WORKSHOP AGENDA

Long Term Plan #2

to be held on **Tuesday 15 September 2026 commencing at 10:00am**
in the Council Chambers, 36 Weld Street, Hokitika and via Zoom

Facilitators:	Chief Executive and Chief Financial Officer	
Members	Her Worship the Mayor	Deputy Mayor Burden
	Councillor Gillett	Councillor Mackenzie
	Councillor Maitland	Councillor Manera
	Councillor Martin	Councillor Munns
	Councillor Walker	Kaiwhakahaere Tumahai
	Kaiwhakahaere Madgwick	
Council Staff	B. Phillips, Chief Executive	S. Lewis, Chief Financial Officer
	L. Webster, General Manager Regulatory and Compliance	E. Bencich, General Manager District Assets
	J. Birnie, Strategy and Transformation Manager	J. Warren, Senior HR Advisor
	M. Tahapeehi, General Manager Business Enablement	D. Maitland, Quality Assurance Manager
	R. Parekh, Principal Communications Advisor	C. Dodds, Executive Assistant
	S. Hewett, Governance Administrator	

The purpose of this workshop is primarily for the provision of information and discussion on the 2027/2037 Long Term Plan and will not be used to make any decisions or pass any resolutions.

1. **Present & Apologies**
2. **Workshop Items:**

2.1. Introduction

Chief Executive to speak to this item.

2.2. Community Engagement Verbal Update

Principal Communications Advisor to speak to this item.

2.3. Council's Strategic Direction **(3)**

Seeking Councillor feedback on this item.

2.4. Proposed Community Outcomes **(4-7)**

Seeking Councillor feedback on this item.

2.5. Rates Capping **(8-12)**

Chief Financial Officer to speak to this item.

2.6. Key Proposals **(13-18)**

- Development Contributions – Significant change to costs of development in Westland
- Rates vs User Pays Ratio – Significant change to rate funding
- Spatial Planning - Significant change to the direction of development throughout the region.
- Council Reserves - Significant change to rate funding
- Rate Payer Assistance Scheme – Introduction of a new community assistance programme

2.7. Proposals **(19-46)**

- Community Halls
- Land and Buildings
- Public Conveniences
- Properties
- Ross Swimming Pool
- Westland Sports Hub
- Harbourmaster
- Parking Charges
- Responsible Camping
- Swimming Pool Hokitika
- Destination Hokitika
- General Rate Funding Reserve
- Hokitika Library Reserve
- Emergency Rural Fire
- Parks and Reserves
- Civil Defence CDEM
- Glacier Township Development Rate
- Taxi
- Corporate Services
- Council Facilities

2.8. Next Steps

Chief Financial Officer to speak to this item.

WORKSHOP CLOSE
DATE OF LONG TERM PLAN #3 WORKSHOP: 30 OCTOBER 2026
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 36 WELD STREET, HOKITIKA AND VIA ZOOM

Council's Strategic Direction

Councillors are invited to review and confirm their continued support for the strategic direction below, which has been carried forward from the previous Long-Term Plan.

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.

Our Aspirations, Values and Role

Active leadership
Council works with integrity and honesty building the respect and confidence of the community.

Togetherness
Building strong relationships and partnerships with stakeholders, encouraging citizens to play an active role within their communities for success.

Future proofing
Safeguarding our unique natural environment and cultural heritage to support communities' resilience in the face of social, economic, and environmental challenges.

Proposed Community Outcomes

Outcome 1

Enabling a liveable district

Enabling a district that is safe, accessible and enjoyable to live in, ensuring current and future generations can enjoy a high quality of life.

Outcome 2

Protecting Westland's communities, culture and heritage

Protecting the people, places, culture and heritage that shape Westland's identity and strengthen community wellbeing.

Outcome 3

Supporting and enhancing the natural environment

Supporting and enhancing our natural environment to support biodiversity, strengthen resilience, and preserve Westland's unique landscapes.

Outcome 4

Providing future-fit infrastructure and services

Investing in reliable and adaptable infrastructure and services that meet current needs and support the district's future growth.

