

THE WEST COAST REGIONAL COUNCIL

MINUTES OF A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE COUNCIL HELD ON 5 JUNE 2009, AT THE OFFICES OF THE WEST COAST REGIONAL COUNCIL, 388 MAIN SOUTH ROAD, GREYMOOUTH, COMMENCING AT 10.30 A.M.

PRESENT:

R. Scarlett (Chairman), B. Chinn, D. Davidson, A. Robb, A. Birchfield, T. Archer

IN ATTENDANCE:

C. Ingle (Chief Executive Officer), R. Mallinson (Corporate Services Manager), T. Jellyman (Minutes Clerk), The Media.

The Chairman opened the meeting and welcomed all those present. He stated that the purpose of today's meeting is to hear submissions relating to Council's Long Term Council Community plan, which is mainly a financial document and outlines how Council will spend ratepayer's money. He stated that Councillors will discuss the submissions at a workshop following the meeting and decisions would be made at a later date.

SUBMISSIONS TO DRAFT LTCCP – PRESENTED TO COUNCIL

Greymouth Floodwall – Mr Stewart Nimmo

Mr Stewart Nimmo stated that his submission is very similar to Greymouth Heritage Trust's submission and that he is a member of the Greymouth Heritage Trust. Mr Nimmo stated that he sees a lot of people using the floodwall and he would like Council to recognise the aesthetic values along with practicalities of the floodwall when designing the upgrade. He does not want to end up with a monstrosity that would look out of place and would like Council to consider working with Landscape Architect's. Mr Nimmo stated that currently access onto the floodwall is very dangerous especially around the clock tower. Mr Nimmo stated that from an historic point of view the old bridge truss from the railway bridge needs to be tidied up along with the completion of the path. Mr Nimmo spoke of the group of people trying to restore the old signal box. He would like Council to consider lifting up the signal box onto the top of the floodwall.

Cr Scarlett asked Mr Nimmo what is the problem with access to the clock tower. Mr Nimmo responded that upon stepping down from the clock tower there is no footpath and that you step directly onto Mawhera Quay. Cr Birchfield reminded Mr Nimmo that the floodwall is a structure designed to protect the town from flooding and that Council would not want to clog it up with structures and buildings. Cr Birchfield stated that heavy machinery needs to have easy access when there is a flood and that first and foremost the floodwall is a flood protection structure. Mr Nimmo responded that he is mindful of this. Cr Archer asked Mr Nimmo whether or not the current floodwall proposal incorporates the designs Mr Nimmo is speaking about and does Mr Nimmo have any idea of the costs involved. Mr Nimmo responded that he has not looked at any detailed plans but has looked at some proposals. Mr Nimmo stated that from a cost point of view he wants Council to "get it right" and that he feels that the floodwall is important for the town. Cr Archer asked Mr Nimmo if he thinks the community would be prepared to meet the costs of the design and access issues that Mr Nimmo would like considered. Mr Nimmo stated that he feels the costs would be minimal if the design is done wisely.

The Chairman thanked Mr Nimmo for his submission.

Greymouth Floodwall – Greymouth Heritage Trust

Mr David Stapleton and Mrs Rae Eder presented the above submission. Mr Stapleton stated that Mr Nimmo is also a member of the Trust and that they have 120 members in the Grey district. Mr Stapleton stated that they see their role as preserving, promoting and facilitating the ongoing use of Greymouth heritage. Mr Stapleton stated that the Trust would like to see themselves as partners with the Regional Council as they are with the District Council. The Trust is seeking Council's support to develop Grey River Heritage Parks with the floodwall as the

