



Council

OPEN MINUTES

Minutes of a meeting of Council held in the Council Chamber, 15 Forth Street, Invercargill on Thursday, 29 November 2018 at 9am and reconvened on Friday, 30 November 2018 at 9.03am in the Stewart Island Pavilion, Ayr Street, Oban.

PRESENT

Mayor
Deputy Mayor
Councillors

Mayor Gary Tong
Paul Duffy
Stuart Baird
Brian Dillon
John Douglas
Bruce Ford
Darren Frazer
George Harpur
Julie Keast
Ebel Kremer
Gavin Macpherson
Neil Paterson
Nick Perham

IN ATTENDANCE

Chief Executive
Group Manager – Community and Futures
Chief Financial Officer
Group Manager, Customer Delivery
Communications Manager
Governance and Democracy Manager
Committee Advisor

Steve Ruru
Rex Capil
Anne Robson
Trudie Hurst
Louise Pagan
Clare Sullivan
Fiona Dunlop

1 Apologies

There were no apologies.

2 Leave of absence

There were no requests for leave of absence.

3 Conflict of Interest

There were no conflicts of interest declared.

4 Public Forum

There was no public forum.

5 Extraordinary/Urgent Items

There were no Extraordinary/Urgent items.

6 Confirmation of Council Minutes

Resolution

Moved Mayor Tong, seconded Cr Douglas **and resolved:**

That Council confirms the minutes of the ordinary meeting held on 19 September 2018, extraordinary meeting of 23 October 2018 and ordinary meeting of 1 November 2018 as a true and correct record of those meetings.

Reports - Policy and Strategy

**7.1 Draft Stewart Island/Rakiura Visitor Levy Policy and Bylaw - hearings and submissions
Record No: R/18/10/23782**

Resolution

Moved Cr Kremer, seconded Cr Dillon **and resolved:**

That the Council:

- a) Receives the report titled "Draft Stewart Island/Rakiura Visitor Levy Policy and Bylaw - hearings and submissions" dated 20 November 2018.**
- b) Determines that this matter or decision be recognised as not significant in terms of Section 76 of the Local Government Act 2002.**

- c) **Determines that it has complied with the decision-making provisions of the Local Government Act 2002 to the extent necessary in relation to this decision; and in accordance with Section 79 of the Act determines that it does not require further information, further assessment of options or further analysis of costs and benefits or advantages and disadvantages prior to making a decision on this matter.**
- d) **Receives all written submissions and hears from the submitters who wish to be heard on the draft Stewart Island/Rakiura Visitor Levy Policy and Bylaw.**

Submitters to the draft Stewart Island/Rakiura Visitor Levy Policy and Bylaw

- 1. Suzanne Jones (submission 85) did not address the meeting in relation to the draft Stewart Island/Rakiura Visitor Levy Policy and Bylaw.
- 2. Bill Moffatt for Stewart Island Flights (submission 112) addressed the meeting in relation to the draft Stewart Island/Rakiura Visitor Levy Policy and Bylaw. A copy of Mr Moffatt's notes are attached to the minutes as appendix 1.
- 3. Manfred Herzhoff for Rakiura Adventure Limited (submission 58) addressed the meeting in relation to the draft Stewart Island/Rakiura Visitor Levy Policy and Bylaw. A copy of Mr Herzhoff's notes are attached to the minutes as appendix 2.
- 4. Nicola McCracken (submission 65) addressed the meeting in relation to the draft Stewart Island/Rakiura Visitor Levy Policy and Bylaw. A copy of Mrs McCracken's notes are attached to the minutes as appendix 3.
- 5. Paul Norris (General Manager) and Fiona Black (Consents and Concessions Manager for Real Journeys Limited (submission 105) addressed the meeting in relation to the draft Stewart Island/Rakiura Visitor Levy Policy and Bylaw. A copy of the Real Journeys notes are attached to the minutes as appendix 4.

(The meeting adjourned at 9.57am and reconvened at 10.10am.)

Mayor Tong and all Councillors were present when the meeting reconvened.