Previous Community Outcomes

Diverse economy	***Goals*** Enable a prosperous economy that supports and celebrates local businesses success, encouraging both traditional and innovative businesses so that our community thrives. This community outcome seeks to support a thriving community and economy for the security of future generations.
	Focus areas **Collaboration** We will collaborate with other stakeholders to achieve common outcomes and realise external funding opportunities. **Sustainable growth** We will ensure that development is sustainable, meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. **Innovation** We will support innovation and new opportunities for diversity within and from traditional Westland industries.
Sustainable environment	***Goals*** Reduce the human impact on the environment, while enhancing and protecting the unique natural environment of the Westland District. This community outcome seeks to improve environmental outcomes and support the community to embrace a culture of sustainability.
	Focus areas **Support sustainable waste management practises.** We will develop, lead, and promote sustainable waste management practises. **Care for the environment** We will plan proactively for climate change, promoting and supporting low-carbon, low-energy practises. **Encourage biodiversity.** We will support strategies, plans and policies to enhance and protect and celebrate the district's flora, fauna, and ecosystems.

Live and play	***Goals*** Westland is a place where communities are safe and healthy; a unique and enjoyable place to live with affordable, accessible social and cultural facilities. This community outcome seeks to ensure that we provide the infrastructure and opportunities that support our communities and enhance people's health and wellbeing.
	Focus areas **Healthy and safe** We will support community projects that enhance community safety, health and wellbeing for all. **Active lifestyles** We will support opportunities for walking and cycling, connecting our communities safely. **Community spaces** We will develop and maintain community spaces that encourage active participation, reduce social isolation, and enhance wellbeing.
Embracing our culture	***Goals*** Enabling a rich cultural life for our citizens where people feel welcomed and have civic engagement. This community outcome seeks to ensure that all voices are enabled and heard, power is more evenly distributed, and the community can share its strengths.
	Focus areas **Enabling community** We will support initiatives that involve caring for community members at all life stages to reduce isolation and promote inclusion. **Partnership** We will ensure that engagement with iwi promotes partnership, participation, and protection. **Open to innovation** We will support the community to enable community ownership of new initiatives and opportunities. **Community pride and participation** We will actively encourage the community to take part in opportunities for democratic participation and education, and grow community pride through sharing and documenting of local history.

Resilient infrastructure

Goals

Investing in the future with careful, considered planning of projects which support the growth, development and wellbeing of our communities and environment.

This community outcome seeks to ensure that communities are less vulnerable to natural hazards and climate change and critical transitions are considered for longevity.

Focus areas

Responsive planning

We will ensure that we will plan our infrastructure to reduce communities' vulnerability to natural hazards and climate change.

Forward focus

Our investment in infrastructure will meet the future needs of the community in an affordable manner.

Data driven decision making

Our decisions will use good quality data and good practice to enable high quality decision making.

Communities first

We will engage with our communities to develop infrastructure solutions that meet the communities needs now and into the future.

LONG-TERM PLAN 2027-37

Rates Capping

1. What is the cap and how will it be set
2. Timeline
3. Exemptions to the cap
4. Implications

LONG-TERM PLAN 2027-37

What is the cap and how will it be set

- A limit on Councils that caps how much rates can increase each year as a percentage
- The initial target range is between 2% and 4%
- A regulator will be set up to advise MCERT on future cap ranges
- Based on a new metric called the Rates Price: Total sum of rates divided by number of rating units
- The cap is applied as an average over the first three years of an LTP

Year	Rate Price	Annual Change
2028/29	$3,000	
2029/30	$3,120	4.0%
2030/31	$3,307	6.0%
2031/32	$3,373	2.0%
2032/33	$3,437	1.9%

In this example the average rate increase for 2030/31, 2031/32 and 2032/33 is 3.3% so even though 2030/31 is above the 4% cap Council would still be in compliance

LONG-TERM PLAN 2027-37

Timeline

- Applies to Long-Term Plans from 1 July 2027
- Councils need to ‘have a regard’ to the cap for FYs 2027/28 and 2028/29
- From FY 2029/30 Councils must comply with the cap
- Cap will be reviewed every 6 years
- 2029/30 – rates decisions need to comply with the target rate
- 2030/31, 2031/32 and 2032/33 – rates decisions need to comply with the target range on average
- 2033/34, 2034/35 and 2035/36 – rates decision need to comply with the target range on average