linking spine. Mr Stapleton stated he is mindful of Cr Birchfield statement that the prime function of the floodwall is flood protection and that it needs to allow heavy machinery in when necessary. Mr Stapleton responded to Cr Archer question to Mr Nimmo, he stated that a lot of ramps and steps are already in place for pedestrians and wheelchair users. Mr Stapleton stated it is important that these steps and ramps are included in the floodwall upgrade. Mr Stapleton stated that the signal box is owned by the New Zealand Railways Corporation and the Heritage Trust has a management role for the NZRC to keep an eye on the signal box and to advise them of works required for the signal box. Mr Stapleton stated a formal management licence is currently being put together between the Trust and the NZRC. Pictures were tabled of the signal box showing that the floodwall was built around the signal box and a montage of what the signal box could look like if placed on top of the floodwall following the upgrade. Mr Stapleton stated that Greymouth Heritage Trust would like to think that the cost of putting the signal box would be less than having to build around it. He requested that Council and the Trust work together on this. Mr Stapleton advised that Greymouth Heritage Trust is in possession of the old Kaiata Station, which is almost identical to the old Riverside Railway Station. They would like to put that station back on the lower level of the floodwall opposite the railway station carpark and request Council's support with this. Mr Stapleton stated that Greymouth Heritage Trust have an application placed with Enterprising Communities for a grant of \$112,000 to pay for a Coordinator for a further 18 months. Mr Stapleton is requesting a letter of support for this purpose from Council. Mr Stapleton stated that an application is also in place with Development West Coast for this purpose and they request a letter of support for this purpose. Mrs Eder stated that there are plans to restore the signal box back to its original state on top of the floodwall. Cr Archer raised the matter of vandalism to the signal box. Mr Stapleton stated this is because the signal box is sitting in a lower level, is out of sight and there is also a seat next to the signal box where people sometimes sit at night. Alcohol is consumed at this site and vandalism often follows. Mr Nimmo advised that a floodlight has been placed on the lamppost opposite the signal box, which lights up this area at night and has successfully put a stop to the vandalism.

Mr Stapleton stated if the signal box is placed on top of the floodwall this will help reduce vandalism, as the signal box will be in full view of the public.

Cr Scarlett thanked the Greymouth Heritage Trust for their submission.

Greymouth Floodwall

Mr Kevin Curtis presented the above submission. He tabled detailed maps and photographs of the Blaketown, Cobden and river mouth areas. He showed where the river used to run and spoke of the old rubbish dump in this area. He stated that some parts of the floodwall were built on a rubbish dump and sinking sand. Mr Curtis stated that half of the river mouth is now blocked off. He stated that a spillway is required through the Cobden area near the old recreation area. He stated that this is his opinion and he welcomed questions from Council. Cr Scarlett asked Mr Curtis if he had spoken to Grey District Council about this matter. Mr Curtis confirmed that he has. Cr Chinn asked Mr Curtis if he felt if the floodwall was moved back from the bottleneck and reclaimed beach area if this would make a difference. Mr Curtis confirmed that a sludge channel in this area would keep the area clear. Cr Scarlett asked if a spillway would still be required. Mr Curtis stated that during a southerly a spillway is required on the Cobden side. Cr Archer asked if Mr Curtis is talking about a cut in the floodway. Mr Curtis demonstrated to Cr Archer exactly where he means the spillway to be placed. Cr Archer asked what consideration Mr Curtis has given to drift coming into the area. Mr Curtis responded that by lowering the level of the river this would keep it clearer. Cr Archer asked if dredging of the river would be necessary. Mr Curtis stated that a cement block, spring tides and getting rid of the bottleneck would assist with this. Cr Scarlett thanked Mr Curtis for his submission.

Lake Brunner / Dairying – West Coast Fish and Game

Mr Chris Tonkin (Manager, West Coast Fish & Game) presented the above submission. He stated that the primary role of Fish and Game as it relates to the Regional Council as set out in the Conservation Act is to manage, maintain and enhance sports of fish and game birds and the recreational use of anglers and hunters. He stated that a further function is to represent the interests and aspirations of anglers and hunters in the statutory planning processes. Management of water quality and environmental integrity of rivers, lakes and streams in the region is a Regional Council function. He stated that Fish and Game rely on the Regional Council to do their job so that Fish and Game can do their job. Cr Scarlett confirmed to Mr