- 6. Alison Broad for Southern Conservation Board (submission 119) addressed the meeting in relation to the draft Stewart Island/Rakiura Visitor Levy Policy and Bylaw.
- 7. Kevin O'Sullivan for New Zealand Cruise Association (submission 92) addressed the meeting via video link in relation to the draft Stewart Island/Rakiura Visitor Levy Policy and Bylaw.
- 8. Rachael Moore-presenting Tourism Industry Aotearoa (TIA) (submission 109) addressed the meeting via video link in relation to the draft Stewart Island/Rakiura Visitor Levy Policy and Bylaw.

Reports - Governance

9.1 Minutes of the Finance and Audit Committee Meeting dated 14 June 2018

Record No: R/18/11/26634

Resolution

Moved Cr Macpherson, seconded Cr Dillon **and resolved:**

That Council receives the minutes of the Finance and Audit Committee meeting held 14 June 2018 as information.

9.2 Minutes of the Finance and Audit Committee Meeting dated 30 August 2018

Record No: R/18/11/26636

Resolution

Moved Cr Macpherson, seconded Cr Dillon **and resolved:**

That Council receives the minutes of the Finance and Audit Committee meeting held 30 August 2018 as information.

9.3 Minutes of the Finance and Audit Committee Meeting dated 24 September 2018

Record No: R/18/11/26639

Resolution

Moved Cr Macpherson, seconded Cr Dillon **and resolved:**

That Council receives the minutes of the Finance and Audit Committee meeting held 24 September 2018 as information.

9.4 Minutes of the Services and Assets Committee Meeting dated 26 July 2018

Record No: R/18/11/26627

Resolution

Moved Cr Macpherson, seconded Cr Dillon **and resolved:**

That Council receives the minutes of the Services and Assets Committee meeting held 26 July 2018 as information.

9.5 Minutes of the Services and Assets Committee Meeting dated 5 September 2018

Record No: R/18/11/26625

Resolution

Moved Cr Macpherson, seconded Cr Dillon **and resolved:**

That Council receives the minutes of the Services and Assets Committee meeting held 5 September 2018 as information.

9.6 Minutes of the Edendale-Wyndham Community Board Meeting dated 24 April 2018

Record No: R/18/11/26630

Resolution

Moved Cr Macpherson, seconded Cr Dillon **and resolved:**

That Council receives the minutes of the Edendale-Wyndham Community Board meeting held 24 April 2018 as information.

9.7 Minutes of the Edendale-Wyndham Community Board Meeting dated 26 June 2018

Record No: R/18/11/26631

Resolution

Moved Cr Macpherson, seconded Cr Dillon **and resolved:**

That Council receives the minutes of the Edendale-Wyndham Community Board meeting held 26 June 2018 as information.

9.8 Minutes of the Edendale-Wyndham Community Board Meeting dated 28 August 2018

Record No: R/18/11/26632

Resolution

Moved Cr Macpherson, seconded Cr Dillon **and resolved:**

That Council receives the minutes of the Edendale-Wyndham Community Board meeting held 28 August 2018 as information.

9.9 Minutes of the Stewart Island/Rakiura Community Board Meeting dated 8 October 2018

Record No: R/18/11/25811

Resolution

Moved Cr Macpherson, seconded Cr Dillon **and resolved:**

That Council receives the minutes of the Stewart Island/Rakiura Community Board meeting held 8 October 2018 as information.

9.10 Minutes of the Wallacetown Community Board Meeting dated 28 June 2018

Record No: R/18/11/26641

Resolution

Moved Cr Macpherson, seconded Cr Dillon **and resolved:**

That Council receives the minutes of the Wallacetown Community Board meeting held 28 June 2018 as information.

9.11 Minutes of the Wallacetown Community Board Meeting dated 21 August 2018

Record No: R/18/11/26643

Resolution

Moved Cr Macpherson, seconded Cr Dillon **and resolved:**

That Council receives the minutes of the Wallacetown Community Board meeting held 21 August 2018 as information.

9.12 Minutes of the Winton Community Board Meeting dated 1 October 2018

Record No: R/18/11/25609

Resolution

Moved Cr Macpherson, seconded Cr Dillon **and resolved:**

That Council receives the minutes of the Winton Community Board meeting held 1 October 2018 as information.

