports the annual events calendar organised by the key staff, such as the Santa Parade and Carols on the Green.

5. Our community board has assisted Rec Park Centre with operational issues such as recycling services.

6. Rec Park Centre has a direct relationship with Tasman District Council staff regarding maintenance of the facility and improvements at Recreation Park reserve. This is a positive relationship and assists the key staff with oversight of management.

7. The comparison suggests that a local board would be responsible for certain decisions in its area and would be required to identify and communicate local interests and also develop bylaws for the local area. What the document doesn't make clear is that this is what the current community board is also responsible for.

8. At Rec Park Centre we believe that a local board does not offer any benefits that are not being delivered by the current community board or could not be delivered by any future community board.

9. Therefore, the increased targeted rate will impose a burden of tax on all our ratepayers without additional benefits.

345. Can't see any evidence of improvement for Golden Bay people through a Golden Bay local board. Still individuals with own agenda when elected, having the ability of implementing things (bylaws) which the majority may not like. Trust so far the existing system.

346. –

347. Give Golden Bay some autonomy in decision-making. The community of interest is sufficiently different from the rest of the Tasman District that money spent and decisions made in Richmond are sometimes not in accord with what Golden Bay would decide on its own. The community board does not have sufficient delegated powers or autonomous funding to meet this need.

348. John Allen (*See attached*)

349. I have observed a lack of basic awareness and understanding in the community around the current structure of community boards and how the Golden Bay Community Board operates within the larger governance of the region. There is not enough information within the submission document to properly assess and compare the current community board model with the proposed local board model. There are no specific areas of responsibility (either allocated or delegated), and the full cost of a local board (and how that would be met) remain unclear.

It is clear however, that the level of autonomous local decision-making available under the proposed local board structure has been overstated to the Golden Bay community by the Working Group for a Golden Bay Local Board, who have encouraged unrealistically high expectations for a fully autonomous local board which would operate independently of the Tasman District Council.

I am not convinced that forcing a change of governance structure will result in an improved relationship or greater representation between the Golden Bay community and the Tasman District Council.

I think a local board for Golden Bay has the potential to adversely impact the relationship not only with council, but with other wards in the Tasman District.

I am unconvinced a local board in Golden Bay would result in savings for the district as a whole, rather resulting in increased duplication with work allocated to Golden Bay still being required for other Tasman wards.

I do not believe it would be fair to expect the ratepayers of wider Tasman District to foot the bill for one ward to have additional representation they would not.

Knowing the costs to ratepayers can only be determined once council has all the details of the structure is alarming, as council will only receive that information after a decision has been made to establish a local board - a permanent change we would be unable to repeal, and would be stuck paying for.

In these times of uncertainty, asking Golden Bay to sign a blank cheque in exchange for a board which would have slightly more powers, leads me to err on the side of caution and support the retention of the status quo, and request the LGC encourage TDC to delegate more responsibility to the Golden Bay community through the existing community board structure.

It is for all of the reasons detailed above that I support the retention of the current community board model. Thank you for taking the time to read my submission, I do not wish to speak to the commission at any hearings, I do give consent for the submission to become a public document once personal information has been removed.

350. Philip Woolf (*See attached*)

351. Joan Butts (*See attached*)

352. I believe, and there is plenty of evidence to support this, that the key issue is not whether to have a local board or not, but the dysfunctional relationship between the council and the GB community board. The core problem is a lack of trust between those bodies. Without trust and goodwill between the governing body of the council and the local board, negotiations relating to budget and the activities and services to be provided in the local areas are unlikely to achieve a satisfactory outcome for the local community.

On the other hand, if there was a relationship of trust between the two bodies, the GB community board could already have more delegated authority in consultation with council.

Apart from the trust issue, I am concerned about conflicts of interest when decisions are being made too close to home. Especially in a small community, community representatives may be unduly captured by a particular interest group and unable to find a decision with the common good in mind. The current electoral system favours those with the most connections, loudest voice and privilege to set aside time for being on the council; knowledge and skill rate much lower in people's voting preferences.

Additional cost and the risk of losing one GB councillor at the TDC table, also speak in favour of maintaining the current system, albeit with some energy put into improving relationships between GB community board and council.

353. Manawhenua ki Mohua (*See attached*)

354. –

355. –

356. At the present time, of the 3 options available to consider, we support the retention of community boards option.

However, in order for the community board to function in the best interest of the community, Tasman District Council (TDC) needs to delegate some of its powers to the community board. This could happen in a step wise manner. If there are concerns from TDC about the risk of delegating any future powers, any delegation could be based on objective measures of performance against agreed indices. With the ability to reduce powers if performance measures are not achieved. To date, TDC has resisted any delegation of powers. Any influence central government, or other organisations, can bring to bear to encourage TDC to start along the path to delegation would be welcome.

The fact that disagreements have not been able to be resolved through dialogue and has reportedly resulted in \$500,000 of legal costs recently demonstrates the current degree of relationship problems between Golden Bay interest groups and TDC. We recommend that the Local Government Commission encourage a path towards delegation of powers and further mediation to resolve tensions, as required.

Option of a local Golden Bay Board and local boards elsewhere in Tasman District

The only current example of the use of local boards involves greater Auckland where the population base is far greater than the Tasman District.

The low population base of Golden Bay, and some other geographically remote areas in Tasman, would result in far higher operating costs for such local boards compared with Auckland. We are not persuaded that the higher cost structure of operating such local boards (as signaled by TDC) would realise sufficient benefits from to justify setting up local boards.

Further a local board set up only for Golden Bay and no other geographically distinct areas of the Tasman district would be inequitable.

Option of a Golden Bay local board

We are unable to support the option for a Golden Bay Board for the following reasons:

1. We do not believe the benefits will justify the additional costs (as signaled by TDC).
2. We are extremely concerned that:
 - Tasman District Council (TDC) has total control over what they would charge for costs of a local board. And
 - The recent information released by TDC that proposed that the servicing costs for a Golden Bay local board would be significantly greater than the costs estimated by the Local Government Commission, and direct and indirect costs may be shared differently from the shared cost proposal by the Local Government Commission.
3. If Golden Bay had a local board, TDC may down size the number of councilors on the council from Golden Bay from two to one, which would significantly reduce Golden Bay input and influence on wider Tasman matters and major council responsibilities concerning Golden Bay not delegated to a local board.
4. The current relationship between concerned Golden Bay groups and TDC has fueled the proposal for a local board as residents have felt they have nowhere else to turn.

357. Richard Kempthorne (*See attached*)

358. *Also supports local boards in: Lakes-Murchison, Moutere-Waimea, Motueka, Richmond*
In many (European) countries they discover that centralisation does not work well and is very ineffective. Decentralisation is the word and regulatory and non-regulatory responsibilities including the budgets are delegated to local bodies. I think we can see the same in the Tasman District. No direct lines, no transparency, and no direct relations and connection with the local areas. Councillors have to serve the general interest of the district and staff seems to have their own agenda. So, yes, I opt for local boards wherever possible in the Tasman District and delegation of regulatory- and non-regulatory responsibilities. It will be cost effective, time consuming, and better tailored for the local circumstances.

359. A local board in Golden Bay would give the community more of a voice and a little more muscle in the decision-making process for this isolated and special area. Its needs and concerns are quite different to the more urban Richmond area and have often been ignored or denied by TDC who at times appear dismissive and even hostile to the requests of Golden Bay resulting, in some cases, with costly court cases which could have been avoided if TDC had listened and acted with more interest and sympathy for the wishes of the Golden Bay community.

360. I support the retention of existing arrangements i.e. community boards (not local boards) in Golden Bay and Motueka. I have lived in Golden Bay for 36 years. I have seen local governance by Golden Bay County Council, the transition to TDC and the effectiveness (or not) of every elected community board.
In my opinion the delegations proposed to a local board by the LGC are already well managed by a functional community board. As a ratepayer I can choose to be involved in nearly all these functions either directly e.g. through reviews of reserve management plans or public submissions, and I can, if I choose, lobby both the board and the TDC councillors. I struggle to see how a local board could add value to managing libraries when these are already managed on a district basis with collaboration with Nelson.

My observation is that Golden Bay is a hard community to represent, opinions on contentious issues usually divide fairly evenly so it is unrealistic to think that a local board is suddenly going to achieve consensus. Golden Bay County Council had major disagreements.

My feeling is that many people do not understand how both the Local Government Act and the RMA place huge constraints on council, especially the consultation processes which are very long-winded so people often do not engage but then get grumpy at the outcome.

I served on the Golden Bay Community Board for two terms one with a chair who took a more adversarial approach to TDC and one who tried to build effective working relationships, and from my experience a board that chooses to put in the time to build those relationships with TDC (this included the ability to sit in on council meetings and workshops with speaking rights, an arrangement which still stands) Golden Bay's voice was considered and where possible council decisions aligned with the board's view. Some of the triggers for Golden Bay's perceived dissatisfaction with TDC are due to problems with both the TRMP and the Building Act, a community board has as much input and ability to advocate as a local board, in fact the community board won an LGA award for their 'eastern Golden Bay planning', a collaboration with a TDC planner. In summary, a community board can negotiate delegations, if there is a constructive relationship with TDC this benefits both parties and all the extra costs of a local board can be avoided. I support local decision-making and feel this can be achieved under the current community board, but as with any publicly elected body the effectiveness of that body depends on the quality of those elected and their willingness to put in the time to understand and advocate on behalf of their community.

361. Gaylene Wilkinson (*See attached*) Also supports local boards in: all wards

362. Judith Nicholls (*See attached*)

363. Neither for or against any of the three options. For change in how communities can have more direct input into their community.

All communities need to have a representative from their local community association into council decisions that impact their community.

I am neither for or against a local board. I understand and appreciate some of the concerns held by the Golden Bay community and the inequity they may feel and experience. However, I also believe they are not the only community in Tasman District who feel they are not listened to or heard. However, considering the economic recession we are heading into due to Covid-19, I am not 100% convinced a local board in Golden Bay will fully address the inequity over the entire Tasman District.

I believe part of the inequity issues experienced throughout Tasman District can be directly related to the disproportion of councillors allotted to each ward. I feel each ward would be more fairly represented if there were equal numbers of councillors in each ward. Currently Richmond has four councillors; Motueka and Moutere-Waimea three; Golden Bay two and Lakes-Murchison only one. My suggestion would be for each ward to have three councillors each. This would give councillors within wards that may have smaller populations but huge distances to travel to meet residents an equal opportunity when it comes to decision-making around the council table. This option would cost ratepayers the wages of an additional three councillors over the four wards but also save the cost of four Golden Bay local board members wages.

If the above option was adopted, instead of community boards, community associations who already work closely with their residents, councillors and council. Community association could have one representative who sat around the council table when decisions regarding their community were being tabled and voted on. It is very timely to take the future decisions away from council staff, enabling councillors to be fully informed, while empowering communities to have direct input into the ethos, atmosphere, functionality, environment, and well-being of their individual communities. Everyone needs to remember who lives in a community; who pays the rates; who the clients are (the ratepayers); who owns the assets (the ratepayers); and basically who works for who to ensure good service is delivered.

364. I have lived in Golden Bay for over 20 years and been actively involved in a number of issues with TDC. It has become apparent to me that TDC is not responsive to local issues in a timely manner and often spends considerable money while delaying implementation. Examples include a landscape plan for Golden Bay (long delays and \$800 000 spent and still not in the District plan); Wainui Spat farm which had to be taken to the Environment Court; slowing down the proposal and trying to dilute to controls needed for the protection of Te Waikoropupu Springs and Associated Aquifers by way of a Water Conservation Order; spending considerable sums to oppose the restoration of the grand stand at the recreational grounds.

In my strong opinion much of this stems from the centralised structure of TDC in Richmond. Not too long ago they expanded the building at considerable cost to ratepayers. TDC staff are largely based in Richmond and so do not have sufficient empathy and understanding of local issues. Having local boards with SIGNIFICANT powers would go part of the way of alleviating this. But TDC must give up a significant proportion of their current powers and trust the sub-regions, such as Golden Bay, to a much greater extent.

Perhaps of even greater importance would be to decentralize staff. I see no reason why each sub-region could not have planners, engineers, technicians etc living in their community. As the Covid experience has shown us, and with the much better information systems available these days, it is not so important for all staff to be located in Richmond. Groups such as engineers, hydrologists, planners etc can easily have regular meetings and interact with each other using tools such as Zoom. This would mean relocating staff (with perhaps one-off costs) but no extra staff. Some services such as accounts would continue to be centralised in Richmond. Having staff in the regions such as Golden Bay would mean they would not only be more connected with residents' issues and aspirations but would cut back on traveling time. It takes about 2 hours to drive from Richmond to Golden Bay so that means half the day is lost with travel, plus increases in other costs etc.

I would urge the Commission to consider decentralisation. The current structure has become ponderous and is not trusted by many residents.

365. I was on the Golden Bay Community Board 1992-95. The then mayor, Kerry Marshall, led the council into respecting the newly established community boards by delegating several tasks and listening to their advice. Since then the relationship between Tasman District Council and the boards deteriorated. The perception was the council was ignoring the boards' input and did not seem to respect their advice or appreciate their usefulness for local consultation. The situation is now better than it was. The relationship can be enhanced through mutual respect and appreciation of their separate roles. Appropriate delegations are the key and the council should initiate

them. If Golden Bay is given a local board and other wards are not, there will be an imbalance in democracy.

366. –

367. Celia Butler (*See attached*)

368. Golden Bay people need decision making that is more locally relevant, made by people that live here, and would have this area's best interests in mind.

A particular issue that comes to mind for me is the quality of council services to our township and surrounds, such as gardens, kerbs, walk ways and cycle ways. To me Richmond looks like its had a lot of money spent there, well presented, quality seating and public spaces, and Golden Bay, needs to be upgraded in terms of presenting itself as a destination, and for the sake of local pride. The cycleway from Pohara to Takaka is bumpy, gravel, at times flooded, and not rideable for road bikes. Richmond cycleways are tar sealed. To me this is unacceptable. Golden Bay deserves proportionate spending. A local board would be able to listen to its residents more intimately, advocate for our needs, and make local decisions for this region's best interest.

369. I support the existing arrangement. A local board is likely to serve a local group of serial activists rather than the community. This group have their own agendas and actively promote their interests. There is a HIGH risk that all or part of this group would infiltrate a local board which would not represent the wider 'silent' community.

370. Golden Bay Community Board (*See attached*)

371. I don't support this proposal because it will cost the ratepayers considerably more than the current community board but will not give any more decision-making power to the ratepayers. It is a proposal which has been promoted by a small group who are motivated by their own self interests and are supported by the anti-Tasman District Council lobbyists.

372. –

373. –

374. We are about to go into a major recession, x-covid, causing huge financial pressure to the residential and agricultural community, presenting hardship in the Golden Bay community. The system that we have now, works well and the last thing we need is further costs of representation. History has shown us (example, GB County Council) that the proposed board is neither necessary or affordable.

375. Hugh Cropp (*See attached*)

376. –

377. –

378. –

379. Leave it the same as it is. Not paying any more money.

380. –

381. –

382. –

383. I believe that Golden Bay would be better served by providing greater support and education to our existing community board and working at strengthening relationships between TDC and our community board and its councillors.

384. I don't want the twats over here making decisions on my behalf. Should of smashed that bloody grandstand to the ground when you had the chance!
385. The introduction of a local board would enable residents of Golden Bay to feel more empowered to make/be involved in decisions that affect the Golden Bay community. The formation of a local board would require the Tasman District Council to give it more respect and consideration than is currently shown to Golden Bay Community Board.
386. I would like to see a local board in Golden Bay so that residents would be more involved in the decisions that affect the Golden Bay community.
387. *Also supports local boards in: Motueka including Mara, Richmond*
Local boards could give more local decision-making opportunities to their areas regards project/maintenance decisions, expenditure and prioritisation, rather than full council decision-making behind closed doors. However the extra costs involved with paid officers, bureaucracy and time delays would have to be affordable. TDC rates are too high already and the community as a whole would need to see local benefits as well as a reduction in the very large paid TDC team. Volunteers could fill many local roles and be pleased with results. I have concerns for the rest of very rural TDC area.
388. We are concerned about the cost to ratepayers of changing to a Golden Bay local board. We believe it will be actually more expensive than stated. We don't believe we will be any better off under the new scheme. Our halls, cemeteries, libraries are being well looked after now so why change a good system. We are concerned that we could lose a councillor in this process. We believe there should have been more consultation over this proposed board and believe the time scale to respond is far too short for us to make a really informed decision. We should have a vote on the proposal.
389. –
390. I consider the current arrangements best suit Golden Bay. More consultation with the Community Board and Counsellors usually has positive results.
391. Penny Griffith (*See attached*)
392. A very difficult decision to make and much thought has been put into the final choice. After initially supporting the idea of a local board I have decided on SUPPORT THE EXISTING ARRANGEMENTS
I am very much in favour of greater responsibilities being given to local areas BUT I think this could be obtained far more easily if only a real effort could be made on behalf of the council staff and councillors to genuinely and honestly communicate better and really try to understand the requests and feelings of the smaller communities in their care. Improved communication and genuine caring would be far cheaper and less disruptive than the forming of a local board.
393. Robin Schiff (*See attached*) *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere*
394. I wish to submit in favour of implementing a local board for Golden Bay and elsewhere in Tasman District as appropriate. I would like to see an adequate budget given to the board so that work could start immediately. As a long time Golden Bay resident, I have watched this unique and isolated place plummet from a healthy, locally governed population to a problem ridden, expensive, democracy denied, continuous delima with a shiney worded public relations person. This may sound harsh, but you admit to knowing of this dysfunctional reputation which has sadly burned out many a once caring member of this community. I will make this short to acknowledge the extreme brain work required to read and digest all submissions. My basic concern is to improve

Golden Bay management and to protect the environment. I would, however like to elucidate and provide more information on my decision verbally at the hearing, with interesting props that may hold your attention amongst the many views you will be considering.

395. I believe having our unique region represented with a group (local board) that can respond to the local needs of our people and businesses is vital to our future development and prosperity. This position has been made painfully clear with the Waimea dam project, an incredible expense to Tasman District ratepayers of which Golden Bay residents receive no community or economic benefit. We need jobs in our region not financial debt.
396. Working Group for a Golden Bay Local Board (*See attached*)
Also supports local boards in: all communities of Tasman District
397. Graeme Wilson (*See attached*)
398. *Also supports local boards in: Lakes-Murchison, Richmond, Moutere-Waimea, Motueka*
I support the establishment of local boards across Tasman District. My reasons include: If a decision principally affects a specific community, or group of communities, then those decisions, over the long-run, will produce better community outcomes if they are made by a democratically elected body from the affected community(ies). If the decision affects the community as a whole, then the decision should be made by the council's governing body at the regional level. This is exactly what local boards achieve. Local government decision-making within Golden Bay will encourage greater community-level engagement which is critical to building future resilience and community well-being. A recent survey showed that 98% of Golden Bay residents affiliate first with the Golden Bay community than the Tasman District.
399. Golden Bay/Mohua is an area isolated by the Pikirunga range from the greater Tasman District, with only one access road in and out.
The five thousand people who choose to live here do so because they consider it a special area. The residents are for the most part well spread out across the land area and pay for their isolation with long travel times, and the extra cost of transporting everything either in or out of the Bay, over the hill.
The average age of the residents of Golden Bay is somewhat older than the general population of New Zealand, and the level of education is known to be higher than average for similar sized populations. This means that there is a lot of interest from the residents in decisions made by governing bodies that affect their lives or pockets and in having a greater say in what can and should happen locally in Golden Bay. Tasman District Council does not have a good track record of listening to the wishes of the residents of Golden Bay.
I believe Tasman District Council would give a local board wider decision-making capability upon the recommendations of the elected representatives of the community and the dedicated council employee. The requirement of a local board to prepare a three-year plan with a clear vision statement for Golden Bay would be an important beginning.
If we had a local board with more governance decision-making capability, I believe it would be easier for TDC to allow Golden Bay more "special departures" from some of the rules and regulations that may need to be enforced in other jurisdictions under its control i.e. the 30 metre building distance from title boundaries.

The local board should have greater influence over choosing local contractors for work to be done locally, consequently saving both money and time. I see the implementation of a local board and a dedicated local council officer as of great benefit to the community, despite the predicted cost which I think should be covered out of the general rates and not a targeted rate.

I wish to retain two ward representatives from Golden Bay to enable them to continue to cover and represent this diverse community.

400. The suggested delegations to the proposed local Board can be met by the current community board. The various cost (of the several estimates) associated with this proposal would not lead to any significant material changes to Golden Bay. Any significant rate increase due to adoption of the current proposal - could not be supported.
401. 1. Although I unreservedly support a Golden Bay local board I have issue with the projected costs being borne by GB ratepayers. All costs should be shared equally across the Tasman District – the precedent has already been set by TDC with GB ratepayers contributing to the Waimea Dam, a project that when finished will have no benefit at all to those ratepayers of GB. Also, no consideration has been made to offset the obvious savings that will be made by TDC if a GB local board is established.
2. Further, our GB community is deprived of many of the TDC funded services that are afforded to the residents of Richmond and its outlying areas, yet our rates don't reflect these shortcomings. A GB local board fully funded by TDC would in my opinion help 'balance the equation'.
3. Golden Bay is isolated and predominately rural, having little in common with either Richmond, or with Richmond's outlying rural areas. It's my opinion that GB's governance and decision-making should be at our local community level for the benefit of our local community.
4. Also, to conclude, if a GB local board is established then it should have far greater decision-making powers than those set out on pages 9 and 10 of the Local Government Commission booklet that accompanied this submission form. It's my opinion that these powers should at least include all of those that are listed under the Advocacy heading on pages 10 and 11 of this same booklet, in order that a GB local board would be in the strongest position to comprehensively serve its local community in the best ways possible.
402. I do not support any of the 3 options available. I would like Nelson and Richmond to amalgamate as they have similar political needs and structures, and for the rural areas to have local boards overseen by a regional council.
403. Thank you for this opportunity. I support retention of the current community board, and for Tasman District Council to have oversight by a regional council.
404. Golden Bay is distinctly different from Richmond & the other wards of the Tasman District Council. Too often, what suits an urban area like Richmond is foisted onto Golden Bay e.g. the large recycling wheelie bins. The community board can make suggestions to TDC, based on community support or request, but they appear to be given very little credence. I do have 2 concerns if a local board is established.
- 1) Will TDC be able to set the costs for the board, without proof or oversight of the maths behind those costings before just slamming Golden Bay with unaffordable rate additions?

- 2) I know we have plenty of competent people in Golden Bay, but how many are willing to expend the time to prepare 3-year plans, monitor progress and report & liaise with TDC?
405. Autonomy for Golden Bay. Hopefully more possibility of infrastructure and facilities to accommodate a growing community especially low cost housing for local families and low income workers. Maybe we could have more effect on roading with Transit NZ directly not via TDC. Facilities for the aged are non-existent especially the area of physical activity.
406. I support the retention of existing arrangements in Golden Bay and Motueka. I have recently been made redundant. I own a property in Golden Bay and the thought of rates increasing at this stage with the economy as it is, is not good. The costs would greatly escalate with local boards. What extra benefit are we going to get for all the additional costs? The current system works well. The timing of adding additional costs at this stage seems unreasonable.
407. Jennifer Maclaren (*See attached*)
408. –
409. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere-Waimea, Lakes-Murchison*
 I would like to see local boards (LB) in Tasman District as I think the geography and population distribution of the district are very suited to this kind of local government. I could easily see LBs in Richmond, Motueka, Lakes-Murchison, Moutere Waimea, and particularly Golden Bay (GB) Wards. I imagine Tasman District Council (TDC) would be pretty keen as well to let local people deal with their own local environment and issues – how can people in Richmond possibly know what’s what in an isolated rural community 100km away?
 I very much like the idea of having a plan for Golden Bay so that we can actively manage things like tourism, dark sky, the advent of McDonald’s etc instead of reacting to things after they have happened. Tourism in my view, especially needs a supply based plan where the ratepayers decide how much we can offer to tourism without compromising the environment that we are the current custodians of, and also our own way of life. Currently with tourism in GB we react to demand and in many instances the sheer number of tourists is ruining what people come here for, both to visit and to live.
 I believe that a LB in GB would be a cost effective way of locally governing. Large costs have been cited as a reason not to have a LB but not much has been said about the saved costs of TDC not being taken to court as much. I think the chances of a good decision being made first time will be much increased with a LB.
 GB has many halls most of which are cared about. I think a LB would be more aware of the importance we residents attach to our history, and the respect we have for the people who came before us and worked to create the facilities that we have now, resulting in better decisions.
 A good example of where local knowledge would have helped is the crossing refuge between the supermarket and the visitor centre carparks in Takaka. A zebra crossing was envisaged but one with an island and no stripes was put in. Which might have been fine except the road now uses the hard shoulder to accommodate the island in the middle – and so there is now nowhere you can park near the grocery shop with a trailer on.

I would prefer the chairman of a LB in GB to be elected directly by the electors and not the Board. I think it would be more representative.

410. A local board will cost a lot more to run without any real extra benefit for that community. It will be an extra layer of governance with no accountability nor responsibility in setting and charging rates on behalf of ratepayers for the whole district. What we need is better representation around the TDC board table. Size of wards not just population density should be taken into account so we have more councillors representing rural wards is the only answer to the problems we now have in feeling under represented. Creating token governance bodies will only create further frustration.
411. It appears that little meaningful local decision making has been delegated to the existing Golden Bay Community Board since the 2007 recommendations by the Local Government Commission, despite repeated requests and arguments proposed by a variety of community board and local councillors.
- This community has consistently shown engagement, and support for the democratic process through the high voter turnout for both local and national elections. Yet our local council seems hell bent on showing that our individual and collective voices in the democratic process are of little concern in their decision making – and this at a time when increasing numbers of voters show a lack of trust in their leaders. This does not seem like good modelling of a caring democracy.
- Our ‘slap in the face’ from TDC is particularly hurtful in respect of purely local decision making, for example the fates of our grandstand and local port. Local decision making powers over local assets would remove what I imagine is a ‘thorn in the side’ of TDC and give the local community an enhanced feeling of ownership of their future. Indeed there have been many local initiatives to improve our resilience, to stand us in good stead should various disasters befall us, yet we have almost no control over the infrastructure that is in place through our rate payments.
- Too many times it has seemed that TDC wish to cling onto power over their ‘domain’, and have been prepared to use bullying tactics to achieve their aim, the latest example being their threat of a targeted rate that is nearly 4 times greater than the figure supported by yourselves. I know that this has given many supporters of the proposed local board cause for great concern with respect to affordability in the face of few guaranteed benefits. I am sure you are acutely aware of the critical dilemma this places us all in. I would hope that the implementation of a local board would meet with tactical support from both yourselves and other central government departments so that this ‘experiment with no exit’ might have the greatest possible chance of long term success, and a model for other areas to follow.
- In conclusion, I feel that there is little evidence of TDC wishing to heal the relationship with Golden Bay ratepayers and a local board is the only way in which we can move forward with a voice that gives legislative power to honour our wishes.
412. We do not support a local board. TDC still has the ability to retain certain assets et al under their jurisdiction. Community board still has options to have more input as required also the locally elected board can vote on persons with more governance experience if required. The TDC indicative costings would prove to be a burden on those on fixed incomes which is a large % of Golden Bay populous.

413. Many residents of Golden (GB) feel frustrated that their opinions on what is best for Golden Bay are not really considered by Tasman District Council (TDC). At best, opinions are sought by TDC but ultimately they ignore the result of surveys/submissions and proceed with their own views of GB's needs. Often this is accompanied by TDC claiming that they have surveyed opinion and listened before deciding what to do. The grandstand debacle is an important example of this where TDC have wasted much ratepayer money working against the wishes of the majority of locals and pushed ahead with plans to demolish the historic (and basically sound) grandstand with no plans for any type of replacement structure. The Pohara-Takaka shared walk-cycleway is another example where TDC claims to have provided a wonderful local asset, when in fact there have been frequent requests for this for at least 25 years. There have also been frustrations with affordable housing schemes not progressing because of TDC's interpretations of the Resource Management Act and requirements/limitations of their own district plan, where often the issue comes down to the prohibitive cost of trying to alter their response to applications. Hopefully a local board would have the power to make a decision on many such issues without the high cost to Golden Bay as a whole and/or the individual(s) concerned.
414. As a general principle, I support the establishment of a local board for Golden Bay; moving to an increased level of autonomy regarding governance, future decision-making and development of resources and services in this area. My reasons for this are:
- GB is a geographically remote area, having a unique character and presenting specific challenges that are best understood, and arguably best managed by those residing permanently in the area and having a strong commitment to it.
 - There exists in GB, a rich, diverse pool of talent, knowledge and expertise that, given the opportunity, could successfully become engaged in its governance, management of its resources and future development.
 - Golden Bay ratepayers should not incur debts generated in the wider TDC catchment area, relating to projects that have no local relevance and do not directly benefit its residents (a recent example being the Waimea Dam). I would anticipate that a local board would help avert a recurrence of such issues as this.
- Matters suggested for further consideration:
- GB ratepayers need more detailed and specific factual information relating to the fiscal implications of establishing and servicing a local board. It is impossible to make a confident choice, based on vague figures such as those currently available.
 - In addition to having a strong advocacy role, a local board should have responsibility for and control over more substantive issues affecting Golden Bay (for example, the future development of Port Tarakohe).
 - If a local board is to be established in Golden Bay, there should be a well-planned, transparent process of transition towards its implementation – and this should be overseen and mediated by an impartial entity, unencumbered by vested interests.
 - A binding referendum should be conducted on the option of a local board, so that all current ratepayers of Golden Bay have the opportunity to make their preference known on such an important matter of governance.
415. John & Suzy Hall (*See attached*)

416. I am frustrated by some of the decisions made by Tasman District Council and feel that Golden Bay, as a geographically remote rural community, could make better decisions on issues specific to our region of Tasman District. The culturally significant historic grandstand at the recreation centre is a good example of a decision that clearly could have been made with more ease and wisdom by our Golden Bay community and would have saved a lot of time and money wasted on frivolous legal costs. In short, a local board would be better connected to the needs of our community and provide local government making local decisions. I request that you please create a local board for Golden Bay that has guaranteed decision-making powers. Thank you for your consideration.
417. I believe decisions for Golden Bay on local issues are best made by Golden Bay community leaders. Hence my support for a local board. The development of a 3-year plan for the Bay will be a valuable exercise and enable the community to focus priorities on the areas most important to us. However, I have some concerns with the local board proposal as it stands.
1. The open-ended cost. Without a clear indication of costs, or even an agreement on the support model to be used, it is difficult to make an informed choice. If the model of support employed is the one proposed by the Commission (one dedicated staff member and support) with a cost increase of approximately \$75/annum then I would support the formation of a local board. However, if the model used is the one proposed by council with 4.5 support staff and a cost of >\$200/annum/ratepayer – then I do not support it.
 2. The delegation of powers should come with an associated delegated budget from council for the delivery of services that are the subject of the delegated powers.
418. Lisa Savage (*See attached*)
419. David Ogilvie (*See attached*)
420. –
421. –
422.
 1. This proposal will bring another cost of bureaucracy on top of the existing system.
 2. Additional costs to our rates.
 3. Those supporting this change all appear to have current or past grievances with TDC so their objectivity is suspect.
 4. If these people are the brainwaves of the opposition to the Waimea dam and save the grandstand at a price of \$930,000 and to be used half full for 3 hours one day a year, it is a straight-out nonsense. If this is an example of what a local board would bring, it would hold up progress of our community e.g. developing health services in the Bay.
 5. Not sufficient ratepayers in Golden Bay to support the infrastructural requirements for the Bay.
 6. Rates too high now.
 7. Previous county council for Golden Bay closed down because they could not have the finance or expertise, machinery and money to make the district work effectively.
423. –
424. I think a local board for Golden Bay will get much more done, according to the wishes of Golden Bay residents, than the present community board.
425. –
426. –

427. –

428. Due to the specific nature of the Golden Bay community as a highly diverse professionalised community with many people who have been drawn to Golden Bay because of its unique food growing capacity, if given real local decision-making authority, Golden Bay could be looked to as a world-leading example of how communities might transform in a world searching for direction and solutions in the wake of COVID-19.

I believe that such outcomes are only possible if the local board has decision-making power over community assets such as Takaka Community Centre, Takaka Information Centre, Pohara and Collingwood motor camps, Takaka aerodrome and Port Tarakohe. The community will run these assets to benefit the entire district in a way that gives the local board the economic security that can facilitate enormous change that will benefit the wider district both economically and in terms of community health.

Greater decision-making authority at the local level financed in a way that the community believes it can make long term goals to impact the Golden Bay community in 50 to 100 years (i.e. above) will:

- enhance people's sense of political agency;

- build cohesiveness of community;

- enable greater transference of ideas between diverse cross-sections of the community;

- drive innovation;

- greatly enhance the long-term health of the community and the environment.

Thank you for the diligent and faithful work of the Commission in working together with the Golden Bay community to reach this point.

429. Brian Wilson (*See attached*)

430. –

431. Cost of having a local board is very uncertain.

Only supporting a local board if Golden Bay retains its 2 councillors.

Only supporting a local board if all wards have one. This would not work if Golden Bay was the odd one out, and increased efficiencies of having a support team in Richmond. I am concerned about creating even more bureaucracy.

Having an approved 3-year plan is a good idea which could be done by an advocacy group in GB.

Council should consider giving the community board more delegations to show good will.

432. –

433. –

434. –

435. *Also supports local boards in: Motueka, Richmond, Murchison*

A distributed system of local boards should be more cost efficient than a single board in Golden Bay. Golden Bay needs to have much more local autonomy in decision making on local matters. We have been promised this often at the time of local body elections but little has ever eventuated. I don't believe it would be any different now.

The results of the lack of delegation have been seen in enormous sums wasted on issues such as the grandstand. I am sure that other regions would similarly benefit from having more autonomy.

There seems to be a determined effort to frighten us off having a local board by making us think it has to be very expensive for the rate payers here, and cost certainly is important, but the lack of goodwill towards the proposal from TDC only emphasises why we need to secure an empowered local board, with a wide range of powers delegated to it. Other parts of Tasman District would similarly benefit from having a local board.

436. Averill Grant (*See attached*)
437. I have no faith in our current TDC and local boards. They don't listen to the people!
438. The costs are outweighed by any potential benefits. I prefer to see our community board continue to develop. Effective functions of any structure is dependent on the members of the group and their abilities.
439. Chris Hill (*See attached*) I have not ticked a category above. I do support the retention of an existing community board in GB. It is for the people of Motueka to decide on their own structure.
440. I don't want to see the potential increase in rates as this could increase the amount I pay in rent. And in the future I want to buy property in Golden Bay and I don't want to be paying for something I don't agree with. I also don't feel there was enough information provided as to why the local board would be more beneficial to the community over the current community board.
441. For me the most important issue is to have full coverage of Tasman District with either local boards or community boards.
As the first chairperson of GB's community board in 1989, it very quickly became clear that not having full district coverage with community boards made the 2 boards less effective and the structure of the district council inefficient. We tried unsuccessfully to promote community boards in other wards because the existing ratepayer organisations did not want to adapt. From 1995-98, I was ward councillor and strongly supported the mayor of the time in his attempt to restructure the council to have a more governance orientated basis to its functioning. We started too late and the 1998 elections halted progress. Councillors should be focussing on being 'directors' of the multi-million business that they are running and leave all things of community level to a full coverage of community boards or local boards. Let's start with 5 community boards that upgrade to local boards if warranted later.
442. I support the option of a Golden Bay local board and a local board or boards elsewhere in the Tasman District.
My main residence is in Christchurch, however I spend 2 - 3 months every year in Golden Bay. As a ratepayer and possible future full-time resident, I feel that the above option will best serve the future needs of this area.
443. *Also supports local boards in: Motueka*
The current community board system does not serve the democratic process well.
444. Laurie Healy (*See attached*) *Also supports local boards in: all wards*
445. –
446. From the summary in the GB Weekly of the cost of the local board I think it seems too expensive for what benefits the local board may impart for our community. I am happy to pay more rates if those funds go into projects rather than further bureaucracy.
447. More democratic system.
448. Golden Bay Province, Federated Farmers of New Zealand (*See attached*)

449. I strongly support district-wide coverage of a community-level tier of local governance. Community boards need to cover all wards. Otherwise we all become dis-enfranchised and council remains inefficient – we need the suggested system in place for all areas of Tasman District to be represented and their unique/specific problems/interests to be heard.
450. Richard Lamb *(See attached)* Also supports local boards in: all areas that comprise current TDC jurisdiction
451. Liz Thomas *(See attached)*
452. We need to be heard.
453. Also supports local boards in: Motueka, Moutere-Waimea, Lakes-Murchison, Richmond
454. We in Golden Bay need more authority and more say over what happens in our area. We are the people who see what is needed here and not those outside the area.
455. Also supports local boards in: all areas
To have LOCAL BOARD in Golden Bay and also Local Boards elsewhere in Tasman District in all wards with TDC DECENTRALISE.
My organisation is Golden Bay Community Arts & Health, Educational & Charitable TRUST CC50334
456. I support the retention of existing arrangements as I believe we have enough bureaucracy already in place and having the option of a Golden Bay board will only add to this. I also think the cost is prohibitive and will only increase with time, we pay enough rates as it is.
457. I support amalgamation with Nelson City Council.
458. Also supports local boards in: all areas currently with community boards – for equity and better listening to local concerns by TDC
Given my frustration over years as well as examples of recent costs to TDC (\$500,000 in legal fees included), I believe the costs of not listening carefully to local concerns are higher than costs of resourcing and interacting with local/community boards more positively and respectfully.
I am sorry to see so few powers available to delegate to the local boards, and how beholden a local board still would be to TDC hierarchy to determine financing - if not for the costs both to TDC and to communities of the poor listening of (particularly) top council personnel over time it is nearly not worth pushing for the local board option. I can certainly understand, given TDC's outlining of why all households in the area were sent copies of the LGC consultation document, why ratepayers from other communities within TDC might not be keen to support a local board for Golden Bay:
"The Local Government Commission has released its consultation document on the application to establish a local board in Golden Bay and its financial implications for the whole district."
Copies of the consultation document have been distributed to homes throughout the wider Tasman District due to the potential financial impact on all ratepayers and the opportunity for all Tasman residents to comment on or provide an alternative to the proposal." 19345 TDC Newsline Issue 478_31 July 2020 Web
Yet another opportunity for TDC Richmond to cause me to grit my teeth - along with their submission and what they consider costs might be. I'm sure they don't have to be like that. Yet again using ratepayer money to act against the wishes of a considerable number of... ratepayers!