LONG-TERM PLAN 2027-37

Exclusions

	Exemption Type-1 – exceptional circumstances	Exemption Type-2 – future financial planning	Exemption – FY 29/30 capital works	Exemption – financial difficulty
Description	Allow increases in rates above the target range for situations that are unpredictable, unforeseen, extreme. Examples include responding to and recovering from natural disasters or catastrophic infrastructure failures.	Where financial management is prudent, councils can increase rates above or below the target range provided they also consult with their communities on the proposed increase. Examples include investing in reducing natural hazard risk and improving the financial sustainability of the council.	Where councils have significant capital expenditure planned or underway at the time of enactment, they can increase rates above the target range for FY 2029/30 as part of their 2027-2037 long-term plan.	Where councils are financially at risk, increases above the target range are permitted from FY 2029/30.
Purpose	Councils can recover from exceptional circumstances.	Councils who are financially prudent have more flexibility to determine how much rates revenue they collect.	Capital expenditure that is already planned or underway for FY 2029/30 is not cancelled.	Financial issues are not entrenched or made worse by a rates cap.
Who may be eligible for the exemption?	Any councils which have experienced exceptional circumstances in the current or previous long-term plan period.	Councils who are deemed by the regulator to be financially prudent.	Specific councils will be invited by the interim regulator to apply if they meet certain criteria.	Specific councils will be invited by the regulator to apply if they meet certain criteria.
How much can the exemption be?	Depends on what is necessary or desirable to enable the council to respond to or recover from the exceptional circumstances. A new target range will need to be set.	To be determined by the regulator considering mandatory statutory considerations. A new target range will need to be set.	The exemption itself will not set a new target range. The council will be required to have regard to the target range for 2029/30. The council will need to determine what is needed for the capital works project.	The exemption itself will not set a new target range. The council will be required to have regard to the target range for 2029/30 (and potentially longer, if approved). The council will need to determine what is needed for the council to get back to a sound financial position as soon as possible.
How long is the exemption for?	To be determined by the Minister, depending on what is necessary or desirable to enable the council to respond to or recover from the exceptional circumstances.	To be determined by the regulator considering mandatory statutory considerations.	1 year (2029/30 only). After which the council can apply for an Exemption Type-2 if necessary.	To be determined by the regulator, depends what is needed for the council to not be financially at-risk. (Assumption is that it will be short duration due to the transition period in 2027/28 and 2028/29)
Who determines the exemption?	Minister of Local Government on advice of the regulator.	Regulator determines.	Regulator identifies councils, invites them, determines applications.	Regulator identifies councils, invites them, determines applications.
Is consultation on the exemption required?	No.	Yes, as part of regular long-term plan consultation.	Yes, as part of 2027-2037 long-term plan consultation.	Yes, as part of 2029/30 annual plan consultation if council determines that it is necessary.
When can exemptions be applied for?	As needed.	Every three years from 2030 long-term plan. Application must be lodged 11 months before an LTP is due to be adopted (e.g. 31 July 2029 for the 2030 long-term plan). Is not available for FY 2029/30.	After invitation from the regulator (expected to be in early 2027, depending on when legislation is enacted).	After invitation from the regulator (expected to be during FY 2028/29).
Timeframe for making decision	60 calendar days for Minister to determine an application.	Regulator must determine application within 60 calendar days so councils can consult as part of long-term plan.	Application must be determined no later than 29 June 2027.	Application must be determined by 29 June 2029.

LONG-TERM PLAN 2027-37

Implications

- Councils current forecast rate increase are (including 3 Waters from current LTP):

2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	2031/32	2032/33	2033/34
$31,165k	$34,170k	$35,439k	$36,617k	$37,473k	$38,310k	$39,640k
12.6%	9.6%	3.7%	3.3%	2.3%	2.2%	3.5%

- Will lock the shape of Council at the point the cap is adopted
- How will projects with significant costs attached be financed: Head Start
Spatial Planning
- Councils only options will be to cut services, cut expenditure or increase borrow
- Mechanisms to operate outside the target range in exceptional circumstances

LTP Key Proposal – Development Contributions

Cost Centre	Regulatory and Compliance
LTP Forecast	Currently nil
Funding Source	Development Contributions
Author / Lead	District Assets General Manager Regulatory and Compliance General Manager
Community Outcome	Enabling a liveable district Supporting and enhancing the natural environment Providing future-fit infrastructure and services

Background

Westland has Financial Contributions (RMA) but does not have Development Contributions (LGA).