9.13 Minutes of the Five Rivers Water Supply Subcommittee Meeting dated 17 October 2017

Record No: R/18/11/26787

Resolution

Moved Cr Macpherson, seconded Cr Dillon **and resolved:**

That Council receives the minutes of the Five Rivers Water Supply Subcommittee meeting held 17 October 2017 as information.

- 9.14 Minutes of the Matuku Water Supply Subcommittee Meeting dated 17 October 2017**
Record No: R/18/11/26788

Resolution

Moved Cr Macpherson, seconded Cr Dillon **and resolved:**

That Council receives the minutes of the Matuku Water Supply Subcommittee meeting held 17 October 2017 as information.

- 9.15 Minutes of the Balfour Community Development Area Subcommittee Meeting dated 27 August 2018**
Record No: R/18/11/26789

Resolution

Moved Cr Macpherson, seconded Cr Dillon **and resolved:**

That Council receives the minutes of the Balfour Community Development Area Subcommittee meeting held 27 August 2018 as information.

- 9.16 Minutes of the Colac Bay Community Development Area Subcommittee Meeting dated 23 August 2018**
Record No: R/18/11/26758

Resolution

Moved Cr Macpherson, seconded Cr Dillon **and resolved:**

That Council receives the minutes of the Colac Bay Community Development Area Subcommittee meeting held 23 August 2018 as information.

- 9.17 Minutes of the Dipton Community Development Area Subcommittee Meeting dated 9 May 2018**
Record No: R/18/11/26629

Resolution

Moved Cr Macpherson, seconded Cr Dillon **and resolved:**

That Council receives the minutes of the Dipton Community Development Area Subcommittee meeting held 9 May 2018 as information.

9.18 Minutes of the Mossburn Community Development Area Subcommittee Meeting dated 25 June 2018

Record No: R/18/11/26599

Resolution

Moved Cr Macpherson, seconded Cr Dillon **and resolved:**

That Council receives the minutes of the Mossburn Community Development Area Subcommittee meeting held 25 June 2018 as information.

9.19 Minutes of the Nightcaps Community Development Area Subcommittee Meeting dated 28 August 2018

Record No: R/18/11/25543

Resolution

Moved Cr Macpherson, seconded Cr Dillon **and resolved:**

That Council receives the minutes of the Nightcaps Community Development Area Subcommittee meeting held 28 August 2018 as information.

9.20 Minutes of the Ohai Community Development Area Subcommittee Meeting dated 28 August 2018

Record No: R/18/11/25549

Resolution

Moved Cr Macpherson, seconded Cr Dillon **and resolved:**

That Council receives the minutes of the Ohai Community Development Area Subcommittee meeting held 28 August 2018 as information.

9.21 Minutes of the Orepuki Community Development Area Subcommittee Meeting dated 21 August 2018

Record No: R/18/11/25870

Resolution

Moved Cr Macpherson, seconded Cr Dillon **and resolved:**

That Council receives the minutes of the Orepuki Community Development Area Subcommittee meeting held 21 August 2018 as information.

9.22 Minutes of the Riversdale Community Development Area Subcommittee Meeting dated 27 August 2018

Record No: R/18/11/26790

Resolution

Moved Cr Macpherson, seconded Cr Dillon **and resolved:**

That Council receives the minutes of the Riversdale Community Development Area Subcommittee meeting held 27 August 2018 as information.

9.23 Minutes of the Thornbury Community Development Area Subcommittee Meeting dated 23 August 2018

Record No: R/18/11/25950

Resolution

Moved Cr Macpherson, seconded Cr Dillon **and resolved:**

That Council receives the minutes of the Thornbury Community Development Area Subcommittee meeting held 23 August 2018 as information.

9.24 Minutes of the Tokanui Community Development Area Subcommittee Meeting dated 23 July 2018

Record No: R/18/11/26640

Resolution

Moved Cr Macpherson, seconded Cr Dillon **and resolved:**

That Council receives the minutes of the Tokanui Community Development Area Subcommittee meeting held 23 July 2018 as information.

9.25 Minutes of the Woodlands Community Development Area Subcommittee Meeting dated 16 April 2018

Record No: R/18/11/26645

Resolution

Moved Cr Macpherson, seconded Cr Dillon **and resolved:**

That Council receives the minutes of the Woodlands Community Development Area Subcommittee meeting held 16 April 2018 as information.