459. *Also supports local boards in: all areas*

I believe that a system of local boards throughout the Tasman District offers a greater chance for individuals in these areas to engage in a more transparent democratic process and take greater autonomy for decisions that directly affect them and their region.

I think that the success of this process will be largely dependent on goodwill and cooperation between councillors and staff at TDC and the representatives of the local boards. This may be a process that requires time to evolve to its greatest efficacy and there may be additional costs to implementing these changes, however I do not think these concerns should act as an impediment to proceeding with such a restructuring of local governance, as the long term benefits may be considerable.

Local boards spread throughout Tasman could offer local people a greater degree of responsibility, accountability and approachability to their elected representatives. I have no doubt that this community approach to governance would see local people becoming more involved in initiatives that are for the betterment of their region and therefore Tasman as a whole.

There is a very significant amount of goodwill at local levels within Tasman. I frequently see people here in Golden Bay voluntarily donating money, time and labour to projects and causes that support members of our community and our area.

I have no doubt that if TDC acted to facilitate and support these community initiatives through a local board structure, this will lead to greater efficiency in spending as projects would be tailored to the specific needs of the communities represented. Delegation of decision-making responsibilities to local boards would also mitigate the risk of TDC making unilateral decisions that may be perceived to be NOT in the best interests of the communities they serve.

Local people taking ownership and making decisions about issues that affect their community, with the backing of legislative authority, makes a great deal of sense.

460. Michael Boland (*See attached*)

461. I support a local board for Golden Bay.

462. I support the option of a Golden Bay local board and a local board or boards elsewhere in Tasman District. I tick yes. I would support other local boards in the Tasman District. They would need to identify where they were needed. I feel this is an inappropriately worded and confusing question. I have observed first hand the TDC cause unnecessary conflict and costs to my immediate community of Golden Bay on several different issues, this would certainly have been avoided had these decisions been with a community board. Being a business owner, I am seeing the officers of the TDC repeatedly give wrong and insufficient communication causing additional costs for these mistakes. This happens so often it appears deliberate. The more scrutiny on the present TDC councillors and their officers the better. Sometimes we need to spend money to save it.

463. *Also supports local boards in: all other areas*

I strongly support a local board for Golden Bay. I also support the formation of local boards for all other areas of Tasman District. Although this will be expensive for the first one or two local boards to be set up, the costs should decrease as other areas move into local board governance. Advantages would be increased efficiency of management and costs, understanding, planning, administration as the different types of governance at present in place are dissolved and replaced with one district wide form of governance. Local board representatives would have more knowledge of local

wants and needs and the local resources available. Local board representation for all areas would also allow increased sharing of information, solutions to problems e.g. environmental, as all areas would have a known path or paths in which to communicate with all other areas.

464. Sue Brown (*See attached*)
465. I support the option of a Golden Bay local board. I consider that a local board would provide better local governance for Golden Bay than is currently provided from Tasman District Council. Golden Bay has lacked effective response to its needs, circumstances and opportunities. Should other areas of Tasman District prefer to operate under local boards that option should be open to them, however Golden Bay's physical isolation makes this course of action preferable for it.
466. Ian Alach (*See attached*) *Also supports local boards in: Motueka, Richmond, Coastal Tasman Bay, Inland Rural & Murchison*
467. Tony Lawton (*See attached*)
468. Hazel Pearson (*See attached*) *Also supports local boards in: ideally all wards*
469. Essential to retain 2 councillors for Golden Bay. Also essential to minimise additional rates increase to Golden Bay. Also essential for TDC to embrace the local board and work WITH the new board. Without a commitment from TDC on these three essentials a local board would possibly be of no advantage.
470. I believe we will have better outcomes if decision-making is local – more community involvement, more responsive to local needs, the larger TDC can focus on more important matters.
471. I vote yes and support to have a Golden Bay local board.
472. Iona Jelf (*See attached*) *Also supports local boards in: all 5 wards*
473. Steve Penny (*See attached*) *Also supports local boards in: all wards*
474. I support the proposal for a local board for Golden Bay
475. *Also supports local boards in: Motueka, Murchison*
476. –
477. –
478. *Also supports local boards in: Motueka*
479. It is not at all clear that changing to a local board for Golden Bay will make any significant difference. Perhaps TDC can be encouraged to engage more constructively with the existing community board and thereby save a lot of money which can be used for constructive projects.
480. –
481. We do not need more boards, we need more understanding. Golden Bay needs TDC to listen more to its unique needs. It needs to invest more on the town centre, tourist areas and infrastructure such as toilets and facilities. It needs to remove industrial sites (i.e. Fulton Hogan etc.) to other areas. A large percentage of the population rely on tourism for a very short season. Therefore we need more autonomy and perhaps a little more power to the community board and we need to be heard when we are not happy with TDC decisions.

482. I do not believe the benefits of this change outweigh the cost; in fact I believe it will be overall negative. I also do not believe suitably experienced people will stand for the board which will result in poor decision-making and a dysfunctional board. The current situation and relationship with TDC is not as bad as some would lead you to believe. Golden Bay does very well being part of Tasman District.
483. Lack of quality people capable of standing for board positions. Cost for not benefit. We (Golden Bay) are very well serviced and supported (invested in) by existing arrangements with TDC.
484. *Also supports local boards in: Motueka, Moutere-Waimea, Lakes-Murchison, Richmond*
I believe that local boards would deliver a greater degree of autonomy and local decision-making pertinent to the locality than that offered by community boards via the overarching Tasman District Council does at present. A more democratic process than the present situation is desirable. If that means a further cost to us ratepayers then it's of no mind to me. The urban based tyranny of Richmond centred TDC does not reflect issues concerning more rural areas.
485. –
486. *Also supports local boards in: Motueka, Murchison*
A local board would provide more unbiased decisions in our local area and citizens will be closer to staff making those decisions. We are not well served by TDC staff and the CEO. Some staff regularly ignore limits in legislation that protects citizens from abuse of powers. The CEO ignores written complaints about staff abusing their power stating that "it's too technical" or "I'm too busy". Her conduct violates a citizen's right to natural justice and the terms of the LGOIMA.
487. *Also supports local boards in: Motueka, Murchison*
I think bringing administration closer to ratepayers is the only way to avoid: abuse of power, abuse of democratic principles, managerial dishonesty, staff members insulting ratepayers, managerial incompetence.
488. *Also supports local boards in: Motueka, Murchison*
I believe Golden Bay should never have been part of the forced amalgamation and should now be given an opportunity to regain some degree of 'independence' from the incompetent body which operates in Richmond. Many areas around the district deserve to have far better than what they get so I say bring on the local boards as much as possible. The present regime is simply not sustainable with such an incompetent CEO in charge. Something has to give soon!
489. It's not broke. My opinion any changes would mean too much indecision, confusion and the opportunity for people with their own objectives to gain control.
490. I support the local community board – it works well as a conduit to council for community groups and will give consistency for council going forward. I oppose the local board as the increase of rates is for no discerning benefit – would increase duplicity in governance costs.
491. I am for stronger local decision-making and local government – elected by the local populous. I support less TDC control.
492. *Also supports local boards in: Motueka, Murchison and other areas such as Wakefield that require it*
Although I have ticked Option 2, the only real option is a Golden Bay County Council.

This means we could take control of all decisions, not those imposed upon us by the shifters two hours away in Richmond and use everyone else to gather revenue i.e. the Waimea Dam.

493. –

494. Perhaps GB should have stronger representation by means of an extra councillor.

495. I am a retired dairy farmer who farmed in the Collingwood area for more than 50 years. My sons and I had the largest dairy farming operation in the Nelson/Marlborough area for many years. This issue has arisen because many newer arrivals in Golden Bay are opposed to the cost of the Waimea Dam. However, they expect that TDC will provide them with adequate sewerage and water supplies!! I strongly support the existing arrangements. I own a house property at Collingwood and also on at Hill Street, Richmond.

496. Although I support the idea of more delegation of authority at a community level, I believe the current proposal for a local board for Golden Bay will be too costly for the ratepayers and lead to a possibility of us losing a councillor. I think the creation of a local board will lead to more animosity between TDC and Golden Bay. I would prefer more delegated authority to be given to the community board.

I am also concerned about where five more highly qualified local board members are to be found in Golden Bay as we already have trouble finding anyone willing to stand for the community board! Perhaps the creation of a local board will attract different participants but I am sceptical.

497. *Also supports local boards in: Lakes-Murchison, Richmond, Moutere-Waimea, Motueka*
I support the Auckland centralised services model and costs being used for our region. As a resident of Takaka, I enjoy the riches of living amongst a diverse community with deep values for health and well-being for people, flora, fauna, the land and land-use farming. We have strengths of interest in sustainable living and protection of ecosystems and biodiversity as well as entrepreneurial ventures. I believe having more autonomy would encourage more creativity and engagement within our community. I believe we can be leaders for the rest of NZ and the world in exploring and implementing new ways to live and govern especially at this time of world upheaval. I believe we need to have governance over decision-making for Port Taroako, Takaka aerodrome and GB motorcamps. I support the formation of a local board for Golden Bay even if other boards are not sought or granted elsewhere in Tasman District.

498. *Also supports local boards in: Lakes-Murchison, Richmond, Moutere-Waimea, Motueka*
I see that the formation of local boards across the district would allow for more local decision-making relevant to communities. As a long-time resident of Golden Bay, I feel that it is time for a change of governance. There are several ongoing issues that remain unresolved despite many years of consultation with TDC. The areas of concern that I feel need addressing are our coastal bird feeding and nesting sites, use of vehicles on our beaches in Golden Bay, dog control around bird nesting sites.

Golden Bay is a special community with a wide variety of individuals with diverse skills and thoughtful future visions. I would like the Commission to allow the Golden Bay community the opportunity to have more control of future governance through the formation of a local board.

499. –

500. I believe the cost for installing, as well as annual and future costs, are too high compared with the gains. The LB would be too much in risk of being misused for private gain. Work on relationships with TDC instead.
501. More decisions made locally and not over the hill in Richmond. Golden Bay is physically separate and a discreet part of Tasman District. It has its own unique issues. Personally, I have experienced lack of action by TDC officers on vehicles on beaches, freedom camping etc. They didn't even answer emails. I strongly suspect that councillors have been captured by cabal of long-serving TDC officers. Happy to pay some more rates for more connected decision-making.
502. *Also supports local boards in: Motueka, Murchison, Richmond*
Our community board is given hardly any power. I think it is important for Golden Bay to have greater autonomy and self-determination, for many practical as well as democratic reasons. There is general (great) discontent with the way TDC has been managing GB. I strongly support district-wide coverage of a community-level tier of local governance.
503. *Also supports local boards in: Motueka, Tasman*
TDC has been ignoring our request to have more power. The majority of us didn't want to have the Waimea Dam and it was forced on us and our rates for generations to come. Our cycle lanes are not sealed and suck compared to Richmond. We wanted living light candle to have Tarakohe harbour and develop cafes and tourism and we got tellies (who pay pittance) unattractive and bad for ecology (sic). TDC has allotted too many water permits causing Waikoropupu springs to grow nitrates. TDC spent money in legal fees to go against residents' wishes (grandstand). Golden Bay council was well managed.
504. I support a local board.
505. *Also supports local boards in: Motueka, Tasman*
I like local centralised power and TDC is too far and out of touch with what people want here in GB.
506. –
507. –
508. Very happy with status quo.
509. Don't want any more cost on rates to what we are paying now. Happy with our local (sic) board.
510. Don't want any more money accruing. Happy with the board we already have. Rates expensive enough now when you are on a pension.
511. Do not change what we have now.
512. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Mapua, Motueka*
Local decisions at a local level.
513. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Mapua.*
Local decisions at a local level.
514. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere.*
I support this because we need a more responsive, accountable and transparent leadership, and a bigger say in what happens in our community.

515. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere*
I support this because we need more say in local projects. Accountability and responsive leadership in our community.
516. *Also supports local boards in: Motueka, Richmond, Moutere*
517. *Also supports local boards in: Tasman District*
Protect Puppu springs!
518. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere*
519. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere*
More transparency in local government
520. *Also supports local boards in: all areas*
521. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Upper Moutere*
More local representation
522. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere*
We need better representation and transparency in local government
523. *Also supports local boards in: all over TDC*
More local representation of qualified people
524. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Stoke, Motueka, Moutere*
More local representation
525. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere*
More accountability, more representation for local issues
526. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere*
We need more accountability and transparency in local government
527. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere*
More accountability
528. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere*
More accountability
529. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere*
We need more accountability and better representation in local government.
530. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka*
More local representation
531. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka*
To protect and preserve i.e. Puppu springs, national park reserves and waterways
532. *Also supports local boards in: all areas*
More local representation for local issues
533. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere*
More accountability
534. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka*
More representation
535. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere*
More local representation, better water quality Puppu springs!
536. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere*
Listening to people's voices and action taken on local issues

537. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere*
TDC is not willing to share power with the local people. We need full cost comparison and transparency for each option for each ward.
538. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere*
More local representation
539. *Also supports local boards in: Stoke, Richmond, Tasman*
Important for people in the community to find their own solutions
540. *Also supports local boards in: all over Tasman District*
541. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere*
Better representation in local government, more accountability, transparency and responsiveness
542. *Also supports local boards in: all over Tasman*
More representation
543. *Also supports local boards in: all over Tasman*
544. *Also supports local boards in: all over Tasman District*
545. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere*
We need more accountability in local government.
546. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere*
547. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Tasman, Mapua, Moutere*
548. *Also supports local boards in: all over Tasman District*
549. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere*
550. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere*
More accountability for local government
551. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Lakes, Moutere*
We need better more democratic local representation and decision-making.
552. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Mapua*
Some actual focus on the area requiring/needng assistance would make sense i.e. local attention
553. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere*
Better representation in local government
554. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere*
555. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Lakes, Moutere*
More democracy, transparency
556. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere*
557. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere*
I support more improved local representation and more accountability, more transparency
558. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere*
Local government needs to represent and include the people more
559. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere*
Better representation in local government
560. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond*
More local voice

561. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere*
We need better representation in local government
562. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond*
563. *Also supports local boards in: all over Tasman District*
Better representation
564. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere*
We need more accountability and local decision-making
565. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Mapua, Motueka, Moutere*
Local decision-making, not blanket changes
566. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Stoke, Motueka, Moutere*
More local representation
567. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Mapua, Motueka*
Local decision-making on a local level
568. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka*
More voices heard
569. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere*
Better transparency, better representation
570. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere*
Local decisions at a local level
571. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere*
Need better local representation, more accountability
572. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere*
I think this is better, so people will be heard and have better representation.
573. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere*
I think we can have better representation
574. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere*
Better information and more accountability in local government
575. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere*
More accountability, more representative
576. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Upper Moutere*
More responsive, more accountability
577. *Also supports local boards in: Richmond, Motueka, Moutere*
We need better representation in local communities
578. Pupu springs needs to remain pure
579. *Also supports local boards: across all areas in Tasman District*
I strongly support district-wide coverage of a community-level tier of local governance and in particular Golden Bay to allow us as a community more control of what happens and how our money is spent and not wasted.
580. TDC is the amalgamation of Golden Bay, Motueka, Moutere-Waimea, Lakes-Murchison and Richmond wards, Waimea County Council, Richmond and Motueka borough councils and Golden Bay County Council. Each already has its own councillors on TDC and Motueka and Golden Bay have community board members. Why are we making an exception for Golden Bay to have its own office with duplication of administrators etc? Instead, enable the staff at TDC to work more “fairly” for every ward and to support Golden Bay Community Board to absorb more responsibility.

NZ has gone through the throes of trying to localise boards and then to amalgamate them and now we want to localise them again. Ewan and I encompass change, but to move forward not to go backwards. Events of recent months have shown that technology can be used to help people feel more involved and listened to. We are yet to be convinced that the arrangement in Auckland is working and if anything the whole area is more segregated. Instead of spending time and money on this why not let's see some action for GB within the existing framework.

581. We have enough councillors already being paid too much for not enough wisdom and too much bias. Taxpayers need less boards and councils; less bureaucracy.

582. I can't really fully support any of the three options as pointed out in the attached letter. It's a very real concern to me that the Commission has such weak powers to facilitate far more options and influence on local councils or mediate to get better governance outcomes for communities like Golden Bay. This is such a very poor time to change anything – elections, RMA changes and the Bug!! I know you have all done your best for us – but?

I initially supported the concept of forming a local board for Golden Bay but have reluctantly decided not to support it mainly due to the significant uncertainties on the structure, total costs on rates, cost benefits. The relationship with the existing Tasman District Council. The long-term sustainability, durability of a local board. I am not convinced that the outcomes from a local board would be “any better” than the past decisions.

If the Commission was able to come back to this community with a comprehensive reorganisation draft plan based on what the Commission has indicated in their briefing booklet and that TDC fully endorsed, I would be far more likely to support the local board option.

Tasman District Council response to the local board option to date points to a rather negative and over the top structure and costs that in my view suggest they do not want it. Unless there are positive changes towards Golden Bay's governance, nothing much will change.

I see no reason why TDC cannot give more decision-making responsibilities to our community board. At least try it, why is it so difficult? If it does not work for any reason, it can be reversed.

I think another option worth serious consideration, would be to scrap the community board model completely. Pay the two elected councillors more for the extra work that would be required of them and create a new extra full-time support person based in the Bay to assist the councillors. This will remove unnecessary bureaucracies and resolve many of the ongoing, entrenched and conflicting issues. The outcomes could be far better for everyone!

I am aware that many of the significant positive changes for this community have come about through the committed efforts of individuals, private groups, societies and organisations with support from our elected councillors, with very little or no community board involvement. Which may suggest the community board model is of little use?

Is this a good time to be making any decisions on governance in view of the upcoming elections, changes to the RMA and the Bug? Reluctantly, stay with the community board for now.

Thanks to the secretary and team that put heaps of effort into the local board proposal.

583. –

584. A local Golden Bay board would be filled with all the loud mouth people who are only in it to get their names in the paper. They are not out for the best interests of Golden Bay, just for the recognition they can receive for doing nothing!!

585. I think it's bad enough with a community board not being able to agree just imagine how bad it would get as a GB local board.

586. –

587. My qualifications and lifetime working experience are exclusively in multinational commerce. I cannot see any possibility of a sensible decision being made without access to all financial data from the Tasman District Council. As a businessman I am amazed that, as the TDC's paymasters, we are forbidden access to where our money actually goes.

Until Tasman District Council provides transparency to its financial transactions it would, in my opinion, be imprudent to proceed with the establishment of a local board for Golden Bay. How can any decision involving our rates be made when the TDC refuses to reveal from where its income is derived and where our money is spent? At present the TDC provides only the type of activity it allegedly spends our rates on. The current classification of TDC expenditure is designed to prevent ratepayers from understanding income, costs or benefits derived, by ward. In this day and age, the technology exists to record the direct costs of contractors, material consumed and the personnel costs associated with each activity, by ward.

The vast majority of employees engaged by contractors for TDC related activity are hourly paid individuals who must 'clock in' and 'clock out' of their work. This is easily achieved with inexpensive phone apps. TDC staff should operate to this same discipline; after all, they are our public servants. The idea of public servants who refuse to tell their employers what they do or where they do it, is objectionable.

Submission 15: Lethea Erz

I support a local board in any other area of Tasman District whose residents want one. This decision should be made by those residents, without participation in the process of Tasman District residents from other wards.

The document which this form is part of has done a thorough job of laying out the potential advantages (many) and disadvantages (minor) of creating a Golden Bay local board (p. 14). I see no reason to re-state those here, other than to emphasise that any “perceived inequality of treatment of Golden Bay vis-à-vis other Tasman District communities” is a non-issue if those Tasman District communities also have the option of choosing a local board. The “complexity of arrangements etc.” with other Tasman communities with different governing bodies, and the “Implications for council administration and resourcing” are listed as “Disadvantages” but could be more accurately described as “Issues to be worked out” along with the details of allocation and delegation; they are “disadvantages” only if TDC doesn’t want to make any changes to their current ways of operating, which are NOT serving the residents of Golden Bay.

While I agree with the rationale for dividing the cost of a local board between Golden Bay ratepayers (via targeted rate) and all Tasman residents via general rates, the estimated costs are highly speculative, and the council “support” costs seem quite excessive to me, compared to costs of a community board. However, the projected cost to GB ratepayers for a local board with real authority to make decisions that affect Golden Bay, and carry them out, is still under \$100 per year, and in my opinion the gain in local autonomy is worth the extra cost.

Golden Bay is a unique community, and our rural character and culture, which are why residents choose to live here and others want to visit, have too often been negatively affected by the imposition of “urban” standards, for example: kerbs and channels long rural roads, unnecessarily large and intrusive signage that detracts from the scenic vistas, and glaring yellow street lamps in rural subdivisions that wash out our pristine night sky. Now there is talk of surveillance cameras being imposed on Takaka township; Golden Bay’s crime rate certainly does not justify this expensive and invasive technology, and local residents would be very unlikely to vote to install them. A local board will make decisions more in keeping with the character of our region and the wishes of the residents.

In summary, I strongly prefer a local board with extensive allocated and delegated responsibility and decision-making and regulatory authority. I also urge that Golden Bay voters be allowed to choose the voting method by which our board members are elected (favouring STV), and to decide how the board’s chair will be chosen. The more residents are able to actively influence and participate in the democratic governance of our local area, the more we will respect and support the choices made by our locally-selected representatives.

Tasman District Council's authority is best used to concentrate on providing services that inter-connect all areas of the district. The more responsibility local communities have for their own governance, the more TDC as a whole can concentrate on doing its core tasks effectively. This could result in a reduction of the need for so many TDC employees and eventually reduce the costs of the whole bureaucracy, so that local boards could actually result in an ultimate lowering of overall rates across the district's population. With Golden Bay as a "pioneer" community with a local board, other areas will be able to better assess if a local board will serve them better than their current local representatives.

Therefore, I urge the Local Government Commission to establish a Golden Bay local board and to take all necessary steps to ensure its maximum empowerment with policy-making, spending, regulatory and enforcement authority. I also recommend the LGC monitor the reorganisation process closely, to avoid obstructionism and excessive costs imposed by TDC, which has already indicated its desire to maintain central power, and which has a long history of decisions and actions which Golden Bay residents consider disrespectful, harsh and punitive. Please support our local autonomy and self-governance, for it will result in more-involved citizens, more-willing ratepayers, and more consistent achievement of the Local Government Act 2002's intention "to enable democratic local decision-making and action by, and on behalf of, communities".

Submission 67: Grant Knowles

I am **not** in favor of a local board for Golden Bay. I would like to retain the present community board. I can see no advantage to another governance model as the one we already have does a good job of representing the people of the Golden Bay and improvements could be that we ask council for more delegated responsibility. My arguments against a local board are:

- Too expensive to the ratepayers even though the cost was estimated around 500k the Great Barrier and Waiheke Islands local boards cost about 920k so I do not see how our GB would be much less
- The level of what a local board can do is not much different to a community board
- Cost of the support staff would be a factor to consider
- Cost of extra staff reports, travel over to Richmond etc. is also going to cost ratepayers over the whole district
- The relationship with TDC is most important, it doesn't matter what governance structure we have as long as we have a healthy relationship
- The chance GB will lose one of our council representatives in the future as we would be overrepresented would be difficult for Golden Bay's isolated situation
- Without a true cost benefit analysis, we do not have enough details to make an informed decision
- The imbalance of one local board, one community board and ratepayers' associations are likely to deliver inconsistency, therefore five local boards across the district would be the only fair way to structure this
- The community board has been and will be given more delegated powers and this will ensure more local decisions are made by locals and if the board does a good job more will be given
- The three-year plan/budget the LB gets to write still must go through the local governance of council for approval so the decision is still taken out of GB hands
- The community board can write a plan/budget to submit to the full council for approval

There is a lot of dissatisfaction with TDC from the people of GB but changing the system will not make any difference unless the relationship gets better and in the past four years there has been a vast improvement. If Tasman District is reorganised and we are given a local board I can see there is potential for the relationship to go backwards and we will take some years to even get to where we are now. This is the way things worked in Auckland, which is why I draw this conclusion

There can be huge differences in urban and rural solutions to different problems and this should be considered. Golden Bay has plenty of things in common with Motueka and in the past year both boards are working together to improve some of the challenges we commonly face.

If the people of Golden Bay are for any reason dissatisfied with representation, then democratically voting can change this.

Submission 108: John Lee

1. I support the option of a Golden Bay local board.

I have no opinion on any other boards elsewhere in Tasman District.

1.1 It has been interesting to seek to explain how the now past, but often fraught and contentious debate over the Recreation Park Centre and the showground grandstand might have developed had there been in place at the time a Golden Bay local board:

- “responsible for decision-making for the....Recreation Park Centre and fields...”and
- “advocating on behalf of the community in relation to...community funding and operational grants “, as well as
- ‘working in collaboration with the council...on... projects and programmes to improve local environments...helping build community networks and relationships...”

1.2 Had such collaboration, as only now proposed, occurred, this would have helped “build community networks and relationships”. [my emphases]

1.3 A major problem had been that centre advocates were dealing direct with the council as they knew that only the council had authority, and that consequently the views of the Golden Bay community were of no consequence.

1.4 What did occur?

... significant angst as well as extra charges on all ratepayers, and further decline in support for the Tasman District Council, its elected GB ward members and staff.

2 As I expect improved accountability between myself as a ratepayer and the Local Authority, the development of effective communication processes between the Council and the Golden Bay community will likely take time and effort.

2.1 The ‘deal on the table’ could achieve this

2.2 Given that ‘Firstly the purpose of local government is to enable democratic decision-making and action by, and on behalf of communities’ [my emphasis]and that the “purpose of local government is *also to promote the social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being of communities in the present and for the future*’, so I am seeking more democratic decision- making.

2.3 The Tasman District Council has already developed “Community outcomesas the outcomes council seeks for the Tasman District and its communities. They reflect what the community sees as important for its well-being and they help to build up a picture of the collective vision for the District’s future. Council is not expected to achieve the outcomes on its own, but in collaboration with the community. The outcomes guide decision-making by council. The council links its activities and services back to the outcomes”. [my emphasis]. This quotation comes from a council document!

2.3.1 Two outcomes raise questions for me:

1. Under 'Infrastructure' what evidence demonstrates that ' infrastructure is efficient, cost effective and meets current and future needs'? and

2. Under 'Governance' what evidence exists to demonstrates 'community engagement'? Indeed, it is far from clear what is meant by ‘community engagement’!

3. However, there is no reference to all inputs and outcomes needed to deliver these strategic outcomes.

It is this failure on the part of the Tasman District Council to account appropriately and effectively to its ratepayers, which lies close to my support for a local board.

What took place recently over the showground grandstand illustrated very clearly the cost to ratepayers when the Council - initially – disregarded the will of the people of Golden Bay.

Golden Bay Local Board Submission

1. Introducing Tasman District Council


- 1.1 Tasman District Council is one of only six Unitary Authorities. We combine the functions, duties and powers of both a territorial authority and a regional council. This includes promoting community wellbeing and development, public health and safety, reserves, recreation, libraries and culture, resource management, infrastructure (water supply, stormwater, wastewater, solid waste, roads), river and coastal management, biosecurity, civil defence and emergency management, regional land transport and environmental information.
- 1.2 Tasman District is located in the north-west of the South Island and covers an area from the boundary of Nelson City in the east, to Murchison in the south and Golden Bay in the northwest. Our District covers more than 14,800 square kilometres of mountains, parks waterways and territorial sea including 812 kilometres of coastline.
- 1.3 The land area alone is 9,771 square kilometres. Of this, a significant proportion is owned by Te Tau Ihu Iwi Trusts and Maori entities. Approximately 66% of Tasman District's land area is managed by the Department of Conservation. Our population is 54,700 and by 2043 is projected to reach 63,900 (high growth) or 55,800 (medium growth).
- 1.4 The elected Council consists of the Mayor and 13 councillors. The Mayor represents the District at large, while the Councillors cover five areas of the District (Golden Bay, Motueka, MoutereWaimea, Lakes-Murchison and Richmond). We also have two community boards comprising four members each in the Golden Bay and Motueka Ward.

2. Does this document provide the community/district with sufficient information to make an informed assessment?

- 2.1 The Options paper developed by the Local Government Commission (LGC) seeks "community views on the option of establishing a Golden Bay local board and more particularly the levels of support and opposition for such a board". The Tasman District Council (the Council) is concerned that the information presented in the Options paper does not have sufficient depth of analysis or that it fairly portrays the current breadth of responsibilities, advocacy and collaboration opportunities that the Golden Bay Community Board currently has compared to that delivered through a local board.
- 2.2 Specifically, the Council believes the following information will be misinterpreted by readers who are unfamiliar with the purpose and functions of the Council and that of the current community boards.

- Page 6 of the paper lists key differences between a local board and community board. The presentation suggests that only a local board would be “responsible for certain decisions in its areas...and is accountable to the local community for these decisions” and that it will also be given the new opportunity of being “Required to identify and communicate local interests and preferences in relation to council strategies, policies, and bylaws”. The Local Government Act 2002 Part 5, S52 specifies these as current responsibilities of a Community Board. These are not unique to a local board.
- Page 8 – the image of the Tasman District Council should have included the following comparative population and ratepayer statistics:

2.3 **Table: Comparative population and representative statistics broken down by Ward**

	Current Representation	Number of Ratepayers ¹	Number of Electors ² in roll	Population (est) ³	Population per councillor/member ⁴
Lakes-Murchison Ward	1	2,304	2,654	3,230	3230
Golden Bay Ward	2+4	3,505	4,029	5,370	895
Golden Bay Local Board	2+5	3,505	4,029	5,370	767
Motueka Ward	3+4	5,888	9,116	13,130	1876
Moutere-Waimea Ward	3	5,790	10,519	15,500	5167
Richmond Ward	4	6,820	12,696	17,530	4283
Total		24,307	39,014	54,760	2608

¹ Numbers taken from July 2020 rates strike, as are the “Capital Value by ratepayer”

² Number of Residential Electors as at 30 April 2019 received from Enrolment Services.

³ Subnational population estimates 30 June 2019 - data extracted on 16 Jul 2020 01:28 UTC (GMT) from NZ.Stat

⁴ Population figure divided by the total number of councillors and community board, for each Ward.

- Pages 9 – 11 describes ‘What might a Golden Bay local board do?’ with the paper listing Advocacy and Collaboration across a number of areas. These are existing responsibilities of the current Community Board, and while the Council recognises the nuances of the terminology used within the introductory paragraph such as “enhanced” and “stronger”, there is a genuine concern that these finer points are easily overlooked by other submitters.
- Page 14 lists the Advantages and Disadvantages of a Golden Bay local board. The Advantages which are listed are intangible and cannot be measured. The Disadvantages are tangible and can be measured. Presenting the Advantages and Disadvantages this way does not allow a submitter to undertake a balanced assessment.
- Page 14 listed as a disadvantage the “requirements for new funding policy, three year plan and annual plan” but did not go into sufficient detail as to why these processes are a disadvantage. It would help other submitters if they understood that while local boards prepare their local board plans (and may have to meet the associated costs), the prioritising of funding for implementation remains the responsibility of the governing body and that the local community may still not achieve all of their stated priorities if they are to rely on district-wide funding to support them.

3. Will a local board encourage greater community involvement in decision making in Golden Bay?

- 3.1 The Council does not believe that a local board will change the appetite of the community to be involved in local decision making in Golden Bay.
- 3.2 The community, if choosing to go down the path of a local board, will still be selecting representation from the same talent pool. A change in structure does not guarantee a change in the relationships, skills or experience on the board.
- 3.3 The Council is aware of the historical frustrations expressed by parts of the Golden Bay community, and believes that significant progress has been made in terms of improving the relationship and addressing those concerns. The recent solution surrounding the Golden Bay Grandstand is evidence of that.
- 3.4 The existing Community Board is empowered with a number of decision making responsibilities, and these are always open for expansion where legislation allows. The Council has a positive history of adding delegations and these are reviewed periodically and often occur on a project basis. Working groups are also frequently established to ensure localised input to decision making is supported and encourages participation from as large a cross section of the interested community as possible. Recent examples include Takaka Freshwater and Land Advisory Group, Golden Bay Natural Landscapes Project and the Port Tarakohe development.

4. What might a Golden Bay local board cost?

- 4.1 It is difficult to ascertain the actual costs of running a local board in advance of any final structure being determined, however the experiences of the Auckland Council establish a reliable base-line.
- 4.2 Advice from the Auckland Council on the level of support required to support a geographically isolated local board, indicates the following direct staff support required in Golden Bay:
- Lead team member
 - Customer support officer
 - Senior and part time advisor
 - PA/Community liaison officer
- 4.3 We also sought to understand the costs to deliver this support and used figures from the Auckland Council's 2017/18 Annual Report for Governance costs specific to a comparable local board:
- Waiheke (5 members, pop 9250) governance costs were \$918,000
 - Great Barrier (5 members, pop 939) governance costs in were \$909,000
 - Great Barrier is 10% of the population of Waiheke but has similar governance costs demonstrating there are fixed overhead costs associated with supporting a local board structure.
- 4.4 Tables 2 and 3 below show the likely additional ratepayer costs calculated by the Council over and above the costs already incurred in servicing a Community Board. These are based on the Auckland Council figures and compared to those provided in the Options paper. The column 'Costs if only funded by Golden Bay' shows the cost if all the costs of a local board were covered by a targeted rate. The column 'Costs if funded district-wide' shows the cost if all the costs were spread across the District.

4.4.1 Table 2: Costs based on Auckland Council figures from their 2017/2018 Annual Report

		Costs if only funded by Golden Bay	Costs if funded district-wide
	\$	\$ Per property	\$ Per property
Current targeted rate (from Tasman District Council reports)	17,558	5.01	-
Elected Members Local Board remuneration	75,000	21.40	3.09
Governance costs (from Auckland Council)	900,000	256.78	37.03
	975,000	283.18	40.11

4.4.2 Table 3: Costs based on Local Government Commission figures provided in Options paper

		Costs if only funded by Golden Bay	Costs if funded district-wide
	\$	\$ Per property	\$ Per property
Current targeted rate	17,558	5.01	-
Elected Members Local Board remuneration	75,000	21.40	3.09
Direct costs (from LGC estimates)	240,000	68.47	9.87
Indirect costs (from LGC estimates)	190,000	54.21	7.82
	505,000	149.09	20.78

4.5 These costs are indicative and the two scenarios are not the only options. The purpose of this table is to demonstrate that the costs provided in the report severely underestimate what the actual costs are more likely to be, based on the actual experience of Auckland Council. Even if the costs of a Golden Bay local board were half the cost of the Auckland example, that would still represent an increase in costs, the benefits of which are understated or unclear.

4.6 If costs were funded through general rates the allocation of costs by Ward would be based on capital value as set out in the table below (that is, the additional cost of a local board would be met in proportion to the capital value split shown):

4.6.1 Table 4: General rates split by Ward

Ward	Capital Value	%
Lakes-Murchison Ward	\$ 1,624M	9%
Golden Bay Ward	\$ 2,229M	13%
Motueka Ward	\$ 3,838M	22%
Moutere-Waimea Ward	\$ 4,716M	26%
Richmond Ward	\$ 5,389M	30%

Allocated and Delegated functions

4.7 Page 9 of the Options Paper does not specify which powers and functions would be allocated and which would be delegated. This is relevant because there is a difference between allocation and delegation of powers and functions. Allocated powers are more permanent (and difficult to change) compared with delegated functions.

- 4.8 As an additional point, many of the powers and functions listed as possibly being delegated or allocated to the local board are already delegated to the community board. In the Council's view, this is not adequately highlighted by the Options Paper. This is problematic because it would be difficult for members of the public to weigh up the differences between the existing community board (and its functions/powers) and the proposed local board.
- 4.9 As it is currently worded, the Options Paper does not have enough detail as to which specific powers are proposed to be delegated or allocated to the local board. The Council recognises that that additional detail is not necessarily required at this stage of the Commission's process, however given the existing delegations to the community board it is important that the differences between the powers allocated and delegated be clear. The Council suggests more robust analysis be undertaken in relation to the powers that are proposed to be allocated or delegated to the local board (and that this be clearly compared with the existing delegated powers of the community board).