Tonkin that councillors have read his submission. Mr Tonkin drew attention to water quality management in Lake Brunner and the Brunner catchment in the Annual Plans, LTCCP and the Proposed Water Plan 2007. He stated that non-point agricultural discharges are the primary cause of declining water quality in Lake Brunner and this was established in the 2007 Proposed Water Plan. Mr Tonkin stated that in the previous LTCCP it was highlighted that management of water quality in Lake Brunner was a high priority. Farm compliance in this catchment was also identified as a priority and that the decline in water quality has been linked to the steady increase of phosphates. Mr Tonkin stated that the Regional Council's performance in relation to Lake Brunner has been strong on planning rhetoric and weak on action. Mr Tonkin spoke of his dealings with farm management plans and is aware of good work done. He spoke of School Creek being a blatant example of the effects of dairying and the ineffectiveness of the consent authority in dealing with it. Mr Tonkin spoke to emails he has received regarding compliance issues in the Brunner catchment and in the La Fontaine Road at Hari Hari. Mr Tonkin accepts that often complaints are compliant with the RMA and that public perception is important. Mr Tonkin stated that dairying in the Brunner catchment is a problem and that effective performance targets in the Annual Plan are a requirement. He stated that public opinion surveys show that water pollution is the most important environmental priority for the public and that objectives for the improvement of water quality need to be met. Mr Tonkin's submission also wants enforcement of stock crossings and riparian fencing, and riparian zone rules to be looked into. Cr Chinn asked Mr Tonkin how Fish and Game feels about disturbing the riparian margins in the Lake Brunner area for the purpose of building marinas and jetties. Mr Tonkin stated that the activity doesn't matter but the affect on water quality is what matters. Cr Archer asked Mr Tonkin if he feels that farm management plans are working. Mr Tonkin responded that 80% of landowners participated in the farm management plans. 75% of the 80% had completed phase 1 and now four years have past, Mr Tonkin said he has not heard of any feedback since. Mr Tonkin stated that from what he is seeing now the farm management plans have not been followed through.

Cr Archer asked Mr Tonkin feels that the information sent out to the public by the Regional Council on what the Regional Council's functions are is good information. Mr Tonkin stated that in general he feels that the average local does not have a clue what the Regional Council is there for and he feels this would be standard throughout the country. He feels that the public often confuse Fish and Game and the Regional Council. Cr Archer stated that the Regional Council tries hard to put out public information explaining its function. Mr Tonkin stated that water quality is not improving in Lake Brunner and that there is a lack of compliance with existing rules. He stated that stronger enforcement could be an option and the recent prosecutions have caught the attention of the farming community. Educational approaches have not achieved their purpose in Mr Tonkin's view. Cr Scarlett thanked Mr Tonkin for his submission.

Animal Health Board – Funding

Mr Chris Pullen from the Animal Health Board presented the above submission. He stated that Mrs Helen Lash representing the Tb Free committee on the West Coast would also be speaking. Mr Pullen thanked the Regional Council for the support it has given to the Animal Health Board and the Tb Free Programme over the past year. Mr Pullen stated that the AHB is trying to keep down the number of infected herds in the area. Mr Pullen spoke of the funding partnership between The Crown, the industry and the region. Mr Pullen stated that crux of his submission is to use the opportunity to increase the programme on the West Coast if the Council would consider a further financial commitment. He stated that for every dollar that Council gives to the programme the Crown would subsidise the programme for a further \$9.00. The Animal Health Board is asking Council for a further \$100,000 for the programme, this will equate to \$1M for the West Coast programme. Mr Pullen stated that the funding requested is not for aerial work but to increase the capacity for groundwork. Cr Archer asked for clarification as to if \$100,000 is correct and that this is ratepayer funded. Cr Archer asked if there has been discussion with the ratepayers who are required to fund this increase as to what their views are. Mr Pullen stated that stakeholders in the programme have been consulted but not the general ratepayers.

Mr Danny Templeman for the Animal Health Board addressed the meeting. He explained that the Regional Council pays 10% of the regional share. He confirmed that there has been no consultation with individual ratepayers and that the only area in New Zealand where ratepayers are consulted is Otago. He stated that AHB can get more funding from the Crown if they can get funding from the Regional Council. Cr Archer asked what statutory power does the Animal

Health Board have to insist on the apportionments being met. Mr Templeman stated that the regional share is discretionary. Cr Davidson asked if the funding request is a one off or will it be requested every year. Mr Pullen stated he would like to think it is a one off for this year but this is dependant on the strategy review. Cr Davidson asked if this would be a way to alleviate some of the pressure of 1080 being close to waterways. C. Pullen stated waterways is only one issue and there are other aspects of delivery as well. Cr Scarlett asked if there has been any research done on the question of what are we getting for this extra funding. Mr Pullen stated that Animal Health Board report back to stakeholders via their annual report. Cr Scarlett stated that it would be handy to have this information prior to a decision being made. Mr Pullen stated there are positive spin offs for keeping the programme local and using local contractors. Cr Scarlett asked where are the costs benefits, as decisions need to be made on facts. Mr Pullen stated that the Animal Health Board has to be ready to change their methodology if required and that they need to be ready to do this.