Previously not charged as may have been seen as a deterrent to development in Westland.

Development Contributions are to recover a proportion of capital expenditure for growth related infrastructure e.g. water, Reserves, Community Facilities.

Financial Contributions offset or mitigate environmental effects of development and may fund environmental protection or enhancement.

Development contributions can only be required where the development requires territorial authorities to provide new or additional assets or increased capacity.

Proposal

To introduce development contributions – usually money, can be land for reserves.

Impact

If land is accepted – this may increase costs for ratepayers in the future to manage.

Will increase costs of development in Westland

Assists in reducing the burden on future generations for the cost of development today

Risk

Some developers may decide not to pursue development in Westland as a result of the introduction of Development Contributions

The cost of development will increase the cost of sections for purchasers

Need to ensure that contributions are not taken twice for the same type of development

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.

LTP Key Proposal – Spatial Planning

Cost Centre	-
LTP Forecast	**$7 million + (regional costs)**
Funding Source	Rates
Author / Lead	General Manager Regulatory and Compliance
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

RMA Reform – Regional Spatial Planning.

Simplifying Local Government- Headstart.

No current spatial planning undertaken e.g. 30-year vision.

Proposal

Establish a framework for regional consideration and benefits.

Link to Destination Management, Parking, Franz Josef (Waiho), Economic Development.

Impact

Additional spatial planning resources will be required.

Unknown outcome following reforms.

Community engagement essential and can take time and must be considered.

Challenging short timeframes for development and implementation.

Significant costs.

Long term strategic vision.

Risk

Central government elections.

Implementation and implications of new legislation from Planning Bill and Natural Environment Bill – short timeframes.

Some TTPP provisions may be struck out if not aligning with Planning Act and Natural Environment Act.

Regional benefits and outcomes may differ from local vision and desired outcomes.

This will involve aspects undertaken by Regional Council currently.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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

- 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.

LTP Proposal – Properties

Cost Centre	Land and Buildings Fox 3811 Franz 3813 Hari 3807 Hoki 3804 Kaniere 3805 Kumara 3802 Ross 3806 Rural 3815 Whataroa 3808
LTP Forecast	**$ 85,037**
Funding Source	Fox Glacier U: $2,560 Gen: $4,784 Hari Hari – U: $3,282 Gen: $6,132 Kaniere – U: $2,034 Gen: $3,802 Ross – U: $7,201 Gen: $13,456 Whataroa U: $4,882 Gen: $9,122 Franz Josef – U: $1,781 Gen: $3,328 Hokitika – U: $5,086 Gen: $9,504 Kumara – U: $492 Gen: $918 Property – Rural U: $2,326 Gen: $4,347
Author / Lead	General Manager District Assets
Community Outcome	Enabling a liveable district Protecting Westland’s communities, culture and heritage Providing future-fit infrastructure and services

Background

Fox Glacier & Hari Hari: Two properties currently leased out by Destination Westland. Council proposing to sell these.

- Fox Glacier: Located at 2 Main Road.
- HariHari: Located at 429 Petersen Road.

Whataroa: The clubrooms located at the golf course north of Whataroa. The course itself is managed by the Whataroa Recreational Reserve Board.

Ross: Located at 4 Grimmond Avenue; currently functions as the Ross Domain rooms. Core community asset. Council could vest this to the community.

Franz Josef: The old motel site situated south of the Waiho Bridge. The motel has been demolished due to severe flood risks, leaving the site as vacant land. Because of this ongoing environmental risk, the land is deemed unsuitable for sale.