5. The four questions in the Options paper:

5.1 **What are your views on an appropriate balance between: ▫ More local decision making in Golden Bay and ▫ District-wide decision making?**

5.1.1 The Council believes there currently is an appropriate balance between local decision making and district-wide decision making, especially given the way in which activities are funded.

5.1.2 The current community board has appointments on the Takaka Aerodrome User Group, the Port Tarakohe Advisory Group, the Golden Bay Museum Board, all Hall Committees, holds a budget for funding community activities and projects, and Community Boards hold portfolio responsibilities for the respective standing committees.

5.1.3 In assigning functions, LGC and the community need to be aware of legislative limitations imposed by legislation, for example the Reserves and Other Land Disposal Act 1959,

which specifies the ongoing management arrangements of the recreation reserve in Takaka.

5.2 **Given its geographical features and the relative remoteness of Golden Bay, do you consider more local decision-making is necessary to promote local community resilience and wellbeing now and in the future?**

5.2.1 The Council also believes that the mechanism necessary to promote local community resilience and well-being exist within the current governance structure and that a local board will not enhance this.

- 5.2.2** Nor does the Council support the establishment of a local board on the basis of ‘relative remoteness’. In fact, there is only a 6 minute differential in driving time between Takaka to Richmond vs Murchison to Richmond.⁵
- 5.2.3** The Council entirely agrees that local decision-making is necessary to promote local community resilience and well-being now and in the future, for any community. The Council has always acknowledged the uniqueness of the Golden Bay Ward with the higher number of representatives than normally provided by legislation. In the ‘Table 1: Comparative population and representative statistics broken down by Ward’ it shows clearly that Golden Bay already has a higher representative to population ratio than the other Wards with each member representing 895 people, versus, for example, the Motueka Ward representing 1876 people per member. If the decision is to proceed with a local board, the Council encourages the LGC to be more explicit in their expectations of an appropriate governance structure for the board that would be in proportion to, and not disadvantage, the rest of the District.
- 5.2.4** A local board in Golden Bay risks encouraging further isolation rather than the current inclusive club approach across the District.
- 5.2.5** To provide utility infrastructure, the Council has three clubs – one for each of the water supply, wastewater and stormwater activities. How the clubs operate is that most of the urban areas where the Council provides utility infrastructure services all pay the same amount of rates per household or business for those services. Clubs only apply to the urban areas which receive these services. The rural areas, which do not get these services, do not pay.
- 5.2.6** Over time, the Council spends money maintaining, renewing and upgrading the three waters services in each urban area and the funding for this work comes out of the Club funding pool. By taking this approach, it reduces the fluctuations in rates incurred by ratepayers due to lumpy infrastructure demands. It also tends to mean that the smaller communities are provided with infrastructure that they may not otherwise be able to afford without some cross-subsidisation from the larger urban communities. A local board proposal in Golden Bay, or in other areas of the District, has the potential to unwind the Club approach, reinforce “user-pays”, and therefore make it harder for smaller communities across the District to:
- a. upgrade their water supplies to meet the ongoing increase in the Government’s drinking water standards;
 - b. meet increasing environmental standards for wastewater treatment; and

⁵ Google Maps driving time from Richmond to Takaka is 1 hour 34 minutes, the driving time from Richmond to Murchison is 1 hour 28 minutes

- c. meet the increasing need for stormwater management due to climate change and other factors.
- 5.2.7** With respect to community infrastructure, the Council has taken a Club approach to the provision of new multi-purpose community facilities. The Council recently constructed a new \$4.2 million community recreation facility in Takaka for the Golden Bay community. Over \$1 million of this funding was raised by community fundraising, but the balance came from funding spread across the District. Smaller communities in our District may not be able to afford such facilities without District-wide funding through the Club approach.
- 5.2.8** District-wide funding through the Club approach enables the Council to deliver similar levels of service to all the urban areas within our District, with everyone paying the same amount of rates for that service no matter where they live. The question arises as to how funding one local board might impact on this arrangement, or how it can be ring-fenced to ensure it doesn't.
- 5.3 Is there community support for the establishment of local boards elsewhere in the Tasman District? Can you demonstrate the level of support?**
- 5.3.1** When the LGC originally called for submissions only one submission supported a local board, which is not indicative of support by the wider community.
- 5.3.2** Nor was this supported through the representation review, conducted in 2018, prior to the 2019 triennial elections. While the Representation Review did not ask about local boards, there was the opportunity to ask for community boards through the Review process.
- 5.3.3** No requests for other community boards were received as part of the submission process.⁶
- 5.3.4** Should the Commission decide on a local board, the Council's least preferred option is five local boards across the District due to increased costs, increased inconsistency of policy and service levels across the community and cuts across communities of interest.⁷
- 5.3.5** Costs and staff resources would be considerably higher with additional local boards to service. There would be more transaction costs liaising with boards on regulatory and non-regulatory matters and as a statutory recognised entity the current informal arrangements that currently exist with community organisations may cease.⁸

⁶ [Final Representation Review Proposal 2018](#), August 2018

⁷ Letter from Tasman District Council to Local Government Commission, Key Matters to Consider for Local Board Proposal, June 2019

⁸ Local Board Workshop material, May 2019

5.3.6 The Council believes that while there may be some limited support for local boards, it is based on incomplete information and that the support is not universally widespread. It also believes that local boards based on the current Wards may not necessarily correlate with communities of interest.

5.3.7 Further to this, the Council believes that any new requests for local boards initiated as part of this process should be considered under the current Reorganisation rules⁹, where the threshold would require 10% of electors in the affected area, with the affected area being the entire District, not just a Ward, as the funding arrangements potentially impact the entire District.

5.4 Do you have comments on possible local board representation arrangement or on councillor presentation in the event a local board(s) is established in Tasman District?

5.4.1 The Golden Bay Ward currently has two Councillors for a population of 5,370 (2,685 per member) with an average population per Councillor of –32.43% when compared to the District average. This is outside of the ‘+/- 10% rule’ as outlined in section 19V(2) of the Local Electoral Act 2001. Please note that this representation does not take into account other elected representatives as currently provided by community boards.¹⁰

5.4.2 However, the Act allows for particular community of interest considerations to justify a deviation of this rule. The Council already considers Golden Bay Ward to be treated as an isolated community under section 19V(2) of the Local Electoral Act 2001 for the following reasons:

- The Ward is an isolated community requiring specific representation in order to provide effective representation;
- Reducing the number of members will compromise the rural voice and increase the population per member to almost 5,000;
- It has a very clear geographic line that separates Golden Bay from the balance of the District;
- Weather patterns can vary considerably from the rest of the District that can isolate the Bay, as shown recently by Cyclone Gita;
- Contracts for roading, parks and reserves etc. are all carried out from depots and staff based in the Bay;
- Has a relatively small permanent population which swells considerably during the holiday season with domestic and international visitors;
- There are four distinct settlements within the Golden Bay Ward which make up the broader community of interest;
- Elected members are the ‘eyes and ears’ of the community and often their first point of contact.

⁹ Schedule 3 of the LGA deals with reorganisation

<http://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/2002/0084/latest/DLM4926391.html>

¹⁰ Final Proposal for Representation Arrangements for the 2019 Local Elections, August 2018

5.4.3 If Golden Bay was to get a local board, it will receive a higher level of governance service than other areas in the District. Therefore, it would be difficult to justify a second Councillor for Golden Bay on the Council. As many matters of importance to Golden Bay (along with the rest of the Tasman District) will still be considered by the Council, it may disadvantage the Golden Bay community if their representation on the Council was reduced to one Councillor. ¹¹

5.4.4 The Council is required to undertake a representation review for the 2025 Triennial elections. If a local board is established this would need to be considered as part of this process, and as mentioned earlier the Council encourages the LGC to be more explicit in their expectations of an appropriate governance structure for the board that would not disadvantage the rest of the District.

6. Conclusion

6.1 We appreciate the legislation empowers the LGC to make a final reorganisation proposal once it has considered feedback on the current proposal. The Council also appreciates and acknowledges the desire of communities within Tasman to have voice in the decision making processes affecting them. On the basis of what the LGC has presented, we are unconvinced that a compelling case for a local board has been presented given the likely cost implications to the Tasman community generally and Golden Bay in particular. We draw the attention of the LGC to the Council's earlier submission as we do not believe the proposal currently out for submission has adequately addressed the matters we raised.

6.2 We would like the opportunity to speak to our submission in person at the Commission hearing.

Yours sincerely



Tim King
Mayor, Tasman District Council



Janine Dowding
Chief Executive, Tasman District Council

¹¹ Letter from Tasman District Council to Local Government Commission, Key Matters to Consider for Local Board Proposal, June 2019

Submission 146: Motueka Community Board

The Motueka Community Board has reviewed the re-organisation document distributed by the Local Government Commission and is concerned about three key aspects of the document:

1. The document implies that more localised decision-making can occur for local boards that community boards do not have. Whilst factually correct it fails to highlight that local board allocated powers are exactly the same as potential community board delegations. (The key difference is allocated versus delegated). The Motueka Community Board Chair has had no instances in my two terms of council where council has not allocated a specific delegation to the board upon request. It is also important to highlight that Mayor King has made a commitment to meet with both community board chairs on a 6-weekly cycle to keep engaged directly with the work of the two boards.
2. The added cost of the local board. Our ward has welcomed a 0% rate increase for the 2020/21 year and I constantly hear residents unhappy with the level of rates paid. Whilst no calculations have been submitted for a Motueka Community Board scenario one can only assume it is at a similar level to the Golden Bay local board. In attending a council workshop on the LGC's document there was further information that would suggest that the indicative cost of the local board was under-represented in this document. Long-term community projects such as a community swimming pool, traffic congestion and storm and waste water upgrades in the Motueka Community Board's view would be a much more worthy use of any additional targeted rate, rather than adding to the governance cost of council.
3. Local decision-making, an annual plan and 3yr plan are all made by the local board. This implies that the local board has autonomy over all local budgets and local work-streams. The reality is however that TDC set the LTP and annual plan, sets the rating policy and therefore remains the sole decision-maker in what actually gets delivered. Whilst the local board reorganisation document suggests that Golden Bay retains two ward councillors it also leaves this open for TDC to review. If the result of a local board was a loss of a ward councillor in either the Golden Bay or Motueka wards, we believe that this would be devastating.

Whilst the Motueka Ward does believe that the Golden Bay community have the absolute right to decide and therefore fund any form of representation, we do not have a strong objection to the Golden Bay communities request, we do however have a strong objection for the Commission on the back of this review suggesting that Motueka could also be appointed a local board with very minimal consultation to our community.

Furthermore it is disappointing that whilst the Commission has decided to include "other wards" into a possible re-organisation, including specifically mentioning Motueka Community Board in option #3, the Commission has been absent in presenting to the Motueka Community Board or the Motueka community to seek a wider view, choosing simply to send an email with the discussion document attached seeking feedback. For a review seeking to promote "locally-based" decision-making the Commission's engagement with the local ward has been very poor.

Submission 269: John Hutton

This proposal strikes me as being extremely self-serving; crying out 'victimisation' at the hands of other ratepayers (or the Council itself – as if Council was anything other than representative of all ratepayers in another form).

I believe the proposal will result in greater inefficiencies at a time when we all want more productive government service levels for our rates, not less.

The proposal seeks to reverse recent trends of amalgamating inefficient councils or governance areas and instead seeks to 'Balkanise' an area of New Zealand just because a vocal minority feels it has been hard done by TDC.

In an area as large as Tasman District, there are inherent difficulties in most areas (apart, perhaps from Richmond itself) of any area to self-fund its infrastructure requirements, such as Motueka's improved stormwater system, waste treatment facilities in several areas of the district, a local health facility in say, Murchison, or a dam on the Lee river.

It strikes me as incredibly self-serving and fatuous that backers of this proposal seek to set themselves up as 'semi-self-governing' while still asking others in the District to continue to fund them – the opposite of "Taxation without Representation", this becomes "Representation without Taxation" – otherwise known as gaining an unfair benefit.

The proposals seeks to have non-Golden Bay ratepayers subsidise services (governance and other) to Golden Bay and this would seem to be inefficient as well as ineffective as there will be several (many?) financial needs within Golden Bay which can only be met by assistance from an 'outside' source (ie, TDC ratepayers at large).

Thus, Golden Bay will seek to be 'independent' and as separate from the 'others' in TDC until they need/want something they can't afford, then TDC ratepayers will be their best mates (who will be tapped for that loan to build 'x').

Obviously, I strongly object to this proposal in its entirety; it is a proposal which has grown out of the 'internal' issues created by two groups of ratepayers in Golden Bay. These two groups have developed over the past 10+ years, representing the local farming community vs the relatively new 'free spirits' from Nelson as they migrated out of the growing Nelson area to a more rural, bucolic, and less frenzied lifestyle.

Now, the ratepayers of the greater Tasman District are faced with funding a request which seeks to further isolate the area from its neighbours in the District because they don't like how they've been treated.

The current feeling in Golden Bay seems to be "anything TDC wants is the opposite of anything that we want" or "if TDC wants it, it must be bad for us here in Golden Bay", and rather than seeking to improve the situation, those disgruntled individuals seek to use ratepayers funds to withdraw into their own little 'shell', drawing financial assistance from the outside to pay for their needed infrastructure but not wanting to effectively participate in the governance process which seeks to represent the entire District. Whatever happened to "we're all in this together"?

Instead of focusing on things which separate us, I strongly believe we should be looking at all those things that we share in common. This unmitigated desire to seek the lowest common denominator of values, governance, funding, and representation will surely result in a debasing of many of our common values and will weaken the features that bind us all together, as New Zealanders, as South Islanders, and as Top of the South residents.

I firmly state my opposition to this proposal and ask that the Commission reject it in its entirety. Further, rather than setting up local boards, I believe we should be looking at amalgamating existing council areas, perhaps creating a greater regional council or two for areas outside Canterbury.

Thank you for your consideration.

Submission 282: Provincial Executive of Golden Bay Rural Women

Golden Bay Provincial Executive is made up of three branches, Takaka, Bainham, and Pakawau. Each branch represents members within their distinct communities and the provincial has representatives from all three branches. This organisation represents approximately 80 members.

The Rural Women Provincial Executive has made the decision to make a collective submission to the Local Government Commission regarding the local board proposal for Golden Bay.

We do not support the option of a Golden Bay local board as contained in this proposal. We support the status quo. We seek the retention of the existing elected community board with two elected councillors to Tasman District Council. We do wish to be heard.

We do not think this document offers anything additional to Golden Bay governance that cannot be had now through delegations to the existing community board.

The cost of this proposal makes it totally unacceptable. Both of the estimates of likely costs, initially by the LGC in the proposal document, and latterly by TDC in their own estimates to council (which are even higher), would put an unacceptable financial burden on Golden Bay ratepayers.

Our Rural Women members have carefully considered the pros and cons of this proposal and have decided that they do not support this proposal for a local board nor a targeted rate to fund this board. They point out that Golden Bay is a low wage economy and that many of our members are themselves paying very high rates and they have only very limited incomes and do not want to be burdened by yet another targeted rate.

Additionally, it was pointed out that Golden Bay Rural Women, Takaka, Pakawau, and Bainham Branches all support Mohua Social Services food bank which provides a much needed service in this community. However, with Covid 19 and the loss of jobs in an economy that has many businesses that are reliant on the tourist dollar, the need for the foodbank parcels had been even greater than usual. To impose higher rates on people who are already struggling would be an unfair imposition.

Consideration was given to the possibility of the reduction of one councillor for Golden Bay as result of perceived additional local government representation. While no one can predict what may happen at the next representation review, Golden Bay Rural Women members felt the retention of two councillors for Golden Bay was vital.

It adds another expensive layer of administration and bureaucracy.

The full time corporate support person will be employed by, and be accountable to, Tasman District Council, which may cause conflict with the proposed local board.

Whether it is a community board, or a local board; Golden Bay Rural Women members believe that it is all about relationships, and the promotion of an environment of mutual respect and honesty, between Tasman District Council and the Golden Bay Community Board is the most positive way of achieving constructive outcomes.

Carol Wells – President Takaka Branch, Joyce Wylie – President Pakawau Branch, Carolyn McLellan – President Bainham Branch and Golden Bay Provincial President

Submission 285: Judith Rothstein

I am wanting a local board for Golden Bay. I support any or all of the other 4 wards who may also want a local board. It is up to those communities to determine what the best governance is for them. I think it would benefit the Tasman District to have more local boards so that the council can focus on the regional concerns that need to be addressed.

I am in full support of a Golden Bay local board. As an active community member for 13 years, I have been impressed with local involvement in the big and small issues in our community. I have also been greatly disappointed that TDC has time and again refused to take the input, ignored it or actually fought (legal) our community efforts. Local decision-making is necessary in order to have a sense of community and to feel empowered to take action for the well-being of our community. It makes sense that all concerns and tasks that primarily are of a local nature would be decided by the representatives of that community, and that the central authority, TDC, be tasked with focusing on regional issues.

The varied expertise in Golden Bay is amazing. And people generously share their knowledge and give their time and energy because they care about helping make this community a healthy place for all. It is this wealth of local knowledge and understanding of the local context and culture that facilitates creative solutions that work for the community as a whole. I value this and know that it nurtures a resilient response to difficulties that arise. I feel confident that if we have a local board, they will consult with the people directly involved in whatever the issue is and they'll call in some of our local experts to provide information and perspective. I am looking for honesty and transparency in our governing process. We do not have that with TDC.

I have not been involved with the Working Group for a GB Local Board but I've read their information and I feel it is comprehensive and speaks to our needs as a community. I was able to look at their response to TDC's response to the application - Feb '20. The Working Group articulated clearly why what TDC presented was not accurate or was missing the point. Half-way through that document I felt overwhelmed and discouraged. TDC had no concept of working collaboratively. They didn't indicate that they understood that creating a local board means shared governance. And they stated that supporters' preference for a local board "is strongly linked to a perception that they do not receive their proportionate value from the rates spend". TDC's whole emphasis on the financial aspect was infuriating. It is exactly this kind of mis-reading of our community that is at the root of the problem. I and other community members want to be heard, respected and have a voice in determining what is right for our community. That's why we have a preference for a local board. We're not going to get more \$ allocated. The funding formula doesn't change.

I think TDC is trying to scare people about how much it will cost us if we go with a local board. They made their submission public on 5 August with the same cost analysis without regard to what the LGC proposed re: fewer staff/lower direct cost/indirect costs district-wide. I consider this as a mis-representation on TDC's part on actual costs and it is damaging to this democratic process as people make submissions this week. I was able to spend hours reading over the information provided by the Working Group but so many people in our community may not have the time to sort out what's true in all of this.

And I think this is representative of what TDC does when they want things to go their way. It's confusing and divisive. Chris Choat, TDC Community Relations Manager added to the misinformation by submitting a letter to the editor in Friday's paper. He wrote: "TDC does not have an opinion either way". That's community relations for you!

It would be really nice to cut through all of this. And be able to work together towards a common good. I really think there would be advantages to TDC - I'd like to see a local board be able work WITH them. For the well-being of the region we need to create a collaborative culture.

Some specifics re: the local board:

—5 members elected. Members of the board selecting their own chair. If it's possible to rotate the chair, I think that would be ideal.

—I would like to retain 2 councillors from Golden Bay. I think our input about what direction we want to see the region go is important. We have a very small voice as is on the council so would hope not to reduce that.

—I agree with the Working Group on: "LGC should err on the side of greater allocation and delegation than risk granting too limited powers" to the local board. The problems that I have experienced (as have many community members, including the community board) is that TDC does not often take our *advocacy* voice into consideration when they make decisions. I would like to see LGC list ALL regulatory and non-regulatory responsibilities that effect the GB community and are located in Golden Bay be within the local board's allocations and delegations. It seems important that these be identified clearly so that we can feel secure in being able to follow through on projects or programmes that will need to be gradually developed and implemented. The legislation makes clear what the exceptions to this would be. Other than those exceptions, the decision-making power needs to rest with the local board for all environmental, social and cultural impacts that any use of Tasman District assets within Golden Bay might have. (Port Taroakohe, aerodrome, Collingwood campgrounds, etc.) It is a significant difference for me to vote for local board representatives who will make those decisions rather than a committee that is formed by and reports to TDC.

—It is unclear to me how the support services officer will be selected. This would be a full-time person who is employed by TDC but paid fully through our targeted rates. I think it's extremely important for the local board to have equal say in who fills that position. I wonder if there is anyone currently who has the qualifications and experience and who either lives in the Bay or has previous connection here. I suggest that the job description include experience with collaborative process and excellent communication skills.

—Costs: LGC researched this and got advice and suggested an affordable plan that seems reasonable to me. An increase of \$75p.a. for GB ratepayers for the direct costs and the indirect support costs being paid through the general rate. I am very worried that TDC will use their power with the control of money to put the costs out of our reach. Both their submission and Mr Choat's letter showed that they were maintaining a targeted rate of \$283. If the LGC does not have authority to regulate this, then what do we do?

I appreciate the work of the LGC and the fact that you accepted our application is validating - that there is reason to explore a better way of governance. This submission asks the LGC to establish a Golden Bay local board. Thank you.

Submission 294: Dr Roland Toder

I support (2nd Option): the option of a Golden Bay local board and a local board or boards elsewhere in Tasman District

A local board (LB) is able to prepare a three-year community plan (including budgeting and work schedules) and a LB provides for significant community involvement in its own governance.

This is the first community application to the Local Government Commission (LGC) under the Government legislation implemented in 2014. Therefore, I do see a clear challenge for LGC and the community to get the agreement tailored in an effective and prosperous way. Certainly the so far proposed targeted rates are significantly too high for the GB community (see below).

1) More local boards than just in Golden Bay (GB)

I believe that it would be important and critical to have more than one local board in the Tasman District. It will make the entire process far more economical and the already existing numerous community associations (and community boards) covering many of the districts smaller communities, such as Brightwater, Dovedale, Mapua, Marahau, Moutere Hills, Motueka Valley, Murchison, Rotoiti, Tapawera etc. plus Motueka and Richmond itself could be harmonized in forming approximately four to five local boards. Because the only other LBs known in NZ are in Auckland. There are 21 LBs in Auckland and they are funded from the general rates.

We would face quite a different situation to that in Auckland here if there would be just one LB (GB only) and it needs to be clarified within this process NOT AFTER THE DECISION on whether a single LB for our community of 5000 people is practical and affordable.

While LGC has identified an approximate \$75 increase in annual rate per property in GB, TDC released their proposed governance support structure for a GB local board after consulting with the Auckland Council. TDC proposes that it requires four and a half council staff (not one, as suggested by LGC), located in GB, at a cost of \$975,000 p.a., or \$283 p.a. per household if funded solely by the local community. This amount of targeted rates (\$283/household) will certainly be unaffordable for the GB community.

So clearly it would not be sensible to implement a LB for GB without finalizing an acceptable cost structure – e.g. targeted rate per GB household.

I personally could see in the near future the amalgamation of TDC with Nelson City Council (NCC) and Marlborough District Council (MDC) forming a 'Top of the South Island' Council with many (similar to Auckland) LB across the Top of the South Island. This structure would allow general rates that would be significantly lower than proposed (from LGC and TDC).

2) How should the LB look like

I would support to have 5 elected members and 2 appointed members (the two ward councillors, if there will be still two). The board chairperson should be elected by the LB since they need to most effectively work with each other.

3) Decision making responsibilities of GB LB

Regulatory Responsibilities (Delegations) If the effects of regulation are on the GB community, then, responsibility for making those decisions should reside with the GB local board. We see significant benefits in certain regulatory functions being tailored for Golden Bay, such as housing/land usage regulation. It is of imminent importance to make sure that all relevant responsibilities are agreed on in the first place. This is based on the fact that responsibilities that will be proposed after the LGC's initial list of local decision-making responsibilities allocated to the LB (in the first reorganization plan), could only be changed in future if the governing body of TDC (i.e. mayor and councilors) and the GB LB agree.

I would suggest to have all critical responsibilities (&assets) allocated to the GB LB with the special arrangement that parts of the ones in the initial reorganization plan (between 50% - 70%) will be allocated immediately and the rest after the second LB election (after 4 years).

Assets:

- Parks & Reserves as suggested by LGC
- Campgrounds (Collingwood and Pohara) Because this will be directly connected with decisions around freedom camping as well as community needs. For example, Collingwood residents complain about the limited access of various areas around the Collingwood Campground, a LB could tailor needs and expectations from the community far better.
- Recreation Centre as suggested by LGC
- Takaka Library as suggested by LGC • Cemeteries as suggested by LGC
- Playgrounds as suggested by LGC • Public Toilets/showers as suggested by LGC
- New or major upgrade of community facilities as suggested by LGC • Community halls as suggested by LGC
- Port Tarakohe recreational part (shared management) Because this is a key feature for the GB community and needs tailored support and governance around cultural, social and environmental needs to guarantee the wellbeing of the community.
- Port Tarakohe commercial part (after the first 4 years) Because the oversight and management of the commercial part of the port (mussel boats, truck traffic frequencies, marine farming in relation to environment (noise, blue penguins, water quality etc.) will be key for the wellbeing of the community. Aerodrome

Other responsibilities:

- Community projects, activities and events as suggested by LGC
- Dog rules etc. as suggested by LGC
- Alcohol regulations as suggested by LGC
- Traffic control signs as suggested by LGC
- Bus stops and shelters as suggested by LGC
- Street names approval as suggested by LGC
- Streetscapes & trees as suggested by LGC
- Community housing
- Community funding and grants
- Flood protection and river control – community will act a lot faster than TDC has in history

4) Costs and who might pay?

While I accept that the LGC does not have the power to determine local authority rates as part of any reorganization plan, I strongly recommend that Government, TDC, LGC and GB community need to agree on final costs (direct and indirect) reflected in general and especially targeted rates to the GB community BEFORE a final decision for a LB is made. While I personally believe that the LGC's proposed targeted rate of \$75 p.a. per property on GB ratepayers is already too high and for many GB households difficult to manage, I strongly believe that the proposed targeted rate of \$283, as suggested from TDC, is simply not affordable for the GB community. It would be not viable to establish a LB under such targeted rate conditions. I can't accept and therefore would debate that final funding arrangements should be under TDC's sole discretion. Because this is a rather unique and new (outside of Auckland) situation and a unitary council, such as TDC, is too small, inexperienced and potentially biased to solely define and finalize overall costs. Federal Government should provide 'checks and balances', monitor and certainly have a significant impact as well. As mentioned above, Federal Government might even look at this proposal in the view of amalgamating the three unitary councils TDC, NCC and MDC. The advantage of such an amalgamation would be that major responsibilities, such as the 'three waters' could be handled far more efficiently.

I would certainly prefer the implementation of Tasman-wide local boards (we suggest four-five), utilising the Auckland centralised services model and costs, in conjunction with reallocation of a reasonable share of TDC's existing central governance budget (50% of the current 2019 \$4.5million p.a.). We (LB Working Group) estimate that to cover a portion of local board governance costs, would push the Tasman-wide general rate up by \$60 p.a.

Submission 296: John & Carolyn McLellan

We support the retention of the existing Golden Bay Community Board. (We believe any decisions regarding the other wards should be made by their own communities)

Working Party.

This Proposal has been interesting and the Proponents of a Local Board have worked hard to get this option to this stage. However unless there is to be a complete Reorganisation of the whole area, there seems little or nothing to be gained from Golden Bay going it alone, with a Local Board.

History

There is certainly “history” between the Golden Bay Community Board and Tasman District Council, with Tasman District Council voting in the 2007 Representation Review to abolish the Golden Bay and Motueka Community Boards. The Golden Bay Community mustered huge support for the retention of their Community Board and was rewarded with a Determination from the Local Government Commission for its retention. This Determination did not make things better and indeed heralded a new level of hostility from Tasman District Council. Our parent Council instigated a system of charging the Community Board for every visit by TDC staff to the Bay; for example, \$330.00 per hour for the CEO (who no one wanted to see anyway), \$260 .00 per hour for Senior managers and \$180.00 for less senior managers plus mileage, and these were all a cost against the Golden Bay Community Board. It was a really sad time in our history with relationships at an all-time low. Managers like Lloyd Kennedy who was the Community Board support person tried hard to help and mitigate the ongoing disastrously toxic situation.

Relationships

Things did gradually improve with a new CEO who made it his business to forge a new and positive relationship between Tasman District Council and the Community Board, and gradually Councillors, Community Board and Tasman District Council worked as a Team.

It may seem inappropriate to mention this history, however because of how things have been, and how we have been treated, as soon as any issue becomes inflamed then there is a tendency for Golden Bay residents to resume battle stations and issues can quickly become exacerbated.

Unfortunately the now (thankfully) resolved Grandstand debacle and the Dam debate have not helped recent relationships; and it may be that for some residents a seemingly new and improved governance Model may be seen as a panacea for fixing all ills.

In spite of all that has gone before, there is absolutely no reason for that to stand in the way of current and future positive relationships.

Golden Bay residents are passionately engaged with all issues affecting this community which is cause for celebration. They really care about all aspects of life here, and want the very best for Golden Bay. Occasionally the decisions made for the Tasman District may not seem to align with what some residents of Golden Bay believe is the best outcome for our Area.

We do not believe a new model of Governance with a Local Board will make any difference with relationships.

We believe that early consultation between Tasman District Council and the existing Golden Bay Community Board, and equally, early consultation between the Golden Bay Community Board and the various communities within Golden Bay is the key to ensuring that everyone is being listened to, and feels heard.

Costs

We do not want to pay an increased targeted rate such as outlined in the LGC document and we certainly do not want to be financially burdened with sums such as Tasman District Council have estimated in their paper.

Golden Bay is a low wage economy and many people struggle to pay their substantial rate bills now, so any increases like those mooted would not be well received.

We cannot see that there is any discernible cost benefit to make a case for this Local Board Proposal to go ahead.

Representation

As a result of the 2007 Representation review Golden Bay has the right to elect two councillors from Golden Bay to Tasman District Council. We believe it is important that this level of representation around the Council table is maintained. To have only one councillor would be to the detriment of local democracy for Golden Bay. Our two councillors are a vital conduit from the Community Board to Council.

Additionally the ability for the Golden Bay Community Board to send the respective representatives to the Standing Committee Meetings to be welcomed and sit around the table and to be part of the debate is also a significant advantage. Although these Community Board Members cannot vote they can make a difference and ensure that the Golden Bay viewpoint is well heard and may be a support for the Golden Bay Councillors.

Golden Bays Geographical Isolation

Golden Bays geographic isolation does play a big part in how we see ourselves, and any potential erosion of governance and or services, causes huge concern in this community.

We do seek as much autonomy as possible for any decisions affecting Golden Bay. There is no reason why the existing Golden Bay Community Board cannot maximise all opportunities and delegations.

Golden Bays has clearly defined boundaries and within Golden Bay we have several distinct communities of interest. We do not currently have any elected representatives from western Golden Bay which may disadvantage those communities, unless the elected representatives ensure they do seek opinions and consult with all the district not just convenient small sectors.

By changing to a Local Board there is no reason to believe that there will be any different pool of people offering themselves for election.

Decision Making

The list is given in the Local Board Document of possible responsibilities for the Local Board to take over and we would say WHY?

Tasman District Council does an outstanding job now with Parks and Reserves, Takaka library, Playgrounds, and Recreation Park and Fields. Some like the Rec Park has local input but why alter a recipe that works. Often a global contract is negotiated for the whole of Tasman that will give a much sharper price than Golden Bay would be able to negotiate.

Local Halls are managed superbly by Francie Wafer for Parks and Reserves; regular money is allocated for whatever is needed for our wonderfully maintained well-loved local Halls. Our Bainham Hall Committee like other Hall committees has an excellent relationship with TDC through Francie, and we have no complaint only praise, and do not want any change in this relationship which works exceptionally well.

Golden Bay Cemeteries are always well maintained and graves in good condition, no change needed there.

The existing Golden Bay Community Board are regularly consulted and have input into all these assets so there is as much involvement as they wish now, we cannot see what can be gained by changing to a Local Board.

Full Time Corporate Support

Golden Bay used to have a Service Centre manager who wrote all the Reports, collated all the issues that related to Golden Bay and made sure the Board Members were fully informed on the issues. It was a top-down model of governance with the Service Centre Manager, in effect, running the Board and the Takaka office.

Cuts saw this position disestablished with a Tasman District Council Senior Manager providing support, and traveling from Richmond for meetings, and assisting by email or phone where needed in between meetings.

The demise of the Service Centre Manager position allowed the Community Board much more autonomy, with the Community Board Chair doing a heap more work, writing the reports to the Board, collating all the information from the various Council Meetings and working alongside the Board Secretary in the Takaka Office. Also managing the correspondence with the Board Secretary and setting the Board's own Meeting agendas and deciding who the board should have to give expert presentations at Board Meetings.

Not having a Service Centre Manager gave the Board much more freedom and this proposal to employ a highly paid Support Person is like a blast from the past that will take the power from the Local Board if instigated.

Furthermore this new proposed additional layer of bureaucracy will be a very costly exercise for Golden Bay and will not achieve the increased autonomy that the Golden Bay Local Board is seeking in this proposal.

This highly paid support person will be employed by Tasman District Council, will be paid by Tasman District Council, and will be accountable to Tasman District Council NOT the Golden Bay Local Board.

In Conclusion

Tasman District Council have always been there for Golden Bay in times of disaster for example with the Takaka hill slips, the disastrous Pohara and Ligar Bay landslides and the Aorere Floods; and we do not know what future challenges we will face with Climate change

We are interdependent, one with another, and the existing Golden Bay Community Board needs to continue to work together with Tasman District Council and continue to foster constructive long lasting and positive relationships now and into the future.

We do not believe a case has been made to persuade us that a Local Board for Golden Bay will deliver any tangible benefits therefore we ask the Commissioners to make a determination that Golden Bay does not proceed with a Local Board but remains with the Status Quo of a Golden Bay Community Board.

Submission 303: Philip Gaffney

I cannot support the proposal for a local board:

1. TDC reluctant to work together

For a local board structure to work, it is clear that Tasman District Council needs to be willing to work together with the local board. TDC's past refusal to delegate anything other than the most trivial matters to the community board shows that it is determined to keep all decision-making in Richmond wherever it can. Without a spirit of co-operation, I cannot see how a local board is going to work without the board frequently referring matters to the LGC.

2. Inefficient model

While Golden Bay residents would certainly like more local decision making, the rest of Tasman District appear to largely prefer the current mishmash of community boards and local associations. If Golden Bay went with a local board, the district would have two different systems, requiring TDC to consult more fully with Golden Bay than the rest of the district. The additional co-ordination effort is being used by TDC as justification for the pumped-up costs they will try to pass on to Golden Bay residents. I believe the most efficient system would be for the whole district to move to a local board structure and TDC's role changed to co-ordination of the local boards rather than retaining central control from Richmond.

3. Council Representation

It has been made clear that the establishment of a local board for Golden Bay is a significant risk to our quota of 2 TDC councillors. The local board would give GB residents control over some non-regulatory functions, but losing our second voice at council would significantly diminish our representation on the decision-making body. I believe that having this level of representation at council is more important than having local responsibility for non-regulatory matters.

4. Cost

This is of course the big issue. Whilst a higher level of autonomy is highly desirable, the cost of a co-ordinator at an additional \$75 per rateable property would already be a significant hurdle for some residents. My understanding is that TDC would have the power to set the rate charged to residents and they are taking a totally unreasonable attitude of apportioning the gross cost of administering a council structure incorporating a local board. They appear to be unwilling to adapt to this structure and their estimate of \$240 per property as a supposed marginal cost is unacceptable. This again illustrates the unwillingness of TDC to co-operate with a structure which would lead to some loss of control from their Richmond centre.

Although I do agree that the additional local representation offered by a local board structure is highly desirable, I think the local board option is not feasible because of TDC's lack of willingness to delegate and the cost of operating a dual-structure district. The crux of the problem is the poor relationship between the Golden Bay community and TDC. As an isolated but vocal community, we are often regarded by TDC as a nuisance. But we have different needs and priorities from those in urban Richmond.

I would very much like to see a strengthened version of the current community board structure, where TDC give some real responsibility to the GB Community Board and let the local community make decisions on local matters. Currently, the community board has no power to do anything unless TDC agrees with its views. There needs to be a process where the community board can easily refer what it considers unreasonable behaviour to an independent party with the authority to arbitrate with TDC in a constructive manner. A review of TDC's current level of delegation to the district's community boards and a documented plan on how to improve the relationship would be a great place to start.

Submission 325: Sara Chapman

I support the retention of community boards in Golden Bay (and Motueka) for the following reasons:

- The time is not now
- A local board will further diminish confidence and trust.
- Elected representatives need to build a relationship with TDC.
- Autonomy or else is an ultimatum.

The solution rests with people prepared to make a difference, not by a change of local structure.

The introduction of a \$95 targeted rate for a local board is too high for our population demographic. We have 3,500 rateable properties, but overall our residents have limited employment opportunities. Golden Bay has young families on single incomes, single parent households and a high proportion of retirees and senior citizens. Housing is expensive and in short supply. Jobs provide moderate to low incomes with many being seasonal or casual and minimum wage. We are dependent on roading within and outside of Golden Bay. We have two small TDC reticulated water schemes. We are proud of the Takaka Aerodrome, Port Tarakohe, Te Waikorupupu Springs, our national parks and natural landscapes.