9.26 Minutes of the Woodlands Community Development Area Subcommittee Meeting dated 6 August 2018

Record No: R/18/11/26647

Resolution

Moved Cr Macpherson, seconded Cr Dillon **and resolved:**

That Council receives the minutes of the Woodlands Community Development Area Subcommittee meeting held 6 August 2018 as information.

7.1 Draft Stewart Island/Rakiura Visitor Levy Policy and Bylaw - hearings and submissions - CONTINUED

Record No: R/18/10/23782

1. Rachael Moore-presenting Tourism Industry Aotearoa (TIA) (submission 109) addressed the meeting addressed the meeting via video link in relation to the draft Stewart Island/Rakiura Visitor Levy Policy and Bylaw.

The meeting adjourned for morning tea 10.45am and reconvened at 11.04am.

Mayor Tong and all Councillors were present when the meeting reconvened.

Public Excluded

Exclusion of the Public: Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

Resolution

Moved Cr Paterson, seconded Cr Dillon **and resolved:**

That the public be excluded from the following part(s) of the proceedings of this meeting.

C10.1 Contract 18/14 Great North Road Stormwater Renewal

C10.2 Abandoned Land

C10.3 Public Excluded Minutes of the Finance and Audit Committee Meeting dated 14 June 2018

C10.4 Public Excluded Minutes of the Finance and Audit Committee Meeting dated 30 August 2018

C10.5 Public Excluded Minutes of the Finance and Audit Committee Meeting dated 24 September 2018

C10.6 Public Excluded Minutes of the Services and Assets Committee Meeting dated 5 September 2018

C10.7 Public Excluded Minutes of the Edendale-Wyndham Community Board Meeting dated 28 August 2018

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

General subject of each matter to be considered	Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
Contract 18/14 Great North Road Stormwater Renewal	s7(2)(a) - The withholding of the information is necessary to protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of a deceased person. s7(2)(b)(i) - The withholding of the information is necessary to protect information where the making available of the information would disclose a trade secret. s7(2)(g) - The withholding of the information is necessary to maintain legal professional privilege.	That the public conduct of the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists.
Abandoned Land	s7(2)(a) - The withholding of the information is necessary to protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of a deceased person.	That the public conduct of the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists.
Public Excluded Minutes of the Finance and Audit Committee Meeting dated 14 June 2018	s7(2)(b)(ii) - The withholding of the information is necessary to protect information where the making available of the information would be likely unreasonably to prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied or who is the subject of the information.	That the public conduct of the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists.

	<p>s7(2)(e) - The withholding of the information is necessary to avoid prejudice to measures that prevent or mitigate material loss to members of the public.</p> <p>s7(2)(f)(ii) - The withholding of the information is necessary to maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through the protection of such members, officers, employees and persons from improper pressure or harassment.</p> <p>s7(2)(i) - The withholding of the information is necessary to enable the local authority to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations).</p>	
Public Excluded Minutes of the Finance and Audit Committee Meeting dated 30 August 2018	<p>s7(2)(c)(i) - The withholding of the information is necessary to protect information which is subject to an obligation of confidence or which any person has been or could be compelled to provide under the authority of any enactment, where the making available of the information would be likely to prejudice the supply of similar information or information from the same source and it is in the public interest that such information should continue to be supplied.</p> <p>s7(2)(h) - The withholding of the information is necessary to enable the local authority to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities.</p>	That the public conduct of the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists.
Public Excluded Minutes of the Finance and Audit Committee Meeting dated 24 September 2018	<p>s7(2)(e) - The withholding of the information is necessary to avoid prejudice to measures that prevent or mitigate material loss to members of the public.</p> <p>s7(2)(i) - The withholding of the information is necessary to enable the local authority to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations).</p>	That the public conduct of the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists.
Public Excluded Minutes of the Services and Assets Committee Meeting dated 5 September 2018	<p>s7(2)(a) - The withholding of the information is necessary to protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of a deceased person.</p> <p>s7(2)(f)(ii) - The withholding of the information is necessary to maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through the protection of such members, officers, employees and</p>	That the public conduct of the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists.

	persons from improper pressure or harassment. s7(2)(h) - The withholding of the information is necessary to enable the local authority to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities.	
Public Excluded Minutes of the Edendale-Wyndham Community Board Meeting dated 28 August 2018	s7(2)(i) - The withholding of the information is necessary to enable the local authority to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations).	That the public conduct of the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists.