Tb Free West Coast – Regional Funding

Mrs Helen Lash presented the above submission. She stated that she is Chair of the Tb Free West Coast committee and represents the funding stakeholders to the Animal Health Board. The funding stakeholders are Dairy New Zealand, New Zealand Deer Farmers Association, Federated Farmers Dairy, Federated Farmers Meat and Wool, Local Government New Zealand and Dairy Industry NZ. Mrs Lash stated in 1995 there were in excess of 270 infected herds on the coast. Today there are 42. Infection previously went from Karamea to Whataroa, it now goes no further south than the Mikonui. There were 14 infected herds south of Hokitika now there is one. There were 13 densely infected Tb regions on the coast, now there are just three. Mrs Lash stated that great progress has been made. She added that the plan is not to eradicate possums but to eradicate Tb disease. Mrs Lash stated that there are other regions in New Zealand becoming Tb free due to their successful control programmes. Mrs Lash stated that it is achievable for the West Coast to become Tb free. Mrs Lash stated the Tb Free West Coast remains hopeful of getting rid of feral Tb. Mrs Lash stated that the repercussion of having or not having a well-funded programme are quite phenomenal. Mrs Lash thanked the Regional Council for their continued support with the regional funding. Mrs Lash stated that Tb Free West Coast is currently ahead of expectation and the goal is achieving Tb free status for the West Coast. Cr Archer stated to Mrs Lash that judging from the number of submissions received nobody is opposed to the eradication of Tb. He stated the issue that most people have raised is the methods used, he asked if other means of control are being researched that might satisfy submitters who are opposed to 1080. Mrs Lash stated that the Animal Health Board invests millions of dollars every year and works in with Landcare Research to look for an alternative means. She stated the alternatives have to be trialed and that these trials are lengthy and intensive. Mrs Lash stated that 1080 is the only toxin that can be applied aerially. Mrs Lash said there are a multitude of options being looked at and that this is continuous with both alternative measures and improvements on what is done and how it is done. Cr Archer stated that there does not seem to be a lot of information out about ground control methods with either the costs of this or research into water catchment areas being treated by ground control rather than aerial. Mrs Lash stated that ground control would not contain the disease if aerals were taken out of the programme. Cr Archer asked if there was sufficient funding would there be adequate resources. Mrs Lash stated if you know what resources you have available then it is achievable to bring in more contractors but the contractors of today have to do extensive training and it is very hard work. Mr Pullen stated that the simple answer is coverage and that you don't get the coverage with ground control that you get with aerial. The costs are likely to go up by 80% with ground control. Cr Scarlett stated that topography is also a problem. Mr Pullen stated that some areas are dangerous, unmanageable and unsuitable to be covered by ground control. Cr Scarlett thanked Mrs Lash and Mr Pullen for their submissions.

Mr Lindsay Molloy – 1080 Issues

Mr Molloy presented the above submission. He stated that he pleased that Council is prepared to take on board the views of ratepayers on 1080. Cr Scarlett stated that the view must relate to the LTCCP. He stated he is not prepared to take on views of a political nature but is very keen to hear submissions relating to the LTCCP. Mr Molloy stated he is a concerned ratepayer and is the Chairman of the Harihari Community Association. Mr Molloy stated he is questioning the impartiality of the Regional Council in issuing resource consents for 1080 drops in particular the granting of a ten year consent to the Animal Health Board. He is concerned that the

resource consent was made non-notifiable. Cr Scarlett asked Mr Molloy to direct his comments to the LTCCP document. Mr Molloy feels his submission is legitimate and he would like to continue speaking. Cr Scarlett reminded Mr Molloy that his submission must relate to the LTCCP and that his concerns regarding resource consents would be more properly directed to the RMA. He advised Mr Molloy to direct his concerns to the Council in writing and outlining his concerns regarding the RMA. Cr Scarlett stated that the LTCCP is a ten year plan that sets out what will be done with ratepayers funding and seeks the community's feedback. Mr Molloy feels his submission is not political.

Mrs Mary Molloy – 1080 Issues

Mrs Molloy stated that she couldn't direct Cr Scarlett to a page in the LTCCP that relates to her submission. She asked that the Regional Council review their consent process and to no longer issue consents for the use of 1080. She stated she feels her submission reflects the concerns of ratepayers. Cr Scarlett stopped Mrs Molloy and asked for her to direct him to the particular issue she wishes to speak to in the LTCCP. He stated if she cannot do this then it is an abuse of process. Cr Scarlett advised Mrs Molloy that her submission might be better addressed to the Animal Health Board. Mrs Molloy stated that ratepayers are concerned about waterway contamination from the use of 1080. She stated that the protection of ratepayer's interests should be included in the LTCCP.