1. The time is not now

Golden Bay is being considered as the first local board outside of the Auckland Region. This represents an aberration. Some have called it an “experiment” and this represents a risk to our community. The time for the introduction of local boards is when Tasman District Council and Nelson City Council and possibly Marlborough District Council amalgamate to form a top of the south Te Tau Ihu rohe. At that time, the option of ward boards could then provide local decision-making to support the regional governing body. This would ensure that the transition to local boards is a large and fundamental transition of governance, not a one-off and not a trojan horse.

2. A local board will further diminish confidence and trust

Even with decision-making allocated by the Local Government Commission (LGC) a local board sets us apart. This is not a good basis for building confidence and trust and given our history, is likely to increase the divide between Golden Bay and Richmond. There is already mistrust of the proposed costings by the LGC and by TDC. Despite the evidence of Waiheke Island and Great Barrier Island where the costs are \$900,000p.a., there are people speaking today who claim the direct costs are a punitive fine from the local governing body (“why aren’t there centralised savings to be passed on to Golden Bay”).

3. Elected representatives need to build a relationship with the local governing body

As a ratepayer, my vote is given to entrust our elected representatives to work in a respectful and collaborative manner with the CEO and staff of the local governing body. Local iwi have been given a place at community board which is by appointment, in recognition that in Golden Bay it will be difficult for Māori to attain a seat by election. A community board that fully engages with the community should be capable of successfully negotiating delegated responsibilities. We envisage a community board that is proactive rather than reactive, and that is informed and understands the process of local government decision-making. Changing to a local board will not provide a greater level of decision-making than is already possible by agreement with council. Changing to a local board will not heal the dysfunctional relationship between five new board members, disgruntled residents and Tasman District Council.

4. Autonomy or else!

The introduction of a local board will be detrimental to our community because the working group and their supporters are seeking greater autonomy than is able to be granted. So, disappointment will lead to protest and demand for greater self-determination over local decision-making. A local board will not deliver the outcome of secession with a return to a Golden Bay County Council. The local governing body will be subjected to appeal and threat of High Court action. "If we don't like it then we'll initiate a judicial review against TDC". There goes another \$500,000.

A community board is capable of succeeding. The solution rests with people who are prepared to make a difference, not by a change of local structure. Tangata tu Tangata ora.

Submission 331: Nigel Ritson

I am an ordinary ratepayer and have never stood for any position in local government or taken any particular interest in it until the Waimea Dam fiasco. Proven undemocratic and unfair decisions by TDC in relation to this have been foisted on district wide ratepayers through processes of manipulation, obfuscation, deception and denial further adding to the previously common perceptions that -

1 TDC planning rules can be bypassed if sufficient cash is paid.

2 TDC often does not comply with its own rules.

3 The Golden Bay Community Board is powerless and ineffective in facilitating the needs of Golden Bay community, businesses and environment.

4 TDC is an out of control overstuffed bureaucracy over which the Golden Bay councillors have little or no influence, and Golden Bay community repeatedly misses out of benefits of being participants in the council structure.

5 The Council structure design is inherently defective- ineffective, unfair and incapable of ever properly meeting the needs of Golden Bay and other outlying areas of the Tasman District.

6 The TDC is incapable of reforming itself so as to become democratically and fairly representative of and serving the needs of the ratepayers funding it.

1 Balance between local boards decision making and district wide decision making.

Though not yet in existence, local boards in the Tasman District offer the possibility of more community engagement, better informed planning, better prioritized decision making and though not necessarily lower cost decisions, a better fit between needs and delivery of benefits. Underlying this opinion is the long experience of humans through history that group decisions based on free dissemination of information, informed discussion and contestability with free discussion, debate prior to democratic decisions brings about better trust, solidarity, common agreement, and community cohesion. 'More minds are better than one.'

'One mind can think only of its own questions; it rarely surprises itself.' -*Author: Orson Scott Card*
'If heads of states fail to seize the opportunity of our entry into the third millennium to provide for a better government of planet Earth, history will not forgive them - if there is a history'. -*Author: Robert Muller*

'You may fill your heads with knowledge or skilfully train your hands, but unless it is based upon high, upright character, upon a true heart, it will amount to nothing. You will be no better than the most ignorant. -*Author: Booker T. Washington*

2 Given its geographical feature and the relative remoteness of Golden Bay, do you consider more local decision making is necessary to promote local community resilience and wellbeing now and in the future?

In short yes.

The Waimea Dam decision was a colossal expensive blunder that will divert wealth from the great majority of ratepayers in the whole district for decades that will result in insufficient funds for meeting other basic needs and generally agreed on desirable community projects, and environment, species and landscape protections, to name a few inevitable future losses.

Every effect has a cause and every bad decision will have bad outcomes.

3 Is there community support for the establishment of localboards elsewhere in the Tasman District? Can you demonstrate the level of support?

I work hard and don't have the time, funds or inclination to survey the entire districts opinion on this question but will comment that I have met enraged people outside Golden Bay who are deeply dissatisfied with the TDC. The fact that few submissions were made to the Local Government Commission on this issue doesn't in my opinion indicate that people don't care, it's more likely that they feel powerless against corruption and are deeply cynical that they can change anything, so think that making a submission will be a waste of time.

I believe that if Golden Bay does agree to a Local Board, that over time increased demand for better representation and control over their own localities will emerge in other districts such as Motueka and Lakes-Murchison, for examples.

4 Do you have any comments on possible local board representation arrangements or on councillor representation in the event of a local board(s) is established in Tasman District?

I think that every organizations structure has consequences on the way it operates, how it facilitates human interactions that produce productive efficient working relationships, or on the contrary engenders attitudes of distrust, disfunction, and hostility. The latter for Golden Bay residents is in a general summary where we have arrived at over decades of largely negative experience of local government.

Not having studied democratic structural methods of organization I can't make concrete suggestions as to different and actual reorganisation, but invite the Local Government Commission itself to reflect on the nature of it and compare it to the adversarial systems of the the institutions of the Courts and Parliament in NZ, their effect on damaging both individuals and on public trust, and the fact that access to justice is unaffordable to most New Zealanders. In parallel so it is for ratepayers in Golden Bay- presently they don't have the power to get fair representation or have financial redress where the TDC has taken financially irresponsible decisions that the ratepayers become burdened by, and have no recourse other than voting out representatives at local Government elections. Contrast this with improper or criminal conduct by individuals within companies or companies themselves where redress and compensation can be sought by aggrieved parties through the Courts. This current power of corrupt individuals in local governments behave in non-representative, or unethical, or to evade the laws normally applying to New Zealanders in all other areas of life is deeply unjust and the Commission itself should investigate this matter and attempt to design better structures.

As discussed in the recent Takaka public meeting with the Commission the nature of and frustration at the power imbalance and lack of fair representation between TDC and the Golden Bay Community was frequently expressed.

5 The question of additional costs to Golden Bay ratepayers

I think that the additional cost of \$75 per annum per ratepayer is acceptable in the short term, but I believe in and advocate a restructure of the TDC into a different organization, to one where it provides only regional services as are required by law, and all other services are provided for and funded at a local level, or by agreements between districts. This should in time make elected representatives and local government more directly accountable to those they represent, and reduce the size of the present expensive and at times proven unaccountable local government bureaucracy.

Submission 343: Martin Potter

The relationship between the Tasman District Council and the Golden Bay Community has been slowly deteriorating over the last 15 years, to point where there is little trust between the parties. Whether a local board is the correct path for improvement is the crux of the debate. While a better working relationship with Council, and a divesting of more responsibility to the community board would initially appear an easier way forward, history would suggest otherwise. In 2007, the LGC made a recommendation that more responsibility should be divested to the community board but nothing has eventuated. Also, over the last 20 years I have made submissions both as an individual and as a registered professional surveyor. I have submitted on the annual plan process and the engineering standards reviews, Port Tarakohe, various District Plan changes. The only results of these submissions have been a polite “thank you for your time Mr Potter, we appreciate your input”. There has not been a single change to any of the proposals submitted on. It is this continual fobbing off that has led to the movement for a local board. A similar feeling arises when we look at the lead up to the Waimea Dam, and how that was handled by Council – there wasn’t even an opportunity to submit on that project.

However, I am not sure that a local board as mooted will resolve many of these underlying issues and resentments - partly as there is not a lot of responsibility being devolved. More importantly, there is total uncertainty in the costs involved. While the LGC is suggesting costs of around \$75, TDC is suggesting \$420 in their press releases. The high TDC figures are certainly raising concerns among the Golden Bay community to the extent that a number of my friends are against purely on the grounds of costs. Of course the cynic in me wonders whether Council is suggesting such high targeted rate increases purely to encourage the community to submit against the proposal. I am on a pension, and a further \$420 on my rate bill of \$3100 is beginning to look rather daunting. Can the Local Government Commission place any caps on future targeted rates? If not, then the risk of the Golden Bay Ward being penalised by very high rates in the future does raise alarm bells.

I accept that democracy inevitably requires compromise, and that even with a local board there will be submissions that do not create change. However, there needs to be a more tangible responsibility allocated to the Golden Bay community and advisory roles as allocated to the community board do not meet that requirement. A local board with some rigorous responsibility can only be beneficial to the governance of the whole district. Indeed, I also support local boards for at least the rural wards, if not all. Given the diversity within the District, with a fast developing urban area and some quite remote rural areas, I believe local boards could well prove to be a better way to govern these areas both effectively and economically.

While I do have some reservations as noted above, I still believe that a local board will provide better local governing in Golden Bay and should be implemented. I feel that any devolvement of responsibility is a start, and should lead to improved governance for the Golden Bay community – and hopefully further responsibilities may be forthcoming in the future.

Submission 348: John Allen

My name is Kenneth John Allen. I am the joint owner and ratepayer of a foreshore property located at Pakawau. I am now retired from local government. I worked in this sector for a period of 48 years rising to the position of Policy and Leasing Administrator for the Christchurch City Council.

Support for a Local Board

I support the proposal to change the local authority representation for the residents of Golden Bay from a community board to a local board with some caveats which I have set out later in this submission. The reasons for this are as follows: -

- I strongly believe that where possible decision-making should be moved to as close as possible to the community that will be affected by the decisions made, thereby ensuring that the communities aspirations and idiosyncrasies are properly taken into account by the decision-makers, as required by the Local Government Act 2002 and its amendments, (LGA). The more remote a decision is made from the community likely to be affected, the greater opportunity there is for some issues around the decision not to be properly assessed.

There have been a number of recent decisions made by Tasman District Council, (TDC), on issues affecting Golden Bay, where clearly the decisions did not properly consider local residents wishes on the issues being decided. In one case the decision was later reversed by council when the original decision was legally challenged by local residents. This concerned TDC's decision to remove the grandstand by the sports ground in Takaka, the removal of which was stopped when residents bought a legal injunction against the council. My personal view is TDC has at times failed to take into account Golden Bay residents' views when deciding on a particular course of action. Such action as indicated above by TDC is in clear contravention of the LGA consultation requirements. TDC needs to be reminded that it must follow the consultation and decision-making requirements as set out in the LGA. When controversial issues arise TDC needs to work/explore possible solutions in partnership with local residents to find an acceptable solution which where possible both residents and the council, are comfortable with.

- The Golden Bay District is a separate community of interest within Tasman District Council's area.

The Golden Bay District is geographically isolated from the rest of the Tasman District Council area by the Takaka Hill. The area is predominantly a dairy farming area, much of which has a high annual rainfall. This understanding is well made in point 6.4.2 on page 8 of TDC's submission to the Local Government Commission.

- Delegations made to a community board by a Council are made at the Council's discretion, and can be removed at the Council's discretion, whereas decision making powers granted to a Local Board are only able to be removed by agreement being reached between the Local Board and Council.

In my opinion therefore Local Boards offer residents in their Board's areas a more equitable power sharing arrangement with Council than Community Boards do.

Caveats to My Support for a Local Board

I acknowledge there will be some increase in costs to service the local board, their decisions needing to comply with all the requirements of the LGA. The additional staffing requirement, (4.5 additional staff), based on the Auckland City Council local boards put forward by TDC in their submission needs further in depth assessment, before the likely increased costs can be defined to service a local board. Clear information on the present costs of servicing the Golden Bay Community Board, and what additional costs will be necessary to service the proposed Golden Bay local board, and the benefits so accruing to the Golden Bay community do not appear to have been properly assessed which makes a notional analysis problematic.

Under the LGA, TDC will have been required to have staffing in place to ensure that the community boards operate in a way which is fully compliant with the LGA's requirements; (consultation, presentation of various options available, coupled with the financial implications/budget etc. required when making a decision). It is difficult to comment on the additional staffing requirement to service a Local Board, above those presently employed to service the present community board. It is presumed however that the present staffing enables the community board to operate in a fully compliant manner in accordance with the requirements of the LGA. I understand that some of the technical expertise required to provide fully informed reports for the board's consideration is provided by staff domiciled in Richmond currently. This support will of course need to continue, and in some cases may need to increase somewhat, however full advantage needs to be taken of recent technological advances in communications, e.g. officer support of local and community board meetings provided through 'zoom technology' etc. It may be necessary to employ a technical person versed in a number of technical areas to be domiciled in Golden Bay, but a further 3.5 staff above this number as proposed by TDC appears to be 'excessive' in my opinion. In summary the staffing requirement will need to take into account the level of decision making granted to the Local Board, the latest advances in communication technology, what staffing is already present to service the existing community board, opportunities to refocus existing staff support into different supporting roles etc.

Clearly TDC do not want to move to one or more local boards preferring the centralised decision-making model as at present. It is obvious to me that a lot more work needs to be undertaken on the staffing and costs required to service a local board verses a community board in Golden Bay, before a final decision is made on whether to stay with the status quo or to set up a local board to service the Golden Bay community. It is most important that this work is done before the final decision is made to ensure that a natural miscarriage of justice does not occur.

Submission 350: Philip Woolf

I support the retention of a community board for Golden Bay. Local Government NZ has 25 years evidence that community boards are capable of strong connection to local neighbourhoods and an ability to bring decision-making down to a level where citizens can have real influence. Golden Bay and community board members need to work towards a constructive relationship with TDC, councillors, CEO and staff. Community board is capable of being a valuable asset.

The Local Government Commission has presented a short paper on a reorganisation plan for a Golden Bay local board, July 2020.

1. The local board representation would be comprised of 5 elected members and the 2 current ward councillors as appointed members. The estimated cost increases to \$95 per property.

My objection is twofold: The targeted rate is too high for our community and without achieving any additional benefits in local decision-making responsibilities. Furthermore, that with the establishment of a local board for Golden Bay, it is inevitable that we will lose a ward councillor at the next representation review. This is unacceptable.

2. The proposal cites “the relationship between Tasman District Council and Golden Bay has experienced difficulties, at least partly due to the level of distinction and physical isolation between Golden Bay and its neighbouring communities”.

My experience is that the “relationship difficulties” arise from a division between council officers and those who object to local government regulations and New Zealand law. Key examples are: RMA legislation, the Freedom Camping Act.

3. The decision-making responsibilities that may be allocated by the LGC to a local board, are not significantly different from the decision-making responsibilities that may be delegated by TDC to a community board and with specific three year agreements.

My preference is for a community board that builds a positive relationship with council rather than a local board which will continue to battle with TDC for power.

4. The application from the ‘Working Group for a Golden Bay Local Board’ is driven by the desire for local decision-making over areas of local government that cannot be allocated. My observation is that the working group are still seeking far greater autonomy from the local governing body and that their expectations will not be realised.

5. Golden Bay has been through a series of weather events in the last ten years including flooding, slips and the catastrophic collapse of the Takaka Hill. The Nelson Tasman Emergency Management Group is operated by Tasman District Council and Nelson City Council. At a local level, Emergency Management Golden Bay is a strong volunteer team which includes fire, police, St John, DOC and LandSar, supported by the health and welfare community coordination group. As Chief Fire Officer, Takaka volunteer fire brigade, I have been involved with resilience planning, response and recovery.

A local board will not enhance resilience or future well-being. The Mohua 2040 sustainability is in progress. FENZ is establishing a local advisory committee (LAC). Golden Bay is well prepared and well served with a network of community organisations, across the many settlements from east to west.

Submission 351: Joan Butts

I've read the information supplied by the Local Government Commission, the TDC's draft submission, the minutes of the Golden Bay Community Board meeting, the GB Community Board's submission and the information supplied by the local Working Group for a Local Board.

I have lived in Golden Bay for 45 years and been a participant in local politics for about 35 years. I quickly understood that the Golden Bay community operated on a mix of goodwill, cooperation and volunteer labour. The fire brigade, ambulance service, schools, community workers, hospitals, halls, sports grounds and clubs were supported by the community and businesses. Local wisdom is basic knowledge gained from living in a community. It is related to the culture in that community which is accumulated over time and the values, history of families, places, buildings is recorded and acknowledged. It seems to me that there is a disconnect between the TDC and Golden Bay when the TDC officers' knowledge, that is made up from rules and regulations, is used to trump the wisdom of the collective community.

I feel I do not have sufficient financial detail to make an informed opinion to support a Golden Bay local board. I need to know that the TDC cannot impose unreasonable costs on the ratepayers to establish and run a local board. The community has many ratepayers on fixed incomes and even a small increase in rates is significant to them. Many would see a targeted rate of \$283 pa as unaffordable and not even consider a local board option because of the cost.

We need two Golden Bay councillors to cover the Takaka Valley and the western region of our district. The ward representation is discussed by TDC in regard to ratepayer/population numbers when landscape, risk of isolation, exposure to weather events over a vast area makes this west coast district more vulnerable than most. This, coupled with the travel requirements to the outlier GB communities and to Richmond meetings, justifies the two positions. I do not support a reduction of councillor representation if there is a local board established. I see the two councillors as the eyes and ears of the community. I see the community board as a buffer zone between the TDC and the GB community. A safe, local place where views can be respectfully shared and local problems dealt with efficiently.

Ministry for the Environment

The comprehensive review of the Resource Management System in NZ is now complete. The Review document included the following statement:

'There are two matters outside our terms of reference that we wish to briefly comment upon. The first relates to the reform of local government. It has become clear to us that the resource management system would be much more effective if local government were to be reformed. The existence of 78 local authorities in a nation of just five million people is difficult to justify. Much could be achieved by rationalisation along regional lines, particularly in improving efficiencies, pooling resources, and promoting the coordination of activities and processes. Reform of local government is an issue warranting early attention.'

I read a copy of the TDC's Newsline (26-6-2020) and it became very obvious that the Top of the South region already works together for efficiencies.

For example

- Infometrics published a report on the Nelson Tasman economy commissioned by the Nelson Regional Development Agency

- Jobseeker benefit numbers in the local MSD area which includes Tasman, Nelson, West Coast, Marlborough and Kaikoura.
- There is a Nelson Tasman Civil Defence Emergency Management group
- Project Kokiri - The Nelson Tasman Economic Response & Regeneration Plan
- The Nelson Tasman Business Trust offering advice to business owners

Another regional cooperative is the Aquaculture Industry.

The mussels grown on marine farms in Golden Bay will create jobs for people in Golden Bay, Motueka, Richmond, Nelson Havelock, Picton, Christchurch and the North Island. The fish will be processed over the hill and most employment opportunities will benefit those communities in the Nelson Tasman region.

All the Golden Bay people want is for the local representative community board or local board to have some say/control over effects that impact on the wellbeing of the local community from the activities taking place in their backyard. Often the community makes submissions on these matters and not one word of a proposal, plan, rule or regulation is changed. It is just another compulsory consultation to tick the box. This disrespect causes the frustration and anger. I suggest the call for a local board came about because many felt the TDC staff do not understand the background of the position locals were taking on local decisions. (eg The Grandstand at the Showgrounds)

Years ago the community board was promised delegated responsibilities but the TDC never delivered. Many would be happy if the community board was delegated some formal decision making relating to local assets:

I believe the community is most interested in issues such as freedom camping, cycleways, playgrounds, oversight of community halls, dog access, street names, flood and river protection, community and grants, and most importantly the sale or loss of control of their strategic assets such as motor camps, aerodrome, Port Tarakohe and other smaller wharves.

The opportunity to have a local board along with the increased responsibilities could be welcomed if we had more detail on financing the setup, running costs and improved remuneration for the board members. We cannot be expected to make a decision without this information and assurances the costs are affordable. We would need a cross-section of the community on the board and not all suitable candidates are in a financial position to do a great percentage of the job as their public service. Of course it would make sense to have local boards in all our regions' wards to ensure no one was disenfranchised from the decision making process. Local input into local decisions.

After reading the Ministry for the Environment's report it seems to me change is coming whether we like it or not. To manage the resource management system, they believe in rationalisation along regional lines. There could be amalgamated councils with local boards, well-funded and respected, set up to efficiently represent all the district's wards with an equal level of representation. If there is merit in regional councils supported by region wide local boards, further investigation is necessary before any decision can be made. I can see why the Golden Bay ward would be a good place to trial the process.



Manawhenua ki Mohua

Email: mohuamanawhenua@gmail.com

Submission regarding the option of a Golden Bay local board

Manawhenua ki Mohua (MKM) is an umbrella entity for the three manawhenua iwi living in Mohua; Ngāti Tama, Ngāti Rārua and Te Ātiawa. MKM are the descendants of Māori chiefs, who assumed the role of kaitiaki, or guardians of the rohe (area) through raupatu (conquest) and intermarriage; a responsibility which was subsequently passed down by way of whakapapa (genealogy).¹² As the kaitiaki, MKM carry out their obligations to uphold the cultural and environmental integrity of Mohua for past, present and future generations.

Representation and provision for Māori participation

The proposed local board does not provide for Māori representation. The lack of equality afforded to Māori, as the Treaty partner, is of great concern to MKM. Whānau and hapū will in effect be excluded from decision making processes that impact directly on them. Of note, is the failure of the proposal document to make a distinction between whānau, hapū and iwi cultural values and wider community interests in the rohe (area).

Another concern relates to the devolution of powers from local authorities to community/local boards, without clearly affirming the methods and processes these boards will employ to meet local authority statutory responsibilities to Māori under the Treaty and Local Government Act 2002. Iwi are effectively invisible in this proposal; with the importance of Māori participation absent from the analysis of the proposed local board structure and operation. In order to practice kaitiakitanga effectively, it is essential that Manawhenua ki Mohua are represented to ensure cultural values are integrated into local board decision-making processes.

MKM is concerned that the proposed staff member of “one” will not have the capacity to do all the tasks alluded to in the discussion document and therefore will not be in a position to facilitate collaboration with local Māori.

¹² These chiefs included: Te Meihana, Niho Tehamu, Te Aupōuri Mātenga, Henare Tatana Te Keha, Tāmāti Pirimoana, Terahui Hekaka, and Takarei Tewhareaitu

Absence of a 'Cultural lens'

A 'cultural lens' has not been applied to the Local Government Commission consultation process and proposal document. As a result, Māori "lore" has not been upheld and an important opportunity to provide information on the nature of the proposal as it relates to MKM has been lost. The proposed local board will be delegated specific decision-making powers from local government, but the legal obligations of local authorities to Māori under the "law" have not been transferred. As a consequence, the only reference to Māori in the discussion document is as a potential "non-board member" and in "some cases" or "where appropriate" iwi may take part in matters that impact on them. But how the proposed local board will work with MKM, and who will decide on what impacts whānau and hapū is unclear?

In addition, the list of community facilities, which local boards might be responsible for, (in terms of upgrades and maintenance) does not include Onetāhua Marae; despite the fact that the Marae operates as a community facility and is run by MKM in conjunction with the Mohua community.

Cost benefit analysis

The Local Government Commission process and document has not provided a robust analysis of the proposed benefits and estimated costs associated with this proposal. As an independent entity, the Commission was in a position to undertake an unbiased and balanced analysis – to tease out strengths and weaknesses of the new board, while comparing it to the existing community board structure and operation. For MKM, this was an opportunity for the Commission to provide important baseline information to assist local community deliberation of the structure which might work best in Mohua.

Another omission is the identification of the fact that the success of the proposed local board is dependent on the relationship it establishes with the local community. If the community is unhappy with the way the proposed board operates, its effectiveness will be greatly compromised. If this occurs, the increased costs to the local community will greatly outweigh any potential benefits.

In summary,

From the discussion document analysis, the cost of the proposed new board is far greater than the existing community board structure, but does not deliver increased benefits to Māori. In fact, the proposal generates more concerns and questions than it answers for MKM, not least of which include:

- Who has the mandated voice for whānau, hapū, iwi on the proposed local board?
- How will the proposed local board implement the provisions of the Local Government Act in relation to Māori participation in decision-making?
- What opportunities have been created under the proposed new board for whānau, hapū and iwi to input Mohua kaupapa that affects them?
- How will one staff member (proposed adviser to the local board) address the responsibilities to Māori under the Local Government Act in terms of:

- fostering the development of Māori capacity to contribute to the local board processes; and
- the provision of relevant information to Māori to support their contribution into decisionmaking processes.

Manawhenua ki Mohua do not support the option of a Golden Bay local board and wish to speak at the Commission hearing to this effect.

Ngā mihi,

Barney Thomas,
Chairperson

Submission 357: Richard Kempthorne

Option of a Golden Bay local board

I am Richard Kempthorne. I was first elected to Tasman District Council as a councillor in 2001 and was councillor for two terms until 2007, when I was elected Mayor, a role I held for twelve years until the 2019 local body election. I have always been passionate about the strength, well-being and prosperity of the whole of Tasman District.

Thank you for the opportunity to express my opinion on the option of a Golden Bay local board that you have put before our community.

The Local Government Commission has received an application for the establishment of a local board in Golden Bay. The Commission have considered the application and undertaken a reorganisation investigation.

I understand the Commission giving an assessment of the potential benefits and costs of a local board for Golden and Bay. I realise this has gone to the whole district as one aspect of the Commission's proposition is that this could be part paid by the rest of the district.

Cost of a Golden Bay local board

I support giving the residents of Golden Bay the opportunity of establishing a local board if they choose to, but that they fund it. I don't believe there will be benefit to the rest of the district in having a local board in Golden Bay and the rest of the district shouldn't have to pay for part of it.

In my opinion, if a local board is established for Golden Bay, the additional costs, above the current council contribution of funding the community board, should be borne by the Golden Bay community. I also think that the costs for a local board should include the direct and indirect costs. I note the work the council has provided as outlined in their submission. This puts the direct and indirect costs considerably greater than the estimate provided by the Commission. The cost provided for the Auckland boards seems very helpful. Even if the cost is part way between the Commission and Council suggestions, this is significantly greater than that proposed by the Commission.

More than one local board in the district

I don't believe there is sufficient benefit in having any local boards in the rest of the district when taking into account their time and cost.

Richmond local board.

For the entire time I have been on council we have lived in Richmond. From time to time Richmond has had a residents association. As a ward councillor I often attended their meetings as did the other ward councillors. Residents could raise any issue they chose and local councillors would follow up on their behalf. It was often a challenge to maintain enough interest within Richmond to maintain an active and effective association. I believe this it is in part due to the main council office being located in Richmond. Over the years I have found that people in Richmond would most commonly come into the office and find a solution to their personal issues. Sometimes they would raise an issue with an individual councillor. When there are significant issues, as with the upgrade of Queen St in the town centre, there was significant engagement by the mayor, councillors, staff and contractors with the most affected member of the community. It worked very well.

Council is very good at engaging with the members of the Richmond community as issues arise. Personally, I think a local board for Richmond would be a waste of ratepayers' and councillors' time and money. I don't believe it would be an effective and efficient use of resources. As a Richmond ratepayer, I don't want one.

I realise some are interested and I wonder if this an opportunity for them to set up a forum for those who wish to express a view on Richmond issues.

Local decision making and representation

Tasman District has many residents associations, community councils and the Motueka Community Board, that represent the views of residents in their respective areas. These organisations work well, as does the Golden Bay Community Board. They express views and work with council on issues that are important to their communities. I have found there is a respectful and effective relationship between these groups and council. This does not mean that things are always plain sailing. Sometimes there is a difference of opinion when various groups want things that actually don't fit within the budget or workstream of council but by and large the relationships are good, healthy and effective.

Differences between local boards and community boards on page six of the Commissions paper

I find the summary of differences between a local board and community boards a little confusing and potentially misleading. While the community board doesn't prepare its own 3-year plan, it works with the council in the preparation of the district 3-year plan and how it will be funded, which also extends to the annual plan process.

There is a suggestion that there is a lack of local decision making with the current community board structure. It can easily be argued this is not the case. I believe the current board is very effective at promoting the well-being of the Golden Bay community.

I think there is a good balance between local and district decision-making.

I don't think a local board is necessary to promote local community resilience and well-being. The Golden Bay community is very effective at engaging on all matters and the community board has an effective and healthy relationship to bring matters to both council and the Golden Bay community.

The community board already has responsibility for certain delegated functions. The boards effectively identify and communicate local interests and preferences. The Commission's paper suggests these are new functions but this seems incorrect.

Summary

In my opinion:

- It is reasonable for the Golden Bay community to have a local board if they wish to have one. If they do want one, then the direct and indirect costs should be paid by the Golden Bay community. I support the council continuing the current level of financial support that exists for the two community boards.
- We shouldn't create any other local boards in the district.
- We maintain current delegations to the two community boards and consider additional delegations from time to time as required

Submission 361: Gaylene Wilkinson

I support a Golden Bay local board and local boards for all other Tasman wards.

I believe that giving more decision-making power to communities results in increased engagement of residents. Local decision responsibility enables efficient and well-informed decisions to be made by locals on the issues that affect them (often still robustly debated). An interesting by-product of this in Golden Bay is the huge goodwill of the community and local businesses in supporting local projects. This has been seen many times, but as soon as the decisions are seen to be made 'over the Hill' this support stops and the cost of the project escalates.

Golden Bay is geographically isolated, with just one road out, and at times is cut off. Future proofing our communities relies on local resilience. Golden Bay businesses firmly believe that they would have been far better off after the Takaka Hill closure, and the Cyclone Gita damage, if decisions regarding support money and public statements had been made from Golden Bay. Considerable pressure needed to be placed on TDC staff in Richmond to get the support required. Locals are very good at supporting each other in times of crisis.

Having local boards across all 5 Tasman wards makes economic sense, in that the setting up of the support personnel required would become an integral part of the TDC structure, not just an outpost structure for Golden Bay. This would allow reallocation of a reasonable share of TDC's existing central government funds, thereby minimising the cost of Local Boards. I envisage a 'Top of the South' Regional Council being a very efficient way of managing the 3 waters and many of the regions' environmental and planning decisions. Many residents of Golden Bay could not pay the targeted rate of \$283pa that TDC are suggesting, and very few would be comfortable with the open cheque situation that the LGC have made clear would be the case. This is not a viable option, and to me seems a ridiculous thing to ask of a low income community who are asking for more local democracy. As Simon Philp, one of our local builders, put it at the meeting, "no-one would build a house without getting a quote first". There needs to be another step of costing in the process, before a final decision is made.

Unfortunately, the other wards in Tasman have not had the information dissemination that we in Golden Bay have been given over the last 2 years. Tony Lawton and the GBLB Working Group have done a great job of creating an awareness of what is possible under a local board. I would suggest that there needs to be more information given to the residents of other wards before they can make an informed decision about local boards in the district. I agree with the LGC's suggestion of 5 local board members, and believe we have a good chance of getting a high calibre of local people standing for election IF the job they are to do is meaningful, i.e. it MUST entail a reasonable degree of responsibility. Many GB residents are passionate about their community and will serve it with integrity and hard work. This is evidenced in a huge range of volunteer/charity roles in the Bay.

If the local board was given as much decision-making power as possible, I don't really see any need for GB representation by more than one ward councillor.

I would like to see all non-regulatory responsibilities allocated to a GB local board. These should include the Golden Bay assets which were gifted to/absorbed by TDC when the Golden Bay County Council was dissembled, e.g. commercial assets like Port Tarakohe, airport, campgrounds.

As a unique community, we really are different! Many of the regulations that 'fit' for Richmond and urban living are not appropriate for our rural areas, small villages and townships. If the regulatory decisions that are being made affect no-one other than Golden Bay residents, then those decisions should be made by the local board. Things which I see as fitting this are housing, sub-division and land use regulations, marine farming regulations (particularly in relation to mitigation of the negative impacts of the industry). GB residents have complained for many years to TDC about the lack of noise and pollution control on mussel boats operating in the Bay. This industry is now expanding significantly, yet calls for environmental controls are still shrugged off. A group of concerned residents, in the absence of any initiative from TDC, have set up the Marine Farming Impacts Group to lobby the industry and TDC for responsible environmental regulation. A current survey is showing how significant and widespread the noise impact is. I believe a local board would be more receptive to the social and environmental requirements for responsible expansion of our marine farming industry.

Submission 362: Judith Nicholls

It's vital now that Golden Bay have its own local board. (So should any other area if they wish, but we're prepared and ready now!)

Despite previous recommendations by the LGC in 2007, TDC has not undertaken its statutory obligations.

Disregarding these directives with impunity. TDC has proven to be reluctant to relinquish any democratic decision-making at any meaningful level, thereby giving it the unfortunate reputation of being 'the worst Council to work with, in the country'!!

Any increased empowerment of Golden Bay-based decision-making processes will hopefully begin healing the current rifts/impasses between this ward and the TDC.

The current community board is seen as frustratingly ineffectual; delegated responsibilities that can be arbitrarily withdrawn cannot yield consistent commitment or result, whereas allocations to a local board would yield more stability, reversals possible only by agreement of both parties.

It's great the Commission is prepared to make a ruling where there is no agreement reached!

Ward councillors should have speaking rights but not voting rights on the local board - they already indirectly represent TDC - let's give the new board the undiluted responsibility/accountability for which they will have been elected.

Perhaps in future we can look at reducing two councillors to one, once the local board is up and running - help reduce/offset costs.

Chairperson should be elected by local board members.

\$75 dollars per household would be a good return for the essential service of bringing back 'home' more of the crucial decisions that have direct community effect here.

Eventually with more responsive governance, the cost will be seen to be completely beneficial by Golden Bay ratepayers.

The LGC would need to oversee any inclination of TDC to off-load extra charges on our community...

If the success of a Golden Bay local board inspired other wards to follow - TDC would relinquish much redundant activity along with the associated costs, so the charge per household could reduce further, as has happened in Auckland: win/win

The LGC has recommended many areas of responsibility for a local board. These sensible recommendations should naturally include the commercial assets of Golden Bay, including Port Tarakohe, the Takaka Aerodrome and both camp-grounds.

It's clear that TDC wishes to maintain these commodities to underpin their other more risky financial ventures e.g. Waimea Dam where 85% submissions were against proceeding - yet all district ratepayers now hold unspecified liabilities for cost-overruns.

However, the unique geographical isolation of our region plus local knowledge and expertise should require at least shared responsibility for the operation and future of these local assets, with the goal of integrating increased autonomy over time. After all, the outcome and effects of those decisions are felt most, right here, not in Richmond.

Housing regulation and seawall protection should also be returned to local governance.

We have very special community and environmental requirements in Golden Bay - being a national and international tourist destination, it is vital we take this exciting opportunity to get the next move right!

Advocating the collective interests of our community to TDC's governing body by means of a three-year plan with their annual agreement, paves the way for a working relationship of trust and cooperation.

Again, it's great to know the Commission is prepared to make rulings if necessary.

Decisions made now for the future of Golden Bay and the Tasman Region will impact New Zealand as a whole. With collaboration and determined negotiation, we can certainly become a successful local board, an example of community-based autonomy, which is surely the principle of successful democracy.

Submission 367: Celia Butler

I am a Tasman District councillor representing the Golden Bay Ward and resident in Takaka. I have been a member of the Golden Bay community for 40 years as a health professional, and have been involved in the community in a variety of ways during that time.

I declare a conflict of interest in that should there be a local board in Golden Bay there may be a reduction in ward councillors from two to one.

I support the retention of existing arrangements for the following reasons which I have selected to write about as a member of the Golden Bay community. There are other reasons which have been detailed in the TDC submission which as a TDC councillor I support and will not repeat here.

Firstly I would like to express my concern about a comment from Gavin Beattie in the community board meeting that establishing a local board in Golden Bay could be likened to Golden Bay being the "guinea pig". My reasons below are intended to highlight that a local board in Golden Bay is of considerable risk to the community, and to place them in a "guinea pig" role can be seen as high handed at the least, and exploitative at the most.

The consultation process.

The consultation document and process is too flimsy given the significant implications of a local board to the Golden Bay community, not the least of these being the financial cost. The ratepayers who are least likely to be in a position to read and/or take the time to consider and submit on the consultation document are least able to afford to pay the extra rates for a local board. Many I have spoken to said they were unclear what it was about and that the document was thrown out or used for the fire because of busy lives with families and working to pay a mortgage. This really concerns me that it is hardest for the most financially vulnerable group to submit.

What would indicate to the LGC that they have received enough submissions to gauge the community view is not known. After submissions have been received, "consideration of the need for discussion with interested parties" and the absence of consultation on the reorganisation plan amounts to inadequate consultation given the potential costs to ratepayers. For this reason alone, the proposal should not be supported.

There is no information about how the submissions will be processed, i.e. will they be read in full by all the members of the LGC, or will they be summarised?

