

Cover image: Lake Matheson - BareKiwi

Council Meeting Agenda

11 November 2026

Extraordinary Council Meeting

WESTLAND
District Council | Te Kahui o Poutini

AGENDA

RĀRANGI TAKE

NOTICE OF AN EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF

COUNCIL

to be held on **Wednesday, 11 November 2026,** commencing at **1 pm** at the Beachfront Hotel, 111 Revell Street, Hokitika and via Zoom

Chairperson	Her Worship the Mayor
Deputy and Northern Ward Member:	Councillor Burden
Northern Ward Members:	Councillor Mackenzie, Councillor Maitland
Hokitika Ward Members:	Councillor Gillett, Councillor Martin, Councillor Walker
Southern Ward Members:	Councillor Manera, Councillor Munns
Iwi Representatives:	Kaiwhakahaere Madgwick, Kaiwhakahaere Tumahai

In accordance with clause 25A of Schedule 7 of the Local Government Act 2002, members may attend the meeting





by audio or audio-visual link.

Council Vision

By investing in our people, caring for the environment, respecting the Mana Whenua Cultural heritage, and enabling investment, growth, and development we will enrich our district and the people that reside here.

Purpose

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

(a) To enable democratic local decision-making and action by, and on behalf of, communities; and
(b) To promote the social, economic, environmental, and cultural well-being of communities in the present and for the future.

Council seeks to meet its obligations under the Local Government Act 2002 and the achievement of the District Vision adopted by the Council in June 2025, which are set out in the Long Term Plan 2025–2034.

1. KARAKIA TĪMATANGA
OPENING KARAKIA

Kia hora te marino	***May peace be widespread***
Kia whakapapa pounamu te moana	***May the sea be like greenstone***
Hei hurahai mā tātou	***A pathway for us all this day***
I te rangi nei	***Give love, received love***
Aroha atu, aroha mai	***Let us show respect for each other***
Tātou i a tātou katoa	***Bind us all together!***
Hui e! Tāiki e!	

2. NGĀ WHAKAPAAHA
APOLOGIES

3. LONG TERM PLAN 2027 – 2037

3.1. Introduction
3.2. Items for Consideration

- **Council Buildings 36 and 41 Weld Street …… 4**
- **Rates vs User Pays …… 31**
- **Council Reserves and Restricted Reserves …… 45**
- **Parking Charges …… 52**
- **Emergency Management …… 60**
- **Public Conveniences …… 70**
- **Community Halls & Other Council-owned Facilities 76**
- **Ross Swimming Pool…… 85**
- **Community Grant Funding - Regent Theatre …… 90**
- **Museum …… 93**
- **Taxi Grants & Community Investment …… 98**
- **Westland Sports Hub …… 102**
- **Freedom Camping …… 108**
- **Destination Hokitika …… 116**
- **Glacier Township Development Rate …… 119**
- **Rate Payer Assistance Scheme …… 123**
- **Parks and Reserves …… 126**

- **West Coast Wilderness Trail …… 140**

3.3. Next Steps

4. KA MATATAPU TE WHAKATAUNGA I TE TŪMATANUI

RESOLUTION TO GO INTO PUBLIC EXCLUDED

(to consider and adopt confidential items)

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

Item No.	General subject of each matter to be considered	Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under Section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
1.	Hokitika Airport Resilience Project - Airfield Ground Lighting Tender	Good reason to withhold exist under Section 7	That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists. Section 48(1)(a)

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

Item No.	Interest		Section
1	Protect information where the making available of the information:		(S.7(2)(b))
	(i) (ii)	would disclose a trade secret; and would be likely unreasonably to prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied or who is the subject of the information	
1	Enable any local authority holding the information to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations);		(S.7(2)(i))
1	Prevent the disclosure or use of official information for improper gain or improper advantage.		(S.7(2)(j))

DATE OF NEXT ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING
ON 26 NOVEMBER 2026 AT 1.00 PM
LOCATION TO BE CONFIRMED, AND VIA ZOOM

Report to Council

DATE: 11 November 2026

TO: Mayor and Councillors

FROM: Barbara Phillips, Chief Executive

Council Buildings 36 and 41 Weld Street

1. Summary

This report responds to Council's resolutions of 14 October 2026 regarding the future of 36 and 41 Weld Street, both of which have been closed indefinitely due to the assessed risk to life in the event of an earthquake. It considers options for future civic accommodation and their financial, operational and strategic implications. The report recommends retaining 41 Weld Street for redevelopment as a civic and community hub and disposing of 36 Weld Street, subject to further feasibility and financial assessments. It also recommends progressing the necessary Long Term Plan amendment to enable public consultation before final investment and disposal decisions are made.

Council seeks to meet its obligations under the Local Government Act 2002 and the achievement of the District Vision adopted by the Council in June 2025, which are set out in the Long Term Plan 2025–2034.

2. Background

Westland District Council has been considering the future of its civic accommodation and property assets for some time, recognising the need to balance investment in existing buildings with the long-term requirements of Council and the communities it serves. Previous investigations have considered the condition and suitability of Council's existing premises, potential strengthening costs and opportunities for alternative accommodation.

Investigations undertaken since 2023 have considered strengthening and refurbishing the existing Council headquarters at 36 Weld Street, relocating Council operations to the Pakiwaitara building at 41 Weld Street, constructing new premises and alternative accommodation options, including Government House. These investigations have also considered opportunities to accommodate the District Library, isite and other community services within Council-owned facilities.

At its meeting on 29 May 2025, Council received a report outlining the history of the Council headquarters project, previous investigations, options and associated costings. This provided an initial basis for considering investment in existing premises and potential alternative accommodation solutions. The report also identified the challenges associated with the limited availability of suitable buildings within the Hokitika CBD, the condition of Council's existing properties and the financial implications of significant investment in civic accommodation. This information remains relevant to informing the subsequent investigations outlined in this report. A copy of the previous report is included as Appendix 1.

The future of the Pakiwaitara building was also considered through the 2025–2034 Long Term Plan consultation process. Council's preferred option was to sell the building immediately, with 66.66% (22 of 33) of submitters

supporting the proposal. Submissions highlighted longstanding concerns regarding the building's condition, ongoing maintenance liabilities and the cost-effectiveness of addressing its deficiencies.

Following consultation, Council resolved that the Pakiwaitara building be placed on the market immediately, subject to a caveat requiring further investigations and costings for two alternative accommodation options: demolishing the existing building and constructing a new facility on the Pakiwaitara site, or relocating Council operations to Government House.

This resolution informed a further report considered by Council on 24 July 2025, which provided a more detailed financial and operational assessment of four options: strengthening the existing Council headquarters, strengthening and refurbishing Pakiwaitara, constructing a new building on the Pakiwaitara site, or relocating to Government House.

The assessment identified indicative total project costs ranging from approximately $6.6 million to strengthen and refurbish Pakiwaitara to $13 million for relocation to Government House. While strengthening the existing buildings presented lower initial capital costs, the assessment identified ongoing limitations associated with their age, configuration, maintenance requirements and ability to provide modern, fit-for-purpose accommodation.

The July 2025 report identified constructing a new facility at 41 Weld Street as the preferred option, recognising the benefits of a purpose-built development, reduced ongoing maintenance costs, improved operational efficiency and opportunities to accommodate complementary services. Financial modelling also indicated that incorporating other services and potential rental income could provide a more cost-effective solution over the longer term. The resolution from the July 2025 meeting was subsequently made public on 29 October 2026.

While the July 2025 assessment identified constructing a new facility at 41 Weld Street as the preferred option, progressing this proposal would have represented a significant change from the direction adopted through the 2025–2034 Long Term Plan, which provided for the sale of Pakiwaitara. Given the significance of Council's property assets and the financial implications of retaining and redeveloping the site, the proposed change required an amendment to the Long Term Plan and further public consultation before a final investment decision could be made.

Consequently, the July 2025 recommendation did not provide authority to proceed directly with construction. The current report builds on that earlier assessment and seeks to establish a preferred direction from which the necessary consultation and statutory processes can progress.

Council owns 36 and 41 Weld Street, Hokitika, both of which have seismic ratings of 25% of New Building Standard (NBS). Previous investigations identified indicative seismic strengthening costs of approximately $4.53 million excluding GST for 36 Weld Street (November 2024) and $2.81 million excluding GST for 41 Weld Street (April 2025). These historical estimates relate primarily to structural strengthening and exclude the additional investment which was essential to deliver any modern, fit-for-purpose facilities.

The need for a sustainable long-term accommodation solution has become critical following the displacement of Council staff from 36 Weld Street. While interim arrangements have maintained service continuity, to date they present ongoing challenges for operational efficiency, staff wellbeing and service delivery, together with additional accommodation costs. Prolonged reliance on these arrangements is neither operationally nor financially sustainable.

At its meeting on 14 October 2026, Council resolved to investigate the market values of both Weld Street properties and options for constructing new premises on Council-owned land at Hokitika Airport and within the

Hokitika CBD. Council also requested that associated costs and timelines be reported back, together with advice from the Chief Executive on the special consultative procedure required to progress the options.

These resolutions provide an opportunity to consider Council's accommodation requirements within a broader strategic context. With potential local government reform and changing approaches to public service delivery still undetermined, any significant investment in civic infrastructure should be refocused on accommodating future organisational and community requirements. This includes considering whether a conventional administration facility or a broader civic and community hub would deliver greater long-term value to the communities across the district.

A civic and community hub could bring together Council functions, community facilities and complementary public services, creating opportunities for collaboration, shared investment and improved community access. The location of future civic infrastructure also has wider implications for Hokitika's town centre, economic activity and the ongoing provision of community services.

Any proposed investment would need to be considered within Council's Long Term Plan 2025–2034 and associated statutory consultation requirements. Council must therefore balance the need to resolve its current accommodation challenges with the importance of making a financially responsible, adaptable and sustainable long-term investment decision.

3. Current Situation

Council continues to operate under interim accommodation arrangements following the displacement of staff from 36 and 41 Weld Street. While these arrangements have maintained service continuity, they present significant ongoing operational challenges and additional costs. The limited availability of suitable commercial accommodation in Hokitika has further constrained Council's options, with potential premises needing to be assessed against operational requirements, including building compliance, accessibility and the need to filter potential sites through relevant planning and consent requirements, including EP13.

Council retains ownership of 36 and 41 Weld Street. Although neither building is currently occupied by other organisations, telecommunications infrastructure supporting Chorus and Police connectivity remains on site, alongside Council's document and records storage. These requirements will need to be addressed in any future redevelopment or disposal.

Independent market assessments of both properties have been obtained. Investigations have also considered the potential development of Council premises on Council-owned land at Hokitika Airport and within the CBD, including the suitability of each location, indicative development costs, infrastructure requirements and delivery timeframes.

The investigations extend beyond Council's immediate accommodation needs to consider opportunities for a more future focused approach to civic infrastructure. This includes a civic and community hub that could accommodate Council functions alongside community facilities and complementary services, while allowing for changing organisational and community requirements. With the District Library's current lease due to expire in approximately 18 months, there is also an opportunity to consider its future accommodation as part of a more integrated civic and community facility.

The available options must now be considered against their financial, operational and strategic implications, including the future of Council's existing properties, the affordability of new development and the wider benefits for Hokitika and the district.

Council is also progressing consideration of the statutory requirements associated with any Long Term Plan amendment and public consultation. The intention remains to commence consultation before Christmas 2026, subject to completion of the necessary financial, technical and statutory assessments.

4. Options

The investigations requested by Council on 14 October 2026 provide an opportunity to consider the future of Council's existing property assets alongside alternative approaches to the provision of civic accommodation. The scale and long-term nature of any investment warrant broader consideration of how new civic infrastructure could deliver lasting benefits for Westland, beyond meeting Council's current administrative and operational requirements.

The options extend beyond a choice between two locations. Council must also consider the type of facility to be developed, the future use or disposal of its existing properties, and the extent to which any new investment could accommodate changing organisational structures, service delivery arrangements and community requirements. This is particularly relevant given uncertainty surrounding the future structure of local government and the importance of ensuring that significant public investment remains adaptable and fit for purpose over time.

In this context, Council has an opportunity to consider whether its future accommodation requirements are best addressed through a conventional administration facility or through a broader civic and community hub. The latter would provide scope to integrate Council functions with community facilities, public services and complementary activities, creating opportunities for shared investment, collaboration and more effective use of public infrastructure.

The options have therefore been structured around three interconnected decisions: the type of facility Council could develop (Options 1 and 2), where that development could be located (Options 3 and 4), and the future of its existing Weld Street properties (Options 5, 6 and 7). These choices are intended to be considered collectively rather than as seven mutually exclusive alternatives, recognising that decisions about the development model, location and existing property assets will influence one another. In particular, Option 7 provides for the disposal of both Weld Street properties and development at Hokitika Airport, while Options 5 and 6 provide for the retention of one of the existing CBD properties.

What Council could build

4.1. Option 1 – Purpose-built Council administration facility

This option involves constructing a new Council administration facility designed primarily to accommodate Council's operational, administrative and governance functions. The development would provide a permanent civic headquarters, bringing together Council services within a modern facility designed to meet current and anticipated organisational requirements.

The proposed facility would include administrative workspaces, public reception and customer services, Council chambers, governance and meeting facilities, staff amenities, records and storage areas, and associated infrastructure. The design would incorporate appropriate accessibility, building compliance, sustainability and resilience requirements.

The scale and configuration of the building would be informed by Council's projected accommodation needs, including consideration of staffing levels, working arrangements, technology and future service delivery requirements. Provision for flexible internal layouts could also be incorporated to accommodate changes in operational requirements over time.

This option could be developed on Council-owned land at either Hokitika Airport or within the Hokitika CBD, subject to confirmation of site suitability and development requirements.

4.2. Option 2 – Civic and community hub

This option involves developing a broader civic and community hub that accommodates Council's administrative and governance functions alongside facilities and services that support the wider Westland community. The concept extends beyond a conventional Council headquarters to consider how investment in civic infrastructure could provide a multipurpose facility capable of serving a range of community, public sector and complementary activities.

The development would be designed around a flexible and adaptable building model, recognising that the future structure and responsibilities of local government may change. Rather than being configured exclusively around Council's current organisational requirements, the facility could accommodate different functions, organisations and service delivery arrangements over time.

Depending on the scope of development, community needs and potential partnerships, a civic and community hub could incorporate:

- Council administration, customer services and governance facilities.
- A public library, including learning, digital and community spaces.
- Visitor information and tourism-related services.
- Shared meeting, training and community facilities.
- Accommodation for government agencies and community organisations.
- Flexible spaces for community activities, exhibitions and events.
- Complementary commercial or leased spaces.

The concept could provide for shared facilities and common infrastructure, with opportunities for co-location, collaborative service delivery and partnership arrangements. The inclusion of different users and functions would be determined through further feasibility work, engagement with potential partners and assessment of community needs.

Consideration would also be given to the ownership, governance and operating arrangements for the facility, including the potential for shared investment, leasing arrangements and staged development. The building could be designed to enable different components to be developed or adapted over time, subject to demand and available funding.

This option could be developed on Council-owned land at either Hokitika Airport or within the Hokitika CBD, with the final scale, configuration and mix of activities informed by the characteristics of the selected site.

Where Council could build

4.3. Option 3 – Development at Hokitika Airport

This option involves constructing new civic premises on Council-owned land within the Hokitika Airport precinct. The development could accommodate either a purpose-built Council administration facility or a broader civic and community hub, depending on the development model selected.

The option would require identification of a suitable development site and consideration of the airport's existing operational requirements, future development plans and any associated land-use restrictions.

Investigations would consider site configuration, access, parking, infrastructure connections, ground conditions, planning and consenting requirements, and the potential for future development or expansion.

4.4. Option 4 – Development within the Hokitika CBD

This option involves constructing new civic premises on suitable Council-owned land within the Hokitika central business district. The development could accommodate either a purpose-built Council administration facility or a civic and community hub.

The option would involve identifying a suitable site and determining whether the development would comprise a new standalone facility or redevelopment of an existing Council-owned property.

Investigations would consider site availability, configuration, existing buildings and infrastructure, access and parking, ground conditions, planning and consenting requirements, and opportunities to integrate the development with surrounding commercial and community activities.

What Council could do with its existing properties

4.5. Option 5 – Retain 36 Weld Street and dispose of 41 Weld Street

This option involves retaining 36 Weld Street site in Council ownership for redevelopment while disposing of 41 Weld Street.

Disposal of 41 Weld Street site would be informed by its independent market assessment and any applicable statutory requirements. Redevelopment of the 36 Weld Street site would require consideration of the relocation of telecommunications infrastructure supporting Chorus and Police connectivity, together with Council's existing records storage arrangements. These are practical matters to be addressed as part of the redevelopment process rather than barriers to proceeding.

4.6. Option 6 – Retain 41 Weld Street and dispose of 36 Weld Street

This option involves retaining 41 Weld Street site in Council ownership for future redevelopment, while disposing of 36 Weld Street site. Retention of 41 Weld Street site would provide an opportunity to consider its future use for community facilities, public services or as part of a broader civic and community hub.

Disposal of the 36 Weld Street site would be informed by its independent market assessment and applicable statutory requirements, with appropriate arrangements required for the telecommunications infrastructure supporting Chorus and Police connectivity and Council's existing records storage.

4.7. Option 7 – Dispose of both Weld Street properties and develop at Hokitika Airport

This option involves disposing of both 36 and 41 Weld Street sites and progressing the development of new civic premises on Council-owned land at Hokitika Airport. The development could comprise either a purpose-built Council administration facility or a broader civic and community hub, depending on the development model selected.

The disposal of both properties would be informed by their independent assessments, with potential sale proceeds contributing towards the new development. The timing of disposal would need to be coordinated with the delivery of alternative accommodation and arrangements for existing telecommunications infrastructure and records storage.

5. Assessment of Options

The following assessment considers the advantages, disadvantages, financial implications and significance and engagement requirements of each option. The assessment recognises that the development model, location

and future treatment of Council's existing properties are interconnected decisions and should be considered within the context of Council's wider financial and strategic objectives.

5.1. Option 1 – Purpose-built Council administration facility

5.1.1. Advantages

- Provides a modern, purpose-built facility that meets Council's administrative, governance and public-facing service requirements, including accessibility, seismic resilience, energy efficiency and health and safety.
- Enables consolidation of Council functions, improving operational efficiency, staff collaboration and service delivery.
- Offers a clearly defined development scope, potentially simplifying design, procurement, construction and cost management compared with a multipurpose facility.
- Allows for flexible workspaces and layouts to accommodate future operational and staffing requirements.

5.1.2. Disadvantages

- A primarily single-purpose facility may have limited adaptability if local government reform changes Council's functions or service delivery responsibilities.
- Requires significant capital investment, with fewer opportunities for shared facilities, external investment, operating cost contributions or alternative revenue.
- May deliver fewer wider community and economic benefits than a multipurpose civic and community hub.
- Council would retain responsibility for ongoing ownership, operating, maintenance and renewal costs.

5.1.3. Financial Implications

- Indicative capital cost of $12 million, subject to location, design, site preparation, consenting, construction, fit-out and infrastructure requirements.
- Ongoing costs would include utilities, insurance, maintenance, renewals and other property-related expenditure.
- A whole-of-life financial assessment would need to consider funding, depreciation, financing costs, debt and rates implications, together with the potential sale proceeds or ongoing costs associated with 36 and 41 Weld Street sites.
- Development costs and funding requirements would need to be reflected in any proposed Long Term Plan amendment.

5.1.4. Significance and Engagement Assessment

- The development would represent a significant long-term investment requiring assessment against Council's Significance and Engagement Policy, including financial implications, public interest and potential effects on strategic assets.
- A Long Term Plan amendment and associated public consultation are anticipated, subject to confirmation of statutory requirements. Consultation would enable the community to consider the investment, location, costs and alternatives before a final decision.

5.2. Option 2 – Civic and community hub (preferred)

5.2.1. Advantages

- Provides a flexible, multipurpose facility that meets Council's operational requirements while delivering broader social, economic and community benefits.

- Creates an adaptable public asset capable of responding to local government reform, changing service delivery arrangements and future community needs.
- Enables the co-location of Council functions, community facilities, government agencies and complementary services, improving accessibility, collaboration and opportunities to share resources.
- Provides opportunities for external funding, partner contributions, leasing arrangements and shared operating costs.
- Could incorporate the District Library, visitor information services and community spaces. With the library's current lease due to expire in approximately 18 months, there is an opportunity to consider its future accommodation within an integrated facility and potentially reduce reliance on additional leased premises.
- Supports the incorporation of contemporary building standards, seismic resilience, accessibility, sustainability and health and safety requirements.

5.2.2. Disadvantages

- A broader development scope may increase capital costs, design complexity and delivery timeframes compared with a conventional administration facility.
- Benefits associated with co-location, shared investment and operating efficiencies depend on demonstrated demand and securing partner commitments.
- Shared facilities may require more complex governance, tenancy, operational and maintenance arrangements.
- Additional facilities could increase ongoing costs or result in underutilised space if demand changes.
- Careful management of the development scope would be required to ensure affordability and that investment remains proportionate to community needs.

5.2.3. Financial Implications

- Indicative capital cost of $18 million, subject to location, development scope, design, construction, fit-out and infrastructure requirements.
- The financial assessment would distinguish between Council's core accommodation costs and additional community facilities, including opportunities to consolidate existing services and budgets.
- External funding, partner contributions, commercial leasing and shared operating costs could offset expenditure, but these opportunities remain unconfirmed.
- Potential savings from consolidating existing facilities, including the library's leased accommodation, would need to be assessed against development, relocation and ongoing operating costs.
- A whole-of-life assessment would consider capital and operating expenditure, revenue, maintenance, renewals, financing, depreciation and debt and rates implications, together with the future of 36 and 41 Weld Street sites.
- Development costs, funding arrangements and ongoing commitments would need to be reflected in any proposed Long Term Plan amendment.

5.2.4. Significance and Engagement Assessment

- The proposal would represent resource investment requiring assessment against Council's Significance and Engagement Policy, including affordability, public interest and potential changes to community facilities.

- A Long Term Plan amendment and associated consultation are anticipated, subject to confirmation of statutory requirements.
- Community engagement would help determine the appropriate facilities, location, accessibility and affordability, while engagement with potential partners would establish demand and opportunities for shared investment.
- Consultation should clearly distinguish the cost of Council's core accommodation from the additional investment required for a civic and community hub.

5.3. Option 3 – Development at Hokitika Airport

5.3.1. Advantages

- Provides an opportunity to develop new civic premises on Council-owned land, potentially avoiding additional land acquisition costs, subject to site availability and restrictions.
- May offer greater flexibility for building design, parking, access, future expansion and staged development than a constrained CBD site.
- Enables construction of a purpose-built facility incorporating modern building standards, seismic resilience, accessibility, sustainability and health and safety requirements.
- Could accommodate either a conventional administration facility or a broader civic and community hub, with opportunities for complementary activities within the airport precinct, subject to compatibility with aviation operations.

5.3.2. Disadvantages

- Relocating civic functions outside the CBD could reduce accessibility, particularly for residents who walk, cycle or combine Council visits with other town centre activities.
- May reduce the economic and social benefits associated with civic activity in the CBD, including pedestrian movements and support for local businesses.
- Development would need to accommodate aviation operations, future airport requirements and applicable land-use restrictions, potentially limiting site availability and flexibility.
- Additional infrastructure, access, drainage or ground improvements may be required, notwithstanding Council ownership of the land.
- Use of airport land for civic purposes could limit future aviation-related or commercial development opportunities.
- The location may be less suitable for a community hub intended to attract regular public use and integrate with existing town centre services.

5.3.3. Financial Implications

- Capital development costs cannot be reliably established until a suitable site and development model have been identified. Costs will depend on site conditions, infrastructure requirements, building design and construction specifications.
- Further investigations would be required to establish servicing capacity, ground conditions, access requirements and any additional costs associated with airport operations.
- The assessment would need to consider the opportunity cost of using airport land and potential implications for future airport development.
- A whole-of-life financial assessment would consider capital and operating costs, maintenance, renewals, depreciation, financing and debt and rates implications, together with any potential proceeds from the disposal of 36 and/or 41 Weld Street sites.
- Development costs and funding arrangements would need to be reflected in any proposed Long Term Plan amendment.

5.3.4. Significance and Engagement Assessment

- Development at Hokitika Airport would represent a significant investment and potential relocation of Council's principal civic functions, requiring assessment against Council's Significance and Engagement Policy.
- A Long Term Plan amendment and associated public consultation are anticipated, subject to confirmation of statutory requirements.
- Community consultation would need to consider accessibility, affordability, the suitability of the location and potential social and economic impacts on the Hokitika CBD.
- Engagement with airport management and relevant aviation stakeholders would be required to confirm site availability, operational compatibility and future development requirements.

5.4. Option 4 – Development within the Hokitika CBD

5.4.1. Advantages

- Retains Council's civic and administrative functions in a central, accessible location for residents, businesses and visitors.
- Supports the vitality of Hokitika's CBD through increased pedestrian activity, opportunities for local businesses and continued investment in the town centre.
- Provides opportunities to integrate Council services with existing community facilities, government agencies and commercial activities, improving accessibility and collaboration.
- Offers particular advantages for a civic and community hub, potentially incorporating a library, visitor information services and shared community spaces.
- Enables Council to maximise the strategic value of its existing CBD sites through redevelopment.
- Could encourage partnerships, shared facilities and complementary activities that strengthen Hokitika's role as a service centre for the wider district.

5.4.2. Disadvantages

- Redevelopment would require demolition, site clearance, infrastructure upgrades or other enabling works, increasing costs and complexity.
- Ground conditions, neighbouring properties and planning requirements may create additional design, consenting and construction challenges.
- Construction within an active town centre could temporarily disrupt businesses, pedestrian movements, traffic and public access.
- The scale of development achievable may be limited by site constraints, potentially requiring a more compact or multistorey design.

5.4.3. Financial Implications

- Capital development costs cannot be reliably established until a suitable CBD site and development model have been identified. Costs will depend on site constraints, any demolition or enabling works, infrastructure requirements, building design and construction specifications.
- Additional expenditure may be required for demolition, ground improvements, infrastructure upgrades, and other enabling works.
- The assessment would need to consider the market value and opportunity cost of Council-owned land, together with the financial implications of retaining, redeveloping or disposing of 36 and 41 Weld Street.

- Opportunities for partner contributions, shared investment and commercial leasing could offset costs, subject to further investigation. Wider economic benefits to the CBD should also be considered, although these may not directly generate revenue for Council.
- A whole-of-life financial assessment would consider capital and operating costs, maintenance, renewals, depreciation, financing and debt and rates implications.
- Development costs and funding arrangements would need to be reflected in any proposed Long Term Plan amendment.

5.4.4. Significance and Engagement Assessment

- CBD development would represent a significant investment with implications for Council's property portfolio, community accessibility and Hokitika's economic and social development, requiring assessment against Council's Significance and Engagement Policy.
- A Long Term Plan amendment and associated public consultation are anticipated, subject to confirmation of statutory requirements.
- Community consultation would need to consider the development's location, affordability, accessibility, potential community benefits and comparison with the airport alternative.
- Engagement with CBD businesses, property owners, community organisations and potential partners would help identify opportunities for collaboration and manage potential construction impacts.

5.5. Option 5 – Retain 36 Weld Street and dispose of 41 Weld Street

5.5.1. Advantages

- Retains Council ownership of a strategically located CBD property for future civic development.
- Provides an opportunity to redevelop the 36 Weld Street site to meet future accommodation requirements.
- Allows existing telecommunications infrastructure supporting Chorus and Police connectivity, together with Council's records storage, to remain in place until suitable relocation arrangements are established.
- Disposal of 41 Weld Street could release capital to contribute towards redevelopment and future civic infrastructure.
- Provides an opportunity to rationalise Council's property portfolio while retaining a central CBD asset.

5.5.2. Disadvantages

- Redevelopment of the 36 Weld Street site would require significant capital investment, including demolition or site preparation, construction and associated infrastructure.
- Council would remain responsible for ongoing property holding costs until redevelopment is completed.
- Retaining the 36 Weld Street site would limit the capital available for alternative investment.
- Disposal of the 41 Weld Street site would relinquish a strategically located property with potential for a broader civic and community hub.
- The seismic condition of 41 Weld Street may affect market interest, achievable sale proceeds and disposal timeframes.

5.5.3. Financial Implications

- Independent market assessments as of May 2025 identified 36 Weld Street at $1,754,000 and 41 Weld Street at $1,178,000.

- Redevelopment of the 36 Weld Street site would require a new capital cost assessment covering demolition or site preparation, design, consenting, construction, fit-out and infrastructure requirements.
- Council would incur property holding costs pending redevelopment, together with the opportunity cost of retaining the site.
- Disposal of the 41 Weld Street site could generate proceeds of approximately $1,178,000, subject to market conditions, transaction costs and applicable requirements.
- A whole-of-life financial assessment would consider redevelopment costs, future operating and renewal expenditure, potential disposal proceeds, financing and debt and rates implications.
- Any changes to Council's capital programme and financial forecasts would need to be reflected in the relevant Long Term Plan processes.

5.5.4. Significance and Engagement Assessment

- Redevelopment of the 36 Weld Street site and disposal of 41 Weld Street would have implications for Council's property portfolio, future civic infrastructure and financial position, requiring assessment against Council's Significance and Engagement Policy.
- The proposal would need to be considered against Council's Long Term Plan and applicable statutory requirements.
- Community consultation would need to explain the costs and benefits of redeveloping 36 Weld Street, potential disposal proceeds from 41 Weld Street and the implications for future civic and community facilities.

5.6. Option 6 – Retain 41 Weld Street and dispose of 36 Weld Street

5.6.1. Advantages

- Retains a strategically located CBD property for redevelopment as a civic and community hub, supporting town centre activity and accessibility.
- Provides an opportunity to integrate Council functions, the District Library, community facilities and complementary services within a flexible, multipurpose development.
- With the library's current lease due to expire in approximately 18 months, presents an opportunity to consolidate services and potentially reduce reliance on leased accommodation.
- Creates opportunities for partnerships, shared facilities, external funding and alternative revenue streams, while providing flexibility to respond to future local government reform.
- Disposal of 36 Weld Street could release capital towards redevelopment and reduce Council's exposure to the ongoing costs and liabilities associated with the existing building.

5.6.2. Disadvantages

- Redevelopment of the 41 Weld Street site would require significant capital investment, with feasibility, site suitability and development costs yet to be confirmed.
- Council would remain responsible for property holding costs pending redevelopment and ongoing operating and renewal costs following completion.
- Disposal of 36 Weld Street would relinquish a centrally located Council property, with its seismic condition potentially affecting sale proceeds and disposal timeframes.
- Telecommunications infrastructure supporting Chorus and Police connectivity, together with Council's records storage, would require suitable relocation arrangements as part of the disposal process.

5.6.3. Financial Implications

- Independent market assessment in May 2025 identified 36 Weld Street at $1,754,000 and 41 Weld Street at $1,178,000..
- Redevelopment of the 41 Weld Street site would require a comprehensive capital cost assessment covering site preparation, demolition or modification of existing structures, design, consenting, construction, fit-out and infrastructure.
- Disposal of 36 Weld Street could generate proceeds of approximately $1,754,000, subject to market conditions, transaction costs and applicable requirements.
- Potential efficiencies from consolidating existing services, including the library, and opportunities for partner contributions or leasing revenue would need to be assessed and confirmed.
- A whole-of-life financial assessment would consider development and operating costs, maintenance, renewals, potential revenue, financing, depreciation and debt and rates implications.
- Development costs, disposal proceeds and associated funding arrangements would need to be reflected in any proposed Long Term Plan amendment.

5.6.4. Significance and Engagement Assessment

- Redevelopment of the 41 Weld Street site and disposal of 36 Weld Street would represent a significant investment and change to Council's property portfolio, requiring assessment against Council's Significance and Engagement Policy.
- A Long Term Plan amendment and associated public consultation are anticipated, subject to confirmation of statutory requirements.
- Consultation would need to clearly explain the proposed civic and community hub, development costs, potential disposal proceeds, affordability and anticipated community benefits.
- Engagement with community organisations, potential partners and existing service providers would help establish demand, development requirements and opportunities for shared investment.
- Disposal of 36 Weld Street would require appropriate arrangements for telecommunications infrastructure and records storage, alongside compliance with applicable property disposal requirements.