That the Chief Executive, Group Manager, Community and Futures, Chief Financial Officer, Group Manager, Customer Delivery, Governance and Democracy Manager, Communications Manager and Committee Advisor be permitted to remain at this meeting, after the public has been excluded, because of their knowledge of the items C10.1 Contract 18/14 Great North Road Stormwater Renewal, C10.2 Abandoned Land, C10.3 Public Excluded Minutes of the Finance and Audit Committee Meeting dated 14 June 2018, C10.4 Public Excluded Minutes of the Finance and Audit Committee Meeting dated 30 August 2018, C10.5 Public Excluded Minutes of the Finance and Audit Committee Meeting dated 24 September 2018, C10.6 Public Excluded Minutes of the Services and Assets Committee Meeting dated 5 September 2018 and C10.7 Public Excluded Minutes of the Edendale-Wyndham Community Board Meeting dated 28 August 2018. This knowledge, which will be of assistance in relation to the matters to be discussed, is relevant to those matters because of their knowledge on the issues discussed and meeting procedure.

That the Senior Projects Engineer, Water and Waste Services be permitted to remain at this meeting, after the public has been excluded, because of their knowledge of the item C10.1 Contract 18/14 Great North Road Stormwater Renewal. This knowledge, which will be of assistance in relation to the matters to be discussed, is relevant to those matters because of their knowledge on the issue discussed.

That the Finance Officer, Credit Control and Finance Manager be permitted to remain at this meeting, after the public has been excluded, because of their knowledge of the item C10.2 Abandoned Land. This knowledge, which will be of assistance in relation to the matters to be discussed, is relevant to those matters because of their knowledge on the issue discussed.

The public were excluded at 11.04am.

Resolutions in relation to the confidential items are recorded in the confidential section of these minutes and are not publicly available unless released here.

The meeting returned to open 11.29am.

Adjournment of Meeting

Resolution

Moved Mayor Tong, seconded Cr Ford **and resolved that Council adjourns to reconvene at 3pm on Thursday 28 November 2018.**

The meeting adjourned at 11.20am.

Mayor Tong and all Councillors were present when the meeting reconvened.

The meeting reconvened at 3pm to hear one more submitter to the Draft Stewart Island/Rakiura Visitor Levy Policy and Bylaw.

7.1 Draft Stewart Island/Rakiura Visitor Levy Policy and Bylaw - hearings and submissions - CONTINUED

Record No: R/18/10/23782

1. Helen Cave for Southsea Hotel, Southern Seafood and the Airstrip (submission 30) did not address the meeting in relation to the draft Stewart Island/Rakiura Visitor Levy Policy and Bylaw.

Adjournment of Meeting

Resolution

Moved Mayor Tong, seconded Cr Ford **and resolved that Council adjourns to reconvene at 9.45am on Friday 30 November 2018 in the Stewart Island Pavilion, Ayr Street, Stewart Island.**

The meeting adjourned at 3.01pm on Thursday 29 November 2018.

The meeting reconvened at 9.45am in the Stewart Island Pavilion, Ayr Street, Oban on Friday 30 November 2018.

PRESENT

Mayor	Mayor Gary Tong
Deputy Mayor	Paul Duffy
Councillors	Stuart Baird
	Brian Dillon
	John Douglas
	Bruce Ford
	Darren Frazer
	George Harpur
	Julie Keast
	Ebel Kremer
	Gavin Macpherson
	Neil Paterson
	Nick Perham

IN ATTENDANCE

Chief Executive	Steve Ruru
Community Partnership Leader	Karen Purdue
Community & Futures Administrator	Shanin Brider

Policy Analyst
Publications Specialist
Committee Advisor/Customer Support Partner