Financial costs

There is conflicting information and widely differing views on the cost of a local board, and the cost to ratepayers, either district wide or targeted. A consultant's letter suggesting costs was produced at the public meetings, but copies were not provided. The consultation document encompasses a wide range of possibilities.

Information from Auckland City Council staff indicates that the local boards on Waiheke and Great Barrier Islands cost about the same. The cost of a local board in a small community stays the same regardless of the size of the population. (Economies of scale). If it is being paid for by targeted rate as would probably be the case, then the smaller the population, the higher the cost to each ratepayer. Many families on the mortgage ladder would struggle to pay the extra rates of \$75 minimum, possibly more.

The Covid pandemic has seen numerous examples of costs to citizens being **reduced** by government, banks, power companies etc. The imposition of **extra** costs for only a possibly potential benefit on to this district at this time of financial uncertainty and unemployment would be hard for the LGC to justify.

There is no appetite in the rest of the Tasman District to subsidise a local board in Golden Bay, and so the financial burden will fall heavily on the Golden Bay community.

Reasons to retain the community boards

Golden Bay is so isolated that unlike many other rural districts it has to provide all the members for a host of committees, boards of trustees, governing bodies etc. Getting enough people to stand for office is a struggle at times. Enthusiasm, abilities and commitment ebb and flow and the community board is no exception. From my experience in the community I would not expect this to be different for a local board which, in contrast to a community board, would have a bigger workload, which could be burdensome due to its permanence and fixed responsibilities. A local board would struggle at times to carry out its role in the long term, even though there may be a flush of enthusiasm to start with. On the other hand a community board can ask for delegations in times of strength and relinquish as necessary.

Community boards are flexible compared to local boards. For example, the current community board has a dog bylaw delegation underway. A local board would have fixed control over predetermined areas, in this case, parks and reserves, street names and cemeteries etc, and could be delegated the dog bylaw but would not be likely to accept it due to its permanent responsibilities for parks and reserves. Most people I have spoken to about this say that they would not see any gains in a local board managing parks and reserves as their management from Richmond is satisfactory.

Whether community board or local board, the relationship between it and TDC is the key factor in the success of either. A local board will not improve this, and as was stated by members of the LGC, a local board would bring extra challenges in this regard.

If the community board is retained, then there will still be positive outcomes from this process of considering a local board for Golden Bay. It has brought the issue of the role of the community boards to the fore for TDC and highlighted the importance of the relationship.



RGBCB20-08-11

31 July 2020

Local Government Commission
PO Box 5362
Wellington 6140

Submission on the Option for a Local Board for Golden Bay

The Golden Bay Community Board acknowledge the consultation document released by the Local Government Commission proposing the Option of a Golden Bay local board and wish to comment with the following points:

- 1) The Golden Bay Community Board believe the cost of a Local Board should reflect the level of responsibility, and request the Local Government Commission ensure the Golden Bay community is not exposed to unreasonable costs by the Tasman District Council.
- 2) The Golden Bay Community Board feel the submission document is insufficiently detailed with unknown costs and outcomes which limit the ability to make an informed submission.
- 3) The Tasman District Council wards should be represented consistently with a local level of representation.
- 4) The Golden Bay Community Board do not support a reduction of Councillor representation in the Golden Bay ward in the event of the establishment of a local board.
- 5) The Golden Bay Community Board believe it is important the local representation and Council share a positive relationship built on mutual respect, regardless of the governance model.

The Golden Bay Community Board would welcome the opportunity for our Chair to speak to our submission.

Yours sincerely

Golden Bay Community Board

Chair Abbie Langford, Deputy Chair Grant Knowles, Board Members Averill Grant
and Dave Gowland

Contact email: goldenbaycommunityboard@tasman.govt.nz

Golden Bay Community Board

C/- Tasman District Council

PO Box 74

Takaka 7142

Chair Abbie Langford: abbie.langford22@gmail.com

Secretary Jess McAlinden: jess.mcalinden@tasman.govt.nz

Submission 375: Hugh Cropp

I have mixed feelings about the formation of a local board. My gut feeling is we would be replacing one set of problems with another if one was formed.

In general I have an extremely poor opinion of Tasman District Council (TDC). In my opinion they are dishonest, arrogant, inefficient, fiscally irresponsible, disconnected, vindictive and extremely poor losers. I believe they have often served Golden Bay poorly and have frequently opposed reasonable requests from significant numbers of Golden Bay residents. I honestly believe that much of their consultation with the community has been little more than a sham. It's also my understanding that in the past the TDC has ignored recommendations from the Local Government Commission to give Golden Bay Community Board more power. Because of this, I'm not surprised there's strong support in Golden Bay community for the formation of a local board.

Because of the above, I was initially in favour of a local board for Golden Bay. However on reflection, I have serious concerns about how effectively the board would function in practice, and the costs of establishing and running it. For a board to be successful it would require the goodwill of all parties. I believe it's very possible councillors would be prepared to co-operate constructively with a board. However I believe the TDC's salaried staff will be extremely reluctant to give up their current level of control and management in Golden Bay. Should a local board be established, I expect the salaried staff in Richmond, aggrieved at losing power and influence, to vindictively do everything possible to prevent the board operating effectively and to seek to maximise the costs of running the board. Should a board be established, my expectation is for a significant increase in Golden Bay residents' rates.

Regrettably I wonder who is really in charge at TDC. In the Nelson Mail (1/8/20) it was claimed a retiring Nelson city councillor Stuart Walker had stated "the elected councillors don't run the city, the staff do". I believe a similar "Yes Minister" type situation exists at the TDC. Salaried staff appear to be rarely held to account for serious mistakes and huge cost overruns on projects. Should a local board be established, I fear councillors will be unable to ensure salaried staff treat Golden Bay in a fair and reasonable manner.

I am also concerned that establishing a local board could open up a new can of worms. Golden Bay has a very diverse community that includes many Greens. Many of them seem keen to jump on any bandwagon and frequently attack the area's productive sector. I believe there's a real risk that if a local board is established, the less radical members of the community instead of battling the TDC, will end up trying to combat the introduction of undesirable measures advocated by the Greens e.g. greatly reduced speed limits, limitation on the hours mussel industry vessels can operate. This might be democracy in action, but it will be extremely regrettable if the formation of a local board leads to a less harmonious community.

In conclusion, while the suggestion of a local board sounds appealing to many in the community because of the TDC's failings, I doubt it will prove overly successful in practice. To me, establishing a community board (sic) is treating the symptoms of the problem, not the cause. I honestly believe the root cause of many of Golden Bay's problems is the salaried staff of TDC. Until there is a serious change in their attitude and thinking, I doubt things will significantly improve, regardless of what system of governance we operate under.

Submission 391: Penny Griffith

Why I DON'T support local board options (either in Golden Bay/Mohua or elsewhere in Tasman District):

- Whichever costing is considered (LGC proposal, or TDC based on Auckland)-Local Boards are simply too expensive for the population base of Tasman.
- The formal governance gains (3-year plan + annual agreements) are not worth the significant additional cost--and that cost doesn't lead to any increase in the funding available for council works and services.
- Existing legislative provisions can already allow a far more significant role for Community Boards--IF both Council and the Community Boards have a will to make the relationship work. It's always going to be about building constructive relationships between the layers of governance and staff.
- In particular I don't support a local board option for Golden Bay/Mohua if the governance cost has to be solely borne by the ward ratepayers. (See additional comments on governance costs in section B.)
- Having 1 local board would result in an even more "muddled" fragmentation of Tasman District. Formal (elected) representation would be: councillor/s only (3 wards)--councillors + Community Board (1 ward)--councillors + Local Board (1 ward). I believe this is contrary to developing a "team spirit" that is already lacking in this local authority. (If the LGC decides on change, the very minimum should be to change BOTH Community Boards to Local Boards.)
- The rationale for Local Boards in Auckland (amalgamation of multiple large standalone councils) bears no relationship to the 2020 Tasman District situation.
- Golden Bay/Mohua definitely needs 2 councillors for appropriate representation of its size, isolation and complexity. It would become harder to justify retaining 2 councillors if a Local Board (of 5 more expensive members) were in place.

B: General comments

- Having equitable formal representation right across the district should be a goal--maybe Community Boards for all wards? (I note that in Christchurch City, almost all Community Boards cover 2 wards. Perhaps the 3 Tasman wards that don't currently have community boards could share one?)
- District governance costs should be spread evenly across ALL ratepayers. If the "best" outcome for Tasman District (as a whole) is community boards or local boards--or no boards--then the cost should be spread equally across ALL ratepayers. The current different representation/charging regimes discourage ratepayers from having a broader, inclusive "district" approach.
- Impact of an increased cost of governance in Golden Bay/Mohua. The impact would vary significantly within Golden Bay/Mohua because two localities (Pohara and Collingwood) are already anticipating rate increases of approx \$75pa as a result of the Waimea Dam funding model (plus recovery of cost overruns, not yet known). An additional approx \$75pa cost for governance changes (minimum--as outlined in the LGC proposal) starts to become totally disproportionate to the level of services delivered and additional costs of living remotely--e.g. no public transport, higher prices for goods & services, dependence on volunteer efforts and fundraising.

Submission 393: Robin Schiff

Reasons I support the option I chose.

Sometime, a month or two before Covid came to New Zealand the first time, I became aware that Richmond did not have a community board. While Golden Bay and Motueka do.

I thought, based on my experience working as a volunteer, actually leading, a large successful community led project in Far North, that a community board is an important thing for a community to have. We needed at least that level of interface with council, and advocacy for Far North, Te Hiku Ward, community, for our project in particular to succeed.

I think that without the Te Hiku Community Board, we could not have succeeded in getting the early smaller funding for things like a geo-tech survey, that are a necessary prerequisite to being ready to apply for large amounts of funding. We needed to raise \$12m to build a community sports and aquatic centre. We have done so.

The lack of a community board in Richmond, seemed to me a serious issue. After I got involved in the Nelson Tasman Climate Forum and started looking into urban development, I realised Richmond is heading off on a path of hodgepodge urban development, as opposed to best practice urban development. And without more representation of the community interests, as opposed to just a council/developer relationship, urban planning was not going to go well for the people actually living in Richmond.

When I received the Local Government Commission booklet in the mail about 5 weeks ago, and read it, I was electrified with excitement. I had never heard of local boards before. And when I realised that it would actually have delegated authority that required the council to come to an agreement with the local board re the annual plan and 3-year plan, I thought this is the best thing I ever heard of for enabling proper local representation. It would provide improved levels of representation, accountability and transparency, all currently lacking, for optimal community outcomes.

I had heard about TDC simply shrugging off proposals for safe bike paths and footpaths that would enable children to ride a bike to school, and adults to commute by bike to work or to shop – even along a road like Wensley Road which passes through a residential area and has traffic of 11,000 cars per day on it.

I had heard about proposals for rain water tanks to be subsidised for existing homes and required for new builds, just shrugged off as well. This, even though it is plain common sense to take the pressure off the town water system during increasingly dry, to the level of drought, summers.

I heard about developers minimising or trying to eliminate public reserves in a new development of 450 homes, near where I live. I have made submissions about this to object. However, it seems that real oversight from concerned residents is lacking, as well as the systematic and required interface with council, which I believe local boards would provide.

I think it would be necessary to have at least 4 local boards, and possibly one for Lakes-Murchison if they were interested. Necessary, in order to provide equitable distribution of power across the district.

At the moment I think power is too concentrated among too few people, who naturally have certain special interests that are close to their hearts. Almost unavoidable in human nature, therefore I believe it makes sense to have local decisions made at the local level, and regional decisions made at by a regional authority such as TDC, or eventually in the future, the Top of the South as one regional authority with local boards equitably distributed across the region.

I have read the Golden Bay Working Party for Local Board's draft submission, and I agree with their points. This is a very well researched and argued document, far beyond my capabilities to produce at this time. I especially agree with their economic concerns and believe that it all applies to all wards. This has to be done in a way that the people can afford to pay the increase in rates.

It also means that TDC must come to agreement with the LGC regarding the number of support staff required. There is a big difference between 1 and 4.5 FTEs necessary, and I believe the LGC has the experience to know how much staff support should be necessary.

It seems to me that TDC's counter proposal re staff numbers is an attempt to shoot down the possibility of local boards in Tasman District. I can understand that is natural not to want to share decision-making power particularly when it is so neatly wrapped up and easy with so few actual participants. But I believe real democracy is necessarily going to require more negotiation, thought, time and compromise to reach best outcomes.

I believe the high level of enthusiasm I experienced coming from the public while volunteering to provide information a few times, over the past few weeks, demonstrates a level of interest that – with a proposal from the LGC that outlined for other wards the costs and details, as done for Golden Bay – that public enthusiasm would continue to grow, given opportunities to engage.

I think the public here needs more information and detail for specific wards – such as Golden Bay has received, and I hope very much the LGC decides to proceed with the process.

A last note, I hope that Zoom hearings are provided so that we people in Eastern Tasman can participate easily in oral hearings. I participated in Zoom hearings for Nelson Council's annual plan and they were fine for me. I, myself, due to my medical situation, am not able to travel back and forth to Golden Bay.

Thank you very much for considering the thoughts presented in my submission.



**Submitters: Averill Grant
Tony Lawton
Laurie Healy
Roland Toder
Geoff Aitken
(all of Golden Bay)**

Area of Tasman District: Golden Bay (GB)

Organisation: Working Group for a Golden Bay Local Board

**Contact: www.gblocalboard.co.nz email: tflawton99@gmail.com
Post: PO Box 282 Takaka, Golden Bay 7142**

We wish to speak to our submission at a Commission hearing

1. Which option do you support?

- 1.1 We support both option i) a Golden Bay/Mohua local board, and option ii) a Golden Bay/Mohua local board and a local board or boards elsewhere in Tasman District. We do not support option iii) retention of existing arrangements i.e. community boards (not local boards) in Golden Bay and Motueka
- 1.2 Our preferred option is option ii) local boards for all communities in Tasman. We believe a consistent approach across the region, would result in a more robust, cost-efficient, and functional system of both community-level and regional-level governance for Tasman than a standalone local board for Golden Bay.
- 1.3 We see option i) a GB local board as a viable option which would significantly increase the likelihood of improved local government wellbeings for the GB community over and above that possible under option iii) the existing representation arrangement (either with or without greater delegations to the existing GB community board). We note that the viability of this option, and our support of it, is dependent on an affordable level of governance costs to the local GB community

2 Do you support a local board(s) in other areas of Tasman District? Identify that area(s):

- 2.1 We support local boards (or community boards) for all of the 5 Communities (or Wards) currently in Tasman district: Lakes/Murchison, Richmond, Moutere-Waimea, Motueka, Golden Bay. We note any contiguous area with a population greater than 1,500 people can be constituted as a 'Community-of-interest' (e.g. Mapua), and be granted a local board. Local board areas can also, we believe quite productively, include more than one community-of-interest.
- 2.2 We see considerable advantages in treating all Tasman's communities equally. It creates a feeling of equality across the district, fosters inter-community collaboration, and allows TDC to more effectively and efficiently reorganise to provide community-centric governance services across all its communities. We believe many of the reasons we put forward in our submission for a GB local board are also relevant for Tasman's other communities.
- 2.3 We suggest a possible learning from the Auckland local board experience is that there is a trade-off in respect of increased support costs for additional local boards, such that we see four local boards as affordable and appropriate, cost-wise, for the Tasman region's 50,000 population.
- 2.4 We note Richmond, TDC's most populous (15,000 pop) community, has no form of community representation. Legislation requires Councils to "enable democratic local decision-making and action by, and on behalf of, communities" (LGA s.10(1)(a)). TDC may (perhaps) argue that Richmond's ward councillors sufficiently represent the community's interests to the governing body. However, legally, ward councillors represent the region and not the interests of a community.
- 2.5 If the governing body is providing community-level decision making for communities without a local democratic body, then this raises the issue that this service is funded from the general rate for some communities, yet the two communities with CB's fund their (limited) community governance by a targeted rate. Hardly equitable.
- 2.6 TDC may see combining the ward councillor and community governance roles as a cost-effective approach, however this needs to be weighed against the loss of improvements in the community's four wellbeings of local government that could derive from good community-level governance. We believe TDC has the financial resources to fund community-level governance within its current general rate (refer Appendix III).
- 2.7 Local boards across the region would be an ideal way for TDC to meet its legal obligations for community-level democracy, and provide a platform for economic, social, cultural and environmental development.

3 What are your views on an appropriate balance between more local decision making in Golden Bay and district-wide decision making?

Current Representation Arrangements

- 3.1 **The ‘Shattock’ report, and the low ratings TDC receives in the Annual Residents Survey from GB residents, indicate that the current representation arrangements do not provide an acceptable balance between local and regional decision making for the GB community. Almost all local decisions for GB are made by the Council’s governing body.**
- 3.2 **We note LGA02 sched7.s.32 Deletions (6)“A territorial authority must consider whether or not to delegate to a community board if the delegation would enable the community board to best achieve its role.”**

Local Boards designed to provide balance between local and regional interests

- 3.3 **One of the principle reasons given for establishing local boards under LGA02 was to provide an appropriate balance between local and regional decision making. LGA02 s.48C(b) states the purpose of local boards is to “better enable the purpose of local government to be given effect to within the local board area”.**
- 3.4 **We see the basic principle of local boards (subsidiarity) as defining where district v local decision making should lie. If a decision principally affects a specific community, or group of communities, then better community outcomes will be achieved if that decision is made by a democratically elected body from the affected community(ies). If the decision affects the region as a whole, then the decision should be made by the TA’s governing body.**

Unitary Councils Require Local Boards to Balance Regulatory v Non-regulatory Governance

- 3.5 **For Unitary councils, with their inherent structural weakness in combining regulatory and non-regulatory responsibilities in the same organisation, the advantages of community-level decision making increase.**
- 3.6 **There is a risk, particularly in small provincial TA’s, acknowledged by commentators such as Sir Geoffrey Palmer in 2013, that regulatory/environmental issues can be subservient to economic goals of a Council.**
- 3.7 **In this case, local boards are a tool to provide the correct balance between both local and district wide decision making, and between environmental/regulatory decision making and development/economic decision making.**
- 3.8 **We believe this was one of the key drivers behind the 2014 LGA amendment allowing local boards outside the Auckland area for unitary councils only.**

Council’s Concerns on ‘Club’ Funding

- 3.9 **The Council, in its submission, states that it believes “there currently is an appropriate balance between local decision making and district-wide decision making, especially given the way in which activities are funded”.**
- 3.10 **We understand this to mean the current split between general rates and targeted rates (particularly its ‘club’ approach for water and some recreational facilities), should be a principle determinant of whether decisions are made locally at the community level, or regionally by the governing body.**
- 3.11 **We do not see the logic in Council connecting the provision of local democracy to its funding policy, and see the legislative ability of local boards to set a transparent and fair level of annual funding of the board’s activities as an advantage over the current approach of funding allocation by the Council’s governing body.**
- 3.12 **Use of the local board funding methodology does not preclude TDC funding a particular activity via a ‘club’ approach (i.e. a ringfenced pool of funds collected by a target rate set evenly across the district upon communities using that service or group of services, with the funds only used for the cost of that service). The TA retains all its legislative rights to collect targeted rates revenues and fees & charges (with some limitations in the local board area) as it sees fit. Any use of the ringfenced ‘club’ funds via a local board plan would need to be agreed between the board and Council via the board’s funding agreement, with dispute resolution.**

4 Do you consider more local decision-making is necessary to promote local community resilience and well-being now and in the future?

Current Representation Arrangements

- 4.1 The results of the research given in our application support the view that the current representation arrangements in GB do not provide sufficient local input into decisions over local issues.
- 4.2 Community feedback indicates concern that the community board is not providing the leadership and direction via clearly enunciated vision and objectives embodied in a community-agreed plan which addresses the environmental, social, cultural and economic current and future needs of the community.
- 4.3 We agree the Bay's geographical features contribute to this community view, however our research findings indicate that the primary factor behind the community-view that we need a different platform of representation is the lack of local democratic decision making.
- 4.4 We acknowledge that Council attempt to provide a certain level of community-level planning as part of the regional LTP. However, we submit this is rather an afterthought and part of an overall regional 'top-down' planning approach. We submit that this does not meet the planning/visioning needs of the GB community.

Can Community Board 'Delegations' Address this?

- 4.5 Given the last 30yrs of little delegation, and after TDC declined the Commission's request to do so in 2007, we have significant doubts around Council's commitment to a material level of CB delegation.
- 4.6 In its submission the Council states "significant progress has been made in terms of improving the relationship", giving as evidence the "recent solution surrounding the Golden Bay Grandstand".
- 4.7 We agree the Grandstand is a good example, but one that demonstrates that the relationship has not materially evolved. After several years of legal dispute between a local group and the Council, costing ratepayers and locals over \$400k in legal costs, a settlement was finally reached when TDC backed down over a 'legal issue'. The 'deal' sees the building maintained to operating levels at a cost to GB ratepayers via a targeted rate of \$900k. The community group offered to maintain the building themselves at a cost of \$100k.
- 4.8 TDC state in its submission that the GB CB "is empowered with a number of decision-making responsibilities ... these are always open for expansion". It sees adding delegations on a "project basis" via "working groups ... to ensure localised input to decision making", with the Takaka Freshwater and Land Advisory Group, Golden Bay Natural Landscapes Project and the Port Taranaki development as recent examples. And it lists the CBs appointment to seats on a number of advisory boards (the Takaka Aerodrome User Group, the Port Taranaki Advisory Group, the Golden Bay Museum Board, Hall Committees) as further evidence of its view that it provides adequate support of local democracy.
- 4.9 We have obtained TDC's current GB CB delegations and list these in Appendix I. They amount largely to responsibility for street signs, tree maintenance, design of public seating and the like. The current community board has a delegated budget of around \$17k p.a. largely for community grants (\$10k). The remaining \$7k relates to Christmas street decorations, street flowers and similar level of activities. The budget is funded by a target-rate on the GB community. None of the \$5million p.a. general rate collected from the community is delegated to the GB CB. In comparison, the responsibilities suggested by the Commission for Tasman community boards in the NCC/TDC proposed 2010 amalgamation, given in Appendix II, are extensive.
- 4.10 We agree, in theory, that community board delegations can deliver a basic form of community democracy. However, these delegations are typically task-based, 'point-in-time' delegations, and are dependent on a continuing good relationship with the TA. They can involve significant responsibility, but only after the 'what, when, how much' questions have been answered by the governing body, with the budget remaining under control of the Council.

4.11 Significant CB delegation also has its own issues regarding decision support overhead. Currently, for the little decision-making the GB CB does, as well as the support it receives for its recommendatory role, the overhead for decision-support is funded from the general rate. We believe legally councils are not able to charge this to communities under LGA02 sched.7, although we understand this is a grey area. However, if significantly more delegations are added, at some point the decision-support overhead becomes material. Will this be target-rated or remain general rate funded? At least the Council should be acknowledged that this is a difference in funding policy not actual cost difference when compared to a local board governance cost structure. And if significant budgetary responsibility is delegated to the CB, how is fiscal responsibility maintained? Somewhere down the road of increased CB delegation you arrive at the need for the similar controls Parliament granted local boards – 3-year plan, annual work agreements, funding policy and dispute resolution. This control framework has already been established and proven to work for local boards. Why not use this to enhance the chances of achieving sustainable, productive, community-level governance as under local boards?

Would a local board's 'place-based' model provide the answer?

- 4.12 In comparison to CB 'point-in-time' delegations, local boards permit 'place-based' democratic decision-making. This is where a community sets its own priorities and has control over all decision-making (at least for non-regulatory activities) within its area, for the present, but also for the future as the community's needs and desires evolve over time. Fiscal responsibility is provided via the plan/budget agreements, but this is very different from the CB+delegations budgetary control TDC would be comfortable with. The two approaches, whilst seeming similar to some, are worlds apart if implemented correctly.
- 4.13 We see greater community-level engagement and involvement in local government decision making, at the level of community people principally affiliate with, as critical to building future resilience and community wellbeing. The benefits arising from the ability to construct a plan built from the 'grass-roots' collective visions and objectives of the community, tied to the ability to agree funding and service delivery that can deliver the desired future wellbeings of the community, cannot be overstated. We see this as a key advantage of local boards – its ability to bring communities together to drive change and build resilience through community engagement and involvement.
- 4.14 Our application gave the results of our survey of GB residents. 98% of respondents affiliate first with the GB community rather than the Tasman district, which rated equal with the Nelson/Tasman region as respondents second community of affiliation. It is this greater affiliation to the immediate community that we see as the key to binding the community to its democratically-elected body, and the key enabler of community-driven improvement in its wellbeings.
- 4.15 We note that building resilience at the community level is a core concept in a number of our political parties manifestos for this general election.
- 4.16 In a discussion the WG had with the Chair of Aotea Great Barrier Island local board, Izzy Fordham listed the community planning process as the main benefit the community found in moving from a community board to local a board in 2010.

Does our community have the people for local decision-making?

- 4.17 The Council 's submission states it does not believe that a local board would "improve community involvement in local decision making in Golden Bay", and that it would "not guarantee a change in the relationships, skills or experience" on the elected body.
- 4.18 We know of many current and past representatives on our community boards that have shown the skills, knowledge, and dedication to make good local decision-makers. We know of many local people who would not put their name forward for a community board (at least one with the current delegations) but state they would be involved with a local democratic body that can establish a community plan that encompasses the collective visions and objectives of their community, with the legislative power to negotiate a budget and work agreements with Council to deliver that plan. We see many people in our community with the skills and knowledge to make great local decision-makers.

- 4.19 We submit these diametrically opposed views on the ability of our community's people arises from Council's difficulty in recognising the value of the intrinsic knowledge and experience our people have for the local environmental, social, cultural, and economic characteristics of our community, knowledge that can only be built up over years of living, working, recreating in a community. This makes local people better equipped to deliver higher quality decisions over local issues than decision-makers at the regional level.

Wider Support for more devolved community-level decision making

- 4.20 A survey by the NZ Initiative (<https://nzinitiative.org.nz/reports-and-media/reports/localismnz-bringing-power-to-the-people>) found that the majority of those surveyed support a move towards local services being managed and provided by local decision-makers, finding that the majority of New Zealanders believe that:
Locally controlled services will be more responsive to local needs (54%)
Local government would be more accountable to the locals they live amongst (53%), and
Local people would make better decisions based on a greater understanding of local needs (52%)
- 4.21 Dave Cull, LGNZ 219 conference ... challenge for local government ... [is] to devolve decision making to communities. ... need to give communities more say in the important decisions that affect their lives.
- 4.22 Hon Nanaia Mahuta, Minister of Local Government (August 2019, SWC-19-MIN-0097 Minute: Working with Local Government on Community Wellbeing, Cabinet Office): "...different communities will need different outcomes to maximise their wellbeing ... ensuring communities themselves are driving the mix and nature of services that contribute to these outcomes is critical for community resilience and social inclusion ... make community participation in local governance more accessible, inclusive and effective ... by shifting participation from a 'point in time' activity to an on going dialogue between councils and communities";

5 Is there community support for the establishment of local boards elsewhere in the Tasman District? Can you demonstrate the level of Support?

- 5.1 The basic desire for people to participate in governance decisions for the local areas they live in is, of course, across all Communities, not specific to GB's specific characteristics (remoteness/history etc). Many of the advantages sought, and issues faced, by the GB community will be common across all Tasman's communities.
- 5.2 We believe the level of alternative applications received by the Commission, and Council comments about lack of community requests for greater local democracy outside of Golden Bay, may not be an accurate reflection of community interest.
- 5.3 We note that it took our group over 3 months of community-awareness-building about local boards to attain the wide-spread community support required to meet the application's requirements. There has been no community awareness building program run in other Tasman communities. The one alternative application received for a Motueka board was from the most experienced local government politician in the Top of the South, following from attendance of a WG presentation to the GB community board.
- 5.4 We are now seeing some level of community engagement outside of GB following from the mailbox drop of the Commission's consultation document, with an expectation of at least several hundred submissions. However, there is limited information available to these communities about now a local board would function for their community, and the costs. If that were provided, in conjunction with community meetings with the Commission across the region, as held in GB, we expect that would lead to a very different level of community interest being shown by the wider-Tasman district.
- 5.5 We have received negative feedback from the other communities, and locally, in respect of the cost numbers released publicly by TDC. TDC stated (reported by the Nelson Mail) at a Motueka CB meeting that the per-ratepayer costs to GB residents for a local board would be around \$420 p.a. This was calculated on the incorrect number of rateable units (2,200 instead of 3,500). We have pointed out to TDC what we believe is another material error in that the current figure they have released to the public of \$282 per ratepayer seemingly double-counts local board remuneration costs by adding the Commission's expected remuneration costs of \$75,000 on top of the Auckland local board base cost (\$900k.p.a.).

- 5.6 TDC do not acknowledge that their costs, which they base on an Auckland local board 'base' cost of \$900,000 p.a., is before any reduction in central governing body support costs, or other cost savings/efficiencies, which could be used to offset the rate increase. We believe this has created a public perception, in GB, but perhaps more so in the other Tasman communities, that local boards are prohibitively expensive, and that this perception may affect community participation in the consultation.
- 5.7 We are aware of a growing desire for at least community board-level representation for the Richmond community, both from within the community, and the Council itself. And we are unsure whether the Motueka community board's position in seeing no benefits in moving to local board representation reflects that board's own view or the view of its community.
- 5.8 TDC's claim that there is no requirement or desire for community or local board representation across the other communities appears to be based on reports from its ward councillors. We suggest this may not necessarily reflect communities informed views.

6 Do you have comments on local board/councillor representation arrangements?

Local Board Members

- 6.1 We see 5 local board members (the minimum allowed) as appropriate given the economic/population characteristics of the GB community. We do not see a higher number of members providing significantly enhanced decision-making ability of the board, and it would come at a higher cost to the community.
- 6.2 We are aware of a number of advantages and disadvantages in either electing the Chair from the 5 elected members, or via election by community vote. We do not feel we are able to make a collective recommendation on this issue as a group at this time.

Ward Councillors

- 6.3 We are neutral on the issue of the number of ward 'regional' councillors, who legislatively are required to represent/vote in the interests of the region over the interests of their ward/community, and therefore, we believe, have little relevancy in determining an adequate level of local decision making.
- 6.4 We support the ward councillors being appointed to the local board, however we recommend they do not have voting rights (i.e. speaking rights only) as they legally represent the Council and not the community. We submit that the current arrangements of voting rights of the ward councillors on the current GB community board can and does cause conflict-of-interest situations.
- 6.5 We are aware of community concern that a GB local board may result in the number of GB ward councillors being reduced. Our view is that the Commission would only reduce the number of ward councillors if they established that the additional powers of a local board over those of a community board enabled effective representation at a reduced number of ward councillors.
- 6.6 We recommend that any review of ward councillor representation not be undertaken in conjunction with a local board implementation. The effectiveness of local board representation will, at least in part, depend on a mutually agreed funding agreement being achieved between the board and the Council. The ability to achieve this may not be clear for some time. We also note that, as stated in the 2007 representation review, the Commission will consider a wide number of factors other than the local board impact, including the remoteness of GB from the governing body's base in Richmond, and the diverse geographical area covered by the GB ward, in determining the appropriate number of ward councillors.
- 6.7 We note that Council's submission states that whilst agreeing "that local decision-making is necessary to promote local community resilience and well-being now and in the future, for any community" Council sees the "the higher number of [ward councillor] representatives than normally provided by legislation" providing community-level democracy.
- 6.8 We submit this approach is incongruous with legislative requirements for ward councillors to represent regional interests. The purpose of the ward system is so that the governing body reflects the regional demographics. Ward councillors represent the regional interests, and cannot be used as a 'proxy' for community representation.

7 What might a Golden Bay local board do?

Non-regulatory Responsibilities (Allocations)

- 7.1 LGA02 s.48L(2)(b) requires that all non-regulatory activities in a local board area are allocated (i.e. non-revocable) responsibilities of the local board unless one of the following exceptions apply:
- i) the impact of decisions over these assets/activities will extend beyond GB
 - ii) effective decision-making requires alignment or integration with other decisions that are the responsibility of the governing body
 - iii) benefits of consistent/coordinated approach across Tasman outweighs needs/preferences of GB
- 7.2 We see the test for what should be allocated to a local board as ‘what is the area the operation of the council asset/activity will effect’. Given GB’s physical separation from other Tasman communities, all environmental, social, and cultural impacts resulting from the use of council assets/activities located in GB solely affect GB. This leaves the economic wellbeing as the area where there is some doubt, i.e. the commercial assets being Port Tarakohe, Campgrounds, and the Aerodrome.
- 7.3 TDC manages its commercial assets collectively: operationally under a Richmond-based ‘commercial manager’, and governance-wise, via the Richmond-based ‘commercial standing committee’ of the governing body. The committee includes a number of consultants with governance experience.

Golden Bay Campgrounds

- 7.4 For the two campgrounds, the Council’s argument for exclusion is that these are on “long term leases, therefore there is little role for either Council or the Local Board in the medium term” (from PJ&Associates report).
- 7.5 We submit that this justification does not meet any of the LGA exceptions for non-allocation. The GB local board structure could well be in place for the next 30+ years. It would be short sighted to not allocate these community assets on the grounds of there being a medium-term lease in place.
- 7.6 We are aware of a number of issues around the Collingwood campground where Council has refused to address local community access requests, a social wellbeing issue. We believe this is because TDCs decision making process via its commercial standing committee decision-making process does not take in to account the three non-economic wellbeings.
- 7.7 We see significant potential benefit to the community in combining these community assets into GB ‘solutions’ to its issues; for example, they could, possibly, be part of a freedom camping/high-volume-low value tourism solution. Freedom camping is a significant issue in GB, and we are the community in Tasman most affected by the costs of freedom camping. High-volume-low-value tourism is a significant issue and opportunity for our community. They could form part of a community promotions program during the quieter shoulder season to draw people in for festivals etc in combination with good value accommodation. There are many possibilities a lateral-thinking local board could pursue to intergarted these assets into community-wide local initiatives for the economic, social, cultural and environmental wellbeing of the GB community.

Port Tarakohe and Takaka Aerodrome

- 7.8 TDC’s argument for excluding the Takaka aerodrome and Port Tarakohe is on the basis that these assets are linked to “Council’s strategic objectives including the need for transport alternatives” (from PJ&Associates report).
- 7.9 Councils stated strategic objective for its commercial portfolio is to maximise the financial returns to the Council from these assets, to mitigate future rate increase, and to meet future debt repayments, particularly for the Waimea Dam.
- 7.10 We submit that the inclusion of the current and future cashflows from the GB based commercial assets in TDC’s strategic objectives does not constitute reason under LGA 48L(2)(b)(i) for non-allocation to a local board. All commercial assets across all councils have associated cashflows, which are of course used to offset the need for otherwise higher rates.

- 7.11 We do not see TDC's centralisation of operational management of its commercial assets under the 'commercial manager' as a hindrance in the transfer of the governance role to a GB local board. The commercial manager can refer strategic issues over GB-based commercial assets to a local board in GB as well as to a standing committee of the governing body in Richmond.
- 7.12 The standing committee's sole advantage over local board governance is its access to outside consultant's governance expertise. We submit that this expertise can just as readily be provided to a local board as it can to a standing committee of the governing body, if it is required. If it is not, perhaps due to the greater local knowledge of a local board, then there is considerable potential for regional savings. We note that our community has some of the most experienced business people in NZ, and significant experience in aquaculture than other Tasman communities.
- 7.13 For the test under LGA 48L(2)(b)(ii) we do not see any valid arguments why governance decision over a commercial/recreational port in GB would be improved by being 'aligned or integrated' with 'other decisions of the governing body'. TDC does not manage or actively provide governance decision making over any other port facility. Regarding its 50% ownership of Port Nelson, it is merely a 'sleeping shareholder' and provides no governance knowledge (it provides one passive non-executive director to a monthly board meeting).
- 7.14 In respect of Port Tarakohe, under LGA 48L(2)(b)(iii), whether the benefits of governance decisions under the commercial standing committee outweighs the benefits of having all non-regulatory assets under a GB local board, is a value judgement for the Commission. We see the ability of the local board to weigh all local issues, including social, cultural, and environmental issues, , as well as its likely greater understanding of the local business (such as development of a local marine services industry or a seafood dining experience etc) and recreational use of the Port asset within the overall GB community, would outweigh any claims that the commercial committee has greater governance experience.
- 7.15 We submit that the recreational use and historical context of Port Tarakohe should be given sufficient weight in the Commission's allocation decision. The Port was originally owned by the Golden Bay Cement Company, which when it closed its GB business in the late 1980s, as 'compensation' for the lost jobs, under a deed of settlement, gifted the Port to "the peoples of Golden Bay for commercial and recreational use". The Port remains the only marina in Golden Bay, and is heavily used by recreational boaties, coast guard, youth sailing, waka ama, Pohara boat club, penguin colony (a potential tourist attraction) and is a popular camping area. For the first 30 years of council ownership the Port's chief source of income was berthage from recreational vessels.
- 7.16 We note LGA s.14.1.(h) (ii) "the need to maintain and enhance the quality of the environment" is now a non-negotiable requirement for local government. This will be reinforced in the upcoming changes to the RMA, giving 'environment wellbeing' precedent over straight 'economic wellbeing'. If environmental wellbeing, and therefore 'sustainable economic development', is now an imperative of local government decision-making, then a local board's ability to take into account environmental concerns, as well as social and cultural wellbeing issues, surely means a local board's local decision making provides a better platform to deliver overall community wellbeing than TDC's economic-based decision making via its commercial sub-committee.
- 7.17 For the Takaka Aerodrome, similar arguments apply as to Port Tarakohe. However, TDC may have a stronger case on the grounds that they are, we understand, actively involved in the governance of the Motueka aerodrome. We suggest the Commission would need to validate TDC's level of governance involvement in that business prior to making any decision.
- 7.18 We note there is now a local environmental advocacy group established in the Bay to address the environmental concerns relating to mussel-farming, including that industry's use of Port Tarakohe. i.e. the environmental and social concerns are at the level where the community is mobilising distinct from the Council. For a GB local board to not be involved in working with the local community in addressing these significant issues would undermine the boards status and accountability in the community, with considerable downside potential for the community's environmental and social wellbeings.