5.7. Option 7 – Dispose of both Weld Street properties and develop at Hokitika Airport

5.7.1. Advantages

- Enables Council to rationalise its property portfolio by disposing of both Weld Street properties and consolidating civic functions within a new facility at Hokitika Airport.
- Could release capital from both property sales to contribute towards development costs and reduce borrowing requirements.
- Removes Council's ongoing ownership, maintenance and renewal obligations for two buildings assessed at 25% NBS.
- Provides an opportunity to develop a modern, purpose-built facility incorporating contemporary seismic, accessibility, sustainability and health and safety standards.
- May offer greater flexibility for building design, future expansion and changing service delivery requirements, including potential local government reform.
- Allows Council to coordinate property disposals with the development of new civic infrastructure.

5.7.2. Disadvantages

- Relinquishes two strategically located CBD properties, reducing Council's flexibility to accommodate future civic and community services within the town centre.
- Relocating civic functions to the airport could reduce public accessibility and negatively affect CBD activity and local businesses.
- The condition and seismic ratings of both properties may affect market demand, sale proceeds and disposal timeframes.
- Development on airport land carries an opportunity cost, as the land has an existing value and its use could limit future aviation-related, commercial or alternative development opportunities.
- Airport development remains subject to site suitability, infrastructure capacity and aviation-related restrictions.
- Telecommunications infrastructure supporting Chorus and Police connectivity, together with Council's records storage, would require relocation arrangements.
- Property disposals and construction would need to be coordinated to minimise disruption and additional accommodation costs.

5.7.3. Financial Implications

- Independent market assessments in May 2025 identified 36 Weld Street at $1,754,000 and 41 Weld Street at $1,178,000, representing a combined indicative value of $2,932,000.
- Disposal proceeds could contribute towards new premises, subject to market conditions, transaction costs and relocation requirements.
- Disposal would remove future ownership and renewal obligations. Historical seismic strengthening estimates total approximately $7.34 million excluding GST, although these should not be treated as confirmed savings.
- Development costs cannot be reliably established until a suitable airport site and development model have been identified. The financial assessment would also need to account for the value and opportunity cost of airport land, alongside the wider economic implications of relocating Council's civic functions away from the Hokitika CBD.
- The assessment would need to account for the value and opportunity cost of airport land, net development costs after disposal proceeds, and transitional expenditure.
- A whole-of-life assessment would consider operating costs, maintenance, renewals, financing and debt and rates implications.
- Development and disposal arrangements would need to be reflected in any proposed Long Term Plan amendment.

5.7.4. Significance and Engagement Assessment

- Disposal of both CBD properties and relocation of civic functions would represent a significant change requiring assessment against Council's Significance and Engagement Policy.
- A Long Term Plan amendment and public consultation are anticipated, subject to confirmation of statutory requirements.
- Consultation would need to address disposal proceeds, development costs, affordability, accessibility and potential social and economic impacts on the CBD.
- Engagement with airport management, aviation stakeholders, Chorus and Police would be required to address site suitability and infrastructure relocation.
- Health and safety considerations would include management of existing properties, construction risks, public access and aviation-related requirements.

6. Risk Assessment

The proposed investment in future civic accommodation presents a range of strategic, financial, operational and delivery risks. These risks vary depending on the development model, location and future treatment of Council's existing properties.

The following assessment identifies the principal risks associated with the options, including the risks of retaining the existing properties, progressing a new development and delaying a long-term investment decision. The proposed mitigations are intended to support Council's consideration of the options and inform the further investigations required before a final investment decision is made.

Risk	Potential Consequences	Proposed Mitigation
Financial affordability and cost escalation	Capital costs may exceed initial estimates due to construction inflation, site conditions, infrastructure requirements or changes in development scope. This could increase borrowing, debt servicing costs and rates requirements.	Obtain updated, independently reviewed cost estimates for each development model and location. Include appropriate contingencies and undertake whole-of-life financial assessments, including affordability and sensitivity testing.
Uncertainty surrounding local government reform	Changes to local government structures, responsibilities or service delivery arrangements could result in a facility that no longer aligns with Council's future operational requirements.	Prioritise adaptable building design and flexible accommodation arrangements. Assess development models against potential changes in organisational structure and consider opportunities for shared or alternative use.
Loss of strategically located CBD assets	Disposal of both Weld Street properties could reduce Council's ability to accommodate future civic or community requirements within the town centre. Reacquisition of suitable land may be difficult or costly.	Assess the long-term strategic value and alternative uses of both properties alongside their market assessments. Consider the implications of disposal for future civic infrastructure and community service provision before making irreversible decisions.
Accessibility and town centre impacts	Relocating civic functions to Hokitika Airport could reduce accessibility for some residents and affect pedestrian activity, commercial spending and the wider vitality of the CBD.	Undertake an assessment of accessibility, transport requirements and potential economic and social impacts. Present the airport and CBD alternatives through community consultation before confirming a preferred location.
Site suitability and infrastructure constraints	Unforeseen ground conditions, infrastructure limitations, planning requirements or aviation-related restrictions could increase development costs, delay delivery or constrain the proposed facility.	Complete site-specific feasibility investigations, including geotechnical, infrastructure, planning and access assessments. For the airport site, confirm compatibility with existing aviation

Risk	Potential Consequences	Proposed Mitigation
		operations and future airport development requirements.
Development scope and partner commitments	A civic and community hub may become financially or operationally unsustainable if its scope exceeds demonstrated community demand or anticipated partners and funding contributions do not materialise.	Establish clear development objectives and distinguish essential Council requirements from additional community facilities. Confirm partner interest, potential funding arrangements and operating responsibilities before incorporating these into the final business case.
Property disposal and market uncertainty	The condition and seismic ratings of the Weld Street properties may affect buyer interest, achievable sale prices and disposal timeframes, potentially reducing the funding available for new development.	Use independent market assessments, obtain appropriate disposal advice and undertake financial sensitivity testing. Avoid committing to expenditure based on unconfirmed sale proceeds.
Telecommunications infrastructure and service continuity	Redevelopment or disposal of the Weld Street properties could disrupt telecommunications infrastructure associated with Chorus and Police connectivity, resulting in service interruptions, additional costs or delays.	Engage early with Chorus, Police and relevant technical specialists to identify infrastructure requirements, ownership and access arrangements, and any relocation or protection works. Confirm responsibilities and costs before redevelopment or disposal.
Records management and storage	Disposal or redevelopment of existing properties could compromise Council's document and records storage arrangements, resulting in additional costs, operational disruption or risks to information security and statutory recordkeeping obligations.	Develop a records relocation and storage plan, including appropriate physical security, environmental controls, accessibility and compliance requirements. Include associated costs in the financial assessment.
Health and safety during construction and transition	Construction, demolition, strengthening or relocation activities could create risks to staff, contractors, visitors and members of the public.	Require site-specific health and safety planning, contractor management, safe public access arrangements and appropriate emergency procedures. Ensure building compliance and operational safety requirements are addressed before occupation.
Project delivery and programme delays	Delays in feasibility investigations, consenting, procurement, funding approvals or construction could	Establish a realistic programme with clear milestones, responsibilities and decision points. Incorporate appropriate

Risk	Potential Consequences	Proposed Mitigation
	increase project costs and prolong reliance on interim accommodation arrangements.	contingencies and maintain oversight of costs, dependencies and delivery risks.
Statutory compliance and consultation	Failure to meet applicable Long Term Plan amendment, consultation, audit or property disposal requirements could result in legal challenge, delays or the need to repeat decision-making processes.	Obtain legal and financial advice on the statutory pathway, including Council's Significance and Engagement Policy and the Local Government Act 2002. Confirm consultation and audit requirements before establishing the programme for public engagement.
Risk of delaying a long-term decision	Continued uncertainty could prolong operational inefficiencies and interim accommodation costs, while exposing Council to further cost escalation and ongoing holding costs associated with the existing properties.	Progress the necessary technical, financial and statutory investigations within an agreed timeframe. Establish clear decision points that allow Council to consider the options without committing prematurely to a particular development model or location.

Overall Risk Considerations

The principal risks relate to the scale and affordability of the investment, the suitability of the proposed development for future Council and community requirements, and the potential loss of strategically located property assets.

While a purpose-built administration facility may provide greater certainty around the initial development scope, it could offer less flexibility should local government structures and service delivery arrangements change. Conversely, a civic and community hub could provide greater opportunities for shared use and long-term adaptability, but would require additional investigation to establish its financial viability, community demand and potential partnership arrangements.

The location decision also presents different risks. Development at Hokitika Airport would require careful consideration of accessibility, airport operations and the wider implications for the CBD. Development within the CBD may present greater site and construction constraints but could provide broader economic and community benefits.

Importantly, there is also a risk associated with taking no action. Delaying a decision would not remove Council's existing property obligations or the costs and operational challenges associated with interim accommodation.

The proposed mitigations provide a framework for further investigation and risk management. A more detailed project risk register would be developed once Council has determined which options should progress to the next stage of feasibility assessment and community consultation.

7. Preferred Option(s) and Reasons

7.1. The preferred option is to retain the 41 Weld Street site for the development of a civic and community hub and dispose of 36 Weld Street, subject to the completion of the necessary feasibility, financial and statutory assessments and community consultation.

7.2. This approach provides an opportunity to address Council's long-term accommodation requirements while delivering broader benefits for the Westland community. Rather than investing solely in a conventional administration facility, a civic and community hub would enable Council to consider the integration of its operational and governance functions with community facilities, public services and complementary activities.

7.3. Retaining the 41 Weld Street site would preserve a strategically located Council-owned property within the Hokitika CBD. Its redevelopment could contribute to the ongoing vitality of the town centre by maintaining civic activity, improving access to public and community services, and creating opportunities for increased pedestrian activity and engagement with surrounding businesses.

7.4. A civic and community hub would also provide greater flexibility in responding to potential changes in local government structures and service delivery responsibilities. A development designed to accommodate multiple functions and users could be adapted over time, reducing the risk of significant public investment being tied to Council's current organisational arrangements.

7.5. The preferred approach would enable Council to investigate opportunities for shared facilities, partnerships and alternative funding arrangements. While these opportunities remain subject to further investigation, they could support more efficient use of public infrastructure and potentially reduce the long-term financial burden on ratepayers.

7.6. Disposal of 36 Weld Street would provide an opportunity to rationalise Council's property portfolio and release capital towards the proposed development. Given the building's seismic condition and the significant investment required to strengthen and upgrade it, disposal would also avoid Council retaining responsibility for a property that may no longer provide the most appropriate long-term accommodation solution.

7.7. The preferred option is not without financial and delivery risks. The feasibility of redeveloping the 41 Weld Street site, including its structural condition, site suitability, functional requirements and total development costs, has yet to be established.

7.8. Similarly, the financial contribution available from the disposal of 36 Weld Street will depend on the achievable sale price and any costs associated with the disposal, including arrangements for telecommunications infrastructure supporting Chorus and Police connectivity and the relocation of Council's document and records storage.

7.9. On balance, the preferred option provides an opportunity to retain a strategic CBD asset, support the future development of Hokitika's town centre and establish flexible civic infrastructure capable of serving Council and the wider community over the long term. It also provides a potential pathway to rationalise Council's existing property portfolio and redirect investment towards a facility with broader public value.

7.10. It is therefore recommended that Council progress the retention and potential redevelopment of 41 Weld Street as a civic and community hub, alongside the proposed disposal of 36 Weld Street, as the preferred option for further detailed assessment and public consultation. A final investment and disposal decision would be subject to confirmation of the development's feasibility, affordability, funding arrangements and applicable statutory requirements, together with consideration of community feedback.

8. Recommendation(s)

8.1. That the report be received.

8.2. Notes the investigations undertaken in response to Council's resolutions of 14 October 2026, including the independent market assessments of 36 and 41 Weld Street and consideration of alternative locations and development models for future civic accommodation.

8.3. Directs the Chief Executive to progress the necessary feasibility, design and financial assessments for the proposed civic and community hub at 41 Weld Street, including consideration of potential community facilities, shared services, partnership opportunities and funding arrangements.

8.4. Directs the Chief Executive to undertake the necessary preparatory work for the proposed disposal of 36 Weld Street, including consideration of statutory requirements, telecommunications infrastructure associated with Chorus and Police connectivity, and Council's document and records storage arrangements.

8.5. Notes that endorsement of the preferred option does not constitute final approval to proceed with construction or disposal, and that final decisions will be made following consideration of the confirmed financial implications, feasibility assessments, statutory requirements and community consultation feedback.

Barbara Phillips
Chief Executive

Appendix 1: 29 May 2025, Council Report

Report to Council

DATE: 29th May 2025

TO: Mayor and Councillors

FROM: Chief Executive

COUNCIL HEADQUARTERS

1. Summary

1.1. The purpose of this report is to provide background information on the Council HQ Project.

1.2. This issue arises from the building being classified as earthquake-prone, with a deadline for strengthening by 11 June 2032.

1.3. Council seeks to meet its obligations under the Local Government Act 2002 and the achievement of the District Vision adopted by the Council in June 2024, which are set out in the Enhanced Annual Plan 2024/2025. Refer page 2 of the agenda.

1.4. This report concludes by recommending that Council receive the report.

2. Background

2.1 The reason the report has come before the Council is because the Council HQ building is classified as being earthquake-prone and under the government legislation it needs to be remediated by 11 June 2032 or Council Staff must relocate to another building.

2.2 The previous deadline for remediation was 11 June 2027. The Government brought forward a planned review of the earthquake-prone building system from 2027 to 2024. The review focused on how well the current system is managing seismic risk in existing buildings, and it looked to identify barriers to remediation of earthquake-prone buildings and examined the approach taken by other overseas jurisdictions in regions of high seismic risk. On 26 November 2024 The Building (Earthquake-prone Building Deadlines and Other Matters) Amendment Act has come into effect. The Amendment Act includes an extension of remediation deadlines for earthquake-prone buildings, strengthening of the building warrant of fitness scheme and other minor technical changes.

2.3 The key issues with this project have been identified. These are:

- Council owns a limited number of buildings within the CBD;
- The larger buildings within the CBD tend to be earthquake prone;
- We do not own the building where the library is currently located and will need to provide a new library space in the future as this building is not fit for requirements;
- The i-site is currently located on the ground floor of the Pakiwaitara building, and we will need to provide space for it;
- Councillors are reluctant to spend money on a new Council HQ building due to the cost to ratepayers and the associated reputational risk; and

- There has been inconsistency in Council decision making with regards to what buildings we own and would like to retain.

2.4 Numerous reports have been to Council over the past five years. Council staff have summarised the information and provided it below for Councillors. Please note the estimated project costs included in this section are no longer current.

2.5 **Building: Council Headquarters**

Address: 36 Weld Street

Occupant: Westland District Council Offices

Square Meterage: 2,027

Notes: Earthquake prone. NBS rating not determined and assumed as 0

History: In October 2023 strengthening and refurbishment layout plans were completed by Dalman Architects. This included the removal of i-Site and the library being relocated to the ground floor. This excluded some of the strengthening upgrade as it was an unknown at that time. The estimated costs including strengthening based on the previous SIMCO strengthening design, compliance and office refurbishment was $8,765,675.90.

In November 2024 an update of the estimate costs for the HQ strengthening and compliance upgrade was completed. No allowance was made for the refurbishment or fitout of the building. Structural engineering including Geotech testing has been completed to concept design stage. Services and accessibility studies have been completed to concept stage. Fire report completed in 2013 indicates that the building is non-compliant (some work identified within the report was carried out but not all) and that the public should not be accessing the Council meeting facilities on the top floor.

Strengthening and compliance upgrade of the current HQ building is the most cost effective and straightforward option for the Council. The cost estimate is $4,532,827.59. This includes the temporary relocation of staff and services to Pakiwaitara of $219,180.11 and a 10% contingency.

Documentation Available: Detailed Seismic assessment, Geotechnical Report, Seismic Strengthening Concept Design, Seismic Strengthening Desktop Summary Report

Valuation as at May 2025: $1,754,000 or $4,661,000 if strengthened

2.6 **Building: Pakiwaitara Building**

Address: 41 Weld Street

Occupant: Multiple small leases: Clocktower Café, Stonewood Homes, Massey University, isite, MTFJ, Hokitika Healers and Te Hono o Nga Waka.

Square Meterage: 1,567

Notes: Earthquake prone, NBS Rating 20-34%

History: In October 2023 strengthening and refurbishment plans were completed by Dalman Architects to house Council HQ. Alternative plans were also drafted by Dalman Architects to house a library and community hub. Both options worked well, and the plans demonstrated the building could be modified to suit either. Both options had similar estimated costs.

The cost estimate was $5,213,586.90 and it was suggested by Council that it was not the right building for the future Council HQ.

In May 2024, Council decided to sell the Pakiwaitara building as part of the next Long Term Plan.

Documentation Available: Detailed Seismic assessment, Review of Detailed Seismic Assessment Geotechnical Report, Seismic Strengthening Concept Design (for Council HQ), Seismic Strengthening Concept Design (for Library, Café and i-site), Seismic Strengthening Desktop Summary Report

Valuation as at May 2025: $1,178,000 or $4,006,000 if strengthened

2.7 **Description: Government House**

Address: 14 Sewell Street

Owner: Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga

Occupant: Vacant

Square Meterage: 1,045

Notes: This is a Category 2 listed heritage building. Earthquake strengthening of the building currently underway.

History: In May 2023, plans were completed by ArchitectureWorks to see if Council staff could be situated into this building. The net lettable space was 1,054.1m^2. After the plans were completed, they showed that the actual usable space was considerably less. It was 391m^2 short of fitting all staff.

Therefore, a vacant building on Sewell Street (next door) was also looked at. The cost estimate for Government House was $11,200,000.00 including a $10,000,000.00 contribution to assist with the structural upgrade of the building.

Documentation Available: Seddon and Sewell Building Options

2.8 **Description: Vacant building**

Address: 10 Sewell Street

Owner: Laurence O'Neill

Occupant: Department of Conservation (single story building only)

Square Meterage site: 6,547

(Single story building = 315 meters squared) (Two story building 840 meters squared)

Notes: Vacant single-story building has an NBS rating of 70%, Vacant two-story building has an NBS rating of 50%

History: In July 2023, plans were completed by ArchitectureWorks to see if this building could accommodate the overflow staff from Government House (see above regarding an option for Government House) for 667m^2. This building is assessed at above 34%NBS so not Earthquake prone, but the building would need a complete refurbishment and an upgrade to meet compliance standards.

This was estimated at $4,289,820.00 and needed to be combined with Government House option above. This option provides more space than required. And an expensive fitout of the building is required as all services need to be upgraded since it had been vacant for 12 years.

Documentation: Seddon and Sewell Building Options

2.9 **Option of New Build**

Council has the opportunity to build a new building for Council Headquarters. This could be in three locations: current Council HQ site, Pakiwaitara site or at the Airport. This will provide us with a purpose built facility.

A new building at the airport would be the most cost effective as there is no cost to demolish an existing building. The design for this has been drawn up by Dalman Architects with an estimated cost of $10,703,698.08.

A new building at the Pakiwaitara site was priced up by RDB Consultants.

There have been no costs priced up for re-building on the current Council HQ site however these are expected to be to similar costs to a build on the Pakiwaitara site.

Documentation Available: New WDC Building at Airport Drive Concept Design, RDB Consultants Estimated Costs

3. Current Situation

3.1. All options have been re-evaluated by Council Staff this year. The current available options are:
Option 1: Strengthen the current Council Headquarters
Option 2: Strengthen Pakiwaitara and relocate Council Headquarters
Option 3: Demolish Pakiwaitara and build a new Council Headquarters
Option 4: Relocate Council Headquarters to Government House

3.2. To provide Council with a way to make an informed strategic decision a SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats) analysis for each of the options was completed. This analysis is detailed below:

Option 1: Strengthen the current Council Headquarters

Strengths • Current HQ building • Most affordable option • Central CBD location • Council owns the building currently • Increase value of asst by at least $3.325m	**Opportunities** • Possible staged approach • Options for foundation strengthening
Weaknesses • Poor layout • Dated building • Existing tenant (Chorus) • Building issues (windows, airflow, fire compliance) • Lack in sustainable energy • Staff relocation • Can house EOC. However, building will not be strengthened to IL4. Instead, it will be IL2. Therefore, non-compliant. • Staff morale regarding building	**Threats** • Public perception of spending money on building • Construction industry costs - volatile environment • 2032 deadline for strengthening

• Lack amenities (Toilets, showers etc)	

Option 2: Strengthen Pakiwaitara and relocate Council Headquarters

Strengths • Central CBD location • Better layout • Less intrusive structural strengthening required. • Can repair building while council staff in existing building • Increase value of asset • Small distance for relocation. Minimal work disruption • Building not as old as HQ. • Potentially better staff moral due to new environment, e.g. café. • Lower rates	**Opportunities** • If council moved to Pakiwaitara we can sell council HQ. • More opportunities for layout design
Weaknesses • Constrained by existing layout/site. • Poor Maintenance in past means a lot of minor issues to fix • Premediated opinions from community/elected members • Currently in LTP for sale • Less parking • No lift • Can house EOC. However, building will not be strengthened to IL4. Instead, it will be IL2. Therefor non-compliant.	**Threats** • Council HQ may not be sold for the value council would like due to works required. • Could result in large empty building in CBD. • 2035 deadline for strengthening • Public perception of spending money on Pakiwaitara building

Option 3: Demolish Pakiwaitara and build a new Council Headquarters

Strengths • Central CBD location • Best layout • Modern amenities such as HVAC, Fire security etc • More sustainable building • Increase useful life	**Opportunities** • If council moved to Pakiwaitara we can sell current council HQ • Option to incorporate tenantable spaces • Opportunity to build a new architecturally designed building at entrance to town/CBD • Option to house Council HQ, Library and isite.

• Better staff moral • Easier construction process. No pre-existing layout etc • Ability to design from scratch • Larger land area	
Weaknesses • River running underneath the building, resulting in expensive foundation design • Losing small amount of tenant income • Premeditated opinions from community/elected members • Currently in LTP for sale • Less parking • Must have built by 2032 otherwise council staff will have to relocate somewhere else or work remote • Potential increase in rates	**Threats** • Council HQ may not be sold for the value council would like due to works required. • Could result in large empty building in CBD • Perception of community in regard to spending money on Pakiwaitara/that site.

Option 4: Relocate Council Headquarters to government house

Strengths • Central CBD location • Already structurally strengthened by owner • Staff moral could improve due to new building environment	**Opportunities** • Work in a historic building
Weaknesses • Council do not own this building/land • Constrained by the layout and floor area • Limited on-site parking • Council required to contribute $10million towards the project for an asset we wouldn't own	**Threats** • Council HQ may not be sold for the value council would like due to works required. • Could result in large empty building in CBD • Pakiwaitara building could also remain empty at the entrance to town/CBD • Change in government could mean change in appetite to fund project • Government run out of money during construction • Public perception of spending money on a building we wouldn't own

3.3. The current considerations for a Council Headquarters Building are:

- For staffing requirements, our current staff numbers are 66 although we normally budget for 70 to allow for a small increase.

- The Building Standards state we need to provide a minimum of 10m2 per staff member although they suggest that 14 – 17 m2 per person is more appropriate.
- A minimum of 150m2 for the Council chambers and meeting rooms.
- A minimum of 150m2 for printing, server rooms and archives.
- A staff room; our current one is 56m2.
- Toilets and breakout spaces.
- Parking requirements are likely to be similar to what we have currently.
- The minimum NBS rating for any building we occupy is 67%.
- If we use the building as an Emergency Operations Centre it needs to be IL4, otherwise it can be IL2.
- A library and i-site could be included.

3.4. If Council delay remediation or a new build for more than two years some compliance items will need to be completed to the Council Headquarters. A fire report was done in 2013, which highlighted these. Some of this work was completed in 2014 but there are two main remaining items. These are:

- The council chambers has not been assessed for a public risk group, but instead the assessment was based on a meeting room. The difference between the two risk groups is how familiar the occupants are with escape routes, which corresponds with the time it takes to escape. Having public in the council chambers could very likely be considered a change of use of part of the building. A new report would thus have to be done, which will detail the changes that needs to be made.
- Weld Street stairwell is constructed as a vertical safe path, a path that is fully separated from the building with fire and smoke separations. To comply with this a -/60/60sm fire rated curtain at the public counter, fire rated windows, fire separations to form the safe path and other minor works is required.

4. Options

4.1. Option 1: That Council receives the report.

4.2. Option 2: That Council does not receive the report.

5. Risk Analysis

5.1. Risk has been considered and no risks have been identified.

6. Health and Safety

6.1. Health and Safety has been considered and no items have been identified.

7. Significance and Engagement

7.1. The level of significance has been assessed as being low. The report is administrative in nature.

- No public consultation is considered necessary.

8. Assessment of Options (including Financial Considerations)

8.1. Option 1 – That the report be received. This report outlines the history of the Council Headquarters Project and the current options available to Council. There are no financial implications for this option.

8.2. Option 2 – That Council does not receive the report. There is no reason for Council not to receive the report. There are no financial implication for this option.

9. Preferred Option(s) and Reasons

9.1. The preferred option is Option 1.

9.2. The reason that Option 1 has been identified as the preferred option is that it allows Council to acknowledge the information contained in the report.

10. Recommendation(s)

10.1. That the report be received.

Barbara Phillips
Chief Executive

Report to Council

DATE: 11 November 2026

TO: Mayor and Councillors

FROM: General Manager – Regulatory and Compliance

Rates v User Pays

1. Summary

The purpose of this report is to inform Council regarding the rates v user pays ratios for services provided, and to determine the required ratios for long term plan considerations.

The report considers the financial and operational implications of changing existing funding ratios, service affordability, Council's statutory responsibilities and the wider community benefits of Council services, including their contribution to liveability, cultural identity, economic activity and environmental outcomes.

It recommends that Council considers a staged approach to increasing user-pays contributions for selected services, while recognising that other services warrant continued rates support. Opportunities to improve operational efficiency and manage costs are also considered, for inclusion in the Draft Long Term Plan.

Council is considering which proposals and options should be included in the Draft Long Term Plan consultation document. This report brings the proposal back from the Long Term Plan (LTP) workshop on 15 September 2026 for formal decision.

2. Background

There are various Council services that have both a rating and user pays funding source. The ratios for these vary for each service, depending on different factors e.g. the costs of the service, the number of users and public good aspects of the service.

While fees and charges are reviewed annually, the long term plan provides an opportunity to consider whether the existing funding ratios remain appropriate and equitable, particularly given increasing financial pressures on ratepayers and the need to ensure Council services remain affordable and sustainable.

At the Long Term Plan workshop on 15 September 2026, Council considered reviewing the rates and user-pays contributions for services funded through both sources. The discussion focused on the potential to reduce rates funding by increasing cost recovery from users, while recognising the financial implications for individuals and the need for any changes to be introduced progressively.

Balancing Rates and User-Pays Funding

Increasing the proportion of costs recovered through fees and charges can reduce the contribution required from rates. However, the extent of any reduction depends on the number of users, the cost of providing the service and the level of fees that can reasonably be charged.

Significant fee increases may discourage people from accessing services, reducing anticipated revenue and potentially increasing the contribution required from rates to maintain service delivery.

This is particularly relevant in Westland District, where Council must maintain statutory services and essential community facilities across a large geographical area with a relatively small population and rating base.

The funding approach must therefore balance affordability for individual users, fairness to ratepayers, statutory obligations and the wider public benefits provided by Council services.

The services considered in this report differ in their statutory requirements, operating costs and public and private benefits. Regulatory activities provide direct benefits to applicants as well as community protection; community and visitor services contribute to wellbeing, heritage, economic activity and liveability; and waste management and cemeteries involve continuing public and environmental obligations. A consistent assessment is appropriate, but not a uniform user-pays target.

2.1. Regulatory and Compliance

Building Services

Council undertakes building control functions as an accredited Building Consent Authority (BCA), including processing building consents, undertaking inspections and ensuring compliance with statutory requirements.

Under the Building Act 2004 and associated regulations, Council is required to meet prescribed performance requirements, including:

- **Building consent processing:** Applications must generally be processed within 20 working days, with the statutory timeframe suspended where further information is requested.
- **Building inspections:** A minimum of 80% of building inspections must be completed within three working days of the inspection date requested by the building owner or their agent.

Council must also maintain its BCA accreditation through regular independent assessments and audits, ensuring sufficient staffing, technical capability and appropriately assessed Building Control Officers to meet these statutory obligations. Building Control Officers are subject to regular competency assessments to ensure they maintain the necessary skills and knowledge.

Maintaining these statutory requirements presents particular challenges for a small district, where building consent applications fluctuate in number, complexity and value. Council must retain sufficient capacity and capability to meet its obligations regardless of application volumes, while managing the costs of providing the service against an uncertain revenue stream.

Recent legislative changes enabling greater involvement of private Building Consent Authorities may also affect future application volumes and associated revenue, while Council continues to retain its statutory responsibilities.

In addition to building consent processing and inspections, the team undertakes wider territorial authority functions, including customer enquiries, building warrant of fitness checks, enforcement relating to unconsented building work and residential pool barrier inspections. These functions provide broader public benefits that must also be recognised when determining the appropriate balance between rates and user-pays funding.

The current funding ratio is 56% rates and 44% user pays. Moving to a 50:50 ratio would require a further increase in fees to reduce the rates contribution.

Indicative modelling suggests that the combined impact of the revised overhead allocation and proposed funding ratio adjustment could increase an average building consent cost from approximately $7,500 to $9,450.

Given the potential impact on individual applicants, it is proposed that the funding ratio progressively moves to 50% rates and 50% user pays over three years, with a further review at the end of that period.

Opportunities to improve efficiency and reduce service delivery costs, including greater collaboration and potential shared service arrangements with neighbouring councils, should also be investigated. Any such arrangements would need to maintain statutory compliance, service accessibility and sufficient capability to meet the needs of Westland District.

Planning Services (Resource Management)

Council undertakes statutory planning and resource management functions under the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA), and now the Planning Act 2026 and the Natural Environment Act 2026, including processing resource consent applications, providing planning advice, monitoring compliance and undertaking enforcement activities.

Under the RMA, resource consent applications are generally subject to a statutory processing timeframe of 20 working days for non-notified applications, with different timeframes applying to notified applications and certain other processes. Statutory timeframes may be suspended where further information is requested or other legislative provisions apply.

Maintaining these statutory requirements presents challenges for Council, particularly given fluctuating application volumes, varying levels of complexity and the need to retain appropriately qualified and experienced planning staff. These challenges are compounded by ongoing resource management reform, which creates uncertainty around future legislative requirements, service delivery arrangements and the capability Council will need to maintain.

The service also provides pre-application advice to assist applicants in understanding planning requirements and preparing complete applications. This can reduce the need for further information, minimise processing delays and help manage costs for both applicants and Council.

In addition to consent processing, the team undertakes compliance monitoring, investigations and enforcement relating to activities undertaken without the necessary approvals or in breach of consent conditions. These functions provide wider public benefits that must be recognised when determining the appropriate balance between rates and user-pays funding.

The current funding ratio is 75% rates and 25% user pays. Moving to a 70:30 ratio would require a further increase in fees to reduce the rates contribution.

Indicative modelling suggests that the proposed funding ratio adjustment could increase an average resource consent cost from approximately $3,500 to $4,970.

Given the potential impact on individual applicants, it is proposed that the funding ratio progressively moves to 70% rates and 30% user pays over three years, with a further review at the end of that period.

Opportunities to improve efficiency and reduce service delivery costs, including streamlined processes, greater use of technology and potential shared service arrangements with neighbouring councils, should also be considered. Any changes would need to maintain statutory compliance, appropriate technical capability and timely, accessible planning services for Westland District.

Hokitika Swimming Pool

The Hokitika Swimming Pool is an important community facility that supports recreation, swimming education, health and wellbeing, and the overall liveability of Westland District.

Like most public swimming pools, the facility requires a substantial rates contribution to remain operational. While fees and charges are reviewed annually, there is a limit to the level of cost recovery that can reasonably be achieved without affecting affordability and accessibility for users.