Hokitika:

- The foreshore at Beach Street and Sunset Point (some sections contain residential properties).
- The carparks located at 20 and 22 Revell Street, and 7 Revell Street. Manged by transport team. Carparks for CBD.
- Vacant land at 33 Revell Street. Council reserve land, too small to sell. Not worth reclassifying.
- The old Boy Scouts Hall at 147 Hall Street, currently leased out by Destination Westland.
- An extension of Robbins Park on a separate title, located between Robbins Park and the Rolleston Street roundabout. This is an extension of the existing reserve.
- Lazar Park Hall. The hall land is not owned by Council. Council own the land that the playground is on. This reserve is managed by the Lions Club.

Kaniere: A portfolio combination consisting of:

- Vacant land adjacent to the Hokitika River.
- The reserve at 292 Kaniere Road.
- Vacant land at 13 Kaniere Tram Road.

- The road reserve adjacent to Kaniere Road.
- Vacant land next to the residential property on Kaniere-Kowhitirangi Road.

Kumara: Includes the Kumara Playground and the Kumara Racecourse. (Note: The Kumara Playground should be reassigned to the Parks & Reserves profile). Kumara Racecourse is owned by Council however maintained and operated by Kumara Racing Club.

Rural:
- Ross Cemetery (should be reassigned to the Parks & Reserves profile).
- The creek in Kokatahi.
- The stock pounds and separate vacant land in Ruatapu.
- A vacant strip of land next to Old Christchurch Road.
- Prossers Bush (should be reassigned to the Parks & Reserves profile).
- The Ruatapu Agricultural site.

Proposal

Council is currently reviewing all council-owned properties and reserves, with stage one expected to wrap up by December 2026. This initial phase involves auditing all properties, updating reserve classifications, and recommending to Councillors which sites should be prepared for sale/reclassification. Once Council completes these updates, formal land sales are expected to begin in 2027.

In the short term, however, the specific land sales and asset transfers listed below can move forward immediately without waiting for the full formal review process.

Property Location	Description / Address	Proposed Action	Financial Context (2024 Valuation)
HariHari	429 Petersen Road	Divest / Sell property	Desktop valuation: **$315,000** To go to council to be approved to be sold.
Fox Glacier	2 Main Road	Divest / Sell property	Desktop valuation: **$380,000.** To go to council to be approved to be sold.
Whataroa	Golf course clubrooms (North of Whataroa)	Sell or gift to the Whataroa Recreational Reserve Board	Desktop valuation pending.
Kaniere	Vacant land on Kaniere-Kowhitirangi Rd (adjacent to Fairmaid residential property)	Divest / Sell land	Council approved to sell this land at the start of 2026. To be listed on Trade Me in July.

Impact

Carrying out these short-term property sales and asset transfers will immediately reduce Council's maintenance costs and liability for underutilised assets. Financially, selling the Fox Glacier and HariHari properties will generate an estimated total of $695,000 in revenue based on 2024 valuations. From a community perspective, gifting or selling the Whataroa clubrooms to the local recreational reserve board ensures the asset stays in community hands and remains locally managed, creating a positive social impact.

All remaining titles, reserves, and properties require further evaluation due to the complex regulatory process involved in reclassifying reserve land. Council expects to gain a more comprehensive understanding of its overall property portfolio later this year before making any long-term decisions.

Risk

The primary risk is potential community pushbacks if locals feel public land or assets are being lost without going through the full, formal property review process. There is also a minor financial risk that the 2024 desktop valuations for Fox Glacier and Hari Hari may not perfectly match current market conditions when sold. Lastly, for assets being transferred or sold to local boards (like Whataroa), there is an operational risk if the receiving group lacks the long-term funding or capacity to maintain the facility.

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.

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.

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.

WESTLAND
District Council | Te Kahui o Poutini

LTP Proposal – Harbourmaster

Cost Centre	Cost Centre from Activity Code
LTP Forecast	**$75,000 – New cost**
Funding Source	Rates
Author / Lead	General Manager Regulatory and Compliance
Community Outcome	Providing future-fit infrastructure and services Protecting Westland's communities, culture and heritage

Background

At the 23 July 2026 Council supported the participation in an MoU with WCRC, BDC and GDC regarding regional maritime safety and coastal shipping resilience.

The current regional role is funded by the Ministry for Transport until December 2028.

Consideration on funding would be needed for 28/29 financial year and beyond.