- 7.19 We note that Council's concerns over a wider allocation of responsibilities largely relate to a fear of lost economic gain from the transferred assets. As acknowledged by the Commission, the annual budget process provides a structured way for Council to address these fears, and if agreement is unable to be attained, there is an established dispute resolution process to ensure there is an acceptable compromise between the region's economic objectives, and the local GB social, cultural and environmental objectives. However, we stress that the existing pursuit of Council's economic-centric goals may no longer be sustainable in the light of the latest LGA02 amendments, proposed RMA changes, or the water NPS.

Transport Alternatives / Disaster Recovery

- 7.20 GB has a somewhat unique position in that it is not infrequently cut off road-wise from the rest of NZ. Its only access road is subject to slips in bad weather. At times the road can be closed for significant periods. Alternative transport routes are via either barge/freighter from Port Taranaki, or air via the Takaka aerodrome. Its unique 'disaster recovery' requirements require a specific tailored local solution.
- 7.21 In our application we explained the community-view on the Council's handling of the last 'disaster' – cyclone Gita, which closed the hill completely for a period of weeks, and from which the highway is still single-laned, causing ongoing economic loss for a number of GB businesses.
- 7.22 TDC's disaster response was considered unsatisfactory, especially across the business sector in the Bay. This included TDC's lack of involvement in establishing alternate transport links, and lack of leadership in remedial responses.
- 7.23 We submit that it is a priority to this community that its own democratic body lead (and be accountable for) local government disaster recovery planning and remedial actions, including transport links. Local knowledge is needed to understand the specific GB business and non-business requirements under a disaster. Adequate localised response and leadership, requires local knowledge and coordination across many local organisations. TDC have demonstrated that they do not have the local capability to do this to the level required by the community.

Local Boards allow a 'holistic' approach

- 7.24 A local board structure is, in many ways, analogous to the corporate structure of a subsidiary. One of the lessons from the commercial-world is that subsidiaries are more able to achieve their goals if given freedom to make decisions over all elements within their area of responsibility. We also believe this is a learning from the Auckland local board experience – that the more responsibilities a board is given over its local area the more effective it is in delivering beneficial wellbeing outcomes for its community.
- 7.25 Allocation of all local assets/activities allows a board to take a holistic view of its environment, to think laterally in developing tailored local solutions to local problems, and provides the clarity over responsibilities and accountability a community needs to engender active engagement and participation in its local governance.
- 7.26 We submit that every local community asset/activity removed from the responsibility of the local board reduces its chances of delivering the desired outcomes for the community.

Local boards are designed to handle more responsibilities than community boards

- 7.27 We support all proposed allocations of the Commission to the GB local board listed in the options document. However, we note that these are responsibilities we believe central government expect to be delegated to community boards, and draw the Commission's attention to appendix II listing the proposed delegations to the community boards that would have been part of the proposed 2010 NCC/TDC amalgamation.
- 7.28 We see the level of allocated responsibilities to local boards, as envisaged by Parliament in its 2014 LGA amendment under which this application falls, as being significantly higher than that suitable for a community board given the legislative control framework around local boards, and obviously higher than in the Commission's options document.

- 7.29 We submit that ALL the responsibilities/assets/activities listed under the heading 'Advocacy' in the Commission's proposal document be allocated responsibilities of a GB local board. We appreciate the nuances of a local board's enhanced 'advocacy' role pursuant to its ability to negotiate with the Council via the 3-year plan/annual agreement framework, however we believe that an approach based on 'advocacy' is structurally less likely to lead to effective and efficient outcomes compared to including these responsibilities as allocations by the Commission to the local board.
- 7.30 We believe a mixture of allocation and advocacy roles for a board does not provide clear accountability back to a community.

Regulatory Responsibilities (Delegations)

- 7.31 In setting a local board's initial delegations, we believe the Commission should apply the test given in LGA02 sched 7. s.36C(3) Delegations to local boards from governing body: "In deciding whether to make a delegation, the governing body must weigh the benefits of reflecting local circumstances and preferences (through a delegation) against the importance and benefits of using a single approach in the district"
- 7.32 We submit that this is essentially the same test as for allocation of regulatory responsibilities i.e. that if the effects of the regulation fall within the local board area, and that if none of the following exceptions apply
> the impact of decisions over these regulations will extend beyond GB
> effective decision-making requires it to be done at the regional level
> benefits of consistent/coordinated approach across Tasman outweighs needs/preferences of GB
then responsibility for the policy decisions in respect of that regulation should reside with the local board.
- 7.33 We see the burden of proof residing with the Council to show that local decision making over each regulatory activity meets one or more of the exceptions. We suggest there should be a mutually agreed solution for the initial delegations between the local board, Council, and the Commission as participant and adjudicator, based on sched 7. s.36C(3).
- 7.34 We also appreciate that initial delegations by the Commission will be reviewed by the governing body at the end of the first term of the board. We see LGA02 sched 7 as requiring the Council to meet the same level of proof to establish the exceptions apply. We further suggest to the Commission they consider a role as adjudicator over non-mutual delegation withdrawal by the Council, and discuss with the Minister how this could be legislated for prior to 2025.
- 7.35 Our group's survey analysis of residents identified a number of regulatory areas where there is significant community interest in a local-variant to regional-regulation policy. These are housing/land use regulation including resource consenting, water usage/extraction, coastal managed retreat, and environmental regulation.
- 7.36 For instance, we believe there is wide-spread community support for a variant approach to housing regulation that remains consistent with national legislative regulatory standards, and that a different approach within GB to reflect our more 'rural-lifestyle-eclectic' demographic characteristics would have little effect on housing regulation on communities outside of GB or on the administrative processes of the Council in building/resource consenting.
- 7.37 As the Commission has stated, any regulatory policy made by a GB local board must comply with national regulatory standards. Therefore, any argument by Council against regulation being the responsibility of a GB local board can only be on the basis that a different approach between the wider Tasman area and GB would result in unacceptable additional costs. Yet, as the Council can ensure that any additional costs are borne by the GB Community via the annual budget process, surely it is up to the local community, via its local board, to determine the appropriate trade-off for the community between extra costs, if any, and regulation better tailored to local needs. We believe the potential savings/enhancements in overall wellbeing to the GB community are potentially significant.

Roading / Transportation

- 7.38 Whilst we appreciate the legislative constraint the Commission operates under; we wish to draw its attention to the issue of roading (non-NZTA) in GB. We believe this is an area of concern in the community in respect of cycle-way funding, prioritisation and quality of road maintenance/surfacing, and cost effectiveness and efficiency of the roading maintenance contract. The ‘accepted’ logic is that roading remains under the ambit of the governing body on the basis that there is typically (as there is for TDC) a regional contract for roading maintenance, and that there are issues in allocation/delegation to local boards due to the requirements in respect of the NZTA subsidy.
- 7.39 However, our research has indicated it is also one of the critical areas where Council spending could be i) better prioritised and ii) made significantly more effective and efficient, particularly via local competitive bidding. And, we see none of the reasons for non-allocation to local boards insurmountable. We leave this issue in the hand of the Commission, perhaps for discussion with the relevant Ministers.

Collaboration

- 7.40 We see significant potential in the collaboration activities listed in the Commission’s document. The advice we have received from the Aotea Great Barrier Island local board is that collaborative initiatives between themselves, D.O.C and AGBI Iwi have been a key success factor for the local board’s ability to deliver environmental wellbeing improvements for their community, and we understand, has aided in improving cultural wellbeing.
- 7.41 However, we have a significant question mark over how effective funding can be achieved for these initiatives via the local board funding process.

8 What Might a Golden Bay local board cost? Who might pay?

General Principles

- 8.1 Local board support structures must be tailored to suit the specific circumstances of a community(ies). As such, we support the Commission’s proposed governance support structure of direct support via one local ‘senior advisor’, and indirect support via ‘as-needs’ technical advice across a number of TDC Richmond-based departments to the level of 0.9 FTE, as we see this as an appropriate support structure for a ‘stand-alone’ GB local board.
- 8.2 We support the Commission’s proposed additional target-rate cost of \$75 p.a. per property on GB ratepayers to fund this support structure. However, we submit that the principle for local board governance costs must be that as a local board does the same work locally that a governing body is already doing centrally, much of a local board’s governance costs must be funded by the same general rates as used to fund the work previously performed by the governing body. If this principle is not recognised there is considerable scope for duplication of bureaucracy, waist of ratepayers money, and ‘overcharging’ to local board area ratepayers.
- 8.3 We believe there are many opportunities to provide offsetting savings that could reduce the charge to the ratepayer for a local board - for example, reduced travel costs for TDC Richmond-based staff. A local board must be able to work with its Council to maximise these savings through efficient local solutions.

Direct costs

- 8.4 We see value in the Commission’s recommendation of one additional full-time equivalent officer to provide local direct support services to the local board. We see this position having two main roles;
i) coordinating council service delivery within GB;
ii) facilitating TDC’s Richmond-based indirect support (asset management, regulatory, finance, community engagement and communication) to the local board in their decision making and planning responsibilities.
- 8.5 We see the implied salary for this position, given its required seniority, experience and breadth of knowledge, as about right, however we see scope in reducing the \$110,000-\$130,000 implied ‘overhead’ cost, as we deem this as too high for local circumstances/cost base. We believe some thought should be given to ‘local’ solutions to reduce this cost, such as home-office, zoom meetings, business-subsidised electric car, etc to ensure ‘value-for-ratepayer-money’ and aid in local affordability.

- 8.6 We see other opportunities to reduce this cost which we would like to discuss with the Commission, in conjunction with the Council, if the Commission decides to proceed with a local board implementation.
- 8.7 To fund the direct costs, the Commission is recommending a target-rate on the GB community of \$75 p.a. per property, for a stand-alone GB local board. This would give a total target rate of approximately \$95 p.a. per property for local governance costs. Whilst we see this level of rate as potentially realistic (i.e. value-for-ratepayers-money), it is at the upper end of affordability for the community, due to a number of factors, and may not be affordable for all members of the community.
- 8.8 Average annual incomes across the GB community are the lowest in Tasman, and one of the lowest across NZ. Further, Tasman is already in a high rates-to-income band, with the NZ Taxpayers Union rating the district as the 3rd lowest in rates affordability, so there is little 'wriggle-room'. Also, there is considerable rate pressure coming via a large irrigation project funded by the Council (the Waimea Dam), with a direct rate currently of \$30 per property, and an indirect rate effect resulting from the dam's related debt repayments (likely to be in excess of \$100 million, perhaps significantly higher) being funded from the future cashflows of the Council's commercial assets, meaning those cashflows will no longer be available to mitigate future rate rises for normal council services.
- 8.9 These factors mean the Commission should take extra care that any political representation changes are affordable to the local community, especially those in the lower income quartile.
- 8.10 We note that in the past, during the initial years of a GB community board, there was a similar local position in respect of the 'coordinate council service delivery' part of the direct support role. We understand this position was funded from the general rate, and that it was part of the 'compromise deal' on the initial establishment of the TDC/GB community board arrangement in 1989 which saw the dissolution of the GB County Council. We believe this position was 'absorbed' into the Richmond cost base without reduction of a GB targeted rate.
- 8.11 A concern we have in this area is that if the Commission's proposed responsibility split between 'allocated responsibilities' and 'advocacy responsibilities' stands, then the support position will spend considerable (more than half) of her/his time on the advocacy responsibilities. We accept that although the locally-based position may afford a higher level of service than, say in Murchison, it would only match (or be less than) the level of service provided in, say, Richmond where there are many staff to perform this function. We see a local board's advocacy role as similar to a community boards role, for which we note the decision support costs are funded from the general rate.
- 8.12 We therefore submit that the portion of the direct support role that is to be funded by a GB target-rate be tied to the level of 'allocated' v's 'advocacy' responsibilities that the Commission grant to the GB local board. Currently, we see that such a policy would mean GB ratepayers pay for less than half of the proposed \$240,000 cost of direct support. Obviously, this would change if the Commission allocated further responsibilities than they propose in the options document. Such a policy, we believe, would equitably apportion the cost to where the benefit is received and follow current TDC policy.

Indirect costs

- 8.13 For funding the Richmond-based indirect support (asset management, regulatory, finance, community engagement and communication), we agree with the Commission's consideration of the benefits of improved GB local decision-making on the wider Tasman region; it frees up the Governing Body (14 regional councillors) to better govern regional issues; it provides many opportunities to reduce council expenses (just one example, the \$500,000 TDC spent recently on legal costs on 2 local issues); it reduces travel cost/time for Council staff (etc).
- 8.14 We also agree with the PJ&Associates report that only part of the indirect cost is 'incremental', with TDC able to offset a portion of this cost from its existing budget/staff resources.

- 8.15 Given these 'offsetting' benefits, we support the view that funding the indirect support costs from the Tasman-wide general rate is an equitable compromise for all Tasman ratepayers. It is up to TDC to avail themselves of the opportunities to reduce central costs.

Council's proposed support structure and costs

- 8.16 We accept TDCs position that in todays complex environment the breadth of technical knowledge needed to adequately advise a decision-making local government body cannot be delivered by a single person.
- 8.17 TDC has proposed the following direct support structure, located in Golden Bay; Lead team member; Customer support officer; Senior and part time advisor; PA/Community liaison officer. We believe this structure is copied from the Auckland model.
- 8.18 For a stand-alone local board servicing a community of 5,000 population, the costs of an advisory service of 4.5 local staff is neither affordable nor an efficient way to spend ratepayers money, irrespective whether funded from a general or targeted rate as these staff will not be fully employed throughout the year. It is a staff resource level suitable for 'peak' service level only – possibly for a few days per month around monthly meeting cycle; 2-3 weeks per year whilst negotiating annual agreements/budget; 1-2 months per 3-year planning cycle.
- 8.19 Given TDC has no experience in local boards, they are not in a position to realistically estimate the costs of a 'stand-alone' local board. Using a benchmark cost from the Auckland local boards makes TDC's numbers a guesstimate at best. We submit that TDC will need considerable assistance over the initial period of a GB local board from the Commission, including monitoring and advice (checks and balances).
- 8.20 We have some specific comments on the Council's proposed support roles. We believe there is existing capacity in the TDC Takaka Service Centre to support the Commission's proposed increase of one new position. We also believe there may be scope to combine this position with an existing part-time role in the Takaka service centre staff, and that the existing office administrative team has capacity and ability to provide the PA/Community liaison officer role proposed by the Council. We do not see a critical need for a local customer support/community liaison function given the greater ability of local board members from a small rural community to perform this function with indirect support from existing Richmond based staff. We see the 'senior and part-time advisor' roles being combined into one position given the size of the GB community; and this would effectively be the one direct support role suggested by the Commission. One additional staff position obviously does not need the 'lead team member' role. Leadership can be provided by the local board chair, ensuring tighter coordination between TDC staff and local governance.
- 8.21 We see TDC's proposed target rate of \$283 p.a. on GB properties as unaffordable given the local community's average income levels across the lower quartile of earners. And it is not an efficient nor effective way to deliver the required local government service (i.e. it does not meet legislative requirements under LGA02 for local good local government) as we have explained above.
- 8.22 We note that TDC cost calculations appear to double-count the local board member remuneration costs. Irrespective of this, the proposed targeted rate would remain, in our view, unaffordable to the community. We believe, district-wide ratepayers should reject funding this from the general rate on the grounds that it is an unwarranted and inefficient expenditure of ratepayers funds when compared to the Commission's proposed support structure, or the lower cost-per-ratepayer option of region-wide local boards.
- 8.23 TDCs "STATEMENT OF COMPREHENSIVE REVENUE AND EXPENSE For the year ended 30 June 2019" shows a "Surplus/(deficit) after tax" of \$33.5 million (2018 \$23.7 million). Given TDC's financial position, we submit TDC are in a position to spend more of the existing annual general rate on implementing community level governance in their region. We also submit that sustained financial surplus of 'rates/other revenues less overheads' for the GB community (refer Appendix III) indicate that the GB community could rightly expect the TA to fund a higher level of spending on its community-level democracy from the existing annual general rate taken from the community.

Region-wide cost considerations

8.24 The Commission is obligated to consider establishing local boards for the other Tasman communities. A wider implementation of local boards would facilitate cross-community collaboration, and sharing of governance and establishment costs. We submit that TDC's proposed cost/support structure is only appropriate in respect of a region-wide local board structure, not for a 'stand-alone' board. Also, they are 'gross' costs, based on the Auckland model, before offsetting a reasonable share of existing 'centralised' decision-support costs. Achieving these offsetting cost reductions so as to make the increased rate affordable, and an efficient spend of ratepayers money, would require significant reorganisation of the centralised decision support function within the Council to efficiently service both local boards and the governing body.

We estimate that implementation of Tasman-wide local boards (we suggest four), utilising the Auckland centralised services model and base cost for small local boards (\$900,000p.a.), in conjunction with reallocation of a reasonable share of TDC's existing central governance budget (50% of the current 2019 \$4.5million p.a.) to cover a portion of local board governance costs, would push the Tasman-wide general rate up by \$60 p.a. We appreciate that this would include resizing of the governing body to match its new level of responsibilities. If the Commission see merit in region-wide local boards, further investigation of the costs is warranted so that more informed submissions from the wider Tasman public can be achieved.

General legislative position on community-level democracy costs

8.25 We submit that the general legislative position on overhead costs relating to the provision of community level governance decision-making support is that these costs are part of the overall cost base of a Council, and should not be specifically charged to communities via a targeted rate. LGA 2002 Sched 7, 39 "Expenses of community boards (1) The expenses of the performance and exercise by a community board of its responsibilities, duties, and powers must be paid by the territorial authority within whose district the community is situated."

8.26 We believe this principle reflects that community-level governance is not an 'add-on' or unnecessary expense for the territorial authority that should be seen as an increased-service-level for that community, but that improved community-level governance adds to the region's overall wellbeings. We note that TDC currently accept the principle that community committee costs are funded from the general rate, and that decision-support costs for the two community boards are not target-rated to the two communities. We submit that the Commission should discuss this issue in respect of local boards with the Minister.

Who should set the governance support structure (and therefore governance costs)?

8.27 The Parliamentary intent of the LGA 2014 amendment was to allow the Commission to undertake tailored local board implementations that meet the specific circumstances of individual communities. We acknowledge that Councils retain responsibility for providing the governance support the board needs for its decision-making. However, we question whether parliament's intent was to allow councils to set the support structure & therefore cost levels of local board implementations. This would only be a feasible approach if the Council, in conjunction with the community, were joint and agreeable applicants, However the legislation clearly permits individuals/communities themselves to be sole applicants for a local board reorganisation.

8.28 We note that in the Auckland centralised-service-centre model, the governance costs are funded from the general rate. A 'stand-alone' local board requires an approach suitably tailored to the affected community's circumstances and level of affordability. There are clearly circumstances where adoption of the Auckland local board governance support structure is not appropriate. However, we believe the governance cost funding model, i.e. via general rate funding, is the correct precedent to follow.

8.29 We believe there is a general principal at stake. If any TA can dictate the support structure for a local board local government reorganisation scheme, then it is either, intentionally, or unintentionally, able to dictate affordability, and therefore community acceptance, of any proposed scheme. We do not believe this was the intent of Parliament in granting the Commission the discretionary power to structure local board implementations to suit the specific circumstances of individual communities.

8.30 If each TA, faced with a local board reorganisation, adopted a 'reinvent the wheel' approach to local board support, it would be an extremely inefficient approach, and likely make stand-alone local board implementations 'dead-in-the -water' from here onwards.

- 8.31 We submit that a possible way forward is for the Commission, in conjunction with the D.I.A., and the Ministry, to play a role supporting Council to serve local community by establishing the appropriate governance support structure for the desired local board proposal, as happened for Auckland, and, as we believe, envisaged by Parliament, and that in conjunction with D.I.A. support, the TA be given a ‘packaged’ solution of controls and internal processes to implement that support structure in an effective and efficient fashion. The Minister has the authority to implement this approach.
- 8.32 If not, then a region-wide local board implementation under general rate funding (i.e. the Auckland model) is the only way forward that our group could support, and we believe that this position is a widely-held view of the GB community.

9 Alignment with the strategic direction for local government

- 9.1 We believe any changes in Tasman’s communities representation, should be made in accordance with the strategic directions of central Government for local government i.e. ‘future-proofed’.
- 9.2 If we are to move to a centralised/combined local government plan across Te Tau Ihu (NCC, TDC, MDC), we see local boards for all Tasman communities as providing significant benefits by ensuring communities remain engaged with local government decision-making and planning.
- 9.3 If the 3-waters review sees Councils water assets transferred to a professional operated, publicly owner, regional water CCOs, then we see local boards playing an important role in ensuring community representation as local government is resized and refocused to serving communities.
- 9.4 We see a GB local board as aligning local government decision making with iwi governance principles. There are three distinct iwi groups in Mohua/Golden Bay. We believe devolution of decision-making over local issues within a GB/M local board area follows and complements Manuwhenua ki Mohua representation and decision-making over iwi issues.

10 Final Comment

- 10.1 There has been many comments made over the consultation process, but the one we think best sums up the situation is taken from the GB Weekly 24/7/20: Cath Handley, Chair of the Waiheke Island local board: “people centrally who haven’t got an open mind will try and hold on to power” ... but ... “experience had shown it was possible to come from a very negative place to a positive one”.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit on this important proposal for our community.

For the Working Group for a Golden Bay Local Board

Averill Grant

Tony Lawton

Roland Toder

Geoff Aiken

Laurie Healy

Appendix I: GB Community Board Delegations

Tasman District Council Delegations Register – Part Two Governance; Version 3.6 June 2020 13

3.3 Powers

Community boards shall have **delegated** authority, in accordance with any statutory powers and the policies, plans and bylaws of the Council, to:

3.3.1 may allocate, within Council Policy guidelines, funding and operational **grants to local community groups** in their community from the Grants from Rates Programme within the budget allocated by Council;

3.3.2 **manage and approve usage of any market place** in their community with power to disburse any surplus, after costs, for purposes within the ward;

3.3.3 approve **traffic control signs** on streets (e.g. stop and give way signs etc), the design and location of bus stops and shelters in their community, provided that should the Board disagree with any technical advice tendered by Council staff that matter shall be referred to the Engineering Services Committee for decision;

3.3.4 **approve the design and location of playground equipment, street furniture and street planting** in their community, provided that, should the Board disagree with any technical advice tendered by Council staff, the matter shall be referred to the Community Development Committee for decision;

3.3.5 approve **names of streets and parks** in their community;

3.3.6 grant consent for the **removal of trees from parks, reserves, streets** or other Council land in their community, provided that should the Board disagree with any technical advice tendered by Council staff that matter shall be referred to the relevant Council Committee for decision;

3.3.7 authorise, within approved budgets, board member attendance at appropriate conferences and training courses.

Appendix II: Community Board Delegations from the proposed 2010 NCC/TDC Amalgamation

LGC Proposed TDC / NCC Amalgamation

SCHEDULE 3: Role and powers of the community boards

Statutory role

The statutory role of a community board, as set out in section 52 of the Local Government Act 2002, is as follows:

- (1) represent, and act as an advocate for, the interests of its community
- (2) consider and report on all matters referred to it by the territorial authority, or any matter of interest or concern to the community board
- (3) maintain an overview of services provided by the territorial authority within the community
- (4) prepare an annual submission to the territorial authority for expenditure within the community
- (5) communicate with community organisations and special interest groups within the community
- (6) undertake any other responsibilities that are delegated to it by the territorial authority

Powers

The powers of the Golden Bay and Motueka Community Boards, pursuant to section 53(1)(b) of the Local Government Act 2002, are as follows.

Community planning powers

- (1) Each community board, in the year following the triennial local authority elections, may after consulting its community, prepare and adopt a plan for its community for the purpose of identifying and communicating the interests, priorities and preferences of the community.
- (2) The community plan is to reflect that community's priorities and preferences in relation to the level and nature of activities, services, and proposed developments to be provided or approved by the Council in that community.
- (3) A community board is required to use its community plan as the basis for its submissions on the Council's long-term, annual and other statutory plans.
- (4) Where a community's desired levels of service are higher than the existing or proposed district-wide levels of service, the community board will recommend to the Council the funding mechanism to address this variation.
- (5) For the purposes of clause 4, levels of service relate to:
 - (a) local roads, bridges, footpaths, cycleways, carparks and streetlighting in the community
 - (b) water supply in the community including the Upper Takaka and Collingwood urban water supplies (Golden Bay Community Board) and the Motueka community water supply (Motueka Community Board)
 - (c) wastewater collection and treatment in the community including Collingwood, Takaka, Takaka to Tata Beach and Upper Takaka reticulated schemes (Golden Bay Community Board) and Kaiteriteri/Riwaka and Motueka reticulated schemes (Motueka Community Board)
 - (d) stormwater and river management in the community including Takaka, Pohara, Ligar Bay, Tata Beach, Patons Rock and Collingwood urban drainage schemes (Golden Bay) and Motueka and Kaiteriteri urban drainage schemes (Motueka Community Board)
 - (e) community waste management and recycling including Mariri resource recovery centre (Motueka Community Board) and Takaka and Collingwood resource recovery centres (Golden Bay Community Board)
 - (f) coastal structures in the community including Port Tarohe (Golden Bay Community Board)
 - (g) the Motueka aerodrome (Motueka CB) and the Takaka aerodrome (Golden Bay CB)
 - (h) the mitigation of natural hazards in the community
 - (i) the Motueka library (Motueka Community Board) and the Takaka library and Collingwood link library (Golden Bay Community Board)
 - (j) the Bainham, Collingwood and Rototai cemeteries (Golden Bay Community Board) and the Motueka cemetery (Motueka Community Board)
 - (k) the Collingwood camping ground (Golden Bay Community Board) and the Motueka camping ground (Motueka Community Board)
 - (l) community housing in the community.

Decision-making powers

- (1) Each community board may, provided they act in accordance with approved Council budgets, policies, plans and bylaws:
 - (a) undertake activities for which a budget has been allocated by the Council to the board
 - (b) approve expenditure in its community from reserve funds and development contribution funds
 - (c) allocate funding and operational grants to groups in its community
 - (d) authorise board member attendance at appropriate conferences and training courses
 - (e) monitor and review funding priorities within the approved community board budget
 - (f) seek funding (to be held by the Council) from external organisations which can be applied to community projects within its community
 - (g) undertake the governance of public halls, public toilets and other community facilities in its community
 - (h) undertake the governance of the Golden Bay museum (Golden Bay Community Board) and the Motueka museum (Motueka Community Board)
 - (i) undertake the governance of the Upper Takaka community swimming pool (Golden Bay Community Board)
 - (j) undertake the governance in respect of use of public places in its community including disbursement of any surpluses, after costs, for purposes within the community
 - (k) approve management and landscape plans for parks, reserves and other public areas in its community
 - (l) approve the granting of leases or licences on reserves and public spaces in its community
 - (m) approve the design and location of buildings and other structures on parks, reserves and other Council land in its community
 - (n) approve the design and location of neighbourhood improvements, such as street furniture and artwork, in its community
 - (o) grant consent for the removal or replacement of trees in parks, reserves, streets or other Council land in its community
 - (p) approve traffic control measures, parking restrictions and traffic control signs on streets in its community (e.g. stop and give way signs)
 - (q) approve the design and location of bus stops and shelters in its community
 - (r) approve names of roads, streets and parks in its community.
- (2) Each community board has a responsibility to ensure that decision-making is in accordance with approved Council budgets, policies, plans and bylaws. Whenever this is seen to be either not possible or not desirable, the community board's decision will be by way of a recommendation to the Council.

Powers of recommendation and submission

- (1) Each community board may make recommendations to the Council in respect of:
 - (a) the need for new or amended bylaws in its community
 - (b) traffic speed limits in its community
 - (c) the need for changes to statutory plans under the Resource Management Act 1991 as they affect its community.
- (2) Each community board may make submissions to the Council on notified resource consent applications under the Resource Management Act 1991 relating to its community.

Appendix III: GB Ward Financial Data

Annual Average Cash Position / Financial Position for the Five Years 2014-2018

	Golden Bay	% of Tasman	Tasman District
Population ⁽¹⁾	5,072	11%	48,203
Rateable Units ⁽¹⁾	3,290	14%	22,732
General Rate per property ⁽¹⁾	\$1,574	103%	\$1,528
	'000	%	'000
General Rates ⁽¹⁾	\$5,181	15%	\$34,736
Targeted Rates ⁽¹⁾	\$3,370	10%	\$32,314
Other Revenues ⁽²⁾	\$5,461	9%	\$60,291
Total Revenues ^{(1),(2)}	\$14,013	11%	\$127,343
Overheads ⁽¹⁾	\$11,561	11%	\$105,881
Revenues less Overheads ^{(1),(2)}	\$2,452	11%	\$21,461

Notes:

(1) GB numbers based on information drawn from TDC's letter to the Commission "Re Golden Bay Local Board Proposal", 10 June 2019, Tasman District numbers drawn from TDC's published annual report, particularly the "COUNCIL FUNDING IMPACT STATEMENT"

(2) includes Other revenue, Fees&Charges, Development&Financial Contributions, Share of Associates based on population % of Tasman population; Subsidies&Grants - for the NZTA roading subsidy a recovery rate of 43% of annual GB roading expenditure has been agreed with TDC by the WG, and averages around \$800,000 p.a. over the five year period; excludes Revenues from JVs; Based on information from TDC's published annual reports (mainly the "COUNCIL FUNDING IMPACT STATEMENT") and information obtained under the LGOIMA Act. NB: Contains a number of estimates.

(3) General disclaimer: this information is provided to the best our ability and knowledge, for the purpose of illustrating an ongoing positive financial/cash position for the GB community, and taking in to account we do not have access to TDC's financial information other than that put in the public arena. It contains a number of assumptions on our behalf. However, we believe it provides a materially correct representation of the financial cash position of the GB community/ward in respect of the overall financial cash position of TDC/GB annual averages for the 5 year period 2014-2018.

Appendix IV: List of Supporting Documents

Available at <http://www.gblocalboard.co.nz/downloads>

2. **Application for a Local Board**: Working Group's application to the Local Government Commission for a Golden Bay local board, supported by a petition signed by over 700 locals

8. **TDC's Response to the Application**: The issues raised by TDC in its response to the LGC on the GB LB Application, along with comments from the Working Group

9. **Research into the TDC/Golden Bay Relationship Issues** : A 2017 social research project by Autonomy Solutions examining the relationship between TDC and the Golden Bay community based on an interview of 26 GB local. It lists 2 pages positive comments, 2 pages neutral comments & 11 pages negative comments

Case Study: Great Barrier Island Local Board how a small remote community in the Auckland region operates under a local board 'shared governance' arrangement

Submission 397: Graeme Wilson

There are no compelling reasons for the establishment of a local board in Golden Bay.

The Commission have published some operating costs for a local board and on a simple cost/benefit analysis, there is no way a local board can be justified.

There have been few examples of just what a local board would hold responsibility for.

(Port Taranaki and the Puramahoi airfield have been suggested but it is my opinion local government have no place in the control of these assets.)

I believe that:

1. The present community board do a good job. They are of course restricted by the powers delegated to them by the district council. An honest conversation should take place under the auspices of the Commission with the intention of widening the powers delegated and a greater allocation of funds.

2. The district council, both the elected members and the bureaucracy need to review their existing mindset regarding Golden Bay and try to reach a greater and more compromising approach to servicing the needs and wishes of this community. (Local government is complex and it is this complexity which councillors and the bureaucracy alike find themselves overwhelmed by the responsibilities increasingly placed upon them by an uncaring central government. It is no surprise to me when I learn that 'red-tape' encircles the council and they can be forgiven for sometimes showing little understanding of local issues.)

3. Having said the above, I do believe that by and large Golden Bay is well served by the district council. A great deal of money has been spent here in recent years. Few (residents) understand that the council's geographic area of responsibility is amongst the largest in NZ and included other small communities like Tapawera, Collingwood and Murchison, as well as the urban township of Richmond. Furthermore, few understand that the council also operates as a 'regional council' and must make decisions which can never be delegated to a local board or community board.

4. It is a fact that a small section the Golden Bay community are antagonistic towards the council. They are a group of folk who will never be satisfied! I would like to suggest that the Commission could somehow meet with this group and seek a better understanding by them of a more moderate view of local government. (But this won't happen regrettably.)

5. Local issues, such as the fiasco over the 'grandstand' saga have certainly been badly handled by the district council but equally exacerbated by local intransience.

6. A great deal of anger was generated over the Waimea Dam project. The community at large will be thankful long term that this project has gone ahead. Water storage will be an important issue in years to come. While the cost has made many of us worry, I believe it is, in the long run, money well spent. As a farmer I have great sympathy for those Waimea growers who have experienced soul-destroying drought. (Few Golden Bay people could even spell the word drought!

I THEREFORE HAVE TO CONCLUDE that there is little to commend the application for a 'local board'.

If nothing else, this application will have generated a great deal of local discussion from which hopefully a better understanding between the district council and local people can arise. (I am a retired dairy farmer)

Submission 407: Jennifer Maclaren

I support the option of a Golden Bay local board – that is the focus of this submission. If other communities in Tasman District Council wish to follow suit, that would be a bonus.

I would first like to remind everyone of the purposes of the Local Govt Act 2002:

- 1) To enable democratic local decision-making and action by, and on behalf of, communities
- 2) To promote the social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being of communities.

I fully support the establishment of a Golden Bay local board because the first of these purposes, in particular, is not being met. As a council TDC has been notably obdurate in refusing to even listen to the GB community, let alone “enable democratic local decision-making and action.” In fact it has even taken, or threatened to take, groups in Golden Bay to court - its own ratepayers using our rates! – over issues like the grandstand and the original cycleway proposal.

The incredible fiasco over the Waimea Dam finances (never democratically approved by ratepayers) makes it especially ironic that its objection to a GB local board purports to be a financial one. A further irony is that it argued on the other side of the coin when the proposal was made in recent years for Nelson and Tasman to amalgamate, claiming that Nelson would gain financially to the detriment of Tasman.

Unfortunately, when the current local bodies were established, the headquarters of the old Waimea County Council, Richmond, became the new TDC base and, not surprisingly, it is there the priorities and focus remain: suburban attitudes that suit Richmond but are not applicable to more remote rural communities. For example, once our new Recreation Centre was built, TDC proposed demolishing district halls. They had **no idea** of the “social and cultural well-being of communities” (purpose no. 2 of the LGA 2002) for whom these halls are an important social hub, built by locals, often with land and materials donated by locals, and lovingly maintained by local committees.

TDC seems so anxious to deny any devolution of powers that it overlooks the financial benefits that would accrue if some of its duties were delegated. I give as an example the case of flooding in our street after the 2011 storm. An engineer came over from Richmond 4 separate times, ignored local input, and eventually decided on the solution which had been plainly obvious – to us - all along.

Our local councillor at the time said that in the past a small problem like that would have been dealt with in a twinkling. I’ve heard the same complaint from a councillor in Motueka. Locals know local conditions, which vary greatly around Tasman, and can deal with them more efficiently and more cheaply. Having expertise (and some plant) dispersed around the district would be a benefit to us all, but especially in an area like Golden Bay that can easily be cut off from the rest of the region.

It seems to me that TDC really has not understood the concept of councils and local boards acting side by side, each with their own responsibilities. They appear to be fixated on some hierarchical arrangement where they would need to supervise the powers delegated to the local board, creating a wasteful “doubling up”. Overall their reaction is not based on the stated purposes of the LGA 2002, which could be loosely summarised as “what would be best for the community of Golden Bay”? That is not their focus, as by law it should be.

Submission 415: John & Suzy Hall

Golden Bay is an isolated part of Tasman District. We are not a community on a road to somewhere further on, so our income flows come from day-to-day sales at local shops, of the residents, year round, AND the tourists who travel here because we ARE isolated. We are different, and we offer different attitudes and experiences, special landscapes and features, coastlines on the east, north and west, a variety of farming, horticulture, fishing, rivers, springs, geology, caves, mountains, coastlines national parks and walks at all levels, cycle tracks. So much diversity in such a small piece of the region. A few thousand residents who live here year round.

*We do not believe that TDC appreciates our value as an area, just an area at the end of the rainbow, to be brought up to national standards. Just an area to get improvements from other region's leftovers, we're the last ones at the end of the line. I'm sure that TDC does not believe, for example, that our local knowledge makes us privy to seeing our positives and negatives differently from "urbanites" that make decisions, often to the contrary of our actual needs.