Community feedback received through the Annual Plan process reinforced the importance of the pool and the value residents place on retaining an accessible and affordable swimming facility. These wider

community benefits need to be considered alongside Council's objective of reducing the rates contribution to services.

The current funding ratio is approximately 93% rates and 7% user pays. It is proposed that this progressively changes to 90% rates and 10% user pays over three years, with a further review at the end of that period.

While this approach would provide for a modest increase in user contributions, the revised overhead allocation means that an increase in the overall rates contribution may still be required to maintain existing service levels.

Any changes to fees and charges would need to be considered alongside community feedback, the affordability of access and opportunities to improve operational efficiency. The objective is to achieve an appropriate balance between cost recovery, financial sustainability and maintaining a valued community facility that contributes to the district's liveability.

Animal Control, Alcohol and Environmental Health

Revised overhead allocation has resulted in reduced costs being attributed to Animal Control, Alcohol Licensing and Environmental Health, providing an opportunity to reduce the rates contribution required to fund these services.

The indicative changes are as follows:

- Animal control: The rates-funded proportion would reduce from 68% to 62%.
- Alcohol licensing: The rates-funded proportion would reduce from 73% to 58%.
- Environmental Health: The rates-funded proportion would reduce from 85% to 80%.

These services undertake statutory regulatory, monitoring and enforcement functions that provide both individual and wider community benefits. Maintaining an appropriate balance between rates and user-pays funding is therefore important to ensure Council can continue to meet its legislative obligations while recovering costs where appropriate.

Rates vs User Pays – Annual Plan 2026/2027

Regulatory and Compliance		
Service	**Current Rates**	**Current User Pays (Fees and Charges)**
Building Control	56%	44%
Resource Management	75%	25%
Hokitika Swimming Pool	93%	7%
Animal Control	68%	32%
Alcohol Licensing	73%	27%
Environmental Health	87%	15%
Hokitika Museum	88%	11%
i-site	59%	41%
Hokitika Library	99%	1%
Waste Management	71%	29%
Cemetery Management	89%	11%

The Regulatory and Compliance services account for approximately 17.7% ($3.2M) of the current budget. These services form part of Council's core statutory responsibilities and must be maintained regardless of the number of applications, inspections or other regulatory activities undertaken.

Westland District faces particular challenges in delivering these services across a large geographical area with a relatively small population and rating base. Council must maintain the same statutory standards and technical capability as larger authorities, despite having significantly fewer service users over which to recover costs. This places proportionately greater pressure on ratepayers and reinforces the need to continually assess how services are delivered.

For regulatory services, the review should also consider simplifying processes, reducing duplication, using technology where appropriate, improving inspection coordination and exploring regional collaboration. Changing funding ratios alone does not reduce the underlying cost of service delivery.

2.2. Business Enablement

The Hokitika Museum, isite and Library provide important community and visitor services that contribute to the overall liveability, identity and attractiveness of Westland District.

While each service has different operational requirements and opportunities for generating revenue, all provide wider community benefits that extend beyond those who directly use the facilities. These benefits need to be considered when determining the appropriate balance between rates and user-pays funding.

Hokitika Museum

The Hokitika Museum plays an important role in preserving and sharing the district's cultural heritage, history and identity. Its collections and associated services contribute to community pride, education, tourism and the preservation of Westland's heritage for future generations.

The costs of maintaining collections, meeting appropriate conservation standards and providing public access are ongoing and cannot reasonably be recovered entirely through admission fees or other user charges.

The current funding ratio is approximately 88% rates and 11% user pays, reflecting the wider public benefits associated with preserving the district's heritage with annual operating costs of $430k and fees and charges revenue of approximately $60k.

If the ratios were to be adjusted to an 80 / 20 funding split while maintaining service levels would require entry fees for visitors to increase from $10 to around $20 per visitor. While this may remain reasonable for many visitors and tourists to the district it does remain on the higher end of the average throughout New Zealand and illustrates the trade off that would take place.

Opportunities to improve commercial revenue and reduce operating costs, including accommodation and staffing arrangements, should be assessed separately. Potential savings have not yet been confirmed.

Any consideration of increased cost recovery would need to balance revenue opportunities against accessibility, heritage protection and the long-term sustainability of the service.

Hokitika isite

The Hokitika isite provides visitor information and services that support the district's tourism economy, local businesses and visitor experience.

While some activities generate revenue through bookings and other commercial services, the wider benefits include promoting local attractions, encouraging visitor expenditure, supporting local businesses and providing information that assists visitors to navigate the district.

These benefits extend beyond individual customers and contribute to the economic sustainability and liveability of Westland, particularly given the importance of tourism to the local economy.

The current rates contribution is approximately 59%, with the balance funded through other revenue sources, including user-generated income.

The ability to increase user charges is limited as fee revenue will not materially offset overhead costs. Future opportunities may arise through building options, operational model changes, A potential relocation to new building, review of depreciating funds, and shared service staff model could reduce costs over time.

Opportunities to improve commercial revenue and operational efficiency should continue to be considered. However, any changes to funding arrangements would need to recognise the broader economic benefits of visitor servicing and the importance of maintaining an effective visitor information service.

Hokitika Library

The Hokitika Library provides an essential community service that supports literacy, education, digital inclusion, lifelong learning and social connection.

Libraries contribute significantly to community wellbeing and liveability by providing accessible information, resources, technology and spaces for people of all ages and backgrounds.

The benefits extend beyond individual library users, supporting educational achievement, community participation and equitable access to information and services.

The current funding ratio is approximately 99% rates and 1% user pays, reflecting the predominantly public-good nature of the service.

While opportunities for additional revenue and operational efficiencies may exist, significant increases in user charges could create barriers to access and undermine the broader community benefits the library provides.

The ability to increase user charges is limited as fee revenue will not materially offset overhead costs. Future opportunities may arise through building options, operational model changes, A potential relocation to new building, review of depreciating funds, and shared service staff model could reduce costs over time.

Funding Considerations

Collectively, these services contribute to making Westland an attractive and sustainable place to live, work and visit. Their value is not measured solely through direct revenue or the number of individual users, but also through their contribution to community wellbeing, economic activity, cultural identity and the district's long-term liveability.

While Council must continue to assess operating costs, service delivery arrangements and opportunities for greater efficiency, a substantial rates contribution is likely to remain necessary to maintain accessible and effective services.

Any future changes to funding ratios should therefore consider the wider public benefits, affordability and accessibility of these services alongside Council's objective of managing costs and reducing pressure on ratepayers.

2.3. District Assets

Waste Management

Council has responsibilities for waste management and minimisation services, including the provision of waste disposal and recycling facilities for the community. These services are costly to operate, and landfill disposal costs are further affected by government waste levies and carbon-related obligations, currently estimated at approximately $525,000.

The current funding split is approximately 71% rates and 29% user pays. While increasing user charges could reduce the direct rates contribution, significant increases in disposal and recycling charges may encourage illegal dumping or fly-tipping. The additional cost of investigating and cleaning up dumped waste could offset anticipated revenue gains and increase the overall cost to the community.

A continued rates contribution therefore recognises the wider public and environmental benefits of accessible waste services. Any review of the funding ratio would need to consider affordability, the risk of illegal dumping and the full cost of service delivery.

Cemetery Management

Council has statutory responsibilities for cemetery services, including the ongoing management and maintenance of cemeteries. Burial and interment charges recover a contribution from individual users, but cemetery costs extend well beyond the time of burial.

These costs include ongoing grounds maintenance, mowing and the upkeep of cemetery facilities and burial areas. The expectation of maintenance in perpetuity makes full recovery of lifetime costs through a single user charge impractical.

Westland District has multiple cemeteries but undertakes only approximately 25–30 interments each year. This relatively low volume limits the revenue that can reasonably be generated through burial fees, while the maintenance obligations remain ongoing.

The current funding split is approximately 89% rates and 11% user pays. Maintaining an appropriate rates contribution recognises the long-term community benefit of cemeteries and the need to provide dignified, well-maintained facilities across the district.

3. Workshop Direction and Additional Information

Following the Long Term Plan workshop on 15 September 2026, further information has been prepared to support Council's consideration of the appropriate balance between rates and user-pays funding and the proposals to be included in the Draft Long Term Plan consultation document.

3.1. Financial and Operational Considerations

Across Council services, the appropriate rates and user-pays balance depends on the nature of the benefit and the extent to which charges are practical and affordable. For regulatory services, higher applicant cost recovery may be feasible; for community, visitor and infrastructure services, wider public benefits, accessibility and continuing obligations may justify substantial rates funding. The review should distinguish reallocating costs between funding sources from reducing actual expenditure.

Reducing the rates contribution to selected services requires increased fee revenue , lower underlying expenditure, alternative funding or a combination of these measures.

Westland District faces particular challenges in delivering statutory services across a large geographical area with a relatively small population and rating base. Council must maintain the same statutory standards as larger authorities despite having fewer service users over which to recover costs. Recruiting and retaining appropriately qualified staff also presents challenges.

Increasing user-pays contributions may result in significant fee increases for individual applicants, while delivering relatively modest reductions in the overall rates requirement. Higher fees may also discourage applications or service use, potentially reducing revenue and increasing the remaining rates contribution.

While the financial benefits of changing funding ratios may be relatively modest, the proposed changes would demonstrate Council's commitment to reviewing the distribution of costs and responding to community expectations.

3.2. Regulatory Compliance and Enforcement

Council's regulatory teams apply a graduated approach to compliance and enforcement, taking into account the seriousness of non-compliance, previous compliance history and the circumstances of individual cases.

Infringement fees and penalties are generally prescribed through the relevant legislation, including the Building Act 2004, Resource Management Act 1991, Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012 and Food Act 2014. Council's discretion over the amounts imposed is therefore limited where statutory penalties apply.

Regulatory decisions must be made consistently, fairly and in accordance with legislative requirements. While enforcement decisions can generate complaints or dissatisfaction, operational matters remain the responsibility of the Chief Executive and senior leadership team, with elected members responsible for governance and policy direction.

3.3. Regional Collaboration and Service Delivery

Greater collaboration and shared services with neighbouring councils may provide opportunities to improve efficiency, strengthen technical capability and reduce costs.

However, the effectiveness of shared service arrangements depends on clear responsibilities, adequate resourcing and consistent service delivery across the West Coast. Existing arrangements can be challenged when individual councils experience competing demands on staff and resources.

Any future agreements would need to provide sufficient certainty that services can be maintained across the region, rather than prioritising the requirements of individual councils during periods of increased demand.

The potential implications of future local government reform also reinforce the importance of considering opportunities for greater regional coordination, while recognising that the timing and nature of any structural changes remain uncertain.

3.4. Community Engagement Feedback

Regulatory and Compliance received the strongest signal for reduced spending during the Long Term Plan engagement process, with participants reducing the proposed funding allocation by an average of 3.6%.

Feedback consistently emphasised the need for greater efficiency, proportionality and value for money. Participants identified regulatory processes as complex, time-consuming and costly, with a preference for simpler requirements, faster processing and more practical approaches to service delivery.

There was also strong support for increasing user-pays contributions, particularly for building consents, resource consents, licensing and other services where individuals receive a direct benefit. However, respondents generally recognised that services and infrastructure providing wider community benefits should continue to receive rates funding.

Key priorities identified through engagement included:

- Streamlining processes and reducing unnecessary duplication.
- Improving processing times and service responsiveness.
- Making greater use of technology and automation.

- Investigating shared services and greater regional coordination.
- Increasing cost recovery from individual service users where appropriate.
- Demonstrating operational efficiencies and value for money before committing to additional expenditure.

3.5. Considerations for Council

In determining the preferred approach for the Draft Long Term Plan, Council will need to balance the community's expectations for reduced rates funding and improved efficiency against the affordability of fees, the potential impact on service demand and the requirement to maintain statutory service delivery.

Consideration should also be given to whether changes to funding ratios should be implemented progressively, alongside further investigation of operational efficiencies and opportunities for regional collaboration.

This approach would enable Council to respond to community feedback while recognising the financial and operational implications of shifting a greater proportion of service costs from ratepayers to individual users.

4. Proposal and Options

The proposal seeks to review the balance between rates and user-pays funding for selected Council services to improve the equitable distribution of costs, reduce pressure on ratepayers and respond to community expectations for greater efficiency and value for money.

The review recognises that Council must maintain statutory services and essential community facilities while balancing the affordability of fees and charges with the wider public benefits these services provide.

Two options are presented for Council's consideration.

4.1. Option 1 – Retain Existing Funding Ratios

Retain the current rates and user-pays funding ratios for Council services, with fees and charges continuing to be reviewed annually.

Under this option:

- Existing funding ratios would remain unchanged, with the rates contribution continuing to reflect the public benefit and statutory requirements associated with each service.
- Annual fees and charges reviews would continue to consider changes in operating costs.
- Any additional costs not recovered through fees and charges would continue to be funded through rates or managed through operational efficiencies.
- Opportunities to improve service delivery and reduce costs could continue to be investigated through existing operational processes.

This option would avoid additional changes to funding ratios but may result in increased rates contributions where service costs rise and additional revenue cannot reasonably be recovered from users.

4.2. Option 2 – Progressive Adjustment of Funding Ratios and Service Efficiency Improvements (recommended)

Progressively increase the proportion of costs recovered through user fees and charges for selected services over three years, alongside a continued focus on improving operational efficiency and reducing service delivery costs.

The proposed changes are:

Service	Current rates/user pays	Proposed rates/user pays	Implementation
Building Control	56% / 44%	50% / 50%	Progressively over three years
Resource Management	75% / 25%	70% / 30%	Progressively over three years
Hokitika Swimming Pool	93% / 7%	90% / 10%	Progressively over three years

The revised overhead allocations for Animal Control, Alcohol Licensing and Environmental Health would also be reflected in the financial modelling, recognising the identified opportunities to reduce their rates-funded contributions.

For Hokitika Museum, isite, Hokitika Library, Waste Management and Cemetery Management, Option 2 would retain existing funding ratios at this stage, while continuing to review service costs, operating models, revenue opportunities and public benefits. No additional change to these funding ratios is proposed through this report.

Under this option, Council would:

- Progressively adjust the identified funding ratios over three years to manage the financial impact on individual service users.
- Review fees and charges annually to reflect changes in service costs, revised overhead allocations and the proposed funding ratios.
- Investigate opportunities to improve efficiency, including streamlined processes, greater use of technology, improved coordination of inspections and potential shared service arrangements with neighbouring councils.
- Monitor the impact of fee increases on service demand, revenue recovery, affordability and the rates contribution.
- Undertake a further review of the funding ratios at the end of the three-year transition period.

The proposed approach recognises that different services provide varying levels of public and private benefit and that full cost recovery through user fees may not be appropriate or achievable.

It would enable Council to progressively increase user contributions where appropriate, while maintaining statutory service requirements and the accessibility of important community facilities.

The financial implications, including the impact on rates and individual fees and charges, would be further assessed through the Long Term Plan financial modelling before implementation.

5. Assessment of Options

5.1. Option 1 – Status Quo: Retain Existing Funding Ratios

5.1.1. Advantages

- Maintains the existing balance between rates and user-pays funding, recognising the wider public benefits and statutory responsibilities associated with Council services.
- Avoids additional fee increases arising specifically from changes to funding ratios, helping maintain affordability for individual service users.
- Provides greater certainty for applicants and facility users
- Reduces the risk of declining service demand and associated revenue resulting from significant increases in fees and charges.

- Maintains existing levels of service and allows Council to continue meeting its statutory obligations without changing current funding arrangements.

5.1.2. Disadvantages

- Does not respond directly to community feedback seeking greater cost recovery from individual service users and a reduced burden on ratepayers.
- Retains the existing distribution of costs, which may not adequately reflect the balance between public and private benefits for some services.
- May result in increased rates contributions where operating costs rise without corresponding increases in user revenue.
- Provides limited opportunity to progressively adjust funding ratios to reflect changing service costs and community expectations.
- May reduce the incentive to undertake a broader review of funding arrangements and opportunities to improve service delivery efficiency.

5.1.3. Financial Implications

- This option would retain the existing rates and user-pays funding ratios, with fees and charges continuing to be reviewed annually.
- Maintaining existing funding ratios would avoid additional fee increases specifically associated with changing the proportion of costs recovered from users. However, it would not prevent fee increases arising from inflation or other operating cost pressures.
- No additional capital expenditure is proposed under this option. Existing operational costs would continue to be funded through the current combination of rates and user charges, subject to annual budget and fees and charges reviews.
- The overall rates impact would depend on the final Long Term Plan financial modelling and the extent to which additional service costs can be recovered or offset.

5.2. Option 2 – Progressive Adjustment of Funding Ratios and Service Efficiency Improvements

5.2.1. Advantages

- Responds to community feedback seeking greater efficiency, proportionality and cost recovery from those directly benefiting from Council services.
- Provides an opportunity to progressively reduce the proportion of service costs funded through rates, where increased user contributions are appropriate and achievable.
- Introduces changes over three years, allowing the financial impact on individual users to be managed rather than imposing significant immediate increases.
- Recognises the different public and private benefits associated with regulatory services and community facilities, rather than applying a uniform funding approach.
- Supports a broader review of service delivery costs, including opportunities for process improvements, technology, shared services and regional collaboration.
- Provides an opportunity to monitor the impact of changes on affordability, service demand, revenue recovery and levels of service before undertaking a further review.
- Demonstrates Council's commitment to reviewing funding arrangements and improving value for money while maintaining its statutory responsibilities.

5.2.2. Disadvantages

- Increasing user-pays contributions may result in substantial fee increases for individual applicants and facility users, particularly when combined with the impact of revised overhead allocations.
- Higher fees may discourage applications or use of Council facilities, reducing anticipated revenue and potentially increasing the remaining rates contribution.

- The relatively small number of users across some services may limit the extent to which increased cost recovery can deliver meaningful reductions in the overall rates requirement.
- Increased charges may affect affordability and accessibility, particularly for services such as the Hokitika Swimming Pool that provide wider community benefits.
- Operational efficiencies and shared service opportunities may take time to investigate and implement, with financial savings uncertain.
- Changes to funding ratios do not reduce the underlying cost of delivering services and may create expectations of rates reductions that cannot be fully achieved.
- Council will need to ensure that changes to fees and funding arrangements do not compromise statutory compliance, service quality or operational capability.

5.2.3. Financial Implications

- This option would progressively adjust the rates and user-pays funding ratios for Building Control, Resource Management and the Hokitika Swimming Pool over three years.
- The proposed changes would increase the proportion of operating costs recovered through fees and charges, with the intention of reducing the rates-funded proportion of these services.
- Indicative modelling identifies potential increases in average consent costs from approximately $7,500 to $9,450 for Building Control and from $3,500 to $4,970 for Resource Management. These estimates require confirmation before being used to inform final funding decisions.
- For the Hokitika Swimming Pool, the additional overhead allocation of approximately $135,869 is unlikely to be fully recovered through increased fees without materially affecting affordability and patronage. An increased rates contribution may therefore still be required despite the proposed adjustment to the funding ratio.
- No additional capital expenditure is proposed directly through this option. However, operational improvements involving technology, process changes or shared service arrangements may require further investment, which would need to be assessed separately.
- The overall financial impact will depend on the final funding ratios, annual fees and charges decisions, service demand and any operational efficiencies achieved.
- The proposed changes would be incorporated into the Draft Long Term Plan financial modelling, with the implications for rates, service affordability and future operating expenditure identified before implementation.
- Both options would need to maintain Council's statutory responsibilities and required levels of service, including compliance with applicable regulatory and service delivery requirements.
- Any changes to the allocation of costs between rates and user-pays funding would need to be assessed against Council's Revenue and Financing Policy, Funding Impact Statement and Significance and Engagement Policy, together with the applicable requirements of the Local Government Act 2002.
- Option 2 would require the proposed funding ratios and associated financial implications to be reflected in the Draft Long Term Plan consultation material, with subsequent changes to individual fees and charges progressed through the appropriate statutory and annual review processes.

6. Risk Assessment

The key risks associated with the proposed funding arrangements relate to financial sustainability, service affordability, operational capability and community expectations.

Risk	Option	Potential Impact	Mitigation
Continued pressure on rates	Option 1 – Status Quo	Retaining existing funding ratios may increase the burden on ratepayers as operating costs rise, particularly where additional costs cannot be recovered through fees and charges.	Continue reviewing service delivery costs, identifying operational efficiencies and assessing funding arrangements through the Long Term Plan and annual budget processes.
Reduced service demand and revenue	Option 2 – Progressive Adjustment	Significant increases in fees and charges may discourage service use, resulting in lower-than-anticipated revenue and potentially requiring additional unbudgeted rates funding.	Phase changes over three years, monitor service demand and revenue recovery, and review fees annually to ensure financial assumptions remain appropriate.
Affordability and accessibility	Option 2 – Progressive Adjustment	Higher fees may make regulatory services and community facilities less affordable, particularly where users face substantial increases arising from revised overhead allocations.	Consider affordability and wider community benefits when setting fees, retain appropriate rates contributions and monitor the impact of changes on service accessibility.
Staff retention and operational capability	Both options	Ongoing cost pressures, public scrutiny and criticism of regulatory decisions may affect staff morale, recruitment and retention, potentially compromising service delivery and statutory compliance.	Maintain clear governance and operational responsibilities, support staff in applying statutory requirements consistently, and investigate opportunities for shared services and improved operational resilience.
Community expectations and financial outcomes	Both options	Retaining existing ratios may be perceived as failing to respond to community feedback, while increasing user-pays contributions may create expectations of rates reductions that are not achieved.	Clearly communicate the distinction between changing funding contributions and reducing actual service costs, supported by transparent financial modelling and ongoing reporting.

The risks associated with Option 2 are considered manageable through a staged implementation approach, regular monitoring and continued review of service delivery costs.

While Option 1 avoids the additional affordability risks associated with changing funding ratios, it does not directly address community expectations for greater cost recovery and reduced pressure on rates.

7. Recommendation(s)

7.1. That the report be received.
7.2. Note Option 2 is staff's recommended option for the Draft Long Term Plan 2027-2037.
7.3. Identify Council's preferred option.

Lee Webster
General Manager – Regulatory and Compliance

Appendix 1: 15.09.26 – Rates v User Pays LTP Proposal

LTP Key Proposal – Rates v User Pays Ratios

Cost Centre	Rates v User Pays Ratios
LTP Forecast	-
Funding Source	Rates and Fees/ Charges
Author / Lead	General Manager Regulatory and Compliance
Community Outcome	Enabling a liveable district Providing future-fit infrastructure and services

Background

There are various Council services that have a rating and user pays funding source.

The ratios for these vary for each service, depending on different factors e.g. the costs of the service, the number of users and public good aspects of the service.

Fees and charges are reviewed annually, however the LTP provides for a timely review of these ratios.

Proposal

To review each service that has a rating and user pays ratio.

To determine the impact of varying the ratios regarding the rating reduction and user pays increase to individuals.

To propose immediate and long-term incremental solutions.

Impact

An increase in user pays to reduce the rating contribution may have a significant impact due to small numbers using a service.

While any rating reductions may have a negligible overall effect, the changes reflect the community feeling and Councils commitment to reduce the rating impact.

Risk

Any significant increase in user pays, may result in a reduction of 'users' and a need for additional unbudgeted rates.

DRAFT

Report to Council

DATE: 11 November 2026

TO: Mayor and Councillors

FROM: Chief Financial Officer

Council Reserves and Restricted Reserves

1. Summary

Council has created reserves that it uses for specific projects or purposes that can be split into two groups:

- Renewal Reserves which are where Council funds (sets rates) on depreciation which it then places in reserves. These reserves are used to fund the replacement of Council assets when the asset is due for renewal.
- Other Council Created Reserves which have been set aside for specific purposes and have been funded in a variety of ways.

In addition to Council Created Reserves Council also has Restricted Reserve Funds. These are reserves that are either protected by legislation or where Council has received donations or funds from external parties. These reserves have strict covenants on them with regards to how the funds in them can be used.

Council is considering which proposals and options should be included in the Draft Long Term Plan consultation document. This report brings the proposal back from the LTP workshop for formal decision.

2. Background

Below are the Council reserves that are being reviewed as part of the LTP process. There are other smaller reserves that can be investigated and dealt with through normal Council business.

Name	Reserve Type	Funding Source	Closing Jun-26	Deposits Yr1 LTP
Library renewals	Depreciation	Rates	482,066	82,859
Administration renewals	Depreciation	Rates	386,979	347,731
Building renewals	Depreciation	Rates	650,639	643,794
Parks and Reserves renewals	Depreciation	Rates	1,716,661	668,910
Transport renewals	Depreciation	Rates	6,139,930	1,812,764
General Rates Funding Reserve	Other	General Rate	(1,450,980)	171,547
Racecourse Reserve	Other	Sales Receipts	3,500,000*	0
Reserve Development	Restricted	Financial Contributions	953.869	150,000

*Racecourse reserve balance projection at 31.06.27

3. Workshop Direction and Additional Information

At the workshop Council expressed an interested in looking at the individual reserves and how they could be managed. As each reserve is different and has been set up for different reasons they have been dealt with individually below as decision for one reserve may differ from the proposed treatment of another.

4. Proposal and Options

As a general principle for the depreciation reserve there are three options to consider as shown in the table below.

Cash Backing Option	Cash Contributions	Reserves and Cash	Rates & Borrowing
Full	Cash funds all depreciation	The cash in the reserve will grow or shrink depending on whether contributions exceed expenditure in a given financial year	Maintains depreciation funding through rates. Reduced, but does not remove borrowing
Partial	Cash funds part of depreciation	Cash backing gradually reduces where renewal expenditure exceeds contributions	Reduces rates funding, borrowing will be needed to cover can cash shortfall
None	No new cash is set aside for depreciation	Reserves remain in the accounts; existing cash is used until gone	No rates funding for depreciation, requires borrowing if existing cash is not sufficient to cover expenditure

Under all three options depreciation continues in full as per required accounting policy. The change relates to the cash backing (ie charging rates for the depreciation).

The depreciation reserve-specific proposals use a minimum rates-funding level of at least 80% of depreciation. This has been proposed as a prudent level setting a lower limit, while allowing staff to manage each reserves within the 80% to 100% range.

The Other reserves and the Restricted reserve have different treatment as detailed later in the report.

4.1. Library renewals depreciation reserve

This reserve funds the replacement of library books and other rental materials and accumulates funds for the replacement of library fixtures and fittings.

The reserve balance is significantly higher than annual book renewal expenditure (approximately $50,000 per year). As the library will need to vacate its current building when the lease expires, there is no need to maintain the portion of the reserve intended for renewing fixtures and fittings.

Depreciation is not being funded in the current financial year, in accordance with the adopted Annual Plan for 2026/27.

4.1.1. Option 1 – Reduce rates funding of depreciation from 100% to a level of at least 80%
4.1.2. Option 2 – Maintain rates funding of depreciation at 100% and leave cash allocated to the reserve
4.1.3. Option 3 – Reduce rates funding of depreciation from 100% to a level of at least 80% and reallocate cash to fund other capital projects (project and amount to be determined before adoption of the LTP)

4.2. Administration renewals depreciation reserve

This reserve is used to fund fixtures and fittings and non-capital IT renewal expenditure for all council facilities and buildings along with Council fleet vehicles replacements and the Hokitika Swimming Pool.

4.2.1. Option 1 – Reduce rates funding of depreciation from 100% to a level of at least 80%
4.2.2. Option 2 – Maintain rates funding of depreciation at 100% and leave cash allocated to the reserve

4.3. Building renewals depreciation reserve

This reserve is used to fund replacement of Councils HQ building along with other Council owned facilities (excluding the Hokitika Swimming Pool and Museum building).

4.3.1. Option 1 – Reduce rates funding of depreciation from 100% to a level of at least 80%
4.3.2. Option 2 – Maintain rates funding of depreciation at 100% and leave cash allocated to the reserve

4.4. Parks and Reserve renewals depreciation reserve

This reserve is used for renewal of all Councils Parks and Reserves along with Cemetery facilities.

4.4.1. Option 1 – Reduce rates funding of depreciation from 100% to a level of at least 80%
4.4.2. Option 2 – Maintain rates funding of depreciation at 100% and leave cash allocated to the reserve
4.4.3. Option 3 – Reduce rates funding of depreciation from 100% to a level of at least 80% and reallocate cash to fund other capital projects (project and amount to be determined before adoption of the LTP)

4.5. Transport renewals depreciation reserve

This reserve is used for renewal of Councils road network, footpaths and bridges.

4.5.1. Option 1 – Reduce rates funding of depreciation from 100% to a level of at least 80%
4.5.2. Option 2 – Maintain rates funding of depreciation at 100% and leave cash allocated to the reserve
4.5.3. Option 3 – Reduce rates funding of depreciation from 100% to a level of at least 80% and reallocate cash to fund other projects (project and amount to be determined before adoption of the LTP)

4.6. General rates funding reserve

The general rate reserve had a negative balance as it is effectively a fund that Council 'borrowed' from itself in previous budgets. It is currently being repaid each year by charging rates.

4.6.1. Option 1 **–** Allocate funds from other reserves to clear the outstanding amount
4.6.2. Option 2 – Write this reserve off via equity
4.6.3. Option 3 – Make no changes and continue to repay via rates

4.7. Racecourse reserve

This is a new reserve that has been created to hold the funds from the racecourse reserve. Council needs to decide how it would like to utilise the funds

4.7.1. Option 1 – Use the reserve funds for capital projects for Parks and Reserves reducing loan funding
4.7.2. Option 2 – Use the reserve to fund other capital projects (to be determined before adoption of the LTP)
4.7.3. Option 3 – Hold the reserve for future projects or uses

4.8. Reserve development restricted reserve

This reserve receives Financial Contributions collected under the Resources Management Act 1991. Councils Revenue and Financing Policy currently states that the contributions should be used for growth related infrastructure expenditure.

4.8.1. Option 1 – Use the reserve to fund new infrastructure capital projects (to be determined before adoption of the LTP)
4.8.2. Option 2 – Hold the reserve for future projects or uses

5. Assessment of Options

Options have been accessed together as per the below matrix.

Option	Financial Implication	Preferred Option
Depreciation reserves Option 1 Reduce from 100% to a level of at least 80%	Rates would reduce, however borrowing costs may be higher in the future	Preferred*
Depreciation reserves Option 2 Make no changes	Rates will not reduce, borrowing costs may be lower in the future	
Depreciation reserves Option 3 Reduce from 100% to a level of at least 80% and reallocate some of the existing funding	Rates would reduce; immediate borrowing requirement would be reduced. Future borrowing costs may be higher	Preferred
General rates funding Option 1 Allocate funds to clear reserve	Rates will reduce as the reserve will no longer be repaid via rates. Other reserves will be reduced to clear this reserve meaning that insufficient funds may remain in the other reserves	
General rates funding Option 2 Write off the reserve	Rates will reduce, equity will be reduced as the reserve is written off. Cash reserves will not be increased	Preferred
General rates funding Option 3 Make no changes	Rates will continue to be charged to return the reserve back to zero	
Racecourse reserve Option 1 Fund Reserves capital projects	Borrowing costs will be reduced as Council utilises the reserve to fund projects	Preferred
Racecourse reserve Option 2 Fund other capital projects	Borrowing costs will be reduced as Council utilises the reserve to fund projects	
Racecourse reserve Option 3 Hold the reserve	Borrowing costs would increase as debt would be used to fund projects. Cash would be held in reserve for future projects	
Reserve development Option 1 Use the reserve to fund projects	Borrowing costs will be reduced as Council utilises the reserve to fund projects	Preferred
Reserve development Option 2 Hold the reserve	Borrowing costs would increase as debt would be used to fund projects. Cash would be held in reserve for future projects	

*where there is no option 3

6. Risk Assessment

Risk Area	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigation
Financial	Likely	Medium	Reducing the cash backing of depreciation reserves and reallocating reserve funds to projects would reduce the cash available for future projects and unforeseen expenditure. However, by maintaining cash backing at a minimum of 80% would ensure continued contributions to the reserves. Ongoing liquidity monitoring will support early identification and management of cash flow pressures.
Legal	Unlikely	Low	No legal risks have been identified in relation to the proposed approach.
Reputational	Possible	Low	Reallocating cash reserves may be perceived as financially imprudent. Funding less than 100% of depreciation through rates may also create a perception that future ratepayers could face higher costs if reserves are insufficient to meet future renewal expenditure.
Operational	Unlikely	Low	No operational risks have been identified in relation to the proposed approach.