The Governments Headstart for Simplifying local government may affect what this role and funding methods.

Proposal

To support this function and to consider a proportional percentage funding for year 2 onwards.

Impact

Rates funding would be required, however the cost of this and proportionality have yet to be discussed, as this is a recent matter.

This is a statutory function, however, arguably should be a WCRC function but same rate payers.

Risk

There is an unknown financial aspect currently.

Unknown outcome from Headstart.

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.

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

LTP Proposal – Swimming Pools Hokitika

Cost Centre	Swimming Pools Hokitika
LTP Forecast	**$922,577**
Funding Source	Targeted Township Rates - $922,577.00
Author / Lead	General Manager Regulatory and Compliance
Community Outcome	Enabling a liveable district Providing future-fit infrastructure and services

Background

Provision of the Hokitika Swimming Pool not a core service.

Important community facility, health and wellbeing.

Strong community support for facility through Annual Plan submissions.

90% rates funded, 10% user pays.

Proposal

Continued provision of Council facility

Review of rates v user pays levels e.g. 80/20

Review of fees and charges

Maximise opportunities to increase the use of facility to reduce rating impact

Impact

Continued support from community for valued asset

Positive health and wellbeing for all e.g. aquafit classes

Continued positive ability for children to learn to swim and competitive swimming

Risk

Risk of increased fees, leading to affordability challenges and reduced users, potentially requiring additional rates

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.

LTP Proposal – General Rate Funding Reserve

Cost Centre	NA – Balance Sheet
LTP Forecast	**$195,735**
Funding Source	UAGC $68,231 General $127,503
Author / Lead	Chief Financial Officer
Community Outcome	Enabling a liveable district

Background

In both 2021/22 and 2022/23 rates were held artificially lower by Council.

This was achieved by funding General Rates partially from reserves rather than charging ratepayers.

- 2021/22 $627,406
- 2022/23 $1,392,359

Council has been "repaying" this internal borrowing in subsequent years.

The balance at year end 2025/26 will be c$1,450,000.

Proposal

Use other reserves to repay the General Rate Funding Reserve so that rate payers are no longer charged.

Impact

Rates would reduce by 0.7% for the next 7 years.

Risk

Drawing down reserves means Council has a reduced buffer against future unforeseen expenditure and would have to either increase rates of borrow funds if sufficient reserves were not available.

LTP Proposal – Hokitika Library Reserve

Cost Centre	Hokitika Library
LTP Forecast	**$89,000**
Funding Source	UAGC and General Rate
Author / Lead	General Manager Business Enablement
Community Outcome	Enabling a liveable district Protecting Westland's communities, culture and heritage

Background

Council has created a Reserve that funds book renewals and capital works at the Hokitika Library.

At the end of FY 2025/26 the reserve was $482k.

The reserve is rated and topped up each year.

Withdrawals in the previous five years have ranged from $30k to $65k.

Proposal

Develop schedule for book renewal and reconcile to the reserve balance forecast.

Assuming the reserve has surplus release some of the reserve for use on other projects or to reduce rates.

Adjust the deprecation on the library reserve to only include book renewal and set at a more realistic level

Based upon the book renewal schedule developed.

Impact

Rates expected to reduce as book renewal schedule will be set at a more realistic level.

Borrowing for other projects would reduce if the reserve was used for other purpose.

Risk

If the book renewal schedule is not accurate there could be insufficient reserves remaining to replace books at the library as needed.

LTP Proposal – Emergency Management: Rural Fire

Cost Centre	Rural Fire
LTP Forecast	**$10,486**
Funding Source	Hannahs Clearing U: -$1,708 Gen: $3,191 Kaniere U: $162 Gen: $304 Kokatahi U: $1,785 Gen: $3,336
Author / Lead	General Manager District Assets Facilities and Properties Manager
Community Outcome	Enabling a liveable district Providing future-fit infrastructure and services

Background

Hannah's Clearing Fire Station: Fire and Emergency New Zealand (FENZ) have indicated they may vacate this facility in the future. Because this freehold asset sits within a residential area, it could be sold upon Council approval without requiring land reclassification. The property is currently valued at $150,000, and an adjacent neighbour has previously expressed interest in purchasing it.