*There is a general belief by many residents that we're the forgotten ones. Or that perhaps, because we're so isolated that we haven't noticed that TDC wants the wetlands and swamps filled in to become "good places to put new subdivisions". People in the even more out-lying bays do not necessarily want to have street lights because they (and the visitors) enjoy the 'dark skies', but residents in many parts of the Bay would appreciate proper stormwater systems.

*It would seem to us that other communities like Murchison or Motueka, probably have the same unbalanced support of TDC, but do not have the energy to push for a local board, as a local board may well be a more expensive system.

* We believe there is the acumen and knowledge within the Golden Bay community to be excellent candidates for a local board.

*Along with the influx of general tourists to the Golden Bay region, there is the problem of those freedom campers who sleep in vans and cars, who do not use public facilities, who trash river banks, reserves of all sorts, who have been and still are problem visitors to our area, but not a problem to TDC, who therefore have a complacent view of how to solve it, or even that it is a real problem.

*We are proud of our facilities and services. There are other things we're not proud of. For example, TDC's ability to create coastal erosion solutions for their own properties, but not permit ratepayers to protect their properties, yet in other regions, there are councils who allow their ratepayers to protect their properties. The ratepayers' rates pay TDC councillors and staff presumably, it's an odd attitude. Happy ratepayers have good relationships with their councils.

*FUNDING of a local board. This is a big issue. I believe the LGC can suggest and promote appropriate fees and rates; however, TDC does not have to follow their guidelines. We would likely have much higher fees and rates than we do now. We understand that the costs cannot be correct based on Waiheke Island, they have different needs from us, and different services being provided. And we understand that real costs would be known, further down the track. They will undoubtedly surprise us!

Perhaps having more control and say in ourselves will mean that the number of TDC staff who come over the Takaka Hill most days of the week with only one person in each vehicle, and the (approximately) \$200 per hour of each of them being charged to Golden Bay, will be less.

Perhaps the Port of Taranaki will become a money-making port, rather than have another advisory committee's expenses put against it instead of a decision being made!

Perhaps, the ratepayers paying for the Waimea Dam costs, expenses AND over-runs; or the A&P Grandstand committee's fight to keep the 100+year old grandstand – perhaps the amazing costs would have been different with a different Board

To finish, we need things to change, to a better way, from the toxic unbalanced position we are at today.

This family submits that a local board may be a cleaner, better balanced chance for Golden Bay as a whole, and all legal rights of a local board should be ours.

Submission 418: Lisa Savage

I support a Golden Bay local board and a local board or boards elsewhere in Tasman District. I believe that if all of Tasman had local boards that once a culture has been established and with the lessons learnt with the recent review in Auckland, that new efficiencies will be established.

Golden Bay would be a good case study for the region. There is already a proposal put forward to TDC by NRDA to use Golden Bay as a model for change and development. This proposal is called Addressing the Impact of Covid 19 on Golden Bay's Economy.

We see a GB 'stand-alone' local board as a viable option which would significantly improve local government wellbeing for the GB community over and above that possible under the option of the existing representation arrangement (either with or without greater delegations to the existing GB community board). However, the viability of a GB 'stand-alone' local board and our support of it, is dependent on an affordable level of governance costs to the local GB community.

If you support a local board in other areas of Tasman District:

There are 5 key wards in Tasman. Currently there is evidence of disconnect with the council, (appreciation needs to be made of the effort being made with the new mayor Tim King and Janine Dowding, the culture of some of the current staff still exists which is somewhat undesirable). Key decisions and non-notifiable activities in districts such as land development, aqua culture and potentially mining sees a need for more community input. I do not agree with the TDC comments in their submission about the lack of community engagement with a local board. Our community has been ground down by this council's staff and there is a feeling of being powerlessness.

Your views on an appropriate balance between more local decision making in Golden Bay and district-wide decision making?

Golden Bay is an isolated community. What this actually means is that because we are in the West Coast electorate, we are forgotten about for central government funding as it goes to the West Coast. We are isolated also because we have a local government that is located in Richmond. We are isolated because important decisions about where we live are made in cities or towns that their only interest in Golden Bay is to make money. By having a local board, I imagine we will have a platform to have a voice about what goes on in our community.

We will be able to save our wetlands from property developers in Ligar Bay (TDC has recently given resource consent to create 60 sections in a wetland, notifying only 5 potential affected parties).

When there are natural disasters we will have a local board that will be able to be reactive to the event. After Cyclone Gita we relied on a small group of business owners to organise meetings, engage a lawyer and work with NZTA and central government to get the Takaka Hill operational and for financial support from central government.

Do you consider more local decision-making is necessary to promote local community resilience and well-being now and in the future?

Post Covid, this is more important now than ever. Local businesses have missed out on the STAPP funding to larger tourism businesses, the lack of financial support for SME has a dramatic effect on a district that has one of the largest dollar fluctuation spend in the country. This an important time to have the connect with community and TDC. A local board will enhance TDC and make them a council to be the envy of NZ

Is there community support for the establishment of local boards elsewhere in the Tasman District? Can you demonstrate the level of support?

The creation of a local board would attract the engagement of a different calibre of candidate and I am sure this would be the case throughout the district. This is the opportune time to action this with the current council that has seen a new calibre of councillors, with governance skills and a desire and passion for Tasman. Working with other local boards could only help but improve Tasman and improve efficiencies in Richmond. Less staff would be needed, better decisions would be made, time saved.

Do you have comments on local board/councillor representation arrangements? Local board members

5 local board members

Ward councillors

neutral

What might a Golden Bay local board do?

Non-regulatory responsibilities (Allocations)

I agree with the proposal of the working group. My concern with this is the transparency of the activities and the 'assets extend' beyond Golden Bay. This could be argued that the mussel industry is currently a non-notifiable activity, is out of the Bay but this affects GB greatly with its activity, there will need to be some clarification and clear ground rules around this. Another example is the Sam Creek area, this is an exclusion area from the Kahurangi National Park, it is the richest area in NZ, this too would be out of the local board scope, this would be unacceptable.

Legislation requires that all **non-regulatory activities** in a local board area are allocated (i.e., non-revocable) responsibilities of the local board unless there are good reasons not to do so. I.e. all council assets/activities in GB should be the responsibility of a GB local board unless the following applies: the impact of decisions over these assets/activities will extend beyond GB; effective decision-making requires it to be done at the regional level; benefits of consistent/coordinated approach across Tasman outweighs needs/preferences of GB.

From a business point of view, we lease a small, ugly shed from TDC. We use it to store equipment, it has no power, water or windows and we have supplied the doors. We spent 2 very hard years trying to negotiate the lease for this shed, the cost was over \$30 000 in professional support. Would this happen again, with the current team that we work with? I doubt it, they have been very supportive in the last year. But it only takes one staff member to change this and we start all over again. Would a local board change this, I think so?

Regulatory responsibilities (Delegations)

I see the 'test' for regulatory responsibilities being the same as for non-regulatory responsibilities. If the effects of regulation are on the GB community, then, responsibility for making those decisions should reside with the GB local board. We see significant benefits in certain regulatory functions being tailored for Golden Bay, such as housing/land usage regulation.

What might a Golden Bay local board cost? Who might pay?

I support the Commission's proposed governance support structure of direct support via one full-time equivalent local 'senior' advisor, and indirect support via 'part-time,' 'as-needs', technical advice across a number of TDC Richmond-based departments.

I support the Commission's proposed additional target-rate cost of \$75 p.a. per property on GB ratepayers to fund the direct support costs, with indirect support costs funded from the general rate/offsetting cost savings in Richmond.

I do not see TDC's proposed targeted rate of \$283 as affordable for the GB community. I feel that this targeted rate proposal is to scare our community, I appreciate that it will be expensive to set up, but this process needs to have transparency. Unfortunately, with the accounting activities that have occurred at the Port of Taranaki, we have lost a little trust.

I feel that with the review of the Auckland City council's local boards, lessons can be learnt.

Submission 419: David Ogilvie

1. This submission supports the option of a local board for Golden Bay.
2. A local board in Golden Bay will provide an opportunity and a benchmark to establish local community governance and direction for other localities, within Tasman possibly, but importantly for other places and areas throughout New Zealand.

It is clear that the Auckland example of local boards need not be the model or template for a Golden Bay local board. The considerable differences between urban Auckland and rural Golden Bay are obvious. These differences signpost a distinctive Golden Bay constitution and local board terms of reference, constrained partly by legislation but not limited in their detail. The individual character, culture and identity of Golden Bay will be defined.

There is also a developing move in N.Z. local government towards regionalism and centralisation. With Tasman, there is the continuing possibility of amalgamation with Nelson City, perhaps even a limited union with Marlborough District for regional governance, Te Tau Ihu. Local boards with the emphasis on the local community will balance this change.
3. Governance and management in Golden Bay has historically been independent, based largely on its geographic entity and isolation from Tasman / Nelson communities. Its population of 5,000 is spread widely with the main towns being Takaka, Collingwood, Pohara and Upper Takaka. Its rural base is complemented by tourist activities, with an artistic element added, supported by a welcoming climate. The Golden Bay County Council, initially, was not included in the 1988 local government amalgamation of Richmond, and Motueka boroughs with Waimea County but joined in late 1989. During the 2004 – 2007 triennium the district council resolved to abolish the two community boards (Golden Bay, Motueka). The intense, determined opposition from Golden Bay residents resulted in the Local Government Commission confirming the community boards continuing within the Tasman District Council. The council introduced a special rate for each board to reduce administrative costs and was not prepared to allow decision-making delegations. Recently, however, the council has recognised this status and role of the boards, different from residents associations. Speaking rights at council meetings, with some delegated powers have been allowed. The community board special rate continues.
4. The 2004 – 2007 argument highlights the regular antagonistic relationship between the council and Golden Bay residents. In 2016, for example, the council's own community survey noted a low 26% approval for TDC from Golden Bay residents. There has been improvement since, but Golden Bay registers the lowest approval rate of the five Tasman wards.

In recent years, a number of issues have aroused (perhaps exacerbated) this attitude: management of the Waikoropupu Springs, Golden Bay Grandstand repair, coastal erosion, funding of the Waimea Dam – are some of these. They represent the independence, the search for identity, a lack of faith and trust in the council, local decisions being made “over the Hill”, - which has led to the local board request.

5. The Local Government Commission's brochure (July 2020) explained the local activities which would be allocated to a local board; - the board's decision – making responsibilities, an advocacy role and a collaboration role with the council and potentially with local iwi. It is noted that the legislated role is strikingly different from that of a community board. (Reference p9 – 11).
6. One of the arguments for the “status quo” is the council's district-wide, “club” arrangements and target-rating method. While the council mechanism is tightly-structured it can be un-ravelled and examples of separation (e.g. Motueka domestic water supply rate) exist. A standard, regular challenge for any local authority is how to allocate costs for both capital and operational activities. TDC is not immune from this challenge, which a local board might raise also. This is “part and parcel” of any council functions.
7. For funding a local board in Golden Bay, there is likely to be two main components: (a) a local rate; (b) an “off-setting” payment by TDC. For example, a local rate of \$75 per rateable unit in Golden Bay would realise over \$260,000. An “off-setting” payment from the council could vary from \$1.6 million to \$2.4 million, depending on these activities, projects and services both those legislated and those agreed between board and council.
To explain: at present the 3,500 Golden Bay ratepayers pay approx. \$4.9 million in general and uniform rates to the council. Approximately one-third, or one-half would be returned to a local board to carry out those roles / tasks currently done by council. A minimum budget of \$2 million therefore appears practical, for the local board.
8. The successful introduction and functioning of a Golden Bay local board will depend on a supportive, encouraging relationship with the Tasman District Council. The administrative detailing and separation of local board activities from the district council, along with the financial arrangements specific to these will be challenging, complex, time consuming but not impracticable. The willingness of both local board and district council to achieve a satisfactory conclusion will be necessary, and to work collaboratively in the years following.
9. It is appropriate to acknowledge the submissions of both the Tasman District Council and the Motueka Community Board in their support of the existing council and community board arrangements. These emphasise the implications and difficulties for Council administration of un-tangling the district-wide governance situation, especially the rating and financing mechanisms: an attitude of “separating an omelette”. While carefully considered, these submissions do underline the status quo, are mildly negative and partly reminiscent of the district council's opposition to community boards during the 2004 – 2007 triennium.

Conclusion

10. It is worthwhile to repeat the local board advantages listed in the Local Government Commission's brochure (July 2020):
 - To better achieve the purpose of local government of local decision-making and action.

- To better achieve Tasman District Council's desired community outcomes and policy objectives relating to community engagement, involvement in decision-making, partnerships and responding to diversity.
- To improve local governance by assisting Tasman District Council to focus on strategic regional-level decision-making.
- To provide an effective response to the opportunities, needs and circumstances of Golden Bay.
- To provide an enhanced ability for Tasman District Council to meet the changing needs of Golden Bay for governance and services into the future.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit on this opportunity for Golden Bay.

David Ogilvie, MNZM; MA; Dip Tchg.

- Former, Motueka Borough Councillor, 1971 – 1989
- Former, Nelson-Marlborough Regional Councillor 1989 – 1992
- Current, Motueka Community Board Member
- Current, Tasman District Councillor

Submission 429: Brian Wilson

I support the option of a Golden Bay local board.

I support the option of Golden Bay local board because I believe that where there is real decision-making power in the hands of local people then decisions will be made that better the health of the local community.

When people in a community feel that what they say will be heard and has the potential to make an impact then people are far more likely to become involved in the local issues that affect them. This is vital for community and personal well-being.

Over the years, and very rapidly the TDC has taken over and are now charging the community to use what were previously regarded as community assets. These assets are not getting looked after and are deteriorating. In the past, the community who were using such assets (for example the halls) raised funds and put in their own time and energy into helping to maintain and operate these facilities. This brought all sorts of people together and helped to knit together the fabric of the Golden Bay community. Now council from over the hill have taken over these assets and are charging for the use of them when most of the facilities were donated to the community by members of the community. My grandparents donated the Parapara boatshed land to the community before they died because they were approached by a local organisation at the Collingwood Area School who had found that it was the safest place for children to learn to sail. A love of the ocean and of sailing can give people confidence in themselves, a deep connection to the environment and a sense of belonging that is something you can't put a dollar figure on. Facilities such as these can play a major role in the development of young boys into confident young men and young girls into confident young women of the world.

When council doesn't understand the history of the relationship of the community to such facilities it leaves the community members no longer feeling that the TDC is a structure of governance that is there for them. In fact, it makes people feel the opposite.

If there was a local board then the local board members would be more accountable to the community than the current governance structure. Community assets that play an important function in the social, mental and physical health of the community could not be taken away from the community. Assets that fit into this category are the Parapara boat shed (donated for one cockle shell a year); Port Tarakohe (donated for \$1); Kotinga Hall; Bainham Hall etc.

These kinds of issues really affect the cohesiveness of the community as well as people's sense of political agency and thus their outlook on the future.

Here in Golden Bay a new cycle path has been built from Takaka to Pohara. Local residents from all sides of the Bay know that if there was real local decision-making power in Golden Bay people would come together to find a way to finance buke paths that run from one side of the Bay to the other. Golden Bay would draw attention in the eyes of the world as a rural community that has vision for a healthy way of living for everyone. Cycle paths have an enormous impact on both communities and their environments. They create a connection between people that just isn't possible when people rely on car transport as their primary means of travel. Bike paths also help people connect to their bodies and the environment in a way that car transport also doesn't allow for.

When cross-sections of the community come together around significant issues such as this, or around crises (such a mass whale stranding) it creates the opportunity for people to get to know each other as human beings rather than as people who perform particular functions at a workplace or in the home. In a small community such as Golden Bay this makes an enormous difference. Great innovation comes from the stirring together of ideas and people that had previously never met.

I believe that Golden Bay, being the unique community that it is, and covering the unique landscape that it does, has the potential to lead New Zealand in demonstrating how real local political agency can provide solutions to the social and environmental challenges we will face in the next 100 years.

Submission 436: Averill Grant

I support the proposal for a Golden Bay local board and I wish to make the following points to the Commission:

1. Lack of local decision making & budget delegation

The Golden Bay Community Board (GBCB) has few delegated powers (see attached list). Often recommendations from the GBCB to TDC are not followed by the staff or governing body. TDC control 100% of general rate spending in Golden Bay. The budget allocated to the GBCB (approximately \$70,000 p.a.), is funded by a target-rate on the GB community and not a portion of the general rate.

A good example of the impact of no local decision-making is the Grandstand, where contrary to a GBCB recommendation, the governing body's decision was made based on a staff recommendation which did not reflect local interests, and directly led to significant, avoidable, legal costs for locals and council.

2. Community board fails to deliver adequate community consultation and engagement

TDC staff will advise the GBCB on an issue and consider that constitutes adequate consultation/engagement with the GB community, but the GB community do not. Many local people value the monthly GBCB public forum as a way to voice their views but the GB community do not see this as adequate consultation/engagement with their council.

3. Local based 'service' manager

I support the Commission's proposal for a locally based TDC manager who can support the proposed local board by coordinating TDC's local service delivery, and by liaising with TDC technical staff in Richmond. I believe this position could have significant beneficial impact for the GB community and for the council.

4. TDC's proposed 4.5 additional local board support staff

I see a need for the 'senior advisor' role only. I see this role as the same as proposed by the Commission. I note there is an existing capable Takaka service office administration manager to provide administrative assistance to the proposed additional staff member. I see no need for a 'customer support' staff member as I see the local board members performing this role. There is no need for the 'team leader' role.

5. GB ward councillors do not constitute adequate representation

The 2 GB ward councillors are obliged to support the regional interests and do not provide adequate representation of GB community's interest to TDC. I do not consider a reduction in the number of GB ward councillors would impact the GB community's level of representation.

6. Golden Bay's isolation requires specific representation

Golden Bay's isolation has a significant effect on the need for better local representation. The single access road can be closed for long periods and represents a significant barrier to GB participation in local government based in Richmond. Most people shop and recreate locally so do not often visit Richmond as would people in Murchison. Golden Bay has a diverse population with significantly different requirements to the rest of the Tasman District that can only be adequately served by local democratic decision making.

7. Local board governance costs

I support paying the proposed \$75 p.a. additional targeted rate as I see local decision making having a significant positive impact for the GB community. I see the TDC proposed rate of \$283p.a. as unaffordable for the local community and does not represent value for money irrespective of the responsibilities granted to a GB local board.

8. Shattock Report

I submit that this independent report commissioned by TDC accurately reflects the local community opinion on the adequacy of our community's current representation arrangements. I note that TDC has made no moves to address the issues in this 2017 report. The GB community's response to this report is this application.

9. Tasman-wide community representation

I support community boards with delegations or local boards for all communities in Tasman. A common approach provides a far better platform to build better TDC/community relationships.

10. GB local board responsibilities

I support more decision-making responsibilities for the GB local board than listed in the Commission's proposal. Specifically, I support the inclusion of the commercial portfolio assets and housing regulation/land zoning in the responsibilities of a GB local board.

11. Local board number of members

I support a board of 5 members, and don't see any need for a higher number. I see advantages either way in the chair being elected by the 5 members or by 'at large' by the public.

Submission 439: Chris Hill

I absolutely support local residents being involved in decision making processes on local issues in our community and within the Tasman District. Local generational knowledge and experience, alongside a sense of self determination, where this is possible, are essential aspects of a good local government approach, at a settlement, community and district level. This is caveated of course with the reality of central government and district wide regulation, policy and rules which must be adhered to. The way in which our communities can and do contribute to locally informed decision-making is at the heart of the proposal that is currently in front of us.

The following key points form the basis of my submission for the Golden Bay Local Board Proposal.

1. The application for a local board from the Local Board Working Group is an ideologically driven proposal that has at its heart a seeking of some level of autonomy. It holds the view that Golden Bay's isolation and unique community requires a different level of governance than afforded the other wards of the Tasman District. There was a desire by the Working Group that the assets within Golden Bay, including Port Tarakohe, Takaka Aerodrome, and the two camp grounds, could come under the management of a local board. And further, in principle, that Golden Bay could govern itself to some extent. I believe the application was generated, in part, by dissatisfaction with some TDC decisions and an experience, for some, of not been listened to.
2. There has not been an evidentially based, wide ranging assessment of what works well, what does not, the specific areas that members of the community wish to have decision making ability in or what level of satisfaction there is generally for the delivery of services and infrastructure in our community or the wider district. This is a key aspect in my mind. What are the issues with the levels of service for reserves and facilities maintenance, hall maintenance and provision of infrastructure, input into street names, traffic control signs and street furniture, and community events? What is the actual level of dissatisfaction in these areas in terms of the decisions made and the contribution to the decisions?
3. Golden Bay is a part of the Tasman District and as such contributes to the wider region through rates and through any revenue generated by the assets here. It also benefits from the rating revenue of the wider district, the revenue from assets that are located in other wards, and the shared ownership of Nelson Airport and Port Nelson. This integrated functioning of the district as a whole is essential in enabling the needs of all of the district to be met. In response to this there should be equity in terms of governance, representation and decision-making processes and consultation for each of the wards so that none are disadvantaged by the advantage of others.
4. If a local board is formed for Golden Bay and not for any other ward the district will have community associations, a community board, a local board and a council. This variety of governance arrangements will require significant complexity administratively and is unlikely to lead to cost savings or reduced staff input. It is essential for the effective functioning of the district that the impacts on the whole are realistically assessed.

5. It is often said that there is and has been a difficult relationship between Golden Bay and TDC. There has certainly been no love lost at times and particularly between specific people. It is unfortunate that the whole of the community gets tarred with the 'Golden Bay residents are difficult and combative' notion. Just as it is unhelpful that all of those working within TDC are described as 'controlling, useless and don't care about us over here'. This 'relationship' is easy to generalise. It is certainly fair to say that some Golden Bay residents fought hard to have and retain a community board. It is also fair to say that 'Golden Bay' has been perceived or experienced as being difficult. It is also important to note that there are and have been some significantly successful collaborative projects and processes undertaken by TDC and members of the community. Regardless of the governance structure that is in place in Golden Bay and in each of the other wards, a healthy and mutually respectful relationship will impact on whether good decision-making processes take place and whether the concerns and ideas of residents and interest groups inform decisions.

6. What could a change in governance structure impact? Those who are strongly pro a local board have presented the idea that changing the structure would bring about significant changes to the community and to the relationship. It is conceivable that membership of a local board could be split over any number of issues, that it gets offside with the community, and has good, bad or indifferent relationships with TDC. An effective board that provides good leadership to the community, whether local or community, requires members that are skilled in meeting conduct, that can represent the wide range of views held within the community, are energetic and motivated, understand good leadership ability, can work collaboratively and have the ability to work well with others, and to work well with the council and senior leadership team. I am not convinced that a change only in structure will necessarily bring about the hoped for changes.

7. The cost of the proposed change must be weighed up with the benefits of a change both by ratepayers of course and the Commission. The TDC submission includes figures that have been based on the Auckland boards. Unfortunately this hasn't been more widely distributed. Both the Working Group and the local 'newspaper' have attributed the word inflated to these figures. The Auckland Local Boards Co-ordinator spent a week at TDC assisting in the working out of likely costs. It would have been more helpful for the community to have this information more readily available. I am aware of some level of unease in the absence of clarity of the actual or potential costs, particularly when there is discrepancy between what the Commission has indicated in terms of cost and what TDC indicates to be more likely. This has raised alarm and has meant that residents have been asked to show support or not for a proposal where the cost impact on them is unclear.

8. Iwi, hapu and whanau are absent in the proposal document. How will the proposed local board implement the significant provisions of the Local Government Act in relation to Māori participation in decision-making? The devolution of powers from local authorities to a local board, and the methods and processes the board will employ to meet local authority statutory responsibilities to Māori (under the Treaty and Local Government Act 2002) must be addressed. With such a strong focus on authority to make decisions locally being at the centre of this debate it has been remiss to not include how the Local Government Act obligations to Māori could or would be implemented. I support in full the submission of Manawhenua ki Mohua. The manner in which cultural values and the expression and enactment of kaitiakitanga by manawhenua here in Mohua are integrated into local board decision-making processes is an essential aspect to be resolved, both legally and morally.

9. My vision for our community is that all of the people within our wonderful, diverse, vibrant community are known, acknowledged, listened to and respected, by us all. This would include those whose voices are far less often heard and whose views and positions quite likely less well known, those whose views may be different to those more commonly visible, and those whose cultural values, history, and worldview are unique to this land and these waters. As far as is possible I believe that self-determination can be at the heart of our local political functioning and that this can enhance our community and its sense of agency. I believe this can be present regardless of the formal structure of our board. I am one of the 700 people who signed the petition, primarily in response to issues relating to the Waimea Dam and the grandstand. At that time I thought there could be significant improvement in how TDC went about its business. This formed part of the motivation for me to stand for council. I have no doubt that the relationship between our settlements and residents and the community/local board and the relationship between the board and council has the potential to ensure we make good, effective decisions that enhance our communities and the environment. I am not convinced however that a local board is the only way to bring about improvement, where it is needed. I applaud the Working Group for its intent and vision and what must have been significant research and work. What was applied for and what has been made available in terms of decision-making must have been very disappointing. At a council workshop we explored what was on offer in the proposal document and what aspects of this a community board couldn't do. There is very little that couldn't be undertaken by the community board. The costs, if only funded by a GB targeted rate, could be \$149 based on the Commission's figures or \$283 based on Auckland Council figures provided by TDC. On balance, I don't see that the benefits outweigh the likely costs. It is imperative that the Commission does not make a decision that further burdens our already low wage, high debt, high rate district without there being significant benefit.

10. The community board can be elevated and it is clear to me that council is open to further delegations should the board wish to seek them. The board is currently finding ways to be more engaged with the whole community and to improving its processes. Criticism is the easy old route. What takes more effort and respect is constructive, thoughtful collaboration from us all whatever role we take either as a community representative or a community member.

Submission 444: Laurie Healy

SUMMARY

Tasman District needs local boards in all its wards to bring council back to its core function of serving its people.

Had the relationship with Tasman District Council been one of harmonious co-existence, an application for a Golden Bay local board would never have been submitted to the LGC. The sad fact is the relationship between council and the community can only be described as dysfunctional, and has been so for many years.

One only has to follow the path of the local fight to save Takaka's historic grandstand, where something in the order of \$500,000 has been expended by the community and Tasman District Council in legal fees, let alone consider the wilful damage to the building by council to ensure the building could not be used. The result seems to be that the grandstand stays, but will need expensive repairs and upgrading. The legal expenses were completely unnecessary, but are a fine example of TDC "listening" to its shareholders (ratepayers) and taking "advice" from the existing community board. Those expenses would have gone a long way to repairing the damage caused by council and bringing the building up to standard. It is indeed interesting to note that council, in their submission, highlight the fight (and it was a FIGHT) to save the grandstand as one of their successes in making "significant progress" in improving relationships with the community.

There are other examples of council ignoring or frustrating the wishes of Golden Bay e.g. prohibiting seawalls to protect property where the affected owners are prepared to carry all the cost, but allowing council assets immediately adjacent to be so protected: frustrating expansion of our successful communes (established under the Kirk government in the 1970s) as children and grandchildren wish to establish homes within the commune grounds where they were raised etc.

1. Taking into account council's disconnect from, and disrespect for, its ratepayers, and their dominant position in setting targeted rates to pay for a local board, I support the option of a local board for all wards in Tasman District; or
2. As a distinctly second choice, a local board for Golden Bay;

PROVIDED THAT:

- a. the responsibilities delegated to the local board(s) are ALL those allowed by legislation;
- b. cost per rateable property is affordable and represents value for money;
- c. the local board(s) having the right of veto should TDC wish to sell, otherwise dispose of, or lease long term, local community assets, which in Golden Bay include Port Tarakohe, camp grounds, Takaka airport, various community halls, golf course, etc.

COMMENTING ON THE LGC DOCUMENT "OPTION OF A GOLDEN BAY LOCAL BOARD"

1. What a local board might look like:
 - a. I agree that a board be comprised of 5 elected members and the two local councillors.
 - b. The public election of the 5 members should also include the public election of the chairperson.

c. The two councillors should have speaking rights only. By law, councillors are obliged to consider the interest of the district as a whole. They therefore may be conflicted in dealing with local issues.

2. What a local board may be responsible for:

a. Golden Bay is different (in culture, diversity of population, commerce, etc.) to, and is remote from the rest of Tasman District, a local board should be responsible for ALL local decisions not specifically delegated to council by legislation. A similar argument exists for other wards in the district.

b. In addition, the local board(s) should have a right of veto over the disposal of community owned assets, whether commercial or otherwise. This should also include the granting of long term leases, or any other mechanisms which in essence are de facto disposals.

c. The board(s) must also have an advocacy role on all other matters not allocated to it. (Although how can one be sure council will take any notice is beyond me – they certainly did not listen to the people when deciding to build the Waimea dam or on how it was to be funded.)

d. All other matters should be collaborative, including the management of community owned commercial assets.

3. How a local board might be serviced and funded:

a. I agree that one full time experienced local government adviser will be necessary to assist the local board. That person must be located in Golden Bay. Too much time i.e. productivity – 3 to 3 ½ hours per day – will be lost if that person is located out of the Bay. When one travels over the Takaka hill in the mornings, it is amazing the number of council vehicles one encounters heading for Golden Bay. Totally inefficient to have staff who work in the Bay not located there.

b. I do not agree with council's position that an additional 5 full time equivalent staff will be required to service a local board. Clearly there is staff input into supporting the existing community board at the moment. Their duties would just be changed a little.

c. I agree that part of the cost of a local board be by way of a targeted rate. My concern is that Golden Bay has a number of residents who are on the lower end of the socio-economic scale and cannot afford the additional costs suggested by council in their submission. I go so far as to say that the council's cost per ratepayer figure is a scare tactic designed to deter people from supporting the concept of a local board. But what really worries me is that, should the LGC decide on a local board for Golden Bay, the council can set the targeted rate at whatever level they like, without justification or right of appeal. Should they wish to be vindictive (and I fear they may) they can set the rate at such a level that it will be unaffordable to a significant proportion of ratepayers and act as a deterrent to other wards from seeking their own local boards. As I understand it, LGC can do nothing as they can only advise – council has no obligation to listen to that advice and have a history of not doing so. The only way to avoid a punitive targeted rate being struck for a Golden Bay local board is if all wards in the district have a local board.

4. Commenting on council's submission:

a. "Council does not believe that a local board will change the appetite of the community to be involved in local decision making in Golden Bay."

I note that there is no reference to support this statement. I believe the opposite to be true: that the community does have an appetite to be involved. The reason for perceived apathy

is due to the lack of responsibility afforded the community board and its general ineffectiveness.

b. "The community will still be selecting representation from the same talent pool."

Again, nothing to back up this allegation. And again, the opposite is more likely to be the case – one only has to look at the calibre of those in the working group (Tony Lawton, Dr Roland Toder) and the standard of documentation, detail and presentation they have set in taking the proposal for a local board to the stage it is currently at. That, in itself, will inspire a high calibre of community minded personnel to stand for a board position. PROVIDED the delegations and authority make it worthwhile to do so. This is not the case with the community board, so why would those people be involved if they can't make a difference?

c. "The council is aware of historical frustrations expressed by parts of the Golden Bay community and believes that significant progress has been made in terms of improving the relationship and addressing those concerns..."

The example of the grandstand solution as "improving relationships" beggars belief. Council's lack of listening to the community cost both council and the community somewhere in the vicinity of \$500,000 in unnecessary legal fees! This grandstand issue is still very raw in the community. If anything, council's handling of this issue has had the opposite effect of that claimed and is, in part, what drove the application for a Golden Bay local board.

d. "The existing community board is empowered with a number of decision making responsibilities council has a positive history of adding delegations and these are reviewed periodically ..."

The statements here are blatantly untrue! If they were so proud of their history they would have attached a list of all delegations to verify this statement. They haven't done so because the list would be very short indeed! Yet another claim lacking any vestige of proof.

These statements made by council clearly demonstrate their arrogance, duplicity and disrespect for its people, particularly the Golden Bay community.

Tasman District needs local boards in all its wards to bring council back to its core function of serving its people.



Federated Farmers of New Zealand

Submission on Option of a Golden Bay Local Board

14 August 2020



0800
327
646 | **FED**
FARM
.ORG.NZ

SUBMISSION ON OPTION OF A GOLDEN BAY LOCAL BOARD

To: Local Government Commission

Name of submitter: Golden Bay Province, Federated Farmers of New Zealand
Wayne Langford
Golden Bay Provincial President
Federated Farmers of New Zealand

Contact person: Angela Johnston
Senior Policy Advisor

Address for service..
Federated Farmers of New Zealand
57A Theodosia Street
Timaru

Phone..

Email: ajohnston@fedfarm.org.nz

Federated Farmers wishes to be heard at a Commission hearing.

Golden Bay Federated Farmers welcomes the opportunity to provide feedback to the Local Government Commission on the option of establishing a local board for Golden Bay.

Golden Bay Federated Farmers supports the retention of existing arrangements ie community boards in Golden Bay and Motueka.

We do not believe there are any substantial gains by having a local board especially once the increased cost to ratepayers has been factored in.

Golden Bay is a relatively isolated geographical community, but given the rapid and continual advancement of technology, this geographical isolation is not a barrier to connectedness and involvement in the wider district. An aspect that has been highlighted to all during the recent Covid-19 lockdown.

It is unclear how many Golden Bay ratepayers want a local board. As outlined in the consultation document, there was a very limited response regarding alternatives to the local board application. Was this due to ratepayers being content with the current arrangement, indifference or perhaps a lack of knowledge about the ins and outs of local government?

If it is the latter, then the formation of a local board, could be an expensive mistake for the ratepayers of Golden Bay. Local boards must be a reflection of their community, as currently legislated there is no provision for Maori representation. Whilst the board can appoint non-board members, this would need to be tightly controlled to restrict numbers, prevent tokenism and/or "box ticking" from occurring.

Any group that feels their views are not being accounted for would be lobbying for a non-board member role. Having too many people around a table trying to reach consensus on a matter is just as problematic as too few.

As Golden Bay is a small community, a single matter could result in community division and disconnection. The current application for a Water Conservation Order in relation to Te Waikoropupū Springs is a good example of this happening, and the local division was noted in the Special Tribunal's Recommendation Report.

According to the 2013 Census, the population of Golden Bay is 3756 and 8% of the Tasman District. Golden Bay has two Councilors on the Tasman District Council, of which there are 14 in total, which percentage wise shows an over representation.

If a local board was formed, it is likely to result in a reduction of Councilors representing Golden Bay around the Tasman District Council chamber. It would also result in ratepayers paying more for less representation regionally.

The delegations that a local board would have responsibility for are yet to be determined and carry the very real possibility of increased bureaucracy at community level. It is impossible for an informed decision to be made when so many of the details are missing.

Tasman is a high rates and high debt Council supported by a low wage economy. A Golden Bay local board will likely result in increased cost, increased inconsistency of policy and service levels across the region. The true impact on rates, the fairness and equity of who pays for local boards is also prohibitive.

Of main concern to our members is the rising rates cost. This proposed change is expensive and only relates to a small proportion of the work Tasman District Council does and therefore the rates farmers pay.

Rural ratepayers are already facing increased rates to cover the cost of increased compliance as required by the Action for Health Waterways freshwater reform package (National Policy

Statement, National Environment Standards, Stock Exclusion Regulations, and the Measurement and Reporting of Water Takes Regulations). There are estimations that Tasman District Council needs at least 20 new staff for this package alone.

The thought of paying more rates for minimal or no benefit does not sit well with our members, especially given the unsettled economic position New Zealand is currently in.

The consultation document outlines some advantages and disadvantages of a local board. The advantages listed are aspirational at best, and there is no guarantee that a local board will achieve them. It is also unclear how these advantages would be measured and quantified.

Using the Auckland boards as a basis for comparison to the Tasman region is not appropriate.

Auckland is heavily urbanised and highly populated, whereas Golden Bay is a rural location with a low population, arguably the complete opposite. It is interesting to note that local boards have not been established elsewhere in New Zealand.

No system is perfect, and if the current community boards are not working as they should be, there is no indication as to what has been done to try and rectify the issues.

Submission 450: Richard Lamb

On behalf of Calston Holdings, I supply the following information which forms the basis for support of the LGC proposal for local boards. This is to provide better democratic representation of the interests of all Tasman residents and particularly those of the residents of Golden Bay. I accept that some additional costs to ratepayers may be initially incurred in the provision of this expected functionality.

I provide here one local example of the TDC culture that this proposal will inevitably change. This is a summary of the governance activities of the Tasman District Council in relation to the provision of community recreation facilities for Golden Bay using ratepayer funds accumulated historically for this purpose. There is no reason to believe that this example is not representative of the relationship that the TDC has with other geographic areas of interest with the possible exception of the interests of the agricultural and horticultural community on the Waimea Plain.

Initial consultation on the wishes of residents for recreational facilities were conducted by independent consultants who identified majority support for the construction of recreation facilities, including a community swimming pool in conjunction and adjacent to the Takaka High School.

Sometime later a group of locals commenced campaigning for the construction of a centre at the Takaka Showgrounds. The chairperson of this group was a recent arrival in Golden Bay and also happened to be the president of the Golden Bay Squash Club. He was supported by another recent arrival from a London based international advertising agency who thus came to this new project with a record of causing community disturbance in Collingwood with the construction of a 'heritage centre' in the Collingwood main street alongside the long established Collingwood Museum. Both of these proponents had personal agendas for promoting their project at the Showgrounds with the former wishing to be responsible for the creation of 2 new deluxe squash courts in the new proposed 'shared facility'. To accomplish this required the demolition of the existing squash courts - already of praiseworthy standard - which was an addition to the community constructed Grandstand dating from the late 1800's. Thus the Grandstand with squash court was required to be demolished to achieve these ends and by way of minimalist and deceptive local consultation, but regular and extensive presentations to TDC monthly meetings, they were able to locate the proposed building in a position that necessitated that the existing community constructed buildings be removed for the stated purposes of creating car parking.