7. Recommendation(s)

7.1. That the report be received.
7.2. Note that those options marked as “Preferred” in the options matrix, are staff’s recommended options for the Draft Long Term Plan 2027-2037.
7.3. Identify Council’s preferred option.

Stephen Lewis
Chief Financial Officer

Appendix 1: 15.09.26 – Council Reserves LTP Proposal

LTP Key Proposal – Council Reserves

Cost Centre	Council Created and Restricted Reserves
LTP Forecast	**$3.2 million**
Funding Source	Reserves
Author / Lead	Chief Financial Officer
Community Outcome	Enabling a liveable district Protecting Westland's communities, culture and heritage Supporting and enhancing the natural environment Providing future-fit infrastructure and services

Background

Council has created reserves that it uses for specific projects or purposes that can be split into two groups. Renewal Reserves which are where Council funds, sets rates, on depreciation which it then places in reserves. These reserves are used to fund the replacement of Council assets when the asset is due for renewal. There are also other Council Created Reserves which have been set aside for specific purposes.

COUNCIL CREATED RESERVES

Name	Funding Source	Closing Jun-26	Deposits 2026/27	Deposits 2027/28
Library renewals	Rates - Funded Depreciation	482,066	89,937	82,859
Administration renewals	Rates - Funded Depreciation	386,979	381,711	347,731
Building renewals	Rates - Funded Depreciation	2,053,193	635,681	643,794
Parks and Reserves renewals	Rates - Funded Depreciation	1,716,661	620,270	668,910
Solid Waste Renewal	Rates - Funded Depreciation	(71,432)	40,373	46,022
Transport renewals	Rates - Funded Depreciation	6,139,930	1,293,750	1,812,764
Total Renewal Reserves		**10,707,396**	**3,061,722**	**3,602,080**
General Rates Funding Reserve	General Rate	(1,450,980)	171,547	171,547
Racecourse Reserve	Sales Receipts	2,200,000	1,300,000	0
Emergency Management Contingency	Targeted Rate	76,052	0	0
HariHari Community complex	External	76,710	0	0
Marks Road Haast Fund	External	102,023	0	0
Westland Racing Club Reserve Fund	External	43,497	0	0
Foreshore	Unknown	13,139	0	0
Total Council Created Reserves		**11,767,838**	**4,533,269**	**3,773,627**

Council also have Restricted Reserve Funds. These are reserves that are either protected by legislation or where Council has received donations or funds from external parties. These reserves have strict covenants on them with regards to how the funds in them can be used.

RESTRICTED RESERVES

Name	Funding Source	Closing Jun-26	Deposits 2026/27	Deposits 2027/28
Off-street Parking	Special Fund	71,620	0	0
Reserve Development	Special Fund	953,869	150,000	150,000
Museum Assistance Fund	Trust/Bequest	54,898	2,500	2,500
Kumara Endowment Fund	Endowment	428,360	0	0
Euphemia Brown Bequest	Trust/Bequest	29,005	0	0
Mayoral Relief Funds	Trust/Bequest	30,245	0	0
Three Mile Domain	Local Purpose Reserve	88,425	0	0
Ross Endowment Land	Endowment	62,202	0	0
Total		**1,718,623**	**152,500**	**152,500**

Proposal

Council Created Reserves – Renewals:	As Council mostly rates on the depreciation placed into the renewal reserves Council could look to unfund some or all of this depreciation. Reserves could be redirected to fund other projects. Reserves could be released to temporality reduce rates.
Council Created Reserves – General Rate:	This reserve, which is a liability, is dealt with by another paper which proposes repaying this reserve from other Council Created Reserves.
Council Created Reserves – Racecourse:	This is a new reserve that Council has yet to make a decision on how it wishes to utilise the funds.
Council Created Reserves – Others:	Council will undertake further investigative work to ascertain what the reserve was set up for and the rules on how it can be released.
Restricted Reserves:	Council will undertake further investigative work to ascertain what the reserve was set up for and the rules on how it can be released.

Impact

Depending on the options selected:	New or existing projects could be funded from the reserves with no additional cost to ratepayers. Rates could be permanently reduced if Council decided to reduce the amount of funded depreciation. One off reduction in rates should the reserves be released to fund operational expenditure for a period of time.

Risk

Running down reserves leaves the council exposed to future renewal or unexpected costs that it would then have to either borrow or raise rates to fund.

DRAFT

Report to Council

DATE: 11 November 2026

TO: Mayor and Councillors

FROM: General Manager – Regulatory and Compliance

Parking Charges

1. Summary

The purpose of this report is to provide Council with details regarding the potential introduction of paid parking in strategic locations for long term plan considerations.

Council is considering which proposals and options should be included in the Draft Long Term Plan consultation document. This report brings the proposal back from the Long Term Plan (LTP) workshop on 15 September 2026 for formal decision.

2. Background

Currently, there is paid parking at Franz Heliport and Hokitika Airport, which are administered by Destination Westland, with additional park parking throughout the district as a discussion consideration in the recent LTP engagement on 5 – 24 August 2026.

The engagement received mixed feedback. However, some respondents supported introducing charges in high-use visitor locations, noting that this would enable visitors to contribute more directly to the cost of the infrastructure and facilities they use, rather than these costs being met entirely by local ratepayers.

This support was often conditional on protecting residents from additional costs, through measures such as permits, free periods, discounted parking or designated areas. Many respondents preferred charges to be limited to visitor destinations or peak periods, rather than applied broadly across town centres.

Those opposed to introducing parking charges questioned whether current parking demand, particularly in Hokitika and the smaller townships, warrants such a measure. Concerns focused on the potential impacts on local businesses, shopping activity, accessibility and the overall visitor experience. Some submitters considered that improved management of existing parking could address availability issues without the need to introduce charges.

Financial viability was also a key concern, with respondents questioning whether the costs associated with technology, administration, monitoring and enforcement could outweigh the revenue generated. There was stronger support for simple, cost-effective systems that demonstrate a clear net benefit, with revenue from visitor parking reinvested in the communities and infrastructure where it is collected.

3. Workshop Direction and Additional Information

Council provided direction during the workshop that further information was required in order to make informed decisions to determine what details are included in the Draft Long Term Plan consultation document.

Overall, the LTP engagement feedback suggested some support for paid parking as a visitor contribution mechanism, but limited support for broad district-wide charges affecting residents.

Any proposal should provide clear rationale and financial benefit to the district, within minimal administration and enforcement costs, and mechanisms that recognise the contribution already made by local ratepayers.

Park Paid parking may provide additional revenue to reduce rating impacts in strategic locations such as:

- Hokitika CBD
- Glacial Country
- Hokitika Gorge

Initial conversations have begun with the Department of Conservation regarding the Hokitika Gorge in regards to how this could work through a Memorandum of Understanding/Partnership agreement should this matter be progressed.

It is proposed that an initial parking survey be undertaken within the Hokitika CBD to assess whether the existing parking supply and time restrictions remain fit for purpose, and to establish current occupancy and utilisation rates.

Engagement with the community and local business owners will form an important part of this assessment, ensuring Council understands both day-to-day parking experiences and seasonal variations in demand.

A similar assessment undertaken in 2023 identified 583 parking spaces within the CBD. Of these, 175 spaces recorded occupancy rates of between 92% and 100%**,** as illustrated in **Table 1**. These spaces were subject to a P120 (two-hour) parking restriction**.**

The proposed survey will provide updated evidence to determine whether current parking arrangements continue to meet the needs of businesses, residents and visitors, and whether any changes to parking restrictions or management should be considered.

Table 1 – Carparking Survey 2023

Location	Number of Carparks	Number of car parks occupied	Occupancy rate %
Weld St (Regent Cinema)	27	27	100
Tancred Street (Bike Shop)	34	34	100
Sewell St (Library)	23	22	96
Tancred Street (New World)	66	63	95
Weld Street (Stumpers)	25	23	92

A rudimentary assessment shown in **Table 2** of these parking spaces being used at these rations for $2/hr between 8am and 5pm could provide the following income:

Table 2 – Potential Parking income

Location	Number of Carparks	Potential Annual Revenue 8am – 5pm $2/ hr
Weld St (Regent Cinema)	27	$22,464
Tancred Street (Bike Shop)	34	$28,288
Sewell St (Library)	23	$18,370
Tancred Street (New World)	66	$52,166
Weld Street (Stumpers)	25	$19,136
Total	175	$140,424

A survey would enable Council to undertake a cost/benefit analysis for parking charges beginning with Hokitika CBD as part of a wider parking strategy covering where larger vehicles can park e.g. camper vans and buses etc.

This would also lead to work to investigate opportunities with other agencies, for locations like Hokitika Gorge as part of wider considerations about destination management, freedom camping, spatial planning and economic development projects.

The introduction of paid parking may require capital investment in supporting infrastructure, including parking meters or other parking and payment technology, signage and potentially CCTV. Additional operational expenditure may also be required for administration, maintenance, monitoring and enforcement. The extent of these costs has not yet been established and would need to be assessed alongside projected revenue to determine the financial viability and potential net benefit to Council and rate payers.

4. Proposal and Options

It is proposed that:

- Hokitika CBD is used to trial paid parking
- LTP Year 1 - A parking survey is undertaken of the current parking availability, time restrictions etc
- Community engagement to determine what is / is not working e.g. parking all day, large vehicles, access to local businesses, seasonal challenges
- Draft a parking strategy with a cost/benefit analysis following the community engagement
- Report to Council on the CAPEX and OPEX costs to implement a parking strategy including considerations of enforcement
- LTP Year 2 – Implementation of Parking Strategy if adopted
- Carryout same process for Glacier Country and Hokitika Gorge
- Report to Council of Success/Learnings of Hokitika CBD Paid Parking
- LTP year 3 – review of the implementation of the strategy and paid parking

The following options distinguish maintaining free parking from investigating a staged introduction of charges. Any implementation would require a further Council decision informed by current parking demand, community engagement, financial analysis and applicable legal requirements.

4.1. Option 1 – No paid Parking (Status Quo)

Retain free public parking throughout Westland District. Existing parking restrictions and enforcement arrangements would continue, with any operational improvements considered through normal work programmes. No new paid parking infrastructure or charging regime would be introduced.

4.2. Option 2 – Hokitika CBD Paid Parking (recommended)

Undertake a Hokitika CBD parking survey and community and business engagement in LTP Year 1. Develop a parking strategy addressing time restrictions, turnover, large-vehicle parking, accessibility, resident considerations and the costs and benefits of paid parking. Report findings, including capital, operating and enforcement costs, to Council before any decision to implement a limited trial in Year 2. Review results in Year 3. A trial is not pre-approved by selection of this option.

4.3. Option 3 – All Strategic Locations Paid Parking

Investigate paid parking across Hokitika CBD, Glacier Country and Hokitika Gorge as a coordinated strategic programme. Apply the Year 1 evidence-gathering, engagement and cost-benefit approach to each location, including discussions with relevant landowners and agencies such as the Department of Conservation where appropriate. Any site-specific implementation from Year 2 would require further Council approval, a viable operating model and any necessary legal or landowner permissions; outcomes would be reviewed in Year 3.

5. Assessment of Options

5.1. Option 1 - No paid parking (status quo)

5.1.1. Advantages

- Retains free access for residents and visitors and avoids new payment-system and enforcement costs.
- Avoids potential adverse effects on town-centre shopping and visitor experience.
- Requires no immediate charging infrastructure investment.

5.1.2. Disadvantages

- Foregoes an opportunity for visitors to contribute directly to parking-related infrastructure and services.
- Does not address high occupancy or longer-stay parking in some CBD locations without separate management action.
- Continues reliance on existing funding sources for parking-related costs.

5.1.3. Financial Implications

- No new paid-parking capital or operating expenditure is proposed. Existing parking management and maintenance costs would continue under current budgets. No new parking-charge revenue would be generated; there is no demonstrated rates saving.

5.2. Option 2 - Investigate and potentially trial Hokitika CBD paid parking (recommended)

5.2.1. Advantages

- Tests the proposal in an area with documented high occupancy at selected locations.
- Enables evidence-led decisions on turnover, accessibility and visitor contribution before investment.
- Allows a limited trial and subsequent review before any wider roll-out.

5.2.2. Disadvantages

- Charges could affect local businesses, residents and the visitor experience.

- Survey, engagement, technology, administration and enforcement create costs and capacity demands.
- A trial may not produce sufficient net revenue to justify implementation.

5.2.3. Financial Implications

- The 2023 indicative calculation of $140,424 per annum for 175 spaces at $2/hour is potential gross revenue only, not a forecast or net return. It depends on assumptions requiring validation through updated occupancy, paid-hours and compliance data. Capital costs (such as meters, payment systems or CCTV), ongoing administration, transaction fees, maintenance and enforcement have not been costed. Council should receive a full cost-benefit and rates assessment before approving any trial.

5.3. Option 3 - Investigate paid parking at all strategic locations

5.3.1. Advantages

- Provides a district-wide strategic basis for managing high-use visitor parking.
- May create opportunities for visitor contributions at multiple destinations.
- Supports coordination with destination management, freedom camping, spatial planning and partner agencies.

5.3.2. Disadvantages

- Different locations have different demand, ownership, access and operating conditions; a common charging model may not be appropriate.
- Higher investigation and potential implementation costs and greater operational complexity.
- Risk of community resistance and adverse effects on access and visitor experience across several locations.

5.3.3. Financial Implications

- No reliable capital, operating or net revenue estimates are available for Glacier Country or Hokitika Gorge. Each location requires separate demand and feasibility analysis, including land ownership, agency agreements, infrastructure, payment collection and enforcement. Any potential rates benefit is unquantified and must not be assumed before site-specific business cases and Council decisions.

6. Risk Assessment

The principal risks and proposed mitigations are set out below. They apply to decisions to maintain existing arrangements as well as to investigate or introduce paid parking.

Risk	Options affected	Potential impact	Risk management / mitigation
Financial viability and revenue uncertainty	Options 2 and 3	Parking revenue may be insufficient to recover the capital, administration, maintenance and enforcement costs, resulting in an ongoing cost to ratepayers.	Undertake a detailed cost-benefit analysis, including conservative revenue forecasts and whole-of-life costs, before committing to implementation.
Community acceptance and reputational risk	Options 2 and 3	Introducing parking charges may generate opposition from residents, businesses and visitors, affecting community confidence in Council's decision-making.	Undertake targeted community and business engagement, clearly communicate the rationale for proposed charges and consider appropriate provisions for residents.
Impacts on local businesses	Options 2 and 3	Parking charges may discourage visits to commercial areas, reduce accessibility or displace	Assess parking demand, occupancy and turnover, and consider time limits, free parking periods,

and accessibility		parking into surrounding streets.	designated areas and accessibility requirements.
Implementation and enforcement	Options 2 and 3	Additional infrastructure, technology and enforcement requirements may increase costs and create operational challenges.	Assess infrastructure and operational requirements, investigate cost-effective technology and establish clear enforcement arrangements before implementation.
Equity and visitor contribution	All options	Maintaining free parking places the cost of infrastructure and maintenance on existing funding sources, while introducing charges may disproportionately affect some residents and regular users.	Assess the distribution of costs and benefits, including options for resident concessions and visitor contributions, as part of the parking strategy.
Engagement and consultation	Options 2 and 3	Limited community participation or unclear communication may result in decisions that do not adequately reflect local needs or expectations.	Undertake early engagement with affected communities, businesses and stakeholders, supported by clear information on costs, benefits and proposed arrangements.
Strategic alignment and coordination	Options 2 and 3	Introducing parking charges independently of wider destination management, freedom camping, transport and spatial planning initiatives may result in fragmented investment or unintended consequences.	Develop an integrated parking strategy and coordinate with relevant agencies, including investigating partnership opportunities for visitor destinations.
Maintaining the status quo / taking no action	Option 1	Continued free parking may limit opportunities to generate revenue, improve parking turnover and manage increasing visitor demand, with infrastructure costs continuing to be met through existing funding arrangements.	Review parking occupancy, demand and restrictions, particularly in high-use locations, and consider alternative parking management measures without necessarily introducing charges.

Overall risk consideration

The principal consideration is balancing opportunities to generate additional revenue to reduce rating impacts and improve parking management against the financial, operational and community impacts of introducing parking charges.

While paid parking may provide an opportunity for visitors to contribute towards infrastructure costs, the financial benefits have not been established. Implementation would require capital investment and ongoing operational expenditure, with potential impacts on residents, businesses and visitor experiences.

A staged approach, beginning with updated parking surveys, community engagement and a comprehensive cost-benefit analysis, would allow Council to assess the viability of paid parking before committing to implementation. This would also provide an opportunity to consider parking management improvements alongside wider destination management and infrastructure planning.

7. Recommendation(s)

7.1. That the report be received.

7.2. Note Option 2 is staff's recommended option for the Draft Long Term Plan 2027-2037.
7.3. Identify Council's preferred option.

Lee Webster
General Manager – Regulatory and Compliance

Appendix 1: 15.09.26 – Parking Charges LTP Proposal

LTP Proposal – Parking Charges

Cost Centre	-
LTP Forecast	-
Funding Source	NIL
Author / Lead	General Manager Regulatory and Compliance
Community Outcome	Enabling a liveable district Providing future-fit infrastructure and services

Background

Free parking throughout district.

No strategy regarding paid parking or consideration of parking enforcement.

Potential revenue opportunities to reduce rating impact/ fund infrastructure.

Challenges with larger vehicles in the town centre.

Proposal

Investigate potential DOC partnership.

To consider paid parking opportunities in strategic locations throughout the district, to reduce rating impact.

Link with destination management, freedom camping, spatial planning, economic development projects.

Impact

Some of the community may feel it is un-necessary.

Capital funding maybe be needed e.g. parking meters, CCTV.

OPEX funding maybe required for enforcement.

Risk

Community diversity in approach.

Negativity towards Council and staff.

Engagement apathy.

Reactive projects v strategic planning.

DRAFT

Report to Council

DATE: 11 November 2026

TO: Mayor and Councillors

FROM: General Manager – Regulatory and Compliance

Emergency Management

1. Summary

The purpose of this report is to seek Council's direction on the future allocation of emergency management capital funding for consideration in the Draft Long Term Plan.

The report considers whether existing capital budgets should be reprioritised to better support Council's emergency management requirements and strengthen the district's resilience.

Council is considering which proposals and options should be included in the Draft Long Term Plan consultation document. This report brings the proposal back from the Long Term Plan (LTP) workshop on 15 September 2026 for formal decision.

2. Background

Council's Long Term Plan 2025–2034 includes a programme of capital investment intended to strengthen emergency management capability, community preparedness and the district's resilience to natural hazards.

Several projects have been completed, while others remain programmed for future financial years. Given changes to Council's operational circumstances and the need to ensure that available funding delivers the greatest resilience benefit, it is appropriate to reassess the priorities and allocation of the remaining capital programme.

Central Government have also signalled significant investment in emergency management nationally, and staff will investigate opportunity’s to facilitate and support projects to reduce rating impacts where possible.

Emergency Communications

The Emergency Communications Project aimed to strengthen communications between the Westland District Council Emergency Operations Centre (EOC) and Community Response Groups (CRGs). The 2025/2026 budget enabled the distribution and installation of VHF base stations and handheld radios for CRGs, as well as upgrades to the EOC function-specific mobile phones.

The 2025/2026 project was completed 30 June 2026.

EMAT Cache

The EMAT (Emergency Management Assistance Team) Cache project was established to strengthen Council's ability to operate an alternative EOC if its primary facility became unavailable.

The project supplemented the existing emergency pod (EPOD) at Hokitika Airport, which previously held limited equipment and resources. The upgraded facility now contains communications and technology equipment, emergency power supplies, medical and welfare resources, shelter, sanitation and other operational equipment required to support an alternative EOC.

The 2025/2026 project was completed 30 June 2026.

Emergency Equipment Container

The Emergency Equipment Container Project was established to provide a central store of emergency supplies and equipment to support the delivery of welfare services to people affected or displaced during an emergency.

The project supports a range of welfare functions, including emergency shelter and accommodation, food and water provision, assistance with family reunification, psychosocial support, financial assistance, health needs and veterinary assistance.

The initial stage of the project involved purchasing and equipping a 20-foot storage container with essential welfare supplies, including cooking and sleeping equipment, portable sanitation facilities, cleaning and hygiene supplies, lighting, technology support and general emergency equipment.

The 2025/26 component of the project was completed on 30 June 2026. Further funding is programmed in subsequent financial years to expand the resources available to support the wider range of emergency welfare functions.

Alternative Water Supply

The Alternative Water Supply Project was intended to improve community resilience by reducing reliance on municipal water supplies during natural disasters and other emergencies.

The project considered two potential approaches:

- Household emergency water storage: Purchasing approximately 450 purpose-built 200-litre water tanks for residents at a subsidised cost, reducing the indicative purchase price from approximately $300 to $130 per tank. Similar initiatives have been implemented by other councils to encourage household emergency preparedness.
- Community emergency water storage: Purchasing 25,000-litre water tanks at an indicative cost of approximately $3,500 each, strategically located throughout the district and filled with treated water to provide an alternative supply during emergencies. This approach has been adopted by other councils, including Buller District Council.

While both approaches have potential resilience benefits, further consideration is required to determine their suitability for Westland District, including the volume and location of storage required, ongoing maintenance and operational responsibilities, and whether the investment represents the most effective use of ratepayer funding.

Each water treatment facility has water loss prevention devices to ensure water retention in emergency events.

The project has not commenced due to the need for greater clarity on its strategic direction and the resilience benefits it would deliver.

Emergency Operations Centre

Council's primary Emergency Operations Centre (EOC) was previously located at 36 Weld Street. The building has since been indefinitely closed due to the assessed risk to life in a seismic event. The site is also exposed to natural hazards, including flooding, coastal erosion and inundation.

Temporary EOC arrangements have been established at 51 Tancred Street. However, these are not considered suitable as a long-term solution due to limitations in available space and the ability to accommodate the personnel and functions required during a significant emergency.

Council also has the capability to establish an alternative EOC at Hokitika Airport using the existing EPOD and Emergency Management Assistance Team (EMAT) Cache resources. While this provides an important contingency, it is not considered a suitable long-term alternative EOC facility.

The closure of 36 Weld Street has highlighted the need to reassess Council's EOC arrangements and the priority of existing emergency management capital investment.

The requirements for a permanent primary EOC will be considered as part of Council's future civic accommodation and community hub planning. However, a separate, fit-for-purpose alternative EOC will continue to be required to maintain operational capability should the primary facility become unavailable.

Existing Emergency Management Capital Programme

The Long Term Plan 2025–2034 includes capital funding for several emergency management projects across the 2026/27 to 2028/29 financial years.

Project	26/27	27/28	28/29	Total
Alternate Water Supply		$80,418		$138,500
Emergency equipment Containers	32,390	$33,329	$34,196	$69,548
Emergency Operations Centre	-	$265,225	-	$265,225
EMAT Cache	$32,992	$33,949	$34,832	$68,781
			Total	**$542,054**

Note: The figures reflect the current project information and are subject to confirmation of carry-forward amounts, remaining allocations and total available funding.

The existing programme includes indicative capital allocations of $145,800 in 2026/27, $332,503 in 2027/28 and $69,028 in 2028/29.

Given the change in Council's operational circumstances, there is an opportunity to reassess whether projects identified during the previous planning period remain the most appropriate investments.

In particular, consideration needs to be given to the practical effectiveness of the proposed projects, their ongoing operational requirements and the extent to which they strengthen the district's emergency response capability.

A review of the remaining capital programme would enable Council to consider reprioritising existing funding towards a fit-for-purpose alternative EOC, while ensuring that any changes to other emergency management projects are assessed against their intended resilience benefits.

3. Workshop Direction and Additional Information

Council provided direction during the workshop that further information was required to inform decisions on the prioritisation of emergency management capital investment and the proposals to be included in the Draft Long Term Plan consultation document.

Relatively few comments were received regarding emergency management during the LTP engagement process. However, feedback received highlighted several considerations:

- Alternative funding: Where community halls are used for emergency management purposes, opportunities to secure funding from other sources, including the West Coast Regional Council and central government, should be considered to reduce reliance on ratepayers.
- Availability of emergency welfare facilities: Any proposals to dispose of community facilities, particularly halls, should consider their potential role as emergency welfare centres and the availability of suitable alternative facilities.
- Community responsibility and use of existing facilities: Feedback also highlighted the role communities can play in maintaining their own facilities and suggested greater use of school halls to support emergency response activities.

While the feedback was limited, it reinforces the importance of considering emergency management requirements alongside wider decisions on community facilities, infrastructure investment and funding priorities.

4. Proposal and Options

The proposal seeks to reconsider the allocation of existing emergency management capital funding to ensure investment is directed towards projects that deliver the greatest resilience benefit for Westland District.

Following the closure of 36 Weld Street and the limitations of current temporary EOC arrangements, it is proposed that Council prioritises the development of a fit-for-purpose alternative EOC.

This would involve discontinuing the proposed Alternative Water Supply Project and redirecting its remaining capital allocation towards an alternative EOC. The future funding allocations for the Emergency Equipment Container and EMAT Cache projects would also be reassessed to determine whether some funding could be reprioritised without compromising essential emergency response and welfare capabilities.

The preferred approach would be to investigate modular facilities at a suitable location, potentially Hokitika Airport, rather than relying on the existing emergency equipment containers as a longer-term operational facility.

4.1. Option 1 – Status Quo / Continue with the Existing Emergency Management Capital Programme

Retain the emergency management capital projects and funding allocations currently identified in the Long Term Plan 2025–2034.

This option would involve:

- Progressing the Alternative Water Supply Project, subject to further assessment of the most appropriate approach to emergency water storage.
- Continuing the planned investment in the Emergency Equipment Container and EMAT Cache projects across the remaining financial years.
- Retaining the existing capital allocation for the Emergency Operations Centre.
- Maintaining current temporary and contingency EOC arrangements while longer-term requirements are considered through Council's civic accommodation planning.

This option would maintain the existing investment priorities without reallocating funding between projects.

4.2. Option 2 – Reprioritise Emergency Management Capital Investment (recommended

Reassess the existing emergency management capital programme to prioritise the development of a fit-for-purpose alternative EOC.

This option would involve:

- Discontinuing the proposed Alternative Water Supply Project and reallocating its remaining capital funding towards the alternative EOC.
- Reviewing the 2027/28 and 2028/29 allocations for the Emergency Equipment Container and EMAT Cache projects to determine whether funding could be redirected while maintaining essential emergency response and welfare capabilities.
- Investigating the feasibility of establishing an alternative EOC using modular facilities at a suitable location, potentially Hokitika Airport.
- Assessing the operational requirements, infrastructure needs, capital costs and ongoing maintenance and operating expenditure associated with the proposed facility.
- Confirming the most appropriate allocation of existing capital funding and reporting back to Council before committing to construction or implementation.

The alternative EOC would provide a separate operational facility capable of supporting Council's emergency management functions if the primary EOC became unavailable.

This option would enable Council to reconsider its existing capital priorities in response to changing operational circumstances, while ensuring that any proposed investment is supported by further feasibility and financial assessment.

5. Assessment of Options

5.1. Option 1 Status Quo: Continue with the Existing Emergency Management Capital Programme

5.1.1. Advantages

- Maintains Council's existing emergency management capital programme and planned investment priorities.
- Retains funding for alternative water supply initiatives that could strengthen household and community preparedness during emergencies.
- Allows further investment in emergency welfare equipment and EMAT Cache resources to support emergency response capability.
- Avoids the immediate need to reassess and reallocate existing capital budgets.
- Maintains the current level of planned investment across a range of emergency management functions.

5.1.2. Disadvantages

- Does not directly address the need for a fit-for-purpose alternative EOC following the closure of 36 Weld Street.
- Continues investment in projects where the practical resilience benefits, operational requirements or value for money have not been fully established.
- May limit Council's ability to prioritise the most pressing emergency management infrastructure requirements within existing budgets.
- Retains reliance on temporary EOC arrangements that may not adequately accommodate the personnel and functions required during a significant emergency.

- May result in capital funding being committed to projects that provide less immediate resilience benefit than an alternative EOC.

5.1.3. Financial Implications

- This option would retain the existing capital allocations identified in the Long Term Plan 2025–2034, subject to confirmation of remaining budgets and carry-forward amounts.
- No additional capital funding is proposed through this option. However, the Alternative Water Supply Project and further investment in emergency equipment and resources may generate ongoing maintenance, replacement and operational costs.
- The existing EOC allocation would remain available, although the adequacy of this funding to meet Council's future requirements has not been established.
- Any additional investment required to establish a fit-for-purpose alternative EOC would need to be considered separately and may place further pressure on Council's capital programme and rates.

5.2. Option 2 - Reprioritise Emergency Management Capital Investment

5.2.1. Advantages

- Responds to the changed operational circumstances arising from the closure of 36 Weld Street and prioritises the need for a fit-for-purpose alternative EOC.
- Provides an opportunity to redirect existing capital funding towards infrastructure that supports continuity of emergency management operations during a significant event.
- Enables Council to reassess whether previously identified projects remain the most effective use of available funding.
- Supports a more coordinated approach to emergency management investment by considering operational requirements, infrastructure and equipment needs together.
- Provides an opportunity to investigate modular facilities that could offer a more suitable alternative EOC than the existing emergency equipment containers.
- May reduce the need for additional capital funding by reprioritising existing allocations.
- Allows Council to confirm the feasibility, costs and resilience benefits of the proposed facility before making investment decisions.

5.2.2. Disadvantages

- Discontinuing the Alternative Water Supply Project would mean the proposed household and community emergency water storage initiatives would not proceed at this stage.
- Reallocating funding from the Emergency Equipment Container and EMAT Cache projects may limit planned investment in emergency welfare supplies and response equipment.
- The suitability of modular facilities and potential locations, including Hokitika Airport, has not yet been established.
- The existing capital programme may be insufficient to fully fund a fit-for-purpose alternative EOC.
- Additional planning, design and feasibility work would be required before implementation.
- Prioritising EOC infrastructure may reduce Council's ability to invest in other community preparedness and resilience initiatives within existing budgets.

5.2.3. Financial Implications

- This option would seek to utilise existing emergency management capital funding rather than introduce an entirely new capital programme.
- The remaining Alternative Water Supply Project allocation would be proposed for reallocation towards the alternative EOC. The future allocations for the Emergency Equipment Container

and EMAT Cache projects would also be reviewed to determine whether funding could be redirected without compromising essential emergency response capabilities.

- Capital expenditure may be required for modular facilities, site preparation, utilities, communications infrastructure, technology and other equipment necessary to establish a functional alternative EOC.
- Ongoing operational expenditure would also need to be considered, including maintenance, insurance, utilities, technology, equipment replacement and readiness requirements.
- The total capital and operating costs have not yet been established. Further feasibility and financial assessment would be required to determine whether the proposed facility could be delivered within existing budgets or whether additional funding would be necessary.
- Any proposed changes to capital allocations, associated rates impacts and future operating expenditure would be confirmed before Council makes a final investment decision.

6. Risk Assessment

The following table identifies the key risks associated with each option, including maintaining the status quo, and outlines how these risks would be managed.