Mrs Molloy – Farmers Against Ten Eighty

Mrs Molloy asked Cr Scarlett if Council considers the submission from Farmers Against Ten Eighty a political issue also. Mrs Molloy stated that Farmers Against Ten Eighty require the Regional Council to no longer issue consents for the use of 1080. Mrs Molloy stated she supports the Animal Health Board and other organisations fighting Tb but they do not support the use of 1080. Cr Scarlett advised Mrs Molloy that this submission is more appropriately addressed to the Animal Health Board and Council is not prepared to hear the submission. Mrs Molloy stated that she is sorry that Council does not have the concerns of their ratepayers at heart.

Mr Terry Duthie – 1080

Mr Duthie directed the meeting to page 50 of Council's LTCCP relating to Council's Vector Control Business Unit. He stated that Council is accountable for the use of 1080 as they sign the consent. Mr Duthie stated that farmers need to take responsibility for their own stocks health. He reminded Council of their mission statement. Mr Duthie stated that he wants 1080 out of the water, out of the air and out of New Zealand. Cr Scarlett asked Mr Duthie what he would like the VCS Unit to do. Mr Duthie responded that he wants them to stop dropping 1080 all over the west coast. Cr Scarlett clarified if Mr Duthie wants the VCS business unit stopped. Mr Duthie stated that his submission is about the unsustainable and cavalier use of an indiscriminate poisoning programme. Mr Duthie stated that Kumara had 5 tonnes of 1080 buried in their water catchment. Mr Duthie stated there are plenty of alternatives that don't require poison being dropped from a helicopter. Cr Scarlett thanked Mr Duthie for his submission.

Mr Laurie Collins – 1080

Mr Collins stated he received a reply from C. Ingle advising him that his submission did not relate to the LTCCP. Mr Collins is surprised that this Council does not issue the resource consent for 1080 applications. Mr Collins asked what forum would Council be prepared to hear people in. Cr Scarlett stated that Council is keen to hear from those whose submissions relate to the LTCCP. Cr Scarlett stated that political statements and statements unrelated to the LTCCP cannot be heard in this forum. Mr Collins asked Cr Scarlett if this council is the consenting authority for 1080. C. Ingle responded through the Chair that Council Officers do not process these consents; they are processed by consultants externally. C. Ingle clarified that this Council is the consenting authority but we have a separation process, which eliminates the potential for conflict of interest. C. Ingle stated it is the same for the Greymouth Floodwall where a consent has to go to an external person to be processed but the final decision still lies with the Regional Council. Mr Collins asked when these issues would be addressed, as they are not going to go away. Cr Scarlett explained that Mr Collins needs to address his problems to the Animal Health Board or DoC. Cr Scarlett advised Mr Collins that his views must relate to the LTCCP and his views must be statutory to this. Mr Collins wishes to talk to the Council at some stage on the matter of 1080 at a future date. Cr Scarlett stated this meeting is for the LTCCP

and Mr Collins is unable to direct Council to where he would like to discuss the LTCCP; therefore Mr Collins cannot be heard.

Stuart Davidson – 1080

Mr Davidson presented the above submission. He introduced himself to the meeting and stated that he is a dairy farmer from the Waitaha Valley. Mr Davidson stated that his submission is similar to others today and he is aware that he may not be able to speak to his submission. Mr Davidson drew attention to the recent prosecution of a dairy farmer for illegal dairy effluent discharge. Mr Davidson stated that Council must now prosecute DoC and the Animal Health Board for polluting waterways with a deadly poison. Cr Scarlett reminded Mr Davidson that this is an opinion and does not relate to the LTCCP. Cr Scarlett asked Mr Davidson if whether or not he is going to speak to the LTCCP. Mr Davidson stated that he is not going to speak and that Council has wasted his time.

Westland District Council

A late submission as received from Westland District Council. C. Ingle noted that it was dated 25 May 2009 but it was received two days late which is why it was not included in the bound copy of all other submissions.

Late Submission

C. Ingle advised that another late form submission has been received on the use of 1080. The submitter did not wish to speak and Mr Mallinson noted that the name of the submitter is indecipherable.

Moved (Archer / Scarlett) *that the late submission from Westland District Council be received.*
Carried

Moved (Davidson / Robb) *that all written submissions of relevance to the LTCCP be received.*
Carried

5. GENERAL BUSINESS

There was no general business.

The meeting closed at 12.38 p.m.

.....
Chairman

.....
Date