When the local community finally became aware of this consequence and local opposition was mounted the council remained steadfast in support of the proponents of the new facility's position. The Golden Bay Grand Stand Community Trust was incorporated and required to bring the matter and process followed by the TDC to the Environment Court and thereafter the High Court over the next 3 years. They incurred hundreds of hours of community local time in representations to the council in Richmond and otherwise, and legal - and engineering/architectural report costs adding to direct costs of \$150,000. The TDC legal expenses meanwhile in defending their position are estimated to be considerably in excess of this amount. The TDC have obfuscated and declined to make all of their actual costs public from OIA requests.

The Environment Court case was effectively lost (through lack of Court jurisdiction in parts of the matter) by the supportive locals who were clearly established to be in Golden Bay majority. However the processes followed by the TDC in relation to the Golden Bay A&P Association, who have long-established (s18, 1959 ROLD Act) legal user rights to the facilities the TDC were still requiring to be demolished, allowed for further legal argument and expense to be incurred by both parties.

The legal hiatus on this matter that now currently exists, where the future of the historic Grandstand appears to be secured albeit with the community possibly being responsible for the costs of repairing damage to the building caused by TDC actions and the other remedial works required, appears likely to be required to be met by yet another targeted rate. This is potentially a further financially appalling community outcome through lack of proper and reasonable council governance.

Had a local board managed this process as is intended in the TDC's policy objectives of desired community outcomes through community engagement, it is inconceivable that this wanton waste of residents' time and expense could have occurred for the least of reasons, that proper consultation would have taken place initially and the wishes of the majority of the long term community would have been taken into account. Without this the community were required to take out loans to finance the legal response and make repayments of debt by way of cake stalls and other fundraising activities for the self interested reasons that this Rec Centre project was promulgated. Meanwhile the general ratepayer provides for the TDC costs.

From this one example and not including for the unknown council staff time in this matter and the direct costs to the Golden Bay community in legal expenses, more than one year of the inflated 'costs' posited by the TDC as a consequence of providing 'support' to a Golden Bay local board would be covered. We note that while the TDC have publicly stated a neutral position on this proposal their accounting of provisional costs indicates the opposite with no cost benefit apportioned to actually meeting some of their stated community outcomes.

We see benefit to the other communities of interest in the Tasman area to have local boards offered as we see no reason for the cultural environment that the council operates with to not be negatively affecting democratic and advantageous outcomes to these other communities. With local boards the TDC can more efficiently provide the governance and support and not only potentially meet their objectives of meeting community needs but gain cost efficiencies in the constrained administration role they are thus required to provide.

With provision of a local board we favour the option of the board chairperson being elected directly by the community.

Submission 451: Liz Thomas

I support the option of a Golden Bay local board and a local board or boards elsewhere in Tasman District. The location of the other boards would be up to the residents of the particular ward as to whether they want a local board. If other wards don't want to have a local board, then I still support Golden Bay having a local board.

Having said this, I personally believe that within a council area all wards should have a local (or community) board. This would enable all wards to have more decision making over issues which affect them directly. Having boards in some areas and not others leads to inequality in input, and potential resentment between different parts of the council area.

I support having a local board in Golden Bay, but I have some serious concerns, and comments to make.

1. I am concerned about the process from now on

As I understand it from page 15 of the (rather scanty) booklet, it would appear that after submissions have been heard, the Commission will consider the submissions, and gather information from "interested parties". Following this they will make a final decision on whether or not to prepare and issue a reorganisation plan. They will then undertake a transition process.

If the decision is made to proceed with setting up a local board (or boards), and a reorganisation plan is prepared, it appears that there will be no opportunity for further consideration by local residents. The booklet is full of phrases like "might be responsible for", "might be serviced and funded", which I assume would be more clearly spelled out in the reorganisation plan. At that point it is important that people are given a further opportunity for input, based on more facts and figures.

I request that the reorganisation plan (if there is one) is made available to Golden Bay residents for their further consideration before the plan is finalised and the transition process undertaken.

2. I am concerned that if Golden Bay had a local board, it would lose one of its councillors.

The Commission states that they could review the current representation of Golden Bay on TDC, but thinks it would be appropriate for TDC to decide on the number of Golden Bay councillors as part of the next representation review. At present, based on population, Golden Bay is entitled to about one and a half councillors, but has two. I believe that this is necessary, given the isolated nature of Golden Bay, dependent on access over the Takaka hill, and this will not change.

If Golden Bay had a local board, it will be making decisions for the Golden Bay area. There will still be a great number of decisions made around the TDC council table affecting the district as a whole. It is therefore necessary for Golden Bay to retain its representation on TDC.

I request that TDC guarantees that Golden Bay's representation on the council would not drop because there was a local board.

3. Decision making by the local board

According to the booklet, the local board *might* be responsible for making decisions about parks and reserves, community projects and events, dog and alcohol bans, street names and furniture, bus stops and shelters (hardly applicable in Golden Bay which has little public transport) and traffic control signs (on SH1 as well as council owned roads? Including speed limits?). There is also a list of things the board *might* advocate on, and where the board *might* work in collaboration with local iwi and the council.

These all sound like things which right now the community board could be doing, given all appropriate delegations, and working in an amicable and equal relationship with TDC. A local board would be *required* to draw up a three-year plan, agree with TDC each year on an annual plan for activities and services for the year, and monitor its implementation. There is really nothing to stop this happening at present, albeit without the requirement to do so. All it would need is goodwill between TDC and the community board, and a commitment to decisions being made directly at the appropriate level by those affected.

The reorganisation plan would list all the local decision-making responsibilities allocated to the board. These could only be changed in future by agreement between the local board and TDC, with the Commission making a ruling if no agreement could be reached. The plan *might* also include delegations of decision making responsibility – which could be changed or reviewed by TDC in future. So in other words, delegations would still be decided by the TDC after the initial term of the local board. Not much different to the present situation.

As the booklet says, “an important element of local (or community – my words) board decision-making is the ability of the local (or community) board to agree with the governing body a level of service different from the rest of the district”. In both cases, this needs a good relationship between TDC and the Golden Bay community or local board, and an agreement to work together collaboratively.

One of the main reasons for applying to have a local board was for the Golden Bay community to be able to make decisions affecting Golden Bay. The community will need to see the reorganisation plan, where the decision-making powers of the local board are spelled out more clearly and with more detail, before deciding whether there is anything to be gained by having a local board instead of a community board with all appropriate powers delegated to it. So again:

I request that the reorganisation plan (if there is one) is made available to Golden Bay residents for their further consideration before the plan is finalised and the transition process undertaken.

4. Cost of and funding for a local board

The cost to ratepayers for the direct costs is based on the cost of remuneration of the elected members, and the cost of a *full-time equivalent* (what does this mean??) officer to provide support services. This includes the salary of the officer, and overheads including accommodation and travel costs. These, of course, will depend on where the full-time equivalent officer is based, and the amount of travel back and forwards between the Bay and Richmond.

The Commission thinks it would be appropriate for these direct costs to be funded by a targeted rate, an approximate increase of \$75 per rateable property. This would “provide a mechanism for additional funding, including any increase in local service levels, agreed in future between the board and TDC.”

Then there are the indirect costs, for corporate support for most of the functions of the local board - preparing the required local board funding policy, the three year plan and the annual agreement, reporting, asset management plans, local bylaws, communication and consultation. This, according to the booklet, would cost on average \$190,000 a year. How these costs would be funded, and therefore how much of the cost would be paid for by Golden Bay ratepayers by way of a targeted rate, rather than by the District as a whole, is left for TDC to decide.

The Commission believes that a continuation of TDC’s current policy of funding these across the district by general rates would be appropriate. “Given the benefits to the council, and as result to the district as a whole, it would be appropriate for an element of the cost of a local board to be funded by a general rate across the district”. The “element of the cost” would presumably be decided by TDC. They would also have to take into consideration reductions in costs due to having a local board in Golden Bay.

Another reason for applying to have a local board is to save costs by having more things decided in the Bay, thus reducing the need for car loads of officers to come over the hill frequently, incurring costs of travel and time, including at least 3 – 4 hours sitting in a car per person. Until costs are identified more precisely, it will be difficult for Golden Bay ratepayers to assess whether the benefits of having a local board outweigh the costs. So again:

I request that the reorganisation plan (if there is one) is made available to Golden Bay residents for their further consideration before the plan is finalised and the transition process undertaken.

To sum up, I believe that decisions should be made directly at the appropriate level by those affected. Whether this can best be achieved by a local board, or a community board with all appropriate delegations, can only be assessed when we have more information, and when we feel that there is goodwill to support whichever option we end up with.

I support a Golden Bay local board, subject to more information being made available for consideration by the community before the final decision is taken.

Submission 460: Michael Boland

I, Michael John Boland, and my wife have been property owners, ratepayers and permanent residents of Golden Bay since June 2006. We purchased and operate a small business catering to international tourists, which we have developed over the past 14 years. We have had numerous dealings with Tasman District Council (TDC) and make this submission **in favour of a Golden Bay local board and a local board or boards elsewhere in Tasman District**. We hope this will help protect us and others, if only to a small degree, against future events like the past excesses of some of the officials of the TDC.

We note that most of our issues are with the officials, rather than the elected councillors, however we also note that our elected councillors are so outnumbered in the council they are often unable to effectively represent us.

Golden Bay is a special place and a quite different environment from anywhere else in New Zealand. We sit between two National Parks, and there is only one means of land-based access – the Takaka Hill. Our population is relatively small and diverse, and we have a generally rural lifestyle, very different from the urban lifestyle that is dominant today – even in Richmond – and which apparently dominates the attitudes and thinking of council officials. We note that the TDC is dominated by Richmond, and we think that the city is put ahead of the rural regions most of the time.

The following are some of our problems with the TDC, and examples given relate specifically to our personal experience as residents of Totara Avenue, but they typify experiences of many residents here.

Some key issues from our experience:

- 1. Tasman District Council Officials generally have little or no understanding or familiarity with much of Golden Bay – either the geography or the people. We are “over the hill” – out of sight and out of mind.** As an example of this, our request for a speed limit on Totara Avenue a few years ago was met with a response that Totara Avenue is not, to their knowledge, a built-up area. There are 41 houses on Totara Avenue, which is about 700m long. How is that not built up? The fact is they have never been there and don't care.

The Avenue is zoned rural 2, which requires, among other things, a set-back of buildings of 50 m from the road. Given the size of the sections on this narrow strip of land between the Bay and the Waikato Estuary, this is never possible, thus a special consent process is (unreasonably in our view, given the cost) required for every building.

When we submitted to a subsequent review of speed limits, they said we could not have a speed limit on Totara Avenue because it would have to be 70 kph and that is too fast and therefore recommended that the speed limit remain at 100 kph(?).

- 2. Tasman District Council Officials have repeatedly been obstructive and/or made processing and compliance unnecessarily difficult and expensive for Golden Bay ratepayers for such things as resource consents and building permits and approvals.**

When we changed our Lodge from 2 to 4 rooms, it became technically a commercial operation. This means it required a new consent. This should have been a simple process, but it became complex because TDC required a notified consent and a full hearing – all at our cost.

They also required us to put in a new wastewater system, to replace an identical one that was working perfectly – we had an engineer’s report to this effect. Additionally, they required us to install overflow tanks so the wastewater could be collected and not pumped out during exceptionally high tides. This was reasonable on the face of it, but they required a capacity of 2 days’ storage and **would not accept that there are two high tides and two low tides every day (!)** and that a few hours of storage is all that is needed.

3. **Tasman District Council Officials are rapacious in collecting fees from Golden Bay residents while providing little or no service for them.** As an example, we have to pay an annual administration fee for our resource consent to discharge wastewater. The only “administration” they do is to collect the fee. They have never checked our meter in more than 10 years, although they have collected more than \$3000 for “administering” it.

Similarly, the residents of Totara Avenue pay an annual administration fee for the resource consent to take water from a stream on a neighbouring farm. This supply has only been monitored for the past few months and the fees have been collected for about 20 years. The water that is not used flows straight into the sea anyway, so what is the point?

4. **Dealings with Pakawau.** I have been involved in the dealings of TDC with the Pakawau Community Residents Association. A separate submission has been made by them – I wholeheartedly support it and do not need to repeat chapter and verse here.

Submission 464: Sue Brown

I support the status quo because the current model of a community board already provides for fair and effective representation for individuals and communities.

I am opposed to the local board model for Golden Bay.

I am opposed to a local board model elsewhere in the Tasman District.

Since the amalgamation with TDC (Tasman District Council) in 1992 and the commencement of Golden Bay community board there has been various opinions in Golden Bay on the roles and value of both governing bodies.

It is fair to say that many in Golden Bay feel geographically annexed as well as poorly represented and served by TDC. It was with good intent to remedy this that the “working group for a local board” sought a change of governance model. However, after due consideration I cannot support the local board proposal as I can find no beneficial alignment between the issues the community perceives it has with governance and the proposed option.

In my view it is proving more to be a case of “be careful what you ask for” as the level of responsibility in this model has flipped it into being a burden on ratepayers with no clear benefits.

It is, at the very least, a considerable financial burden.

I am also concerned that there is no discussion presented on what happens to local governance should our small community be challenged to find sufficient (five) representatives willing to take on the increased responsibility of the local board role considering it will be large enough to notably impact their other/paid employment options, and, at times of consultation, may require even more time for little recompense.

Confusion:

I ask that the LCG seek clarity from submitters making submissions made in favour of a local board for Golden Bay that they are not based in confusion around what a local board model truly could deliver over and above the current community board model. I ask this as despite the provision of a consultation document and public information meetings there remains a wide variety of understanding and expectation in the community.

There are some who support a model change as they are unhappy with Tasman District Council decisions that impact them personally and favour a local board in the hope of changes they align with being made possible. As most issues raised sit within regulatory decision making this is misguided support.

There is also misguided support for a local board in expectation that it will provide the equivalent of, or be a significant step towards, a unitary local authority for Golden Bay. Some even seem to forget that such a standalone option of local governance would still be required to heed central government and operate within the LGA 2002 and indeed the full plethora of New Zealand’s legislation, including the RMA.

Comparison of the models:

The LGC consultation document has explained “what a local board might look like, what it might do and what it might cost.”

The reorganisational options are presented in the consultation document in a manner that alludes to a local board offering increased fair and effective representation when compared to a community board.

This is disappointing as in a document contemplating change it is crucial to good decision making to provide comparison that enables understanding of the real differences, not merely offer model generalisations.

For example, on page 4 the document states. “As we explain in this document, local boards have more guaranteed decision-making powers than community boards. They share decision-making with the ‘governing body’ of the council i.e. the mayor and councillors. In contrast, community boards are generally more of an advocacy body for their area with no guaranteed decision-making responsibilities.”

The table on page 6 continues this imbalance of information. The shorter column given to community board, gives a visual impression of less and the wording implies that the community board is considerably constrained in its opportunity to represent its community to the council.

Then on page 9, 10 & 11 under the headings decision making, advocacy and collaboration many items are expanded on and no comparison to, or links given to, the current Golden Bay community board delegations have been provided.

The consultation document could have supported informed comparison of the current model by providing links to TDC website information such as;

➤ <https://www.tasman.govt.nz/my-community/community-support/community-boards-and-advisorygroups/community-boards/>

➤ <https://www.tasman.govt.nz/my-council/key-documents/more/governance-policies/#e466> (pages 11-13)

➤ <https://www.tasman.govt.nz/my-council/meetings/committee-terms-ofreference/?path=/EDMS/Public/Other/Council/CouncilStructure/CommitteeTermsOfReference/Committees>

Exploration of these documents, and review of the agendas and minutes of the Golden Bay Community Board have provided me with confidence that the current delegations are comprehensively enabling to opportunity in decision making, advocacy and collaboration by the community board model and that TDC is supportive of changes in delegations when requested and in-line with the LGA 2002.

Regulatory local governance representation

Fair and effective representation on regulatory matters is put at risk if the two ward councillors are reduced to one and this is highly likely to occur given a local board model. It will be difficult to justify under the Local Electoral Act.

Golden Bay having one councillor representing them on regulatory matters is untenable. Two ward councillors is essential to retain. It enables Golden Bay representation on more committee, sub-committee and working groups for the various strategies, policies, and regulations as well as voting in chambers.

Cost:

Increased cost of local governance to ratepayers estimated by the LGC to be some \$75 pa (as a per property rate Golden Bay rate) and TDC has indicated that it is likely to be a much higher figure.

This extra cost is purely for governance matters of local level only, not a cent will go towards tangible items of benefit to the Golden Bay community services or infrastructure.

This extra cost will be on top of rates increases that have been indicated in commentary on the current TDC Long Term Plan. I reference to the LGC this article

<https://www.stuff.co.nz/business/121720616/debt-and-rate-capsunder-review-at-tasman-district-council>

and as a ratepayer of two rural properties in the Tasman District, I note with concern that this article includes the quote “Changing Government policies such as the drinking water requirements and essential freshwater package carry anticipated additional costs for the council”

District Options:

The LCG references that under the legislation the option for local boards is available to all unitary councils. The inference in the consultation document is that the Auckland local governance model is easily and appropriately transferable to Tasman despite huge difference in geography and population.

Nor is any discussion offered regarding potential future impacts of Tasman moving to district wide local boards on the unique regional local government model of Te Tai Ihu which comprises of three distinct, but adjoining and complimentary, unitary councils.

I find it curious that the LCG proposal options asks us to consider local boards across Tasman without offering guidance on what this would do to district representation of ward councillors to TDC and to the role of the community associations which operate in other TDC wards, notably with high levels of community support. Currently there are twelve listed at <https://www.tasman.govt.nz/my-community/community-support/communityboards-and-advisory-groups/community-associations/>

I see that Golden Bay’s own Pakawau Residents Association is not listed but is an excellent example and works well alongside the Golden Bay Community Board.

Summary:

I conclude that our existing community board model must remain as when supported by a community that understands civic process, it can and does provide an effective and economically viable local governance connection for the Golden Bay community to Tasman District Council.

Submission 466: Ian Alach

For many years I have had the opinion that local government would be better organised into local boards according to community of interest with these boards sending one representative each to make up the (district/regional) council. Then I would propose to amalgamate all councils across the top of the south (4) into one. This would mean efficiencies of scale - only one computer system, CEO, one lot of highly paid employees plus capital efficiencies e.g. vehicles and so on. Local boards would have wide scope to make appropriate local decisions and statutory functions could be covered by the council.

So, with regard to this consultation, local boards throughout the district is the way to go. The vested interests in TDC would not be happy (more on that to follow) but I figure that the budget would be spread over the entire district more with much less needing controlled from Richmond.

Brief background:

I have been resident in Golden Bay 39 years. I run a small farming operation and I have seen the days of the Golden Bay County Council and TDC. I am not opposed to TDC necessarily, it's just that they continually cause me to get steamed up when I'm generally living a peaceful lifestyle. They continually oppose and block matters important to us, including being prepared to commit to significant legal fees against us eg grandstand. They refuse to keep us informed about Port Taranaki and Rangihaeata airport. They work against us e.g. Waikoropupu water conservation order. Downright dishonest? They are claiming "we do not have a position on the local board for Golden Bay". My reading of their submission says otherwise.

Problems with the local board proposals:

Disappointingly, the draft proposals give very little power to the GB board and are perhaps not worth going for.

I am prepared to incur some costs to see improvements but they need to be significant enough to be worth it.

E.g. surely a local board could oversee the two 'ports'?

All the areas listed under 'Advocacy' could be under board control

TDC are claiming that LGC cost estimates are grossly underestimated. We have been looking at the situation in Auckland too. We saw a significant budget provided to their boards for capital works and running costs/maintenance and worked that back to our situation per capita - a budget for GB local board of around \$1million?

What's more the Auckland boards and their council seem to co-exist well enough. Again, what is wrong at TDC?

Summary:

I am in favour of local boards for TDC.

But, only if

(1) a decent set of powers/responsibilities must be provided to them

(2) a significant budget is provided

(3) TDC are somehow required to co-operate.

A key obstacle is going to be TDC. In fact I can't see the changes being successful at all unless TDC itself is reviewed.

"An annual budget will be agreed between the local board and TDC" - are you joking? or just not with it? TDC will stall at every opportunity. We will see most of the year go by with no agreement, therefore effectively no board. Finally our representatives will give in just to get something done and then it will be time to start the next round.

Submission 467: Tony Lawton

I support a local board for Golden Bay/Mohua and local boards for other communities in the Tasman District.

I believe the GB/Tasman local board issue should be considered as part of the overall strategic direction of NZ local government (2nd tier regional government and 3rd tier community-government), and the part local boards can play in ensuring aggregation of local government takes communities along with it.

The 2010 restructure of the Auckland region into a combined unitary council, with all communities represented by local boards, I believe, set the correct strategic direction for future local government. I see the 2014 LGA amendment allowing local boards in other unitary councils as the intermediate step towards all NZ communities being permitted local boards, and perhaps a move towards unitary style councils for all regions.

Local government's direction is, rightly I believe, heading towards a smaller number of 'regional planning areas'. I support that move as I believe the issues we will face, in 3-Waters, climate change/managed coastal retreat, freshwater NPS requirements most kiwis strongly support, etc, will require a higher level of regulatory/ fiscal/ management capability and resource than I see within councils currently in my area. I would be surprised if this is not widespread across NZ. I support a combined planning area for Te Tau Ihu, perhaps with NCC/TDC/MDC remaining as 'feeder' sub-regions, although I remain to be convinced about the need of this 'in-between' local government structure if community-level local government is strengthened.

I believe a regional approach based on an efficient structure of regional/community governance, along with service delivery centralisation, would provide 'top of the south' with far higher environmental, regulatory and economic-development planning /delivery capabilities than I see currently. It would provide a balance sheet with the ability to fund and deliver future public infrastructure requirements, with increased cost-efficiency. One example is the regulation/support of the aquaculture and port industries, where MDC's existing capability could productively be extended across the region.

Centralisation of the local government service delivery has its 'democratic' risks. Our community-level participation in local government is falling, as for most areas within NZ. Disenfranchisement has significant wellbeing risks that should not be underestimated. I believe disenfranchisement does NOT mean that younger generations are apolitical. For example, these generations are the drivers behind online advocacy groups such as 'myactionstation', driving popular political change such as that used to support banning military-style weapons. It is far more likely that they do not buy into the existing paradigm of local government which is not designed for today's 'social-media' culture. They want a direct connection to the decision-makers and immediate response to their issues, with engagement via on-going dialogue both at the regional level, but importantly, at the level of their communities which they affiliate with – not the static monologue largely at the 'provincial' level that is local government consultation today.

Empowered community-level democratic bodies, with community specific planning/budget, is a step towards a platform of local government that can lead to a productive, ongoing engagement with the bright, hard-working, fantastic younger generations I see in GB, and elsewhere across the Tasman District and Te Tau Ihu.

Change is coming in our local government structures. The next generation(s) will eventually drive this if our generation doesn't. Based on the language I see coming from the Ministry, I believe change is on the horizon. I believe a move to local boards, as part of this strategic direction, is critical to the success of the desired changes to local government planning and service (at least i.r.o. 3-Ws) delivery if community engagement is a goal. This need for a better community-centric 3rd tier local government is why I have pushed for a local board for my community.

Submission 468: Hazel Pearson

I support Golden Bay (GB) changing to the Local Board (LB) model. The options given are for this to happen alone in the Tasman District, or for this to happen in conjunction with the other wards also adopting the LB model. I understand that ideally all the wards (or groups of wards if that was sensible) would have a LB, and this is my first preference. However, please transfer my vote to GB alone moving to the LB model - if GB has the opportunity to lead the way in the move towards LBs across the region I support this option above staying with the Community Board (CB) model. I am wary of voting for change for change's sake only, Some of the possible outcomes are unknowable at this stage. Even so in this case I am very happy to vote to change away from the current CB model and to aim to improve the local decisionmaking by doing this. A local board would have as of right a greater governance role, and the community is motivated to keep things transparent and accountable.

My reasons (in no particular order) are as follows:

1. I have been involved for four years in retaining the 121 year old grandstand at the showgrounds in Takaka. After three councils and four years TDC recently turned their direction 180 degrees and moved a long way towards our unchanged position. We have withdrawn the High Court litigation as a consequence of this. As the 1959 ROLD Act s18 remains unexamined, and as there has been no settlement with TDC the High Court action could be picked up in the future if TDC do not meet their obligations. While there is talk of the new council being 'different' – ie not as bad as the old one – to date it is not clear to me whether their recent actions in this dispute are an indication that they want to meet their obligations by keeping and continuing to use the grandstand, or that they just wanted the High Court action to go away. The 'new' mayor was active in the three and a half years of opposition to keeping the grandstand in their deputy mayor role, and without exception (except perhaps with the council's latest resolution – time will tell on that) the council's strategy in opposing retention of the grandstand has been to win by delaying, and in the process exhausting the community groups' resources.
2. I tried to stand back from the grandstand issue, but the more the community groups working to keep the grandstand looked into the background decisions the more errors and questionable processes were discovered, to the point that some of the grandstand supporters feel more strongly about the council's processes than they do about the grandstand itself. It has been very hard to counter the lies by omission (to say the least) put forward by some council staff and some elected members. I think a LB would be more accountable and transparent to us.
3. When the new facility was proposed both TDC and the group putting forward the proposal either ignored or cherry-picked information in the TDC commissioned Vandeskog Report on Golden Bay's community facilities and any new facilities the community might want. This report remains the most rigorous consultation document on this topic. One firm finding was that most of the responses did NOT want a community facility to be up at the showgrounds, though there did need to be larger changing rooms up there. Takaka township was the preferred location. And if there was any consensus on what 'the community' wanted it was a heated swimming pool. We have ended up with two new squash courts as part of a new shared facility up at the showgrounds – you can't even 'share' a squash court – and the changing rooms are too small. TDC's governance of the new facility was lacking or non-existent. I believe a LB would be more accountable. The CB was initially part of the new facility proposal working group, but was jettisoned along the way.

4. At one point the Golden Bay Grand Stand Community Trust (the Trust) had received a \$500 grant from the CB for the purchase of commemorative pens marking the grandstand's 120th anniversary in 2019, while at the same time the council was spending a lot of money on a Simpson Grierson external lawyer fighting the Trust and Golden Bay A&P Association at the High Court.

5. In mid-2018 the High Court action was brought against TDC and an interim stay sought on the otherwise imminent demolition of the grandstand. TDC had the option of voluntarily agreeing to the interim stay while the court action was in progress. Instead TDC voluntarily used ratepayers money – to the tune of \$10,000s - \$58,000 spent on external lawyers in that year alone, and at least \$10,000 of the Trust's funds – to oppose the interim stay in a 'mini' hearing.

I believe the community would make any LB be more transparent with their spending and not stand for such mis-use of public funds.

6. In the Environment Court Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) said the grandstand did not deserve to receive the highest NZ heritage protection but went as far as writing to the local paper saying TDC should list it on their Heritage Schedule and listen to the people they served. TDC ignored this.

I hope that a Local Board would listen more. I understand you can have rogue Local Boards as well as rogue councils, but I'm sure that a protest outside a LB office in Takaka would have more effect than a protest outside the Richmond office if it came to that.

7. I am suspicious of the large costs TDC have come up with for instigating and running a Golden Bay LB. I think improved community outcomes are worth paying more for, however it would help if there were a mechanism by which any surplus at the end of the year or term could go into a local funding pool, or better still be put towards the next year's targeted rate and so reduce it. It is good that the LGC is there to keep an eye on things – TDC are yet to show they can be trusted when it comes to Golden Bay decisionmaking – as far as my direct experience goes.

8. There is talk that GB may lose one councillor if we get a LB. Even that might be okay if the LB functions even half as well as I hope it could.

9. I'm in the business of distributing AES wastewater systems nationwide – we introduced these systems to New Zealand. As such I have communicated with many councils in the consenting arm of the body, and the design engineers who deal with the councils. I have been struck by how helpful some councils are. I thought our complaints about our council were common in all areas, but actually a lot of people say 'Our council's pretty good.' In Tasman District – with few exceptions - I haven't heard that. More than once I have heard of people retiring or changing jobs because of the mental health strain of working with TDC. I would like a Local Board to have more productive people skills, and as the community would have the chance of electing 5 people to the LB, we have a good chance of achieving this.

To save me (and perhaps you) time on this submission I include here as further background to my reasoning a letter I wrote to the GB Weekly. Thank you for asking the questions, and for really listening.

'Both the current Community Board and proposed Local Board models have costs – part of the annual rates. Both would work better when the relationship between Tasman District Council (TDC) and the community they serve is strong. The question is which governance model is more likely to create better outcomes for the people of Golden Bay and the wider community.

In 1989 when governance was moved from Golden Bay County Council to TDC many lobbied to keep Golden Bay separate. Had Golden Bay in 1989 had a choice between a Local Board or a Community Board – that is, more control over the decisions affecting us or not – EVERYONE would have chosen the Local Board.

We have now had a Community Board for 30 years and blimey, what have they been allowed to do? The Community Board's power is given to them or not at TDC's discretion. As reported in the Weekly last week TDC have tried to get rid of the Community Board altogether, and have ignored Local Government Commission (LGC) recommendations to delegate the Board more power. 30 years is enough time for TDC to demonstrate their form.

For four years I have worked to keep the grandstand up at the showgrounds. This is but one example of the less obvious costs of the current, weaker governance model and could have been sorted out over a cup of tea four years ago, back when the grandstand was fully functional. Instead, TDC staff saw no further reason to meet and began an expensive opposition. The GB community has spent over \$150,000 to keep the grandstand; it is fair to assume TDC have spent twice that on their external legal fees alone. That's \$450,000 and excludes TDC staff hours, community volunteer hours, and the subsequent damage to the grandstand under TDC's watch.

We have a chance now to be heard – the LGC commissioners are listening. What kind of decisions would we like to be part of – parking for visiting sports buses? Rock walls to protect properties? Think of our children's children, be bold...(and keep working on the relationships).'

Submission 472: Iona Jelf

My preference would be to have local boards in all 5 regions of the Tasman district. All communities would welcome and benefit from governance at both local and regional levels. Positive relationships between the two has the potential to be very effective, giving true representation and therefore cost effectivity.

However, if Golden Bay alone was chosen to be the pilot local board then that would be acceptable, if the cost of it to ratepayers was. A local board here has the potential to significantly improve the governmental outcomes for the Golden Bay Ward, but from the meeting I attended it was obvious that the extent of delegation is unclear, and it comes with a high price tag. So it is a leap of faith for us, but for those of us that have lived here since the pre-amalgamation of 1989, one that we are prepared to take.

For optimal outcomes, community decisions affecting local communities need to be made by local boards and decisions affecting regional communities need to be made at the regional council level. Greater community engagement and involvement with local decision making within people's own communities enhances the well-being and future resilience of those communities. This is evident wherever you care to look.

Representation:

Our 2 ward councillors have to vote regionally and so rarely deliver outcomes that represent Golden Bay's needs. If we had 5 local board members and only 1 councillor, I would hope that the targeted rate necessary to fund a local board could be acceptable. This would need to be balanced by sufficient local board delegation to ensure good representation outcomes for Golden Bay.

Finances:

I approve of the Commission's recommendation of 1 full-time senior advisor and technical support where necessary from TDC departments. The latter could be offset by cost savings in Richmond from general rates, the former is to be funded by a targeted rate. TDC's proposed annual targeted rate of \$283 is unacceptable and that of \$75 per property more agreeable.

If local boards were Tasman-wide and a centralised model used for services and costs, a reasonable allocation of TDC's governance budget could mean an only \$60 increase in general rates across the district. Worth considering for the benefits that this would bring.

Delegation:

Non- regulatory responsibilities (Allocations) Legislation requires all non-regulatory activities and assets in a local board area to be allocated as the responsibility of the local board, unless:

- = The impact of the decisions made about these assets will extend beyond Golden Bay.
- = Effective decision making requires it to be done at the regional level.
- = Benefits of consistent / co-ordinated approach across Tasman outweigh needs / preferences of Golden Bay.

This can be assessed by asking “What is the area that the operation of the asset affects?” Because of its isolation it is arguable that Golden Bay assets should be allocated to a Golden Bay local board. I believe this approach is relevant but needs to be informed by the 3 factors above, so that the Golden Bay perspective has a significantly larger influence on the local decisions made than it currently has.

The test for regulatory responsibilities (Delegations) is the same. The effects of the regulation are on the community in question and the responsibility for making those decisions should also be with the Golden Bay local board, with proportionate consideration of regional interest.

Golden Bay is a very individual ward with diverse needs and there are many potential benefits of having regulatory functions that are capable of reflecting those needs.

Thank you for your consideration of my submission.

I look forward to speaking at the hearing and the ultimate establishment of a local board for Golden Bay that will truly reflect the needs of the people that live here.

Submission 473: Steve Penny

A new tier of local government would be of benefit to all wards in Tasman District so that all local decisions can be made locally, according to the principle of subsidiarity. A consistent approach across the region, would result in greater economy of scale and easier organisation than a board for Golden Bay alone. A local board for Golden Bay only would still be worthwhile because better and easier decisions would be made locally, saving money and leading to better outcomes than if these decisions were made centrally.

If you support a local board(s) in other areas of Tasman District, identify that area(s):
All wards would benefit.

Your views on an appropriate balance between more local decision making in Golden Bay and district-wide decision making?

The governance of TDC over Golden Bay can best be described as tyrannical; it imposes its will on us with scant regard for what we actually want, and our relationship with it has completely broken down. The tyranny of district councils throughout the nation is rife, with most of them appearing to be completely ignorant of public law and largely under the control of their executives, but TDC has the reputation of being the worst of all, as well as the most corrupt. The installation of a Local Government Commissioner to run it is long overdue.

It is difficult to think of any policies that need apply across both Golden and Tasman Bays; they are almost completely separate communities of interest. Maximum devolution is necessary, and a failure to provide it could lead to the frustration of the community expressing itself in unlawful ways, or a move to become a Territorial Authority or even declaring itself an independent state.

Do you consider more local decision-making is necessary to promote local community resilience and well-being now and in the future?

Yes, it is absolutely necessary.

Is there community support for the establishment of local boards elsewhere in the Tasman District? Can you demonstrate the level of Support?

I have no idea.

Do you have comments on local board/councillor representation arrangements?

Local Board Members

The minimum of five directly elected members would be the best, simply because it is cheapest and sufficient, and because of the probable difficulty of finding more high-quality candidates. Imposing ward councillors on the board would be undemocratic nonsense: these people are elected on the basis of their district-wide policies, and it would be very complicated to elect candidates on the basis of two sets of policies (one local, one district).

Ward Councillors

We should retain two ward councillors. Golden Bay is already bullied by TDC, and taking one away would only help exacerbate that situation. The existence of a local board would be no justification for reducing the number because the fact that we make local decisions has no bearing on our need to be properly represented in district-wide decision-making.

Local Board Chairing

The chair(wo)man should be directly elected by the local board. They are in the best position to know who would be suitable for their needs. Allowing the community to impose an unsuitable person would be very dangerous, and could result in complete dysfunction. It is also much easier to change this officer by a local board decision mid-term for whatever reason, and this should be permitted at any time.

What might a Golden Bay local board do?

All non-regulatory responsibilities should be allocated, as there is no good reason not to. The same applies to all possible regulatory responsibilities, which should be delegated for four years. Given GB's physical separation from other Tasman communities, all environmental, social, and cultural impacts resulting from the use of council assets located in GB are overwhelmingly within GB. Therefore all GB located council assets, including the commercial assets (Port Tarkohe, Campgrounds, Aerodrome) should be allocated to a GB local board, as well as their income streams.

Te Waikoropupū Springs, which are of national and international importance, are under threat because of over-centralised control of freshwater management policy and enforcement: TDC appears hell-bent on permitting increased irrigation (as proved by its opposition to the Water Conservation Order) and it cannot be trusted to make appropriate decisions. Interest in this issue is far stronger in Golden Bay than the rest of the District. Local cultural and conservation values (in particular those of local iwi) would be given more prominent respect and consideration if control of Golden Bay freshwater was in the sole hands of a local board.

What might a Golden Bay local board cost? Who might pay?

The LGC's proposed governance structure of one local advisor and part-time centralised support seems reasonable and sufficient. More cost-effective ways of providing the necessary infrastructure need to be explored e.g. local office space and equipment could perhaps be provided by the community at little or no cost.

Golden Bay is economically challenged and un-resilient to the point where it needs subsidy, so rates need to be kept to an absolute minimum. The cost of the local board should be borne by all Tasman District ratepayers; they currently pay for decisions made that affect only Golden Bay and there is no reason why that should change just because they are being made more effectively and efficiently in Golden Bay rather than Richmond. The purpose of local government is to enable local decision-making, so this overall purpose of TDC is the responsibility of all Tasman District ratepayers; placing the cost of its fulfilment on one section of the community is unjustifiable (it remains a district-wide goal, which is just being better effected by decentralisation of decision-making at slightly greater expense).