Risk	Options affected	Potential implications	Risk management / mitigation
Emergency response capability and operational continuity	Both options, particularly Option 1	Existing temporary and contingency EOC arrangements may not provide the space, infrastructure or operational resilience required during a significant emergency. Continuing the current capital programme without addressing these limitations could compromise Council's ability to coordinate an effective response.	Assess the requirements for a fit-for-purpose alternative EOC, including location, natural hazard exposure, accessibility, communications and operational capacity. Maintain and test existing contingency arrangements until a suitable facility is established.
Community preparedness and welfare capability	Both options, particularly Option 2	Reallocating funding from emergency water storage, welfare equipment and EMAT Cache resources may reduce planned investment in community resilience. This could increase reliance on Council and emergency services during a significant event, particularly where households are not adequately prepared or visitors are unfamiliar with local hazards and emergency arrangements.	Assess essential welfare and emergency response requirements before reallocating funding. Continue supporting household and community preparedness, including emergency water storage, and work with community groups, tourism operators and partner agencies to address identified capability gaps.
Financial sustainability and value for money	Both options	Existing projects may not deliver the anticipated resilience benefits or represent the most effective use of	Review the effectiveness and priorities of existing projects. Undertake feasibility and whole-of-life cost assessments for the

		ratepayer funding. Conversely, the cost of establishing and maintaining a fit-for-purpose alternative EOC may exceed available capital allocations, creating additional financial pressures.	proposed alternative EOC, confirm available budgets and investigate external funding opportunities before committing to investment.
Community expectations and competing priorities	Both options	Communities may hold differing views on emergency management priorities, particularly where investment competes with other services during periods of financial pressure. Limited engagement or perceptions that emergency management is not a core Council responsibility may affect support for proposed changes, despite the potential consequences of inadequate preparedness.	Clearly communicate the rationale, costs and resilience benefits of each option, including the trade-offs associated with reallocating funding. Consider community feedback through the Long Term Plan consultation process and continue working with Community Response Groups to strengthen awareness and preparedness.
Project feasibility, delivery and compliance	Option 2	The suitability, cost and deliverability of modular EOC facilities have not been established. Site constraints, natural hazards, infrastructure requirements, statutory approvals or implementation delays could affect project viability and prolong reliance on temporary arrangements.	Undertake site-specific feasibility, hazard, infrastructure and financial assessments. Confirm applicable statutory and consultation requirements, establish clear project milestones and retain existing contingency arrangements until the alternative EOC is operational.

Overall Risk Consideration

The principal risk is ensuring that Council's emergency management investment provides an appropriate balance between operational response capability, community preparedness and the effective use of available funding.

Option 1 maintains the existing programme of resilience initiatives but does not directly address the limitations of Council's current alternative EOC arrangements.

Option 2 provides an opportunity to strengthen operational resilience through a fit-for-purpose alternative EOC. However, reallocating funding from other emergency management projects may create gaps in community preparedness, welfare resources and response capability.

A staged approach under Option 2 would allow Council to assess these trade-offs, confirm essential emergency management requirements and establish the financial viability of an alternative EOC before committing to capital investment.

7. Recommendation(s)

7.1. That the report be received.
7.2. Note Option 2 is staff's recommended option for the Draft Long Term Plan 2027-2037.
7.3. Identify Council's preferred option.

Lee Webster
General Manager – Regulatory and Compliance

Appendix 1: 15.09.26 – Emergency Management LTP Proposal

LTP Proposal – Civil Defence / CAPEX Review

Cost Centre	Emergency Management
LTP Forecast	**CAPEX ($145,800 - 26/27, $332,503 – 27/28, $69,028 – 28/29)**
Funding Source	Civil Defence Ops $ 186,062
Author / Lead	General Manager Regulatory and Compliance
Community Outcome	Providing future-fit infrastructure and services Protecting Westland's communities, culture and heritage

Background

A number of ongoing CAPEX projects in current LTP.

A need to review the reasoning for projects and options to enhance community resilience.

Need to ensure the Emergency Operation Centre (EOC) is fit for purpose.

Establish a clear direction for CDEM functions for Westland.

Proposal

Review of alternate water supplies, EMAT cache, containers and alternate EOC projects.

Identify a new EOC location and ensure alternate EOC is fit for purpose.

Impact

Projects planned in the previous triennium may be considered not necessary.

Practicalities of some projects may not provide the resilience anticipated.

Review of emergency management resilience to ensure maximum benefits for Westland District.

Risk

Communities may need to ensure they are prepared and self – sufficient e.g. water.

Diverse community opinions on CDEM priorities.

Coasters are resilient, pragmatic but visitors are not as prepared.

Community apathy towards CDEM with projects not seen as necessary or core with costs of living challenges.

DRAFT

Report to Council

DATE: 11 November 2026

TO: Mayor and Councillors

FROM: Erle Bencich – General Manager District Assets

Public Conveniences

1. Summary

This report seeks Council direction on public convenience service and asset changes for inclusion in the Draft Long-Term Plan 2027–2037. The proposals include rationalising under-used facilities, changing selected operating arrangements, replacing the Beach Street toilets with a larger facility, and investigating user-pays or donation systems at the three busiest locations: Haast, Franz Josef and Hokitika beachfront.

The recommended approach retains strategically important facilities while reducing avoidable operating costs and addressing the condition and capacity of the Beach Street facility. User-pays installation and operating cost estimates have been obtained for Haast, Franz Josef and Beach Street.

2. Background

Council's forecast expenditure for 2026/27 for public conveniences is $802,060. Beach Street is one of the most heavily used toilets in Hokitika and requires a major upgrade within the next few years. Sunset Point is the town's only 24-hour facility, while Cass Square, installed in 2024, is well used because of the playground and major events. Fox Glacier and Franz Josef facilities are beside the highway and experience high use through tourist impacts. Haast requires the most additional cleans because of tourist buses and is expensive to service due to its remote location and limited servicing options available. Community-based cleaning arrangements already operate at Otira, Kumara, Ross, Hari Hari, Whataroa, Okarito and Haast.

3. Workshop Direction and Additional Information

At the LTP workshop #2, councillors requested further information on user-pays models and donation boxes, including the cost of installing systems at Haast, Franz Josef and the Hokitika beachfront. Council were also asked to expand further on why the Beach Street facility requires full replacement and why the proposed replacement should be a larger unit comparable with the facilities at Cass Square, Franz Josef and Haast.

4. Proposal and Options

The original proposal rationalised selected facilities and operating arrangements. The revised options below also address demand at Beach Street and investigate alternative contributions from users at the district's three busiest toilet locations. Supplier quotations, payment processing costs, security requirements, accessibility impacts, likely revenue and collection arrangements must be confirmed before a final user-pays budget or charging model is adopted.

<u>User-pays installation cost estimates:</u>

Location	Estimated installation cost	Annual operating cost	Key assumptions / notes
Haast	$21,130	$2,296	Includes payWave and coin operations. Additional 5c per transaction for payWave
Franz Josef	$21,130	$2,296	Includes payWave and coin operations. Additional 5c per transaction for payWave
Beach Street, Hokitika	$21,130	$2,296	Includes payWave and coin operations. Additional 5c per transaction for payWave
Total	$63,3090	$6,888	The estimate reflects the highest-cost scenario, assuming both payWave and coin-operated systems are installed. Costs will be lower if only one payment method is selected. Annual operating costs do not allow for unforeseen vandalism/damage.

Council forecasts based of the annual user of each of the units that the income received from Haast would be $175,200, Franz Josef would be $127,000, and the Hokitika Beachfront would be $84,600. This is based on a fee of $1 per entry.

5. Option 1 – Status quo and essential renewals only

Retain current facilities and operating arrangements, undertake essential renewals, and defer wider rationalisation, user-pays or donation systems, and the full Beach Street replacement pending further investigation.

6. Option 2 – Rationalisation, Beach Street replacement and funding trials (recommended)

Decommission the Paringa toilets and relocate the toilet block to Fox Glacier to replace the older of the two units there, which was installed in 2007; restrict the Tancred Street toilets to museum visitors; operate Kapitea seasonally; investigate community cleaning arrangements for Franz Josef, Fox Glacier, Haast and Otira; and replace the aging Beach Street toilets with a new, larger unit, with an estimated capital cost of $600,000. The Paringa facility will not be relocated to Beach Street. The new Beach Street facility will be designed to match the unit type and service standard provided at Cass Square, Franz Josef and Haast, with capacity appropriate for the district's busiest Hokitika toilet location. User-pays systems and voluntary donation boxes at Haast, Franz Josef and Beach Street are also included for consideration.

7. Assessment of Options

The options are assessed against service continuity, affordability, asset condition, operational efficiency, environmental risk and the need for meaningful LTP consultation.

7.1. Option 1 – Status quo and essential renewals only

7.1.1. Advantages

- Maintains existing access and avoids immediate service changes or charging decisions.

7.1.2. Disadvantages

- Retains avoidable cleaning and maintenance costs, does not resolve redundant facilities, and postpones a durable response to Beach Street's condition and demand.

7.1.3. Financial Implications

- No new user-pays installation cost is incurred. Existing operating expenditure and essential renewal costs continue. The timing and full cost of the Beach Street replacement remain unresolved and may increase if work is deferred.

7.2. Option 2 – Rationalisation, Beach Street replacement, Paringa relocation and funding trials

7.2.1. Advantages

- Removes the redundant facility from Paringa and reuses the toilet block at Fox Glacier to replace the older unit installed in 2007; avoids constructing a separate replacement at Fox Glacier; focuses investment on high-use locations; provides a purpose-built replacement at Beach Street; improves capacity and consistency by matching the unit type used at Cass Square, Franz Josef and Haast; and tests whether users can contribute through charging or voluntary donations.

7.2.2. Disadvantages

- Changes access at some locations. User-pays systems can create accessibility, equity, reliability, vandalism, cash-handling and transaction-cost issues. Donation boxes may return uncertain revenue and require secure collection.

7.2.3. Financial and Rates Implications

- The LTP forecast for public conveniences is $802,060. The original proposal is expected to reduce cleaning, maintenance and consumable costs. Relocating the Paringa toilet block to Fox Glacier is expected to have minimal cost because the required services are already available on site. Relocating the Paringa toilet block will save Council the future capital cost of replacing the existing 2007 Fox Glacier unit with a new unit. The estimated capital cost of constructing the new, larger Beach Street replacement is $600,000. The table in Section 4 provides for user-pays installation and annual operating cost estimates for Haast, Franz Josef and Beach Street, Hokitika.

8. Risk Assessment

Key risks are inadequate toilet access following closures, increased inappropriate waste disposal, insufficient capacity during peak demand, cost escalation, unforeseen condition or relocation issues with the Paringa block, and poor value from charging technology. These risks can be managed through a condition assessment of the Paringa block, confirmation that existing Fox Glacier services are suitable, a relocation and connection plan, site and design assessments for the new Beach Street replacement, robust procurement, accessible payment and non-payment arrangements, secure cash handling, and a defined trial with revenue and service-performance reporting. The risk of taking no action is continued avoidable operating expenditure and deterioration of older facilities.

9. Recommendation(s)

9.1. That the report be received.
9.2. Note Option 2 is staff's recommended option for the Draft Long Term Plan 2027-2037.
9.3. Identify Council's preferred option.

Erle Bencich
General Manager – District Assets

Appendix 1: 15.09.26 – Public Conveniences LTP Proposal

LTP Proposal – Public Conveniences

Cost Centre	Public Conveniences			
LTP Forecast	**$802,060**			
Funding Source	Beach: U: $22,679	Gen: $42,380		
	Bruce Bay U: $31,551	Gen: $58,959		
	Cass Square U: $31,251	Gen: $58,398	Fox Glacier U: $17,635	Gen: $32,956
	Franz Josef U: $27,094	Gen: $50,632	Haast U: $26,751	Gen: $49,991
	Hari Hari U: $8,943	Gen: $16,711	Hoki Town Area: $15,280	Gen: $28,555
	Kapitea $3,541	Gen: $6,618	Kumara $13,465	Gen: $25,163
	Okarito $7,471	Gen: $13,961	Otira $21,143	Gen: $39,510
	Ross $14,006	Gen: $26,173	Ross Rest Rm $808	Gen: $1,511
	Whataroa $17,851	Gen: $33,358	General U $20,119	Gen: $37,596
Author / Lead	General Manager District Assets Facilities and Properties Manager			
Community Outcome	Providing future-fit infrastructure and services			

Background

Hokitika Area: Beach Street is the most heavily used toilet in Hokitika and requires a major upgrade within the next few years. Nearby Sunset Point is strategic as the town's only 24-hour facility. Ideally, these two should be split into separate General Ledger (GL) accounts and building assets. Cass Square (installed 2024) is well-utilised due to the playground and events like rugby, cricket, and the Wildfoods Festival.

Tancred Street (Museum): toilets are required for the museum to trade, but cleaning costs could be reduced significantly by closing them to the public and installing an internal door for museum visitors only.

Bruce Bay & Paringa: These facilities are currently combined under one GL but should be split. Since they are only 16.8 km apart, both are not needed. Following the recent closure of the Paringa Salmon Farm, the Paringa facility is mostly used by freedom campers and could be removed—potentially to replace the aging Beach Street facility. Bruce Bay is next to the State Highway, well-used, and should remain open.

South Westland: Fox Glacier and Franz Josef facilities are next to the highway and experience high usage. Haast requires the most additional cleans due to tourist tour buses; it is also the most expensive to maintain due to its remote location, which incurs high travel and accommodation costs for contractors.

Community-Cleaned Facilities: Toilets in HariHari, Ross, Whataroa, Kumara, and Okarito are maintained by the council but cleaned by local communities via council grants. Note that Kumara will require a new septic tank within the next two years (to be budgeted in the capital programme). Additionally, the Ross Rest Rooms is a legacy asset that was replaced by the current Ross toilets and should be completely removed from the budgets.

Trail & Highway Redundancies: Kapitea is on the wilderness trail but near Kumara, meaning it could potentially become a seasonal facility. Conversely, the Otira toilets (installed 2024) are likely redundant given their proximity to Arthur's Pass Village.

Distance between public toilets:

- Arthurs Pass to Otira – 13.6Km (Arthurs Pass is not a WDC asset)
- Otira to Kumara – 57.7Km
- Kumara to Hokitika – 28.7Km

DRAFT

- Hokitika to Ross – 27Km
- Ross to HariHari – 45.8Km
- HariHari to Whataroa – 30.7Km
- Whataroa to Franz Josef – 31Km
- Franz Josef to Fox Glacier – 23.2Km
- Fox Glacier to Bruce Bay – 45.2Km
- Bruce Bay to Paringa - 16.8Km
- Paringa to Knights Point – 31.5Km (Knights Point is not a WDC asset)
- Knights Point to Haast – 27.5Km

Proposal

Asset Relocation (Paringa & Beach Street): Decommission the Paringa toilets and physically relocate the infrastructure to replace the aging Beach Street facility. This removes a redundant asset from South Westland, eliminates its maintenance costs, and significantly reduces the capital funding required for the upcoming Beach Street upgrade.

Public Access Restriction (Tancred Street / Museum): Close the external public access to the Tancred Street toilets and install an internal door for museum visitors only. This satisfies the museum's commercial trading requirements while drastically reducing public foot traffic, asset wear, and ongoing cleaning / consumable costs.

Seasonal Operation (Kapitea): Convert the Kapitea toilets into a seasonal facility. The toilets will remain open during the high-use summer months for Wilderness Trail users and be locked down over the winter period to eliminate off-season servicing costs.

Community Grants: To reduce operational costs, Council could consider allocating public toilet service contracts in Franz Josef, Fox Glacier, Haast, and Otira to local community groups. Community-managed facilities have demonstrated significantly lower cleaning costs while maintaining service levels. Council could continue to manage the Hokitika public toilets via contracts directly and partner with community organisations in the smaller townships. Under this model, Council would retain responsibility for all maintenance, undertaking regular inspections and maintenance checks. This approach has been successfully implemented in Ross, Okarito, Whataroa, and Harihari.

Impact

Relocating the Paringa facility significantly reduces the capital cost of the upcoming Beach Street upgrade, while the closures and seasonal shutdown at Kapitea will drastically lower ongoing cleaning, maintenance, and consumable expenses.

Risk

Potential ecological hazards of closures – waste impact.

DRAFT

Report to Council

DATE: 11 November 2026

TO: Mayor and Councillors

FROM: Erle Bencich - General Manager District Assets

Community Halls and Other-Owned Facilities

1. Summary

Council owns and maintains a range of community facilities across the district, including Community Halls and other Council-owned buildings. These facilities provide important community benefits but also create ongoing operational, maintenance, compliance, and renewal costs.

Council is considering the future ownership and management of a number of community facilities including Community Halls and the Custom House.

The proposal considered through the Long Term Plan (LTP) process explores opportunities to reduce Council's long-term asset ownership obligations where assets are not considered core Council infrastructure and where community ownership may provide a more sustainable long-term outcome.

Following the Council LTP workshop #2, Councillors requested that building usage and community demographics be considered on a case-by-case basis before any final decisions are made regarding disposal, demolition, gifting, or retention of assets.

2. Background

Council owns and maintains a number of community facilities throughout the district, including community halls and other Council-owned buildings that support local communities.

These facilities provide a range of benefits including community gatherings, recreational and cultural activities, meetings, emergency response functions, and support for local organisations. Community halls in particular play an important role in maintaining social connection and supporting community resilience across the district.

Many of these facilities are ageing assets requiring increasing levels of maintenance and renewal investment. Council must balance the benefits these facilities provide against affordability considerations and competing infrastructure priorities.

The district's hall network currently consists of both Council-owned and community-owned facilities, as outlined below.

Council Owned Community Halls	Operated by	Operating Cost 2026/27	Capital Expenditure LTP 10 Years
Grey power Pensioner Association Rooms	Grey power Pensioners Association	$12,649	$45,000
Band Rooms - Hokitika	Hokitika Brass Band	$2,675	$120,000
Kokatahi Hall	Kokatahi Public Hall Committee	$39,160	$85,000
Ross Memorial Hall	Ross Community group	$44,656	$50,000
Waitaha Hall	Waitaha Community group	$26,777	$15,000
Haast Community Hall	Haast community group	$57,228	$50,000
Okuru Hall	Okuru community group	$57,493	$0
Kumara Hall	Kumara Memorial Hall Incorporated	Nil	$0
Kowhitirangi Hall	Kowhitirangi Community group	Nil	$0
Lazar Park Hall	Pokeka Poutini Ngai Tahu Limited	Nil	$0
Fox Glacier Community Centre	Fox Glacier community group	Nil	$0
Bruce Bay Community Hall	Bruce bay community group	Nil	$0
Franz Josef Hall	Franz Josef community group	Nil	$0
Hari Hari Hall	Hari Hari community group	Nil	$0

Also considered in this report is the Custom House. Owned by Council this building is currently closed to the public due to significant structural safety issues with the sub floor. The facility requires formal structural engineering testing to confirm its earthquake-prone rating against the latest criteria and identify potential seismic strengthening requirements before any future public use can be considered.

Also considered in this report is the Council-owned house at 3 Main Road, Fox Glacier, which Council proposes to sell. Council also owns a house in Hari Hari; however, because the property is located on Council reserve land, the land must be reclassified before the house can be sold.

The Long-Term Plan provides an opportunity to consider whether current ownership and management arrangements remain appropriate and sustainable into the future. Through workshop discussions, Councillors noted the importance of considering building usage and community demographics when assessing individual facilities and recognised that future decisions may need to reflect the differing circumstances of communities across the district.

3. Workshop Direction and Additional Information

Councillors discussed the future ownership and management of Community Halls and Council-owned buildings during the LTP workshop #2. While recognising the ongoing costs associated with maintaining these facilities, Councillors noted that buildings across the district serve different purposes and levels of community need.

A key point raised during the discussion was the opportunity to consider both building usage and community demographics when assessing individual facilities. Councillors acknowledged that what may be appropriate for one community may not be appropriate for another, and that future decisions should reflect local circumstances rather than applying a single approach across all buildings.

No additional information was requested by Councillors during the workshop. However, Councillors indicated that future assessments should consider building usage and community demographics as part of the decision-making process.

4. Proposal and Options

4.1. Option 1 - Status Quo

Retain Council ownership and management of all Community Halls and Council-owned buildings under current arrangements. Continue funding operational costs, maintenance, renewals and any future compliance requirements through existing rating mechanisms.

4.2. Option 2 - Retain Community Halls and Targeted Management of Council-Owned Buildings.

Following consideration of building usage, community benefit, asset condition, demographics, and long-term sustainability, Council proposes a targeted approach to the future management of its Community Halls and Council-owned buildings.

Under this option:

- All Council-owned Community Halls excluding the Hokitika Band Rooms would remain in Council ownership and management.
- Council would continue to work alongside local communities and user groups to explore whether community organisations may, in the future, have the capacity and desire to assume ownership and management responsibilities for individual facilities.
- The Hokitika Band Room would either be vested to the Hokitika Band, subject to their willingness and ability to accept ownership, or be considered for demolition if a sustainable ownership solution cannot be achieved.
- Council would undertake seismic strengthening assessment and repiling of the Custom House and develop a long-term plan for the future use of the building to ensure it continues to provide value to the community.
- Council would sell the property at 3 Main Road, Fox Glacier.

4.3. Option 3 - Vest Council-Owned Halls to Local Communities or Explore Sale/Disposal - (Recommended)

Council would seek to vest all Council-owned halls in local community organisations willing and able to assume ownership and management responsibilities. Where community vesting is not achievable, Council would explore whether the halls could be sold or otherwise disposed of.

Any proposed vesting, sale or disposal would be subject to engagement with affected communities, property and legal due diligence, and a further Council decision.

This option relates to Council-owned halls only. The proposed approach to the Custom House and the property at 3 Main Road, Fox Glacier would remain as outlined under Option 2.

5. Assessment of Options

5.1. Option 1 - Status Quo

5.1.1. Advantages

- Retains all current facilities.
- Maintains Council control over assets.
- Provides certainty for community groups and users.
- Maintains existing Civil Defence arrangements.

5.1.2. Disadvantages

- Continues long-term maintenance and renewal liabilities.
- Potentially retains under-utilised assets.
- Increasing operating and capital costs.
- May not reflect changing community needs and demographics.

5.1.3. Financial and Rates Implications

- Ongoing operational expenditure and future renewal costs would continue to be funded by ratepayers.

5.2. Option 2 - Retain Community Halls and Targeted Management of Council-Owned Buildings

5.2.1. Advantages

- Retains community access to Council-owned halls.
- Recognises the important role halls play in supporting local communities.
- Provides flexibility for future community-led ownership opportunities where appropriate.
- Reduces uncertainty for hall users and community groups.
- Retains strategic community facilities while allowing Council to address buildings with specific challenges.
- Preserves the Custom House while enabling future planning for its use.
- Disposes of a property (3 Main Road, Fox Glacier) that is not core council infrastructure.

5.2.2. Disadvantages

- Council retains responsibility for ongoing maintenance and renewal costs associated with community halls.
- Future ownership opportunities may not be achievable in all communities.
- Significant investment may be required to strengthen and maintain the Custom House.
- A long-term solution for the Band Hall may not be achieved if no organisation is willing to assume ownership.

5.2.3. Financial and Rates Implications

- Council would continue to fund the operation, maintenance, and renewal of community halls through existing budgets and future Long Term Plan provisions.
- Capital funding will be required for seismic strengthening and future planning for the Custom House.
- Future savings may be realised should community organisations choose to assume ownership and management of individual facilities.
- Proceeds from the property sale would not be ring-fenced and could be allocated by Council to other priorities.

5.3. Option 3 - Vest Council-Owned Halls to Local Communities or Explore Sale/Disposal (Preferred Option)

5.3.1. Advantages

- Would reduce Council's long-term operational, maintenance, renewal and compliance obligations for halls transferred or disposed.

- Provides opportunities for local communities to own and manage halls according to local needs.
- Sale or other disposal could be explored where sustainable community ownership is not achievable.

5.3.2. Disadvantages

- Local organisations may lack the capacity or willingness to assume ownership and meet ongoing costs.
- Sale or disposal could reduce community access and affect recreational, cultural and Civil Defence uses where these rely on a hall.
- Council would lose direct control of transferred or sold halls.

5.3.3. Financial and Rates Implications

- Potential savings would depend on which halls are transferred or disposed of the agreed terms and any ongoing Council support. Council could incur valuation, legal costs, and costs associated with any other form of disposal. Vesting would not necessarily generate sale proceeds; any proceeds from sales would depend on property assessments and market interest.
- The net financial and rates impact would need to be assessed for each hall before a final decision.
- Costs relating to the Custom House and the Fox Glacier property would remain as described under Option 2.

6. Risk Assessment

Key risks are ongoing maintenance and renewal costs for retained community halls, community concern or loss of access if ownership arrangements change, failure to secure a sustainable ownership solution for the Hokitika Band Room, significant structural and seismic costs for the Custom House, and delays or a lower-than-expected return from the sale of 3 Main Road, Fox Glacier.

These risks can be managed through asset condition assessments and prioritised renewal planning, early engagement with affected communities and user groups, due diligence on the Band's capacity to accept ownership, structural and seismic investigations and a costed long-term plan for the Custom House, and independent valuation and legal and property due diligence before the Fox Glacier property is sold.

Under Option 3, additional risks include community organisations being unable to sustain ownership and loss of access to halls. These could be managed through early community engagement, assessment of each organisation's capacity, property and legal due diligence, and consideration of future community access and Civil Defence arrangements before any final decision.

The risk of taking no action is continued exposure to unavoidable costs, unresolved safety concerns, and ongoing uncertainty for communities and facility users.

7. Recommendation(s)

7.1. That the report be received.
7.2. Note Option 3 is staff's recommended option for the Draft Long Term Plan 2027-2037.
7.3. Identify Council's preferred option.

Erle Bencich
General Manager District Assets

Appendix 1: 15.09.26 – Community Halls LTP Proposal
Appendix 2: 15.09.26 – Land and Buildings LTP Proposal

LTP Proposal – Community Halls

Cost Centre	Community Halls
LTP Forecast	**$194,157**
Funding Source	Targeted township rates: $194,157 Bruce Bay Community Hall - $18,078 Okuru C Hall - $34,860 Waitaha C Hall - $26,611 Ross Memorial Hall - $47,004 Haast Reserves /Hall - $27,977 Kokatahi Reserves/Hall - $39,627
Author / Lead	General Manager District Assets Facilities and Property Manager
Community Outcome	Enabling a liveable district Protecting Westland's communities, culture and heritage Providing future-fit infrastructure and services

Asset Ownership Clarification

Bruce Bay Hall: This facility is community-owned, not Council-owned, following an historical ownership dispute. Council historically covered the rates and insurance for this hall. It requires immediate verification to determine if these payments are still active; if so, they should be discontinued.

Fox Glacier Hall: The building is owned by the community, but it is situated on Council-owned land. Council provides no financial contribution toward the building itself, and rates are applicable only for the underlying land ownership via the Township Development rate.

Background

Community halls are owned by Council but managed and utilised by local communities for a variety of purposes, including community meetings, social events, sports, and market days.

These facilities serve as vital Civil Defence Centres for local communities. They house emergency equipment and, in most cases, are equipped with backup generators and water storage tanks. Detailed Seismic Assessments (DSAs) have been completed for these buildings to inform future seismic strengthening requirements.

The halls also provide temporary operational space for key agencies, such as the Department of Conservation (DOC), Fire and Emergency New Zealand (FENZ), and the New Zealand Police, when active in the area.

Due to the age of the portfolio and historically low maintenance budgets, ongoing operational costs are expected to escalate, requiring significant capital expenditure and enhanced maintenance funding over time.

Over the past five years, Council has successfully secured external funding to invest in these assets. Completed upgrades include new windows, external cladding, kitchen and bathroom renewals, solar installations, and improved heating systems.

DRAFT

Proposal

Sell or gift the halls directly to local communities. As the primary end users, community ownership ensures these assets are managed by the people who utilise them most.

Impact

From a civil defence perspective, the role of these halls as designated Civil Defence (CD) sites must be thoroughly evaluated. A key financial risk is the potential lack of allocated civil defence budgets to support these specific buildings. If the community assumes management without dedicated CD funding, it threatens both the operational readiness of the sites during a crisis and the long-term financial viability of the facilities.

Risk

If the Council vests the halls back to the community, there is a risk that local groups may lack the resources or expertise to manage the facilities effectively. This could lead to severe asset deterioration beyond the point of practical restoration. Ultimately, this would deprive the surrounding community of a vital central hub, impacting both day-to-day social cohesion and emergency response capabilities.

DRAFT

LTP Proposal – Land and Buildings

Cost Centre	Land and Buildings
LTP Forecast	**$18,660**
Funding Source	Band rooms: Targeted township $2,601 Custom House: $3,410 Pensioner's Ass: Uniform: $4,409, Gen: $8,240
Author / Lead	General Manager District Assets Facilities and Properties Manager
Community Outcome	Enabling a liveable district Protecting Westland's communities, culture and heritage Providing future-fit infrastructure and services

Background

Hokitika Bandrooms

- Condition and Liability: The building is extremely old, significantly deteriorated, and requires substantial capital investment for ongoing upkeep.
- Current Occupancy: The original Hokitika Brass Band officially disbanded at the end of 2025. The facility is currently utilised informally by a local group of musicians for group practice. We believe this group is looking to form a formal Hokitika Band again.

Custom House

- Current Status and Safety: The building is closed to the public due to significant structural safety issues with the sub-floor surface.
- Seismic Compliance: The facility requires formal structural engineering testing to determine its earthquake-prone rating and identify potential seismic strengthening requirements before any future public use can be considered.
- Floodwall Realignment Impact: The West Coast Regional Council (WCRC) intends to raise the adjacent floodwall in the future. This project will require the Custom House to be physically relocated forward by approximately two meters.
- Financial Strategy: While major capital investment is needed to repair the sub-floor, these works should ideally be aligned with the WCRC floodwall project to negotiate a partial cost-share arrangement, given that the infrastructure project necessitates the building's relocation.

Greypower Building (Formerly Pensioners Association)

- Suggested Name: We call this building the "Greypower Building".
- Occupancy and Usage: The building remains occupied by the pensioners' association and serves as a highly active hub for regular community pensioner activities.
- Council Support and Maintenance: Council continues to retain responsibility for the building's asset maintenance and provides an ongoing operational grant to fund toilet cleaning services as part of the local public toilet network.

DRAFT

Proposal

Hokitika Band Room: We propose that the deteriorated building be demolished and the site integrated into the surrounding museum reserve precinct. Because the land already holds a reserve classification, this development removes long-term council liability while enhancing public open space, as the current structure does not warrant further capital investment.

Custom House: We recommend keeping the building closed and align any upgrades with the WCRC floodwall project. Defer major capital works until the adjacent floodwall project proceeds. Negotiate a cost-sharing arrangement with WCRC. This minimises duplication of costs and disruption.

Greypower Building (Formerly Pensioners Association): Retain Council ownership and maintenance responsibility. Continue supporting community use. This recognises the facility's role as an active community hub.

Impact

Hokitika Band Room: Demolishing the building eliminates a dedicated rehearsal space for the local musicians currently using it, risking the group's continuity if an alternative venue cannot be found. Additionally, despite the official disbanding of the Hokitika Band, the removal of the facility represents a loss of localised cultural heritage for some residents. As the Bands are no longer functioning, if required Council staff could assist with securing alternative space. This is not a core Council function.

Custom House: Deferring major capital expenditure until the floodwall project proceeds provides an opportunity to coordinate relocation and seek cost sharing with WCRC, potentially reducing overall Council expenditure. However, the building remains unavailable for public use in the interim and deterioration may continue if only minimal maintenance is undertaken.

Greypower Building (Formerly Pensioners Association): Continued Council ownership and maintenance support allows the facility to remain a well-used community hall and social hub for local pensioners and community groups. Council retains responsibility for ongoing maintenance, renewals, and operational support costs.

Risk

Vesting the asset preserves a local rehearsal space but carries a high risk; if the community group lacks the resources to manage the advanced deterioration, the facility will fall into further disrepair, creating an eyesore in the CBD adjacent to high-profile tourist destinations like the museum and historical riverside precinct, or eventually returning an even larger liability to the Council.

This could produce some negative feedback so would need to be communicated correctly, focusing on reduced capital expenditure.

DRAFT

Report to Council

DATE: 11 November 2026

TO: Mayor and Councillors

FROM: Erle Bencich – General Manager District Assets

Ross Swimming Pool

1. Summary

Council is asked to determine which option for the future ownership and operation of the Ross Swimming Pool should be included in the Draft Long Term Plan 2027–2037 consultation document.

The pool is Council-owned and community-managed. Council have identified three options: retain Council ownership and the current operating model; transfer ownership and management to a suitable community entity; or explore transfer to Ross Primary School, subject to the school, Ministry of Education and any other relevant parties agreeing to a viable arrangement.