Kokatahi Fire Station: This facility is physically attached to the Kokatahi Community Hall and is situated entirely on Council-owned land.

Kaniere Asset: This entry does not represent a physical building asset; rather it accounts for the ongoing depreciation of operational equipment (specifically fire hoses and pump outlets) purchased ten years ago.

Proposal

Status Quo: Retain ownership of all assets and monitor FENZ's operational decisions regarding the Hannah's Clearing site.

Impact

Selling the Hannah's Clearing property would release a projected one-off capital injection of approximately $150,000 which council could choose to invest back into the local area or Haast/Hannahs/Jacksons Bay.

Risk

Work with FENZ to ensure that emergency coverage is still available for the community

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.

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.

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

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.

LTP Proposal – Corporate Services

Cost Centre	Corporate Services
LTP Forecast	**$1,294,087**
Funding Source	Overhead allocation
Author / Lead	Chief Financial Officer
Community Outcome	Enabling a liveable district

Background

The Corporate Services budget covers essential central overheads that support overall Council operations rather than specific Council activities. Many of these costs are regulated, such as audit fees, and there is little scope for negotiation or a reduction in service level.

As part of the annual budgeting process, corporate overheads and operational costs are routinely reviewed to maintain financial discipline. This scrutiny is especially rigorous during a Long-Term Plan and is reviewed at SLT level. Wherever possible, commercial terms, vendor contracts, and supplier agreements are actively renegotiated.

Significant items of expenditure:

Insurance: Council operates a mixture of Indemnity Value and Replacement Value policies. Indemnity Value incurs lower premiums, but potentially leaves a shortfall for replacement that must be funded via rates or borrowing.

Vehicle costs: Council operates a fleet for all departments to use.

Audit Fees and Valuation Fees: Council is required to have its Annual Report and Long-Term Plan externally audited and must also carry out a revaluation of all infrastructure assets every 3 years.

Proposal

Insurance: Review the mix between Indemnity Value and Replacement Value on infrastructure and other assets. Identify cost implications of either increasing or decreasing the number of assets that are insurance for full replacement value.

Vehicle costs: Reduce the fleet in size to reduce costs and decrease the replacement rate of vehicles.

Audit Fees and Valuation Fees: No changes proposed. The Audit Office sets fees for external audit, and Council has limited scope to negotiate. Similarly, revaluation fees are carried out by specialised organisations and again there is limited scope for negotiation.

Impact

Insurance premiums could either increase or decrease dependant on Indemnity value being applied to more or less assets.

Vehicle costs will reduce due to the smaller fleet although could be offset by increased maintenance costs as the vehicles are held for longer before being replaced. Capital costs would reduce due to the extends asset life of the vehicles.

Risk

If Indemnity Value policies were used to cover more of Council assets there is a risk that in the event of a claim again the policy the sums paid out by the insurers would be insufficient to replace the asset. This would mean that Council would either rate or borrow to cover the shortfall.

LTP Proposal – Council Facilities

Cost Centre	Museum, Library & iSite
LTP Forecast	Museum: $713,667 Library: $772,596 isite: $238,024
Funding Source	Museum – UAGC: $172,128 Gen: $321,656 Hokitika Targeted Rate: $219,883 Library – UAGC: $269,318 Gen: $503,278 isite – Tourism Rate: $238,024
Author / Lead	General Manager Business Enablement
Community Outcome	Enabling a liveable district Protecting Westland's communities, culture and heritage Providing future-fit infrastructure and services

Background

The museum, library, and isite support communities by preserving local heritage, offering valuable local services and provide free, accessible public spaces. They also drive the regional economy by guiding visitors to local businesses and showcase local and cultural experiences.

Rates v user pays for each facility is as follows:

	Rates	Fees & Charges
Museum:	88%	12%
Library:	99%	1%
isite:	59%	41%

Proposal

Continued provision of these Council facilities.
Review of rates v users pay levels to reduce burden on ratepayers.
Review of fees and charges.
Review of operational costs.
Explore additional external funding or grants.

Impact

Continued provision of services, but with a reduced cost to ratepayers.

Risk

Risk of increased fees, leading to affordability challenges and reduced users, potentially requiring additional rates.