2. Background

The Ross Swimming Pool is owned by Westland District Council and managed by the community. Access is generally controlled through a key sign-in/sign-out system at the Ross local shop, while some regular users hold seasonal passes and dedicated keys. The facility is not PoolSafe accredited, no lifeguards are on duty, and patrons use the pool at their own risk. Capital funding of $68,495 is forecast, funded from targeted Ross township rates, for urgent structural strengthening of the steel framework in the 2026/27 financial year. The contract has been awarded but the project is paused because of a funding shortfall. The strengthening work is considered necessary for the facility to remain safe for public use, regardless of the preferred long-term ownership option.

3. Workshop Direction and Additional Information

The original proposal considered during LTP Workshop #2 was to transfer the facility to the community for local ownership and management. At the LTP workshop, elected members directed Council to also explore transferring or vesting the pool asset in Ross Primary School.

Transferring or vesting the pool in the Ministry of Education for the benefit of Ross Primary School would require formal engagement with both the Ministry and the school, confirmation that the proposal aligns with education property policy, and agreement on ownership, public access, operating costs, maintenance, renewals, insurance and health and safety responsibilities. Current Ministry guidance indicates that school pools are not considered essential under the School Property Guide and that there is no Ministry funding to build or replace them. Where a school board or community owns a pool, the board is responsible for maintenance and does not receive operational funding specifically for that pool; significant upgrades to Ministry-owned pools are generally treated as non-essential projects. This issue currently exists in Hari Hari

where the community currently operates the local school / community pool which is expensive and burdensome on the residents.

These settings suggest there is likely to be limited Ministry appetite to accept ownership of a public pool serving the wider community, particularly where ongoing capital investment and compliance obligations remain.

4. Proposal and Options

Three options are available. Any transfer would require due diligence, agreement on public access and responsibilities, legal and property advice, and confirmation that the recipient has the capacity and authority to own and operate the facility.

4.1. Option 1 – Retain Council Ownership (Status Quo)

Council retains ownership, while the pool continues to be managed locally. Council would invest in a more secure booking and access system to improve the current process and strengthen oversight of facility use. Council would complete the urgent structural strengthening work and remain responsible for ownership obligations, capital renewal and agreed operating support. External funding would be sought for the strengthening work; if external funding cannot be secured, the work would be funded solely by Council.

4.2. Option 2 – Transfer to a Community Entity

Council seeks a suitably constituted and capable local community entity to accept ownership and management. Council would fund and deliver the urgent structural strengthening project before the transfer takes effect. From completion of that project and transfer of the facility, Council would have no ongoing responsibility for capital expenditure or operating expenditure associated with the pool. Transfer terms would need to address the condition of the asset, ongoing public access, insurance, maintenance, renewals, health and safety, governance and the recipient's capacity to meet all future costs.

4.3. Option 3 – Propose Transfer to the Ministry of Education (recommended)

Council opens discussions with the Ministry of Education to determine whether transfer is legally and operationally feasible. Any arrangement would need to preserve appropriate community access, define school and public-use priorities, allocate operating and capital responsibilities, and address safeguarding, health and safety, insurance, governance and funding.

5. Assessment of Options

The assessment below is preliminary. Exact transfer costs, funding impacts, legal requirements and rates effects require confirmation through due diligence and engagement with potential recipients.

5.1. Option 1 – Retain Council Ownership

5.1.1. Advantages

- Maintains Council control of the asset, public access expectations and future service decisions; provides continuity while structural work is completed.

5.1.2. Disadvantages

- Council retains ongoing ownership, maintenance, renewal, compliance and funding exposure; the existing unaccredited and unsupervised operating model remains a concern requiring active management and large capital investment.

5.1.3. Financial Implications

- The LTP forecast provides $68,495 from targeted township rates. The awarded strengthening project has a funding shortfall; the shortfall, ongoing operating costs, renewal profile will continue to have an overall impact on rates both locally and in the wider community.

5.2. Option 2 – Transfer to a Community Entity

5.2.1. Advantages

- Supports local ownership and decision-making; may reduce Council's long-term operating and maintenance obligations; may strengthen community involvement in the facility.

5.2.2. Disadvantages

- A capable recipient may not be available; volunteer capacity and technical expertise may be limited; public access and affordability could change; failure of the entity could lead to deferred maintenance, closure, reputational impacts or requests for Council assistance.

5.2.3. Financial Implications

- The transfer would reduce long-term Council costs associated to the pool; the Ross Township targeted rate would need to be reviewed, discontinued or redirected toward an agreed transition or ongoing community support arrangement.

5.3. Option 3 – Propose Transfer to the Ministry of Education

5.3.1. Advantages

- Could align the pool with local education, water-safety and community outcomes, provide an established institutional owner, and support coordinated school and community use.

5.3.2. Disadvantages

- Feasibility and willingness are unconfirmed. Ministry approval and property processes may apply. School priorities, safeguarding requirements and restricted hours could conflict with community access, and ownership may impose material cost and liability on the school.

5.3.3. Financial Implications

- The transfer would reduce long-term Council costs associated to the pool; the Ross Township targeted rate would need to be discontinued or redirected toward an agreed transition.

6. Risk Assessment

6.1. Option 1: Council retains financial, compliance, asset-failure and reputational risks. These can be managed through completion of structural strengthening, condition assessment, a funded renewals plan, documented operating arrangements and a review of aquatic safety controls.

6.2. Option 2: The principal risk is that a community entity lacks sustainable funding, governance or technical capability, resulting in deferred maintenance or closure. Controls include an asset condition report, clear transfer terms, minimum public-access expectations, reporting requirements and provisions addressing default or disposal.

6.3. Option 3: The principal risks are that the school or Ministry does not agree, statutory or property approvals prevent transfer, school use conflicts with community access, or costs and liabilities are not sustainable. Controls include early engagement, legal and property advice, a documented operating model, safeguarding and health-and-safety arrangements, and a binding community-access agreement.

6.4. All options: Regardless of the medium to long term solutions sought the urgent strengthening project must be undertaken, and external funding support is being explored.

7. Recommendation(s)

7.1. That the report be received.
7.2. Note Option 3 is staff's recommended option for the Draft Long Term Plan 2027-2037.
7.3. Identify Council's preferred option.

Erle Bencich
General Manager District Assets

Appendix 1: 15.09.26 – Ross Swimming Pool LTP Proposal

LTP Proposal – Ross Swimming Pool

Cost Centre	Ross Swimming Pool
LTP Forecast	**$68,495**
Funding Source	$68,495 Targeted township rates
Author / Lead	General Manager District Assets Facilities and Properties Manager General Manager Regulatory and Compliance
Community Outcome	Enabling a liveable district Providing future-fit infrastructure and services

Background

The Ross swimming pool is owned by the Council and managed by the community.

Capital funding is allocated for the 2026/2027 financial year to complete urgent structural strengthening of the pool's steel framework.

Standard facility keys are managed via a sign-in/sign-out system at the Ross local shop. However, select regular users hold independent access through seasonal passes and dedicated keys.

The facility is not PoolSafe accredited. Consequently, no lifeguards are on duty, and patrons utilise the pool entirely at their own risk.

Proposal

Community Transfer: Handing over the facility back to the community for local management and ownership.

Impact

The planned capital project has been awarded but is currently paused due to a funding shortfall. Regardless of the final option chosen for the pool's future, this project must proceed. The structural steel strengthening is urgently required to ensure the facility remains safe for public use.

Risk

Financial Risk: Low long-term risk for Council as ongoing maintenance and operational costs shift to the community. However, Council may face reputational risk or requests for top-up funding if the community group struggles to meet costs.

Community Risk: High risk if the community group lacks the resources or expertise to manage the facility long-term, potentially leading to deferred maintenance or eventual closure.

DRAFT

Report to Council

DATE: 11 November 2026

TO: Mayor and Councillors

FROM: Acting General Manager – Business Enablement

Community Grant Funding – Regent Theatre

1. Summary

This report seeks Council direction on whether to continue community grant funding for the Regent Theatre through a targeted rate paid solely by the Hokitika Rating Zone, and on the future funding approach and associated governance and accountability arrangements.

Council is considering which proposals and options should be included in the Draft Long Term Plan consultation document. This report brings the proposal back from the LTP workshop for consideration.

2. Background

Council currently supports the Regent Theatre through a single annual grant funded by an additional targeted rate paid solely through the Hokitika Rating Zone. The Regent Theatre is a significant community asset that contributes to the district's social, cultural, and economic liveability. While community outcomes remain a primary consideration, the Regent Theatres role as an economic enabler should also be recognised.

Workshop Direction and Additional Information.

The Council's discussion previously acknowledged the Regent Theatres contribution to the community wellbeing, district liveability and economic activity. Councillors requested a review of the funding model sustainability, targeted-rate suitability, financial resilience, community benefits, and ratepayer affordability.

It should be noted that Council administers a range of other smaller community grants. These grants schemes can be reviewed independently of the LTP process through Councils standard BAU, policy, funding, and operational review processes.

3. Proposal and Options

3.1. Option 1 – Continue with Hokitika Community grant funding at current level (status quo)

Council continues its existing grant funding arrangement with no material changes to the level of funding or the model.

While this option provides funding certainty for the theatre, it does not address its longer-term reliance on Council funding or identify opportunities to reduce future costs.

3.2. Option 2 - Discontinue Council funding in it's current form and explore alternative funding arrangements.

Council would discontinue the current grant funding arrangement and explore alternative options via council.

4. Assessment of Options

4.1. Option 1 – Continue existing Hokitika Community grant funding (status quo)

4.1.1. Advantages

- Provides certainty and stability for theatre operations.
- Enables continuation of current services and events.
- Demonstrates ongoing Council support for the arts and culture.
- Retains Council oversight of public funding.

4.1.2. Disadvantages

- Does not address questions regarding the long term financial sustainability.
- May increase future funding pressure on Council budgets.
- Does not incentivise consideration of alternative revenue opportunities.

4.1.3. Financial and Rates Implications

- Continued funding at an existing level of $74,000 which would need to be incorporated into future operating budgets and associated grant revenue requirements.

4.2. Option 2 – Discontinue Council funding in its current form and explore alternative funding arrangements.

4.2.1. Advantages

- Enables consideration of alternative funding providers.
- Reduces direct Council funding commitments.

4.2.2. Disadvantages

- May significantly impact theatre viability and longevity.
- Potential reduction in community access to film, music, and art productions.
- Risk of loss in economic and social benefits.
- May result in reduced use of theatre.
- Potential adverse community response.

4.2.3. Financial and Rates Implications

- Council funding obligations would reduce however financial implications are unknown until alternative arrangements are fully discovered.

5. Risk Assessment

The key risks associated with the options, including retaining existing arrangements, are set out below.

Risk	Options affected	Potential impact	Risk management / mitigation
Affordability	Options 1	Continued funding may create ongoing pressure on rates and council budgets.	Undertake regular funding reviews, monitor financial performance, and consider alternative revenue opportunities to reduce reliance on rate payer funding.

Equity and local benefit	Option 1	Funding concerns may arise regarding the level of support provided to a single organisation compared to other community groups also seeking funding.	Council would assess funding against community outcomes, demonstrate local benefit, usage levels and strategic priorities.
Accountability	Options 1 & 2	Minimal transparency around outcomes and use of ratepayer funding could create reputational risk for Council and reduce confidence in funding arrangements.	Document regular reporting against agreed objectives, financial measures, and community benefit outcomes.
Financial classification and duplication	Options 1	Maintaining current funding may not address long term model, while ceasing funding could impact the ability to operate sustainably.	Reconcile cost centres and forecast amounts across LTP proposals before consultation.
Continuity of local projects	Option 2	Changes to funding arrangements may delay or disrupt commitments to deliver productions, films, community events.	Identify transition arrangements and support options while alternative funding solutions are explored.
Maintaining the status quo	Option 1	Retaining the current approach may miss opportunities to improve financial resilience, governance, or operational efficiency.	Introduce periodic reporting, reviews, and review triggers within existing arrangements.

6. Recommendation(s)

6.1. That the report be received.

6.2. Notes that the Councils other community grant programmes and smaller discretionary funding arrangements can be reviewed separately through Councils policy and operational review processes and do not require consideration through the LTP process unless there are significant rating or budget implications.

6.3. Note Option 2 is staff's recommended option for the Draft Long Term Plan 2027-2037.

6.4. Identify Council's preferred option.

Ashleigh Baillie

Acting General Manager – Business Enablement

Report to Council

DATE: 11 November 2026

TO: Mayor and Councillors

FROM: Acting General Manager – Business Enablement

Museum

1. Summary

This report seeks Council direction on the option to be progressed through the Draft Long Term Plan 2027–2037 process for museum service delivery and the ownership and management of the Carnegie Building. The proposal considers the ongoing provision of heritage, educational and visitor services alongside the financial sustainability and stewardship of a significant Council heritage asset.

The original workshop proposal identifies three approaches to museum service delivery and three related options for the Carnegie Building. This report brings these considerations together into three distinct options for Council assessment. No preferred option was identified in the source proposal. Further financial, asset and operational information is required before the implications of changing the current arrangements can be reliably determined.

This report brings the proposal back from the LTP workshop for formal decision.

2. Background

Museum services contribute to the preservation and interpretation of Westland's heritage, community education, cultural enrichment and the district's visitor experience. The proposal aligns with the community outcomes of enabling a liveable district and protecting Westland's communities, culture and heritage.

The original proposal records an LTP forecast of $650,148, comprising $430,265 for museum operations and $219,883 for the Carnegie Building.

The Carnegie Building has previously undergone seismic strengthening. Roofing and window renewals remain planned, and the building includes specialist fire protection and HVAC systems that require ongoing maintenance, certification and compliance management. These obligations remain relevant where Council continues to own the building, irrespective of who delivers museum services.

The museum currently relies on the Tancred Street public toilets for visitor facilities. Any proposed closure or change to those facilities would require a suitable alternative. The workshop paper identifies the possibility of internal access to the existing toilets; feasibility, cost and any necessary approvals would need to be established before this could be relied upon.

The LTP process provides an opportunity to test the affordability, sustainability and appropriate governance of the service without presupposing withdrawal from heritage responsibilities.

3. Workshop Direction and Additional Information

The original workshop paper identifies three potential service-delivery approaches: a museum trust, Council-funded building overheads with external service delivery, and continuation of existing arrangements. It separately identifies continued Council ownership, community management with Council ownership, and full transfer of the Carnegie Building.

Further information required before a final operating-model decision includes a verified breakdown of the operating budget, asset renewal and compliance liabilities, collection ownership and custodial responsibilities, the capacity and willingness of potential community providers, proposed service standards, and the capital and compliance implications of visitor toilet arrangements.

4. Proposal and Options

For the purpose of the LTP decision, the museum service-delivery and Carnegie Building considerations are presented as three options. Museum operations, collection stewardship and property ownership are distinct matters; any subsequent implementation would need to address each separately.

4.1. Option 1 - Retain Council ownership of the building and museum service delivery (status quo)

Continue Council ownership and operation of the museum and Carnegie Building under existing arrangements. Council would retain responsibility for museum services, collection management, staffing, building maintenance, compliance and future asset renewals. This option maintains existing service delivery and Council oversight but does not materially change the current operating cost structure or address opportunities for alternative service delivery.

4.2. Option 2 - Retain Council ownership of the building with community or contracted service delivery

Council would retain responsibility for building ownership and associated asset obligations, while operational, maintenance, and compliance responsibilities would be allocated through formal agreements implemented under a structured transition approach. This option could provide opportunities for community participation and alternative funding arrangements while retaining Council oversight of the heritage asset.

4.3. Option 3 – Transfer building ownership and museum operations

Consider transferring ownership of the Carnegie Building and responsibility for museum operations to an external organisation, subject to appropriate due diligence and statutory requirements.

This would potentially reduce Council's direct involvement in museum service delivery and asset management but would also reduce its control over the future management and preservation of the heritage building. The implications for collection ownership, heritage protection, public access, and any ongoing Council financial commitments would require further assessment. Formal agreements would be implemented under a structured transition approach.

5. Assessment of Options

Assess each option to support Council decision-making. Include advantages, disadvantages, financial and rates impacts, risks, levels of service, statutory considerations, and consultation implications.

5.1. Option 1 - Retain Council ownership of the building and museum service delivery

5.1.1. Advantages

- Maintains continuity of museum services and established arrangements for collection care and public access.
- Retains Council oversight and direct control of a significant heritage asset and its maintenance.

- Avoids the immediate costs and disruption associated with changing providers or transferring assets.

5.1.2. Disadvantages

- Council continues to meet museum operating costs and building ownership, compliance and renewal obligations.
- Does not, of itself, provide an alternative source of operational funding or reduce Council's service-delivery responsibilities.
- May limit opportunities to test different governance, community participation or service delivery arrangements.

5.1.3. Financial and Rates Implications

- Council continues to meet museum operating costs and building ownership, compliance and renewal obligations. Does not, of itself, provide an alternative source of operational funding or reduce Council's service-delivery responsibilities. May limit opportunities to test different governance, community participation or service delivery arrangements.

5.2. Option 2 – Retain Council ownership of the building with community or contracted service delivery

5.2.1. Advantages

- Provides an opportunity to test community participation, specialist partnerships and alternative fundraising arrangements.
- Retains Council ownership and strategic oversight of the Carnegie Building.
- Allows service expectations, reporting and funding responsibilities to be established through a formal agreement.

5.2.2. Disadvantages

- Council would continue to carry building ownership, compliance and renewal obligations.
- Service continuity and collection care would depend on the capability and sustainability of the selected provider.
- Transition, contract management and monitoring would introduce additional responsibilities and potentially additional costs.

5.2.3. Financial and Rates Implications

- No net saving has been established. Any change to museum staffing and operational expenditure would need to be considered alongside the ongoing building costs retained by Council, potential service payments, transition costs, legal and procurement costs, and monitoring arrangements. The rates implications cannot be determined until these costs are assessed.

5.3. Option 3 – Transfer building ownership and museum operations

5.3.1. Advantages

- Could reduce Council's direct service delivery and asset management obligations where responsibilities are effectively transferred.
- Could enable independent community governance and access to other funding opportunities.

5.3.2. Disadvantages

- Council would relinquish direct control over the future use and management of a significant heritage building.
- Long-term collection care, public access and heritage protection would depend on appropriate safeguards and the capacity of the receiving organisation.

- Transfer may be constrained by statutory, property, heritage or collection obligations.

5.3.3. Financial and Rates Implications

- No valuation, transfer terms or reliable net saving have been established. The costs of disposal or transfer, treatment of collections and restricted assets, potential continuing support and any residual Council obligations require investigation. A transfer should not be assumed to remove all future costs or rates requirements.

6. Risk Assessment

The following table identifies the key risks associated with each option, including maintaining the status quo, and the measures required to manage those risks.

Risk	Options affected	Potential impact	Risk management / mitigation
Service continuity and heritage outcomes	All options	Changes to funding, governance or service delivery could reduce collection care, public access, educational opportunities and visitor benefits.	Establish minimum service standards, collection safeguards and performance monitoring arrangements before implementing any changes.
Building compliance and renewal	Options 1 and 2	Ongoing investment is required for fire systems, HVAC, certification, roofing and window renewals. Failure to adequately maintain these systems could result in increased costs, compliance issues or service disruption.	Undertake a comprehensive building condition and compliance assessment. Confirm responsibilities for maintenance, certification and renewals, with appropriate funding provisions.
Visitor toilet facilities	All options	Loss of access to the Tancred Street public toilets could compromise the museum's ability to operate and meet visitor requirements.	Confirm a compliant and funded toilet solution before any changes to existing facilities. Assess the feasibility, cost and consent requirements of providing internal access.
Transition and provider capacity	Options 2 and 3	A trust or external provider may lack the financial sustainability, operational capability or governance capacity required to maintain museum services and protect collections.	Undertake provider due diligence, establish clear contractual and performance requirements, and provide for staged implementation, termination rights and contingency arrangements.
Asset disposal and loss of control	Option 3	Transferring ownership of the Carnegie Building could reduce Council's influence over the long-term preservation, maintenance and future use of a significant heritage asset.	Obtain independent legal, property, heritage and financial advice. Assess the feasibility of enforceable heritage protections and ongoing public access arrangements before progressing any transfer.

Financial uncertainty	All options	Unverified budget allocations and incomplete cost information could result in decisions that do not deliver anticipated savings or create additional financial obligations.	Reconcile existing budgets, distinguish depreciation from cash expenditure, assess whole-of-life costs and quantify the financial and rates implications of each option before consultation.
Maintaining the status quo / taking no action	Option 1	Continuing existing arrangements without reviewing service delivery, operating costs and future asset requirements may perpetuate financial pressures, limit opportunities for improved services and defer necessary investment decisions.	Review current service performance, operating costs and asset requirements. Establish a planned maintenance and renewal programme, alongside periodic assessments of service delivery efficiency and financial sustainability.

Overall risk consideration

The principal consideration is balancing the long-term protection of Westland's heritage assets and museum collections with the financial sustainability of museum services. While alternative delivery models may offer opportunities for greater community involvement and operational efficiencies, these benefits must be assessed against the risks associated with provider capacity, service continuity and ongoing asset obligations.

Any proposed change should be supported by a clear understanding of the financial implications, defined responsibilities and appropriate safeguards to ensure the continued preservation of the district's heritage and public access to museum services.

7. Recommendation(s)

7.1. That the report be received.
7.2. Note Option 2 is staff's recommended option for a phased approach, to assess if appropriate to move to Option 3, for the Draft Long Term Plan 2027-2037.
7.3. Identify Council's preferred option.

Ashleigh Baillie
Acting General Manager – Business Enablement

Report to Council

DATE: 11 November 2026

TO: Mayor and Councillors

FROM: Acting General Manager – Business Enablement

Taxi Grants & Community Investment

1. Summary

This report seeks Council direction to continue the provision of the taxi subsidy scheme provided to the Westland taxi operator.

It is proposed that the support be retained through the Long-Term Plan 2027- 2037. The current LTP forecast is $30,384 for the operator subsidy

Council is considering which proposals and options should be included in the Draft Long Term Plan consultation document. This report brings the proposal back from the LTP workshop for formal decision.

2. Background

Council provides a subsidy to the taxi operator to support continued delivery of the service. This funding should not be considered in isolation as the council also fund $1,847 for a Taxi Chit scheme to support eligible residents. The two funding components serve different purposes: the chits contribute to the affordability of individual journeys, while the operator subsidy supports service availability.

The taxi chits scheme is a community support programme intended to assist eligible older residents who have voluntarily stopped driving or do not have independent transport. Eligible participants receive taxi chits covering 50% of the fare for essential journeys, including grocery shopping and medical or dental appointments. Council administers the scheme through its Customer Services counter.

The original workshop proposal identified the activity under Community Services and Land Transport, with community outcomes of enabling a liveable district and protecting Westland's communities, culture, and heritage. Its proposed impact is continued access to affordable transport and the maintenance of independence for eligible older residents.

3. Workshop Direction and Additional Information

The original workshop paper proposes continuation of both the taxi chit service and the taxi operator subsidy, as the taxi chit scheme is reliant on a Taxi service being available.

4. Proposal and Options

4.1. Option 1 - Continue the operator subsidy (status quo)

Continue providing the existing subsidy to the taxi operator to support the availability and affordability of taxi services for residents.

4.2. Option 2 - Review the taxi support arrangements before confirming longer-term provision

Undertake a targeted review of the taxi chit scheme and operator subsidy to establish whether the current eligibility criteria, level of support, operator arrangements and funding remain appropriate. Existing services would continue while the review is undertaken, subject to approved budgets and agreements. Any proposed changes, including a reduction or discontinuation of either component, would return to Council with evidence of service impacts, costs, and any applicable consultation requirements.

5. Assessment of Options

5.1. Option 1 - Continue existing arrangements

5.1.1. Advantages

- Maintains affordable access to essential journeys for eligible older residents and supports independent living.
- Provides continuity for service users and the taxi operator, avoiding disruption while the LTP is developed.
- Retains an established, locally administered scheme with a defined 50% fare contribution.

5.1.2. Disadvantages

- Continues the existing funding commitment without establishing whether the current level and distribution of support remain optimal.
- Does not itself test demand, uptake, value for money or the effectiveness of the operator subsidy.
- The scheme remains dependent on the availability and capacity of the participating taxi operator.

5.1.3. Financial and Rates Implications

- The original proposal forecasts $1,847 for taxi chits and $30,384 for the operator subsidy, a total of $32,231. Continuing the service retains an ongoing rates-funded commitment; the impact on individual ratepayers is not provided.

5.2. Option 2 - Review the support arrangements

5.2.1. Advantages

- Allows Council to assess service use, eligibility, affordability and the outcomes achieved by each funding component.
- Provides an opportunity to test the operator subsidy against documented service expectations and value for money.
- Supports an evidence-based decision before any substantive change to funding or service levels.

5.2.2. Disadvantages

- Requires officer time and engagement with service users and the operator.
- May create uncertainty for eligible residents and the operator if the scope and timing of the review are not clearly communicated.
- Does not produce immediate savings; any subsequent change may affect access to essential transport.

5.2.3. Financial and Rates Implications

- The cost of undertaking a review has not been established. The existing $32,231 forecast would remain the starting point while current services continue. No savings, replacement service costs or changes in rates can be quantified from the original proposal. Any proposed change

would require a separate financial assessment, including the implications for users and the operator.

6. Risk Assessment

Risk	Options affected	Potential impact	Risk management / mitigation
Access to essential transport	Option 2	Reducing or discontinuing support may limit eligible residents' access to shopping and health appointments.	Assess user reliance and availability of alternatives before changes; maintain clear communications and transition arrangements.
Operator viability and service continuity	Option 2	The service may become less available if the operator cannot sustain delivery or arrangements change.	Confirm subsidy terms, expected service provision and contingency arrangements with the operator.
Financial sustainability and value for money	Option 2	Expenditure may not align with use or measurable outcomes, and assumed savings may not materialise.	Verify forecast and actual costs, utilisation, and operator subsidy outcomes; report periodically to Council.
Equity and eligibility	Option 2	Eligibility or access arrangements may not consistently reach intended users.	Confirm and document eligibility criteria, administration, and fair access.
Taking no action / maintaining the status quo	Option 1	Existing arrangements could continue without sufficient evidence of effectiveness or changing demand.	Introduce proportionate periodic review and monitoring without disrupting essential service access.
Transition and consultation	Option 2	Poorly managed changes may create uncertainty or unintended impacts on users and the operator.	Assess significance and any consultation obligations; give adequate notice and stage any changes.

Overall risk consideration: The principal consideration is balancing affordability and service continuity for eligible older residents with responsible stewardship of rates funding. Any material change should be informed by verified demand, operator arrangements and the availability of practical alternatives.

7. Recommendation(s)

7.1. That the report be received.
7.2. Note both options are staff's recommended options for the Draft Long Term Plan 2027-2037.
7.3. Identify Council's preferred option.

Ashleigh Baillie
Acting General Manager – Business Enablement

Appendix 1: 15.09.26 – Taxi LTP Proposal

LTP Proposal – Taxi

Cost Centre	Community Services and Land Transport
LTP Forecast	**$1,847 – Taxi Chits** **$30,384 – Taxi Subsidy** **$32,231 – Total**
Funding Source	UAGR $643.84 Gen $1,203 UAGR $10,592 Gen $19,792
Author / Lead	General Manager Business Enablement
Community Outcome	Enabling a liveable district Protecting Westland's communities, culture and heritage

Background

This is a community support programme that helps eligible older residents pay for essential taxi travel.

The scheme is intended for seniors who voluntarily stopped driving or do not have independent transport.

Eligible participants receive taxi chits that cover 50% of the fare for essential travel, such as grocery shopping and medical or dental appointments. The scheme is administered through Council's Customer Services counter.

Council also provides a subsidy of $30,384 to the taxi operator to support the continued delivery of this service.

Proposal

Continue to provide taxi chit services and taxi subsidy.

Impact

Continued access to affordable transport for eligible older residents, helping them access essential services and maintain their independence.

Risk

Discontinuing the service may leave elderly residents with limited or no access to transport, creating barriers to essential services.

DRAFT

Report to Council

DATE: 11 November 2026

TO: Mayor and Councillors

FROM: Erle Bencich – General Manager District Assets

Westland Sports Hub

1. Summary

Council is asked to determine which option for the future maintenance and insurance responsibilities for the Westland Sports Hub should be included in the Draft Long-Term Plan 2027–2037 consultation document.

Historically, Council's contribution to the Westland Sports Hub has been limited to the annual Building Warrant of Fitness. However, in June 2026 an MOU signed in July 2020 between Westland High School and Westland District Council was identified, confirming that Council is responsible for both insurance and maintenance costs. The MOU has no end date or term noted.

Council has identified three options: retain the existing arrangements; renegotiate the MOU to reduce or share Council's maintenance and insurance responsibilities; or seek to remove Council's ongoing maintenance and insurance responsibilities.

2. Background

Historically, Westland District Council has not been responsible for maintenance costs associated with the Westland Sports Hub, with its only contribution being the annual Building Warrant of Fitness. Previous Chief Executives had directed that no additional costs should fall to Council for this facility. However, an MOU signed in July 2020 with no end date or term noted, between Westland High School and Westland District Council confirms that Council is responsible for both insurance and maintenance costs of the structure. Pavement, equipment and playing surface costs are the responsibility of Westland High School.

A structural audit was undertaken to assess the facility's condition and maintenance requirements. This resulted in urgent safety repairs being undertaken and a quotation being obtained for ongoing annual maintenance programme. Although reasonably new, going costs for the Sports Hub structure are expected to increase, with regular maintenance required to ensure compliance and user safety are assured and the structure remains sound and fit for purpose.

Correspondence has been sent to the Westland High School Board and the principle requesting a meeting to discuss and review future maintenance responsibilities and cost-sharing arrangements. The facility is used by the school and local sports groups, while the school controls access and day-to-day use. The school has previously indicated that it does not consider the facility an educational asset, but rather one used for sporting activities, and may therefore be reluctant to accept responsibility for associated costs. Fees and charges to the various user entities are retained by Westland High School board.

The previous LTP proposal provides an annual forecast of $14,751.

3. Workshop Direction and Additional Information

No further information was requested following the previous LTP workshop.

Councillor Martin was involved in the establishment of the Development West Coast Sports Hub project. Her conflict of interest in relation to this matter should be noted.

4. Proposal and Options

4.1. Option 1 – Retain Existing Arrangements (Status Quo)

Council retains the existing MOU and continues to meet the maintenance and insurance responsibilities currently assigned to Council. Council would continue to fund ongoing maintenance required to keep the facility safe, structurally sound and fit for purpose.

4.2. Option 2 – Renegotiate Maintenance and Insurance Responsibilities (Recommended)

Council continues discussions with Westland High School board to renegotiate the MOU and seek a revised more balanced allocation of maintenance and insurance responsibilities. Any revised arrangement would clearly establish the responsibilities of each party for ongoing maintenance, insurance and other costs associated with the facility. Until a revised agreement is reached, Council would continue to meet its existing obligations under the MOU. Seek clarity around fees and income through the operation of the facility.

4.3. Option 3 – Seek to Remove Council's Ongoing Responsibilities

Council seeks agreement to amend or terminate the existing arrangements so that Council no longer carries responsibility for the maintenance and insurance costs associated with the Westland Sports Hub. This option would require agreement between the parties and formal amendment or termination of the existing MOU.

This option would require escalation to the Ministry of Education as they own the land where the HUB is situated.

5. Assessment of Options

5.1. Option 1 - Status Quo

5.1.1. Advantages

- Provides certainty regarding responsibility for maintenance and insurance.
- Maintains the current arrangements between Council and Westland High School.
- Ensures ongoing maintenance requirements continue to be addressed.

5.1.2. Disadvantages

- Council retains ongoing maintenance and insurance costs.
- Council remains exposed to increasing maintenance requirements and future expenditure.
- Ratepayers continue to fund costs associated with a facility controlled and primarily used by others.

5.1.3. Financial Implications

- The LTP forecast provides $14,751. Ongoing maintenance costs are expected to increase, with future expenditure likely to be required to ensure the facility remains safe, structurally sound and fit for purpose.

5.2. Option 2 - Renegotiate Maintenance and Insurance Responsibilities (Preferred option)

5.2.1. Advantages

- Provides an opportunity to reduce Council's ongoing maintenance and insurance costs.
- Allows responsibilities to be reconsidered based on the use and control of the facility.
- Provides an opportunity for maintenance and insurance costs to be shared or reallocated.
- Establishes clearer responsibilities between the parties.

5.2.2. Disadvantages

- Agreement between the parties cannot be guaranteed.
- Council remains responsible for its existing obligations until the MOU is amended.
- The School Board may be reluctant to accept additional responsibility or costs.

5.2.3. Financial Implications

- A revised arrangement may reduce Council's ongoing maintenance and insurance costs. The extent of any savings cannot be confirmed until discussions are completed, and a revised allocation of responsibilities is agreed.

5.3. Option 3 - Seek to Remove Council's Ongoing Responsibilities

5.3.1. Advantages

- Would reduce Council's long-term maintenance and insurance obligations if agreement can be reached.
- Reduces Council's exposure to future maintenance expenditure.
- Better aligns responsibility for the facility with its use and control.

5.3.2. Disadvantages

- Agreement between the parties cannot be guaranteed.
- The School Board and Ministry of Education may be unwilling to accept responsibility for ongoing maintenance and insurance costs.
- Council remains bound by the existing MOU until an alternative arrangement is agreed.
- May create relationship risks between Council and the School Board / Ministry of Education.

5.3.3. Financial Implications

- Removing Council's maintenance and insurance responsibilities would reduce long-term Council costs associated with the Sports Hub. The extent of any savings cannot be confirmed until an alternative arrangement is agreed.

6. Risk Assessment

6.1. Option 1: Council retains ongoing financial; maintenance and insurance risks associated with the Sports Hub. Ongoing maintenance costs are expected to increase, with future expenditure likely to be required.

6.2. Option 2: The principal risk is that agreement cannot be reached on a revised allocation of maintenance and insurance responsibilities. This can be managed through continued engagement with the School Board and clear documentation of any revised responsibilities. Council would remain responsible for its existing obligations until an amended agreement is reached.

6.3. Option 3: The principal risks are that agreement cannot be reached to amend or terminate the MOU and that transferring responsibility creates relationship issues with the School Board. Council remains bound by the existing arrangements unless mutual agreement to amend or terminate them can be reached.

6.4. All options: Regular maintenance will continue to be required to ensure the facility remains safe, structurally sound and fit for purpose while Council's existing responsibilities remain in place. Financial records are required from the School Board to assess income and equitable cost sharing if required.

7. Recommendation(s)

7.1. That the report be received.

7.2. Note Option 2 is staff's recommended option for the Draft Long Term Plan 2027-2037.

7.3. Identify Council's preferred option.

Erle Bencich
General Manager District Assets

Appendix 1: 15.09.26 – Westland Sports Hub LTP Proposal

LTP Proposal – Westland Sports Hub

Cost Centre	Westland Sports Hub
LTP Forecast	**$14,751**
Funding Source	UAGC: $5,142.03 Gen: $9,608.97
Author / Lead	Facilities and Properties Manager
Community Outcome	Enabling a liveable district Protecting Westland's communities, culture and heritage Providing future-fit infrastructure and services

Background

Historically, the Westland District Council has not been responsible for maintenance costs associated with the Westland Sports Hub, with its only contribution being the annual Building Warrant of Fitness. Previous Chief Executives had directed that no additional costs should fall to Council for this facility. However, in June 2026, an MOU signed in July 2020 with no end date or term noted, between Westland High School and Westland District Council was identified, confirming that Council is responsible for both insurance and maintenance costs. Following this discovery, a structural audit was undertaken to assess the facility's condition and maintenance requirements. This resulted in emergency repairs being completed and a quotation being obtained for ongoing annual maintenance.

Correspondence has been sent to the School Board, as discussions are required regarding future maintenance responsibilities and cost-sharing arrangements. While Council currently holds maintenance obligations under the MOU, the facility is used exclusively by the school, which controls access and day-to-day use. The school has previously indicated that it does not consider the facility an educational asset, but rather one used for sporting activities, and may therefore be reluctant to accept responsibility for associated costs.

Ongoing costs for the Sports Hub are expected to increase. Regular maintenance will be required to ensure the structure remains safe, structurally sound, and fit for purpose, with future expenditure likely to be necessary to meet these obligations.

Proposal

It is proposed that Council review its ongoing responsibility for the Westland Sports Hub, as maintenance and insurance costs are not considered to align with Council's intended role in relation to this asset. However, given the existence of previously signed agreements that assign these responsibilities to Council, removing or transferring this cost liabilities may require negotiation and formal amendments to the existing arrangements.

Impact

Financial Impact: Reviewing and renegotiating the MOU creates an opportunity to eliminate or significantly reduce unbudgeted operational expenditure (insurance, emergency repairs, and ongoing annual maintenance) from the Council's long-term budget.

Operational & Strategic Impact: Aligning asset responsibility with actual asset use ensures that ratepayer funds are not subsidising a facility that is used exclusively by the school and controlled entirely by the School Board.

DRAFT

Community Impact: There is no immediate physical impact on community access, as the facility is currently utilised by the school and local sports groups. However, formalising clear maintenance roles ensures the building remains safe and structurally sound long-term.

Risk

Relationship Risk: The School Board / Education Ministry may strongly resist amending the MOU or accepting cost-sharing, given their stance that the hub is a sporting asset rather than an educational one.

Contractual Risk: Because a signed July 2020 MOU exists, Council remains legally bound to cover insurance and maintenance unless a mutual agreement to amend or terminate the contract can be reached.

DRAFT

Report to Council

DATE: 11 November 2026

TO: Mayor and Councillors

FROM: General Manager – Regulatory and Compliance

Freedom Camping

1. Summary

This report seeks Council direction on the scope of future freedom camping management work to be considered through the Draft Long Term Plan 2027–2037. Following the adoption of the Freedom Camping Bylaw 2026 on 29 October 2026, the decision is whether to proceed with the already agreed review alongside the Reserve Management Plans project, or to develop a broader medium-term programme encompassing regional coordination, visitor facilities and alternative funding opportunities.

Council is considering which proposals and options should be included in the Draft Long Term Plan consultation document. This report brings the proposal back from the Long Term Plan (LTP) workshop on 15 September 2026 for formal decision.

2. Background

Freedom camping has been a longstanding and complex policy issue for Westland District Council, reflecting differing community expectations, the district's geographical characteristics, visitor pressures and the requirements of the Freedom Camping Act 2011.

Council has sought to balance the economic benefits of tourism and positive visitor experiences with environmental protection, community expectations and the provision of appropriate facilities. An important consideration is ensuring that the costs of providing and maintaining visitor facilities are shared equitably, rather than being borne solely by ratepayers. Council initiated the review of its previous Freedom Camping Bylaw in 2024, which was consulted on following Council workshops. The proposed bylaw included elements that arguably did not meet the requirements of the legislation from an evidential perspective, leading to a high risk of legal challenge.

Following this, the bylaw process was paused to consider an alternative approach to address these matters and consider a resolution which may reduce the risk of legal challenge and ongoing circular debates. However, it is unlikely that any proposal will satisfy all parties with such opposing opinions and beliefs.

During this process, the Freedom Camping Bylaw 2018 was statutorily revoked on 25 November 2025.

A workshop was held on 4 May 2026 to inform Council of the previous triennium discussions, the proposed bylaw status and the legal requirements of the Freedom Camping Act 2011.

At its meeting on 23 July 2026, Council received a noting report outlining the challenges associated with the bylaw and a proposed short-, medium- and long-term approach to freedom camping management.

3. Workshop Direction and Additional Information

Council provided direction during the Long Term Plan workshop that further information was required to inform decisions on the future management of freedom camping and the proposals to be included in the Draft Long Term Plan consultation document.

At its meeting on 29 October 2026, Council adopted the Freedom Camping Bylaw 2026 and resolved to undertake a further review in conjunction with the Reserve Management Plans project, anticipated within the next 18 months.

The adopted bylaw provides an initial regulatory framework for managing freedom camping within the district. However, Council recognises that a broader, coordinated approach is required to address longer-term visitor management, infrastructure provision, enforcement and funding considerations.

The proposed medium-term approach would build on the adopted bylaw and include:

- Reserve management: Identifying Council reserves that may be suitable for camping through the Reserve Management Plans project and ensuring alignment with the future review of the Freedom Camping Bylaw.
- Evidence gathering: Monitoring and recording freedom camping-related service requests, complaints and compliance issues over the next 12–18 months to strengthen the evidence base for future regulatory decisions.
- Regional consistency: Working with Grey and Buller District Councils and relevant agencies to explore greater consistency in freedom camping rules, signage, visitor information and enforcement arrangements.
- Visitor facilities and funding: Investigating opportunities to work with commercial providers, such as KiwiCamp, and agencies including the Department of Conservation to develop appropriate visitor facilities and user-pays arrangements. This would provide opportunities for visitors to contribute directly towards the cost of facilities and reduce reliance on ratepayer funding.
- Destination management: Considering opportunities to develop well-managed and appropriately serviced visitor destinations that encourage responsible camping while supporting local communities and economic activity.

Over the longer term, Council would seek to contribute to a more coordinated South Island approach to freedom camping, including greater consistency in regulatory settings, signage and visitor information.

This staged approach would enable Council to address immediate regulatory requirements while progressively developing a more integrated and financially sustainable approach to freedom camping management.

Council will continue to investigate any financial opportunities e.g. Central Government to facilitate the implementation of Freedom Camping and reduce rate payer impacts.

4. Proposal and Options

The proposal considers the next steps in managing freedom camping across the district, building on the adoption of the Freedom Camping Bylaw 2026. The options range from progressing the review already agreed by Council to undertaking a broader programme of work addressing regional coordination, visitor facilities, alternative funding arrangements and longer-term consistency.

4.1. Option 1 - Status Quo – review the Freedom Camping bylaw in 18 months with reserves project

Continue with Council's existing commitment to review the Freedom Camping Bylaw 2026 in conjunction with the Reserve Management Plans project, anticipated within the next 18 months.

This option would involve:

- Progressing the development and review of Reserve Management Plans, including identifying reserves that may be suitable for camping.
- Considering the distinction between camping permitted under the Reserves Act 1977 and freedom camping managed under the Freedom Camping Act 2011.
- Reviewing the Freedom Camping Bylaw alongside the outcomes of the reserves project to ensure a coordinated approach to managing camping across Council-controlled land.
- Continuing to monitor and record freedom camping-related complaints, service requests and compliance issues to inform future regulatory decisions.

This option maintains Council's existing approach and commitments without introducing a broader programme of work or additional initiatives at this stage.

5. Option 2 – Medium Term approach to Freedom Camping Management (Recommended)

Undertake the activities identified under Option 1 while progressing a broader programme of work to investigate opportunities for improved freedom camping management, regional coordination and alternative funding arrangements.

This option would involve:

- Regional collaboration: Working with Grey and Buller District Councils, irrespective of the outcome of the Head Start local government reform process, to investigate opportunities for greater consistency in freedom camping rules, signage, visitor information and enforcement arrangements.
- Visitor facilities and alternative funding: Investigating partnerships with commercial providers, such as KiwiCamp, and agencies including the Department of Conservation to identify opportunities for appropriately located and serviced camping facilities. This would include exploring user-pays and other funding arrangements that reduce reliance on rates, with potential locations such as Department of Conservation land in Franz Josef considered subject to feasibility and agreement.
- Coordinated visitor management: Considering how freedom camping facilities and regulatory arrangements could align with wider destination management, tourism infrastructure and economic development initiatives.
- Development of future proposals: Undertaking preliminary investigations, including financial and operational assessments, and reporting back to Council with options, indicative costs, funding arrangements and implementation considerations before any further commitments are made.

Over the longer term, this option would also support Council working with other South Island councils and relevant agencies towards greater consistency in freedom camping management, signage and visitor information over approximately five years.

This approach would provide a pathway towards a more coordinated and financially sustainable freedom camping network while allowing Council to assess the feasibility, costs and benefits of individual initiatives before making investment decisions.

6. Assessment of Options

6.1. Option 1 - Review the Freedom Camping bylaw in 18 months with reserves project

6.1.1. Advantages

- Delivers Council's existing commitment to review the Freedom Camping Bylaw 2026 alongside the Reserve Management Plans project within approximately 18 months.
- Provides an opportunity to identify suitable reserves for camping and align the management of camping across Council-controlled land.

- Enables further evidence gathering through service requests, complaints and compliance monitoring to inform future regulatory decisions and reduce the risk of legal challenge.
- Maintains existing levels of service without committing Council to additional initiatives or significant new expenditure.
- Allows Council to focus available resources on implementing the adopted bylaw and completing the reserves project.

6.1.2. Disadvantages

- Does not actively progress opportunities for greater regional consistency in freedom camping rules, signage, visitor information and enforcement.
- Limits opportunities to investigate alternative funding arrangements and partnerships that could reduce the cost of visitor facilities to ratepayers.
- May result in a fragmented approach to freedom camping management across the West Coast, with different arrangements between districts and land management agencies.
- Does not address longer-term opportunities to develop a coordinated network of appropriately serviced camping locations.
- May not adequately respond to community expectations for a more comprehensive approach to managing freedom camping and its associated impacts.

6.1.3. Financial Implications

- This option would primarily involve staff time and operational expenditure associated with the Reserve Management Plans project, bylaw review, evidence gathering and any required consultation.
- No additional capital expenditure is proposed specifically through this option. Costs associated with implementing and enforcing the adopted bylaw would continue to be managed through Council's existing operational arrangements, subject to available budgets.
- The review may identify future infrastructure or operational requirements; however, these would be subject to separate assessment and Council decisions.

6.2. Option 2 - Medium Term approach to Freedom Camping Management

6.2.1. Advantages

- Builds on Council's existing commitments while providing a more coordinated and strategic approach to freedom camping management.
- Creates opportunities to work with Grey and Buller District Councils and relevant agencies towards greater consistency in rules, signage, visitor information and enforcement.
- Enables investigation of alternative funding arrangements, including commercial partnerships and user-pays facilities, to reduce reliance on ratepayer funding.
- Supports the identification of appropriately located and serviced camping facilities that improve visitor experiences while managing environmental and community impacts.
- Provides opportunities to coordinate freedom camping management with wider destination management, tourism infrastructure and economic development initiatives.
- Establishes a pathway towards greater consistency across the South Island over the longer term.
- Allows Council to assess the financial viability and operational implications of potential initiatives before committing to investment.

6.2.2. Disadvantages

- Requires additional staff resources and coordination beyond Council's existing bylaw and reserves work programmes.
- Progress will depend on the willingness and capacity of neighbouring councils, government agencies and commercial providers to participate.
- Investigations may identify infrastructure or service requirements that cannot be delivered without additional funding.
- Developing consistent arrangements across multiple jurisdictions may be complex due to differing legislative responsibilities, land ownership and local priorities.
- The benefits of partnerships, alternative funding arrangements and regional coordination are uncertain until further investigations are completed.
- Community expectations may increase before Council is in a position to confirm the feasibility or delivery of proposed initiatives.

6.2.3. Financial Implications

- This option would require additional operational expenditure, primarily through staff time, interagency coordination, feasibility investigations and the development of costed proposals. The extent of these costs has not yet been established.
- Capital investment may be required in the future for visitor facilities, signage, supporting infrastructure and potentially monitoring or enforcement technology. However, no capital expenditure is proposed for approval at this stage.
- A key focus would be investigating alternative funding arrangements, including user-pays facilities, commercial partnerships and contributions from other agencies, to minimise reliance on rates.
- Any future proposals would be reported back to Council with detailed capital and operating costs, potential funding sources, financial implications and implementation requirements before investment decisions are made.

7. Risk Assessment

The following table identifies the key risks associated with each option, including maintaining the status quo, and outlines how these would be managed.

Risk	Options affected	Potential implications	Risk management / mitigation
Community expectations and reputational risk	Both options	Freedom camping remains a contentious issue, with differing expectations among residents, businesses, visitors and elected members. Neither option is likely to satisfy all parties, potentially affecting community confidence in Council's approach.	Clearly communicate the legislative framework, Council's objectives and the rationale for decisions. Continue engagement with affected communities and use service requests and complaints to inform future decisions.
Enforcement and operational capacity	Both options	The district's geographical size and dispersed camping locations make monitoring and enforcement challenging and potentially costly. Limited resources may reduce the effectiveness of the bylaw and	Review enforcement requirements and investigate opportunities for coordinated monitoring and enforcement with other agencies, including the Department of Conservation. Prioritise enforcement based on

		Council's ability to respond to complaints.	identified risks and documented evidence.
Financial sustainability and funding	Both options, particularly Option 2	Investigations, enforcement, visitor facilities and supporting infrastructure may require additional capital and operational expenditure. Without alternative funding arrangements, costs may continue to fall disproportionately on ratepayers.	Undertake financial and feasibility assessments before committing to new initiatives. Investigate user-pays arrangements, commercial partnerships and external funding opportunities, with any investment subject to further Council approval.
Programme delivery and loss of momentum	Both options, particularly Option 2	Competing priorities, limited resources and the complexity of coordinating multiple workstreams may delay progress or result in opportunities not being pursued.	Establish clear responsibilities, milestones and reporting arrangements. Align the work with the Reserve Management Plans project and report progress and any proposed initiatives back to Council.
Legal challenge and regulatory compliance	Both options	Restrictions or future amendments may be challenged if they are inconsistent with the Freedom Camping Act 2011 or are not supported by sufficient evidence. This could result in legal costs, delays and reputational impacts.	Ensure regulatory decisions are supported by documented evidence and meet legislative requirements. Continue monitoring complaints and compliance issues, and obtain legal advice where appropriate.
Regional collaboration and agency alignment	Option 2	Grey and Buller District Councils and other agencies may have different priorities, regulatory approaches or resource constraints, limiting opportunities for consistent rules, signage, facilities and enforcement.	Engage early with neighbouring councils and relevant agencies to identify shared objectives and practical opportunities for collaboration. Progress initiatives where agreement can be achieved without making delivery dependent on full regional alignment.
Statutory and consultation requirements	Both options	Future bylaw amendments, reserve management decisions or infrastructure proposals may require separate statutory processes and public consultation. Failure to meet these requirements could result in legal challenge, delays or decisions being reconsidered.	Ensure compliance with the Freedom Camping Act 2011 and Reserves Act 1977, including applicable consultation requirements. For Option 2, clarify the statutory responsibilities of participating agencies and landowners. Assess future proposals involving facilities, funding arrangements or changes to levels of service against Council's Significance and Engagement Policy and

			applicable Long Term Plan requirements.
Maintaining the status quo / limited progress	Option 1	Restricting the programme to the existing bylaw and reserves review may delay opportunities to improve regional consistency, develop visitor-funded facilities and reduce pressure on ratepayer-funded infrastructure.	Continue monitoring freedom camping impacts and reviewing emerging evidence. Reconsider opportunities for partnerships, regional coordination and alternative funding through future Council work programmes and LTP processes.

Overall Risk Consideration

The principal risks relate to balancing community expectations, meeting statutory obligations and ensuring that freedom camping can be managed effectively and affordably across the district.

Option 1 provides a lower-resource approach by progressing Council's existing commitments. However, it may delay opportunities to address wider operational and financial challenges.

Option 2 introduces additional coordination and delivery risks but provides opportunities to investigate more sustainable funding arrangements, strengthen partnerships and improve consistency in freedom camping management.

A staged approach under Option 2 would allow Council to manage these risks through further investigation, engagement and financial assessment before committing to new infrastructure, funding arrangements or service delivery changes.

8. Recommendation(s)

8.1.1. That the report be received.
8.1.2. Note Option 2 is staff's recommended option for the Draft Long Term Plan 2027-2037.
8.1.3. Identify Council's preferred option.

Lee Webster
General Manager – Regulatory and Compliance

Appendix 1: 15.09.26 – Freedom Camping LTP Proposal

LTP Proposal – Responsible Camping

Cost Centre	Responsible Camping Admin
LTP Forecast	**$44,232**
Funding Source	$44,232 U: $15,418 Gen: $28,813
Author / Lead	General Manager District Assets General Manager Regulatory and Compliance
Community Outcome	Enabling a liveable district Providing future-fit infrastructure and services Supporting and enhancing the natural environment

Background

Currently no freedom camping bylaw.

Frustrations of freedom camping activity.

Negative perception of freedom campers / lack of visitor contribution to community.

Cost of maintaining assets and enforcement.

Proposal

Project to gather evidence to inform decisions regarding freedom camping.

Considerations of private/ public collaboration for sites.

Identify commercial opportunities e.g. Kiwi Camps.

Link to destination management report / Spatial planning / parking enforcement.

Work towards Regional / South Island consistency.

Impact

Longer timeframe for implementation.

Additional resourcing likely to be required to gather evidence/ information and enforcement where necessary.

Council, NZTA, LINZ, DoC collaboration required.

More strategic outcome and positive visitor experience – consistency.

Risk

Community dissatisfied with delays

May require additional funding

Prioritisation of this work when considered against government reforms

DRAFT

Report to Council

DATE: 11 November 2026

TO: Mayor and Councillors

FROM: Chief Financial Officer

Destination Hokitika Rate

1. Summary

Council currently collects a rate on behalf of Destination Hokitika from all Commercial property in the Hokitika rating zone.

Council is considering which proposals and options should be included in the Draft Long Term Plan consultation document. This report brings the proposal back from the LTP workshop for formal decision.

2. Background

The Destination Hokitika rate is targeted at all commercial properties with the Hokitika rating zone at a flat fee of $190. These funds are then transferred to Destination Hokitika to help fund their activities.

3. Workshop Direction and Additional Information

Council indicated that it would be interesting in reviewing this rate and request that Destination Hokitika collects the rate directly from its members.

4. Proposal and Options

4.1. Option 1 – Discontinue Destination Hokitika rate

Council no longer strikes rates for this activity and Destination Hokitika collects its own funds as a membership.

4.2. Option 2 – Status Quo

Council continues to collect the Destination Hokitika rates on behalf of Destination Hokitika.

5. Assessment of Options

5.1. Option 1 – Discontinue Destination Hokitika rate (recommended)

5.1.1. Advantages

- Reduces the administrative workload and associated resource requirements currently borne by Council
- Reduces rates demand for effected rate payers – acknowledging that Destination Hokitika will seek to collect funds directly and reduces the overall rate strike.
- Removes financial risk to Council of subsidising Destination Hokitika in the event that the rate is not collected from some ratepayers but the full amount is transferred to Destination Hokitika

5.1.2. Disadvantages

- Destination Hokitika is unable to effectively collect the membership from Commercial property and suffers as a result
- Potential indirect reputational risk to Council if it is perceived that Council withdrew support

5.1.3. Financial and Rates Implications

- As this is a rate that is collected and then paid back out again there is no impact on the finance of the Council.

5.2. Option 2 – Status Quo

5.2.1. Advantages

- Destination Hokitika operations are not disrupted

5.2.2. Disadvantages

- Administration burden on Council remains and rates strike remains at current level and does not reduce

5.2.3. Financial and Rates Implications

- As this is a rate that is collected and then paid back out again there is no impact on the finances of the Council

6. Risk Assessment

That Destination Hokitika is not able to effectively collect the membership from Commercial property and suffers as a result.

Potential indirect reputational risk to Council if it is perceived that Council withdrew support.

7. Recommendation(s)

7.1. That the report be received.
7.2. Note Option 1 is staff's recommended option for the Draft Long Term Plan 2027-2037.
7.3. Identify Council's preferred option.

Stephen Lewis
Chief Financial Officer

Appendix 1: 15.09.26 – Destination Hokitika LTP Proposal

LTP Proposal – Destination Hokitika

Cost Centre	Destination Hokitika (formerly Enterprise Hokitika)
LTP Forecast	**$40,014**
Funding Source	**$40,014** Tourism funding
Author / Lead	Chief Financial Officer
Community Outcome	Enabling a liveable district

Background

Council currently collects a rate on behalf of Destination Hokitika (DH) from all Commercial property in the Hokitika rating zone at a flat rate of $190 per rating unit.

These funds are then transferred to DH to help fund their activities.

Proposal

Council no longer strikes rates for this activity and DH instead collects its own funds as a membership.

Impact

Removes administrative burden from Council.

Reduces rates demand for effected rate payers (acknowledging that DH will then seek to collect the funds directly).

Removes financial risk to Council of subsidising DH. Rate is paid to DH regardless of collection status of the rate from individual rate payers.

Risk

That DH is not able to effectively collect the membership from Commercial property and suffers as a result.

Potential indirect reputational risk to Council if it is perceived that Council withdrew support.

DRAFT

Report to Council

DATE: 11 November 2026

TO: Mayor and Councillors

FROM: Acting General Manager – Business Enablement

Glacier Township Development Rate

1. Summary

This report seeks Council direction on the continuation of the Glacier Township Development Rate (Franz Josef and Fox Glacier Community Development Officers and Glacier Country Tourism Group Funding) arrangements for the Draft Long-Term Plan 2027–2037. The original workshop proposal was to continue Council collection of targeted rating revenue on behalf of Glacier Country Promotions to support locally identified township development and tourism promotion activities.

The LTP forecast is $85,758. Officers recommend discontinuation of the existing arrangements as the preferred approach for development of the Draft Long-Term Plan.

2. Background

The Glacier Township Development Rate targeted rating arrangements to support locally identified projects beyond standard district-wide services. These may include township infrastructure, beautification, promotion and community initiatives.

The Council currently collects targeted rating revenue on behalf of Glacier Country Promotions via the Tourism Promotions Rate.

The proposal identifies a total forecast of $85,758, rated as follows: Fox Township $24,188 (Community Development Officer); Franz Township $48,232 (Community Development Officer); and Commercial Promotion Rate $13,338 (Glacier Country Tourism Group). The Tourism Rate aligns the activity with a liveable district, heritage and environmental outcomes.

3. Workshop Direction and Additional Information

The proposal is for Council to continue collecting the targeted rate on behalf of Glacier Country Promotions. Its identified benefits are local control, local benefit and community engagement.

Before final LTP decisions, the formal rating mechanisms and purposes for each component, the current funding and governance agreements, approval processes, expenditure reporting, and any unspent funds or existing commitments should be confirmed.

4. Proposal and Options

The decision concerns whether to retain the existing targeted-rate-funded approach or undertake a review of its scope and delivery arrangements. A change to or discontinuation of a targeted rate would require further

analysis of the applicable statutory processes, existing commitments and consultation obligations. The options below are decision-making pathways rather than costed alternative budgets.

4.1. Option 1 - Continue the existing targeted rate arrangements (status quo)

Continue Council collection of the targeted rating revenue and its allocation for Fox and Franz township development and commercial tourism promotion through existing arrangements with Glacier Country Promotions. Retain the locally focused approach while confirming the administrative, reporting and accountability requirements that apply to the funds.

4.2. Option 2 – Cease Arrangements (recommended)

Council would discontinue the current targeted rate collection that supports the Glacier Country Tourism Group and the Franz Josef and Fox Glacier Community Development Officer (CDO).

5. Assessment of Options

The $85,758 is a forecast allocation.

5.1. Option 1 - Continue existing arrangements

5.1.1. Advantages

- Maintains a locally focused funding mechanism for township improvements and tourism promotion.
- Provides continuity and predictability for local projects and the recipient organisation.
- Retains a link between locally raised revenue and local benefit, supporting community involvement.
- Avoids immediate transition costs and disruption to existing programmes.

5.1.2. Disadvantages

- Does not, without further review, demonstrate whether the current allocations and delivery model remain optimal.
- Ratepayers may have limited visibility of measurable outcomes and distributional fairness.

5.1.3. Financial and Rates Implications

- The LTP forecasts $85,758 funded through the Tourism Rate: $24,188 Fox, $48,232 Franz and $13,338 commercial promotion.

5.2. Option 2 – Cease Arrangements

5.2.1. Advantages

- Council gains a simplified rating structure.
- Responds to community requests of reducing rates.
- All townships are supported equally.

5.2.2. Disadvantages

- Losing the dedicated funding.
- Potential Impact on tourism promotion.
- CDO responsibilities could potentially revert to community volunteers.
- Loss of community coordination and capability.

5.2.3. Financial and Rates Implications

- Reduction in targeted rates.
- Simplification of council overhead resource.

6. Risk Assessment

The key risks are summarised in the table below. These should inform further work before the LTP decisions are finalised.

Risk	Options affected	Potential impact	Risk management / mitigation
Local benefit and service outcomes	Both	Projects or promotional activities may not deliver demonstrable benefit to contributing communities or ratepayers.	Set clear eligible expenditure, project selection criteria, outcome measures and annual reporting.
Accountability and governance	Option 1; both during transition	Unclear decision rights or reporting responsibilities could weaken oversight of rate-funded expenditure.	Confirm written funding arrangements, approval authorities, financial controls, conflict management and reporting to Council.
Financial and rating uncertainty	Both	Unverified assumptions or incomplete financial information could misstate the rates impact or available funding.	Reconcile the $85,758 forecast to rating and budget records; confirm administrative costs, balances, commitments and ratepayer impacts.
Equity and ratepayer confidence	Option 1	Contributors may question whether the allocation fairly reflects who pays and who benefits.	Review the statutory rating basis and beneficiary rationale; engage affected ratepayers and transparently report allocations and outcomes.
Continuity of local projects	Option 2	Review or changes to funding could interrupt planned projects or existing commitments.	Map contractual and project commitments, stage any changes and establish transitional funding arrangements where justified.
Taking no action / maintaining status quo without review	Option 1	Existing governance, performance or allocation weaknesses may continue unaddressed, reducing value for money.	Retain periodic performance and funding reviews, with reporting triggers and the ability to reconsider arrangements in future LTP or Annual Plan processes.
Legal and consultation requirements	Option 2	Changes to targeted rating or funding arrangements may be delayed or challenged if statutory steps are not followed.	Obtain legal and rating advice, assess significance and consultation requirements, and document decisions before implementation.

7. Recommendation(s)

7.1. That the report be received.
7.2. Note Option 2 is staff's recommended option for the Draft Long Term Plan 2027-2037.
7.3. Identify Council's preferred option.

Ashleigh Baillie
Acting General Manager – Business Enablement

Appendix 1: 15.09.26 – Glacier Township Development Rate LTP Proposal

LTP Proposal – Glacier Township Development Rate

Cost Centre	Glacier Country Promotions
LTP Forecast	**$85,758**
Funding Source	Tourism Rate
Author / Lead	General Manager Business Enablement
Community Outcome	Enabling a liveable district Protecting Westland's communities, culture and heritage Supporting and enhancing the natural environment

Background

The Fox and Franz Township Development Funds were established under Westland District Council's targeted rating system to fund local projects beyond standard district-wide services.

The funds enable local ratepayers, particularly tourism businesses, to invest directly in infrastructure, beautification, promotion, and community initiatives.

The Commercial (Tourism Promotion) Rate was introduced by the Council to support tourism promotion and economic development, with commercial properties contributing based on their capital value.

The funds are distributed as follows:

Fox Township development - $24,188

Franz Township development - $48,232

Commercial Prom Rate - $13,338

Proposal

The Council continues to collect a targeted rate on behalf of Glacier Country Promotions.

Impact

Local control, local benefit, community engagement

DRAFT

Report to Council

DATE: 11 November 2026

TO: Mayor and Councillors

FROM: Chief Financial Officer

Ratepayer Assistance Scheme

1. Summary

The Ratepayer Assistance Scheme is designed to address a range of economic and social issues.

It will be backed by Local Authorities in the same way as the Local Government Funding Association, i.e. against rates.

Council is considering which proposals and options should be included in the Draft Long Term Plan consultation document. This report brings the proposal back from the LTP workshop for formal decision.

2. Background

The Ratepayer Assistance Scheme (RAS) is modelled on the Local Government Funding Association (LGFA) but is intended to provide loan assistance to Ratepayers.

It will be structured to provide low-cost financing in the form of:

- Deferred Development Contributions / Development Levies
- IMPACT Loans (low-cost home improvement loans)
- Rates Postponement (reverse mortgage, postpone Rates until the property is sold)

3. Workshop Direction and Additional Information

Council indicated that it would be in support of looking at this scheme. Since the workshop no additional information has become available. The original workshop paper is attached at Appendix 1.

4. Proposal and Options

4.1. Option 1 – Expression of interest in the scheme (recommended)

The Ratepayer Assistance Scheme requires support from councils for it to gain approval from central government.

There are establishment costs associated with the Ratepayer Assistance Scheme, but at this stage the recommendation is to offer an expression of interest and seek further information.

4.2. Option 2 – Council does not offer an expression of interest

Council declines to either support or offer an expression of interest in the scheme and will not peruse the matter further.

5. Assessment of Options

5.1. Option 1 – Expression of interest in the scheme

5.1.1. Advantages

- Potential increase in house building by deferring development contributions
- Rate payers able to access loans for essential home repairs/improvements
- Asset rich, cash poor ratepayers would be able to stay in their homes using the Rates Postponement to defer their rates until the property was eventually sold

5.1.2. Disadvantages

- The only disadvantages are financial which have been identified below.

5.1.3. Financial and Rates Implications

- Initial setup costs that would have to be covered by all shareholders
- If the scheme was unsuccessful or had to cease before it reached breakeven, the initial investment in the scheme could be at risk
- Overtime the scheme is forecast to return a profit to shareholders which if realised would result in an additional source of funding that could be used to reduce future rates

6. Option 2 – Council does not offer an expression of interest

6.1.1. Advantages

- The only advantages are financial which have been identified below

6.1.2. Disadvantages

- If not enough Council's issue notices of support, there is a risk that the scheme will not have sufficient backing for it to be setup which would mean the benefits highlighted earlier would not be available to ratepayers

6.1.3. Financial and Rates Implications

- If Council did not participate in the scheme, it would not be required to fund the setup cost
- Council would also lose the rights to any profits that were returned to shareholders in the future if WDC did not participate in the scheme.

7. Risk Assessment

The only risks identified with the scheme are the financial risks identified in 5.1.3.

8. Recommendation(s)

8.1. That the report be received.
8.2. Note Option 1 is staff's recommended option for the Draft Long Term Plan 2027-2037.
8.3. Identify Council's preferred option.

Stephen Lewis
Chief Financial Officer

Appendix 1: 15.09.26 – Rate Payer Assistance Scheme LTP Proposal

LTP Key Proposal – Rate Payer Assistance Scheme

Cost Centre	NA
LTP Forecast	TBC
Funding Source	TBC
Author / Lead	Chief Financial Officer
Community Outcome	Enabling a liveable district

Background

The Ratepayer Assistance Scheme (RAS) is modelled on the Local Government Funding Association (LGFA) but is intended to provide loan assistance to Ratepayers.

Designed to address a range of economic and social issues.

It will be backed by Local Authorities in the same way as the LFGA, i.e. against rates.

It will be structured to provide low-cost financing in the form of:

- Deferred Development Contributions/Development Levies
- IMPACT Loans (low-cost home improvement loans)
- Rates Postponement (reverse mortgage, postpone Rates until the property is sold

Council would receive Development Contributions and Rates from the RAS scheme as and when they fall due, so there would be no impact on Councils cashflow.

It is forecast that the scheme will be breakeven for its shareholders in year 4, reach full payback in year 8 and be making annual divided returns from year 9 onwards.

A similar scheme was established in British Columbia (population c 5m) that now has over 83,000 users and C$2.7 billion in loans.

Proposal

The RAS requires support from councils for it to gain approval from central government. We are therefore proposing that Council indicate that it would support the creation of the scheme. There are establishment costs associated with the RAS, but at this stage the proposal is to offer an expression of interest and seek further information.

Impact

The establishment of the scheme would provide valuable avenues of assistance to ratepayers including:

- Potential increase in house building by deferring development contributions.
- Rate payers able to access loans for essential home repairs/improvements.
- Asset rich, cash poor ratepayers would be able to stay in their homes using the Rates Postponement to defer their rates until the property was eventually sold.

Risk

Should Council choose to back the scheme and become a shareholder there are initial setup costs that would have to be covered by all shareholders. If the scheme was not a success, or had to cease before it reached breakeven, the initial investment in the scheme would be at risk.

DRAFT

Report to Council

Noting Paper

DATE: 11 November 2026

TO: Mayor and Councillors

FROM: Erle Bencich – District Assets General Manager

Parks and Reserves

1. Summary

This report provides Council with an overview of the Land Status Investigation and the direction of the resulting work programme.

The investigation reviewed 263 parcels owned or administered by Westland District Council and established a baseline record of land function, governing legislation, reserve classification and proposed actions.

No decisions on individual parcels are sought through this report. Officers will undertake iwi consultation and further investigation before bringing the proposed programme and any required decisions back to Council in early 2027.

2. Background

Council commissioned a Land Status Investigation to establish a comprehensive and auditable record of land owned or administered by Westland District Council. The investigation reviewed each parcel's current function, governing legislation, Reserves Act classification and any action required. Legal road was excluded from the review.

A total of 263 parcels were reviewed. The Council land portfolio extends across eight functional categories, including open space, property, facilities, three-waters infrastructure, transport infrastructure, cemeteries and land associated with Destination Westland. The review also identified Crown land administered by the Department of Conservation that had previously been understood to be administered by Council.

<u>Open space portfolio</u>

The investigation identified 101 open-space or cemetery parcels, covering approximately 164.2 hectares. Within this portfolio, Westland has 55 parks and reserves across seven open-space categories. Cultural heritage, sports and recreation, and nature areas together account for approximately 86% of the total open-space area.

The open-space categories are based on the Recreation Aotearoa Parks Categories Framework and describe the primary use of land. They include: sports and recreation parks, neighbourhood parks, public gardens, nature parks, cultural heritage areas, civic spaces, and recreation and ecological linkages.

These functional categories are distinct from statutory classifications under the Reserves Act 1977. A park's operational use does not necessarily confirm its legal status or Reserves Act classification. This distinction is one reason the investigation and subsequent classification work are required.

Governing legislation

The investigation found that 121 parcels, representing approximately 46% of the portfolio, are subject to the Reserves Act 1977. A further 115 parcels, or approximately 44%, are not subject to that Act and are generally held in fee simple or another form of tenure administered under the Local Government Act.

The remaining land includes:

- 12 parcels identified as Crown land not administered by Council;
- Six endowment-land parcels not currently subject to the Reserves Act; and
- Five cemetery parcels, together with one dual-legislation parcel, subject to the Burials and Cremation Act 1964.

The Reserves Act provides a statutory framework for protecting natural, cultural and recreational features for public benefit. It also provides for reserve classification, reserve management planning and enforcement. By comparison, land held under the Local Government Act generally provides greater flexibility for disposal or alternative uses but requires appropriate Council policy and governance direction.

Current reserve classifications

Of the 121 parcels subject to the Reserves Act, 87 are classified and 34 remain unclassified. Existing classifications include recreation reserve, local purpose aerodrome reserve, local purpose hall-site reserve, local purpose public-utility reserve and other local-purpose classifications relating to cemeteries, esplanades, memorials and utilities.

The 34 unclassified parcels are already subject to the Reserves Act but do not have a formal classification reflecting their primary purpose. Classification resolutions are therefore required. The review also identified minor inconsistencies in some classification descriptions. Standardising these descriptions before final adoption of the land register will support clearer and more reliable property records.

Proposed actions identified by the investigation

The investigation found that 132 parcels require no immediate action, as their status has been confirmed. It also identified the following principal actions:

- 37 parcels proposed to be declared reserve and classified;
- 33 parcels proposed to have an existing reserve classification completed;
- 17 parcels requiring further review; and
- 10 parcels proposed for removal from Council's database because they are Crown or Department of Conservation land.

Other matters include coordination with the Department of Conservation, corrections to land records, lease reviews and potential disposal investigations. These findings are preliminary and remain subject to verification, consultation and future Council decisions.

Open-space land accounts for a significant proportion of the declaration and classification programme. The investigation identified 40 open-space parcels for declaration or classification and four for potential disposal review. No decision to declare, classify or dispose of any parcel is being sought through this report.

Future work programme

The investigation identified three principal workstreams:

1) Declare and classify land: The current investigation identifies 37 parcels that may need to be declared reserve and classified. A Council resolution will be required, and public notification may be necessary under section 14 of the Reserves Act where land is not zoned as open space in the District Plan.
2) Classify existing reserves: Existing unclassified reserve land will require Council classification resolutions. Of the 34 affected parcels, 33 currently have proposed classifications and one remains under review.
3) Review property and lease matters: Nineteen parcels were identified for lease or potential-disposal review, comprising 14 lease reviews and five parcels requiring Council direction concerning possible disposal.

Before these matters are presented for decisions, Council will consult with Poutini Ngāi Tahu, verify parcel information and consider whether further legal, property or planning advice is required. A detailed work programme and parcel-specific recommendations are expected to return to Council in early 2027. Receiving the present report does not commit Council to any proposed action or alter the status of any land.

3. Workshop Direction and Additional Information

The reserves and land parcels presented at the previous workshop were a selected group intended to illustrate the types of matters identified through the Land Status Investigation. This report provides a broader update on the investigation as a whole, including its overall findings, proposed direction and next steps.

Since the workshop, officers have been preparing for iwi consultation on the proposed direction. Consultation will occur before recommendations concerning individual parcels or the wider implementation programme are presented to Council.

This report is provided as an update, so Council is informed of the project's scope, direction and next steps. It does not seek authority to declare, classify, dispose of or otherwise change the status of any land.

Inclusion of potential camping locations will be adopted into this package of works as noted at the October Council meeting.

The proposed project pathway is:

- Consult with Poutini Ngāi Tahu on the proposed actions.
- Consider feedback and undertake any necessary further investigation.
- Prepare a detailed report setting out parcel-specific actions, statutory requirements, costs and implementation priorities.
- Present the proposed work programme and any required decisions to Council in 2027.

The investigation has identified possible future work involving 37 parcels proposed for declaration and classification and 33 existing reserve parcels proposed for classification. These figures identify the current scope of further work; they are not decisions or approvals.

Include potential camping locations in the final report and include in this workstream.

4. Recommendation(s)

4.1. That the report be received as a noting paper and that Council notes staff will proceed with iwi consultation, verification of parcel information, and preparation of a detailed work programme. Parcel-specific recommendations, statutory requirements, costs, and implementation priorities will then be presented to Council in early 2027.

Erle Bencich
District Assets -General Manager

Appendix 1: Westland District Council Land Status Register

Appendix 2: 15.09.26 – Parks and Reserves LTP Proposal

Appendix 1: Westland District Council Land Status Register

This table summarises the Land Status Investigation at site level.

Township	Site	Function	Parcels	Current status	Recommended action / proposed classification
Kumara	17 Seddon Street, Kumara	Open Space	5	Not subject to Reserves Act	Declare and classify as Recreation Reserve; public notification required
Kumara	Boundary Road to Taramakau River Accessways	Utility – Transport	6	Not subject to Reserves Act	Declare and classify as Local Purpose (Access) Reserve; consider retaining under LGA
Kumara	Kumara Cemetery	Cemetery	1	Burials and Cremations Act 1964	No action
Kumara	Kumara Domain/Recreation Reserve	Open Space	3	Recreation Reserve	No action
Kumara	Kumara Racecourse	Property	1	Not subject to Reserves Act; endowment land	Review lease or consider disposal
Kumara	Land at Sandys Hill Road	Utility – Solid Waste	1	Not subject to Reserves Act; former landfill	No action
Kumara	Otira Highway Cycleway	Utility – Transport	5	Not subject to Reserves Act	Declare and classify as Local Purpose (Cycleway) Reserve
Kumara	Recreation Reserve – Seddon Street	Open Space	1	Recreation Reserve	Confirm intention to dispose
Kumara	Reserves on Seddon Street	Open Space	3	Reserves Act; mixed classifications	No action on memorial parcels; discuss one parcel with DOC
Kumara	Teremakau Lions Park	Open Space	1	Not subject to Reserves Act	Declare and classify as Recreation Reserve
Stafford	Stafford Cemetery	Cemetery	1	Burials and Cremations Act 1964	No action; consider future reserve declaration/classification
Stafford	Waimea Creek Esplanade Reserves	Open Space	3	Unclassified reserves	Classify as Local Purpose (Esplanade) Reserve
Awatuna	Awatuna Utility Reserves	Utility – Transport	4	Unclassified reserves	Classify as Local Purpose (Utility) Reserve
Arahura Valley	Kawhaka Creek Gravel Reserve	DOC	1	Crown land; out of scope	Remove from Council database
Arahura Valley	Old Christchurch Road Esplanade Reserve	Open Space	1	Unclassified reserve	Classify as Local Purpose (Esplanade) Reserve

Township	Site	Function	Parcels	Current status	Recommended action / proposed classification
Hokitika	Area outside Hoki Boatshed Cafe	Open Space	1	Not subject to Reserves Act	Declare and classify as Historic Reserve; alternatively retain under LGA
Hokitika	Building at corner Tudor Street and Hall Street	Property	1	Not subject to Reserves Act	Review lease or consider disposal
Hokitika	Car park on Revell Street_2	Property	4	Not subject to Reserves Act	Review lease or consider disposal
Hokitika	Cass Square Recreation Reserve	Open Space	1	Recreation Reserve	No action
Hokitika	Fitzherbert Street Utility Reserve	Open Space	1	Unclassified reserve	Classify as Local Purpose (Amenity) Reserve
Hokitika	Harper Park	Property / Open Space	8	Mixed: Recreation Reserve, unclassified reserves and Council land	Confirm disposal for one parcel; classify amenity parcels; otherwise no action
Hokitika	Hau Hau Road Reservoir	Utility – Three Waters	4	Unclassified reserves	Classify as Local Purpose (Utility) Reserve; review revocation for selected parcels
Hokitika	Hokitika Aerodrome	Destination Westland	18	Local Purpose (Aerodrome) Reserve	No action
Hokitika	Hokitika Cemetery	Cemetery	1	Burials and Cremations Act 1964	Review status and required action
Hokitika	Hokitika Pool	Facilities	6	Not subject to Reserves Act	Declare and classify two open-space parcels as Recreation Reserve; no action on others
Hokitika	Land at Russell Road	Property	2	Not subject to Reserves Act	No action
Hokitika	Land Corner of Camp Street, Beach Street, Revell Street	Property / Open Space	3	Not subject to Reserves Act	No action
Hokitika	Lazar Park Recreation Reserve	Facilities / Open Space	3	Mixed: two non-reserve hall parcels and one Recreation Reserve	No action
Hokitika	MacAndrew Square	Facilities	4	Mixed: Local Purpose reserves and Council land	No action
Hokitika	Parkland at Bonar Drive	Open Space	2	Not subject to Reserves Act	Declare and classify as Access and Recreation reserves

Township	Site	Function	Parcels	Current status	Recommended action / proposed classification
Hokitika	Parkland at Brittan Street	Property	4	Not subject to Reserves Act	Review site holistically; retain under LGA pending planning
Hokitika	Preston's Bush Recreation Reserve	Open Space	2	Recreation Reserve	No action
Hokitika	Prossers Bush Recreation Reserve	Open Space	2	Recreation Reserve	No action
Hokitika	Recreation Reserve – Rolleston Street	Open Space	3	Mixed: Recreation Reserve and one unclassified reserve	Classify one parcel as Local Purpose (Amenity) Reserve; no change to others
Hokitika	Revell Street Car Park	Utility – Transport	1	Not subject to Reserves Act	No action
Hokitika	Stafford Street – Public Toilet and Grey Power	Facilities	4	Not subject to Reserves Act	No action
Hokitika	Sunset Point	Open Space	3	Two endowment parcels outside Reserves Act; one unclassified reserve	Seek approval to declare/classify endowment land; classify reserve as Recreation Reserve
Hokitika	Swallow Rush Road Water Treatment Plant	Utility – Three Waters	1	Not subject to Reserves Act	No action
Hokitika	Three Mile Utility Reserve	Utility – Three Waters	1	Local Purpose (Public Utility) Reserve	Update land record/title
Hokitika	Wadeson Park Recreation Reserve	Open Space	1	Recreation Reserve	No action
Hokitika	Walker Park Recreation Reserve	Open Space	1	Recreation Reserve	No action
Hokitika	Westland DC Office	Property	1	Not subject to Reserves Act	No action
Hokitika	Whitcombe Park Reserve	Open Space	1	Recreation Reserve	No action
Kaniere	Hokitika River Access	Open Space	3	Not subject to Reserves Act	Declare and classify as Local Purpose (Access/Esplanade) Reserve
Kaniere	Hokitika War Memorial	Open Space	1	Local Purpose (War Memorial) Reserve	No action
Kaniere	Hokitika Wastewater Treatment Plant	Utility – Three Waters	7	Not subject to Reserves Act	No action; retain under LGA

Township	Site	Function	Parcels	Current status	Recommended action / proposed classification
Kaniere	Hokitika–Kaniere Tramway Water Infrastructure Site	Utility – Three Waters	2	Not subject to Reserves Act	No action; retain under LGA
Kaniere	Kaniere Recreation Reserve	Open Space	2	Recreation Reserve	No action
Kaniere	Kaniere Road Esplanade Reserve	Open Space	1	Unclassified reserve	Classify as Local Purpose (Esplanade) Reserve
Kaniere	Kaniere Utility	Property	1	Not subject to Reserves Act	No action
Kaniere	Land at Cement Lead Road	Property	1	Not subject to Reserves Act	No action
Kaniere	Land at Hau Hau Road	Property	1	Not subject to Reserves Act	Review use and future status
Kaniere	Reserves at Lake Kaniere	Open Space	2	Unclassified reserves	Classify as Local Purpose (Amenity) and Natural Hazard reserves
Kaniere	Woodstock Domain	DOC	2	Crown land; out of scope	Discuss administration with DOC
Kokatahi	Bladier Road	Utility – Transport	3	Not subject to Reserves Act	No action
Kokatahi	Doughboy Road Gravel Reserves	DOC	2	Crown land; out of scope	Remove from Council database
Kokatahi	Duck Creek Esplanade	Open Space	1	Local Purpose (Esplanade) Reserve	No action
Kokatahi	Kokatahi Esplanade Reserves	Open Space	4	Mixed: classified and unclassified esplanade reserves	Classify two parcels as Local Purpose (Esplanade) Reserve; no action on others
Kokatahi	Kokatahi Hall	Facilities	2	Local Purpose (Hall Site) Reserve	No action
Kokatahi	Kokatahi Land	Property	1	Not subject to Reserves Act	Review
Kokatahi	Kokatahi Recreation Reserve	Open Space	2	Recreation Reserve	No action
Kowhitirangi	Kowhitirangi Recreation Reserve sites	Open Space	2	Recreation Reserve	Review
Kowhitirangi	Reserve at Kowhitirangi	Property	1	Not subject to Reserves Act	Review; Approved for sale
Ross	43 Tramway Street	Property	1	Endowment land; not subject to Reserves Act	Review lease or consider disposal
Ross	Butlers Landfill	Utility – Solid Waste	1	Not subject to Reserves Act	No action

Township	Site	Function	Parcels	Current status	Recommended action / proposed classification
Ross	Land at corner Tramway and Hoos Street	Property	1	Not subject to Reserves Act	No action
Ross	Ross Cemetery	Cemetery	3	Local Purpose (Public Cemetery) Reserve	No action
Ross	Ross Hall	Facilities	7	Mostly not subject to Reserves Act	Declare/classify core hall parcels as Local Purpose (Community Facilities) Reserve; review two parcels
Ross	Ross Historic Cemetery	DOC	1	Crown land; out of scope	Remove from Council database
Ross	Ross Recreation Reserve	Open Space	6	Mixed Council, Domain Board and Crown parcels	Progress as one package after road realignment; declare/classify Council parcels and liaise with DOC/Domain Board
Ross	Ross Squash Club	Facilities	1	Not subject to Reserves Act	No action
Ross	Ross Swimming Pool	Facilities	6	Endowment land; not subject to Reserves Act	Retain under LGA; consider land-status reports where disposal is contemplated
Ross	Ross Water Supply	Utility – Three Waters	2	Not subject to Reserves Act	No action
Kakapotahi	Beach Road, Kakapotahi	DOC	1	Crown land	Discuss with DOC
Kakapotahi	Waitaha Hall Reserve	Facilities	1	Local Purpose (Hall Site) Reserve	Update title/land record
Harihari	Hari Hari Memorial	Facilities	1	Unclassified reserve	Classify as Local Purpose (War Memorial) Reserve
Harihari	Harihari Cemetery	Cemetery	1	Burials and Cremations Act; cemetery reserve	No change
Harihari	Harihari Recreation Reserve	Open Space	3	Recreation Reserve	No action
Harihari	Robertson Road Public Utility	Utility – Three Waters	1	Local Purpose (Utility) Reserve	No action
Harihari	Wanganui Flat Road Roadmans Cottage	Open Space	1	Local Purpose (Roadman's Cottage) Reserve	Review lease or consider disposal
Whataroa	Tatare Esplanade Reserve	Open Space	1	Unclassified reserve	Classify as Local Purpose (Esplanade) Reserve

Township	Site	Function	Parcels	Current status	Recommended action / proposed classification
Whataroa	Whataroa Cemetery	Cemetery	1	Burials and Cremations Act 1964	Update trustees
Whataroa	Whataroa Public Toilet and Playground	Open Space	1	Endowment land; not subject to Reserves Act	Declare and classify as Recreation Reserve
Whataroa	Whataroa Recreation Reserve	Open Space	6	Recreation Reserve	No action
Whataroa	Whataroa Water Treatment	Utility – Three Waters	1	Not subject to Reserves Act	No action
Okarito	Okarito Cemetery	Cemetery	1	Local Purpose (Public Cemetery) Reserve	Review current use and potential reclassification. Discuss with DOC
Okarito	Ōkārito Lagoon Cemetery	DOC	1	Crown land; out of scope	Remove from Council database
Okarito	Okarito Recreation Reserve	DOC	1	Crown Recreation Reserve; out of scope	Remove from Council database
Okarito	Okarito Township Reserves	DOC	1	Crown Recreation Reserve; out of scope	Remove from Council database
Okarito	Totarakaitorea Cemetery	DOC	1	Crown land; out of scope	Remove from Council database
Franz Joseph	Franz Josef Accessway Reserves	Open Space	3	Unclassified reserves	Classify as Local Purpose (Drainage and Accessway) Reserve
Franz Joseph	Franz Josef Airport	Destination Westland / Utilities	4	Aerodrome and Public Utility reserves	No action
Franz Joseph	Franz Josef Flood Protection – north of Waiho Bailey Bridge	Property	5	Not subject to Reserves Act	No action
Franz Joseph	Franz Josef Flood Protection – Waiho Bailey Bridge	Property	2	Not subject to Reserves Act	No action
Franz Joseph	Franz Josef Gravel Reserve	Property	1	Not subject to Reserves Act	Review
Franz Joseph	Gillespies Beach Cemetery	DOC	1	Crown land; out of scope	Remove from Council database
Franz Joseph	Land at Condon Street	Property	2	Not subject to Reserves Act	No action
Franz Joseph	Parkland at Alymer Place	Open Space	1	Not subject to Reserves Act	Declare and classify as Local Purpose (Esplanade) Reserve

Township	Site	Function	Parcels	Current status	Recommended action / proposed classification
Franz Joseph	Recreation Reserve – Franz Josef/Waiau	Open Space	1	Unclassified reserve	Classify as Recreation Reserve
Fox Glacier	Fox Cemetery	Cemetery	1	Local Purpose (Public Cemetery) Reserve	No action
Fox Glacier	Fox Community Centre	Facilities	3	Mixed: non-reserve, Recreation Reserve and unclassified reserve	Declare/classify one parcel, reclassify one, and classify one for community/recreation purposes
Fox Glacier	Fox Water Treatment Land	Utility – Three Waters	1	Not subject to Reserves Act	No action
Fox Glacier	Property at Fox Town Entrance	Property	1	Not subject to Reserves Act	Review lease or consider disposal
Fox Glacier	Recreation Reserve – Fox Glacier	Open Space	1	Recreation Reserve	Update title/land record; obtain land-status advice before disposal
Karangarua	Karangarua Cemetery	Cemetery	1	Burials and Cremations Act 1964	Review
Bruce Bay	Bruce Bay Hall	Facilities	1	Local Purpose (Hall Site) Reserve	Update land record
Paringa	Moeraki River Ferry Reserve	Open Space	1	Unclassified reserve	Review classification and discuss with DOC
Haast	Haast Hall and Fire Station	Facilities	1	Local Purpose (Hall Site) Reserve	No action
Haast	Haast Water Supply and Sewage Treatment Plant	Utility – Three Waters	1	Local Purpose utility reserve	No action
Haast	Marks Road	Private / Open Space	2	Mixed: disposal land and unclassified reserve	Remove disposal parcel from database; classify reserve as Recreation Reserve
Haast	Paureka, Awarua Opuka Walkway	Open Space	1	Unclassified reserve	Classify as Local Purpose (Access) Reserve
Haast	Utility Reserve Haast Jackson Bay Road	Utility – Three Waters	1	Local Purpose (Public Utility) Reserve	No action
Okuru	Hannah's Clearing Fire Station	Property	1	Not subject to Reserves Act	Review lease or consider disposal
Okuru	Hannahs Clearing Public Utility Reserve	Utility – Three Waters	1	Local Purpose (Public Utility) Reserve	Review; disposal investigation
Okuru	Okuru Cemetery	Cemetery	1	Unclassified reserve	Classify as Local Purpose (Cemetery) Reserve

Township	Site	Function	Parcels	Current status	Recommended action / proposed classification
Okuru	Okuru Hall	Facilities	1	Local Purpose (Hall Site) Reserve	No action
Okuru	Okuru Recreation Reserve	Open Space	1	Recreation Reserve	No action; investigate disposal if pursued
Neils Beach	Arawata Cemetery	Cemetery	1	Not subject to Reserves Act; closed cemetery	Discuss with DOC and confirm authority/status
Neils Beach	Neil's Beach Public Utility	Open Space	2	Local Purpose (Utility) Reserve	No action; consider reclassification if primary use is amenity
Jackson Bay	Land at The Esplanade	Property	1	Not subject to Reserves Act	No action

LTP Proposal – Parks and Reserves

Cost Centre	Parks and Reserves
LTP Forecast	**$204,821**
Funding Source	Heritage Pk $17,082 Memorial Hall RSA $ 4,195 Reserves – Woodstock $ 8,895 Business Area $10,910 Heritage Area $46,776 Wadeson Island $ 8,595 Water Front – Hokitika $108,368
Author / Lead	General Manager District Assets
Community Outcome	Enabling a liveable district Protecting Westland's communities, culture and heritage Supporting and enhancing the natural environment Providing future-fit infrastructure and services

Background

Parks and Reserves Portfolio

The following areas are maintained under the current Westroads Parks and Reserves contract:

- Woodstock Reserve: A highly popular attraction for both locals and tourists. It features historical interpretive panels on the upper section and a well-utilised footpath. This asset requires a low annual financial contribution from the Council.
- Business Area: Covers the maintenance of CBD gardens and planter boxes.
- Heritage Area: Located along Gibson Quay. This forms part of the local heritage walk and includes information and historical display panels.
- Wadeson Island: Covers the upkeep of walking tracks throughout the island. This area sees high usage from locals and tourists but represents a low financial impact regarding ongoing maintenance.
- Hokitika Waterfront: Covers general maintenance of the waterfront area as well as capital works projects aligned with the CBD Concept Plan.

Facilities Portfolio (Reallocations)

- Westland Industrial Heritage Park (Brian Waugh Lane): Reclassified from *Parks and Reserves* to Facilities. The Council provides an annual maintenance grant for the park's buildings and structures, while the actual maintenance work is predominantly carried out by volunteers.
- Memorial Hall RSA (Hokitika): Reclassified from *Parks and Reserves* to Facilities and should be integrated into the *Community Halls* portfolio. The building sits on Council-owned land but is fully maintained by the RSA.

Proposal

It is proposed to maintain these services as they significantly enhance the district's appeal, encouraging repeat visitation from tourists and providing vital ongoing support to local communities and businesses.

Suggest the current levels of service remain.

Impact

Reduced levels of service are a possibility but would be highly obvious and affect the township appeal.

DRAFT

Report to Council

Noting Paper

DATE: 11 November 2026

TO: Mayor and Councillors

FROM: Erle Bencich – District Assets General Manager

West Coast Wilderness Trail

1. Summary

This paper provides an update to councillors on the working operations of the West Coast Wilderness Trail along with funding provisions from the Ministry of Business, Innovation & Employment (MBIE), Councils co-funding requirements and where they are allotted. The paper also advises on what duties are required from the trail coordinator (noted in agreement with MBIE as Trail Manager) and delivered through the West Coast Wilderness Trail Trust.

The reason this information is being presented is at the request of Councillors so clarity around how the wilderness trail is operated, what each of the entities are responsible for and how known funding is collected and distributed. It is an opportune time to provide additional feedback on staff transfer and lines of internal reporting.

2. Current Situation

The current maintenance and support agreement is in effect until June 2028.

MBIE and Council support and funds are allocated as shown in the table on the following page. Council contributions are counted “in-kind” through operational maintenance activities. Financial support for the trail coordinator is a direct cost and provided as a grant.

The table does not make allowance for storm damage remediation and capital replacement investments which are applied for separately on a case-by-case basis.

APPENDIX 1 PROJECT TASKS AND BUDGET Project Task	Estimated Completion Date	Maximum Ministry Contribution (excl. GST, if any)	Co-Funding Contribution (excl GST, if any) – Westland District Council
Trail Maintenance: • Water table maintenance • Trail surface maintenance • Vegetation control such as spraying, pruning, scrub and barring, weed control, managing sightlines • Consumables such as chemicals, fuel, trail counter batter replacement • Structure maintenance such as bridges, signage/interpretation panel, shelter, picnic table, bike rack • Other	30 June 2028	$64,350 Per/annum	$34,650 Per/annum
Trail Manager: • Managing Alerts and Notifications • Managing the Trail communication • Managing NZCT and MBIE requirements and requests such as surveys, supplying information for reports, evaluations etc • Facilitating Trail Enhancement and supporting work of the Trail Owners such as interpretation panels, trail improvements, new signage, trail planning, economic reports and Trail Management Funding – Application Form		$45,000 Per/ annum	$45,000 Per/annum
• dogs and motorbikes, kiosks and surface repairs. • Fundraising • Trust Functions			

The transfer of operational wilderness trail staff from Destination Westland Limited (DWL) to Westland District Council was undertaken in the later part of 2025. The transfer included a wide range of plant and materials from DWL which had to be purchased at a cost of $18,350.00.

The maintenance team is being utilised wherever possible to undertake work previously contracted out to the local contracting market. This minor business structure and usage subsidizes the overall expense of undertaking trail maintenance as well as providing a skilled workforce for the group benefit. This structure requires further time to have an accurate financial position for Councillor review and discussion. Unfortunately, there has been some key staff turnover which required a reporting alignment. This team now reports through the transportation manager.

In the last 4 months the West Coast Wilderness Trail Trust has provided $100K in funding support for some additional work required on the Ruatapu to Ross section. This is the first direct large investment provided by

the Trust. It is presumed that this capital was supplied via the trusts' fund-raising efforts, but some clarity is lacking.

Further information and financial position are to be requested from the West Coast Wilderness Trail Trust. Clarity on donations and how other charges are applied needs confirming. A portion of all of these funds “should” be made available on a regular basis, if they are surplus to operational needs. Attainment of the trust’s financial position and how income is provided and expended is seen as a priority.

The Westland District Council team continue to provide a high level of serviceability for the users of the West Coast wilderness trail. Cost impact on ratepayers needs further time to assess, now that the staff are supplying services across the group.

Availability of accurate financial records from the West Coast Wilderness Trail Trust will be requested.

A further update will be provided once more information is known along with financial position at the end of the 2026/27 year.

The initial trail sections were funded then constructed and vested to Council with a stipulation from central Government that free access would be provided. This was due to the interaction with the Department of Conservation land. Staff will investigate if this position has changed and can be amended to provide additional operational and maintenance funding. This would be targeted at companies utilising the trail for business purposes and monetary gain. Regular events such as marathons or trail races could be included as part of Councils fees and charges.

3. Recommendation (s)

3.1. That the report be received as a noting paper.