Robyn Rout
Chris Chilton
Kirsten Hicks

7.1 Draft Stewart Island/Rakiura Visitor Levy Policy and Bylaw - hearings and submissions (CONTINUED)

Record No: R/18/10/23782

Submitters to the draft Stewart Island/Rakiura Visitor Levy Policy and Bylaw

1. Jon Spraggon (submission 44) addressed the meeting in relation to the draft Stewart Island/Rakiura Visitor Levy Policy and Bylaw.
2. Jon Spraggon representing the Stewart Island Rakiura Community Board (submission 63) addressed the meeting in relation to the draft Stewart Island/Rakiura Visitor Levy Policy and Bylaw.
3. Jeff Bergman representing Bay Motel (submission 61) addressed the meeting in relation to the draft Stewart Island/Rakiura Visitor Levy Policy and Bylaw.
4. Jill Skerrett (submission 19) addressed the meeting in relation to the draft Stewart Island/Rakiura Visitor Levy Policy and Bylaw.
5. Aaron Joy representing an Stewart Island Backpackers (submission 68) addressed the meeting in relation to the draft Stewart Island/Rakiura Visitor Levy Policy and Bylaw.
6. Aaron Joy representing the Stewart Island Promotion Association (submission 59) addressed the meeting in relation to the draft Stewart Island/Rakiura Visitor Levy Policy and Bylaw.
7. Manfred Herzhoff representing Rakiura Adventure Ltd, Jensen Bay House, Ulva Island Ferry, Rakiura Construction Ltd and Rakiura Marine Guardians (submission 70) addressed the meeting in relation to the draft Stewart Island/Rakiura Visitor Levy Policy and Bylaw.
8. Peter Cox (submission 69) did not address the meeting in relation to the draft Stewart Island/Rakiura Visitor Levy Policy and Bylaw.
9. Elaine Hamilton (submission 23) addressed the meeting in relation to the draft Stewart Island/Rakiura Visitor Levy Policy and Bylaw.
10. Susan Ford (submission 43) addressed the meeting in relation to the draft Stewart Island/Rakiura Visitor Levy Policy and Bylaw.
11. Sharon Pasco (submission 93) addressed the meeting in relation to the draft Stewart Island/Rakiura Visitor Levy Policy and Bylaw.

12. Peter and Donna Goomes (submissions 38 and 39) did not address the meeting in relation to the draft Stewart Island/Rakiura Visitor Levy Policy and Bylaw.
13. Phil Dove presenting Phil's Sea Kayak's (submission 90) addressed the meeting in relation to the draft Stewart Island/Rakiura Visitor Levy Policy and Bylaw.
14. Ann Pullen (submission 62) addressed the meeting in relation to the draft Stewart Island/Rakiura Visitor Levy Policy and Bylaw.
15. Beverley Osborn (submission 29) addressed the meeting in relation to the draft Stewart Island/Rakiura Visitor Levy Policy and Bylaw.
16. Margaret Hopkins (submission 120) addressed the meeting in relation to the draft Stewart Island/Rakiura Visitor Levy Policy and Bylaw.
17. Megan Cowley (submission 97) did not address the meeting in relation to the draft Stewart Island/Rakiura Visitor Levy Policy and Bylaw.
18. Graham Okey (submission 98) addressed the meeting in relation to the draft Stewart Island/Rakiura Visitor Levy Policy and Bylaw.

(The meeting adjourned at 11.55am and reconvened at 1.00pm)

19. Lisa Benson (submission 107) did not address the meeting in relation to the draft Stewart Island/Rakiura Visitor Levy Policy and Bylaw.
20. Rhondda Bergman representing Bay Motel Limited (submission 33) addressed the meeting in relation to the draft Stewart Island/Rakiura Visitor Levy Policy and Bylaw.
21. Terry Buckingham (submission 20) addressed the meeting in relation to the draft Stewart Island/Rakiura Visitor Levy Policy and Bylaw.
22. Anita Geeson (submission 27) addressed the meeting in relation to the draft Stewart Island/Rakiura Visitor Levy Policy and Bylaw.
23. Ulva Goodwille representing Ulva's Guided Walks and Ulva Island Bird Sanctuary (submission 83) addressed the meeting in relation to the draft Stewart Island/Rakiura Visitor Levy Policy and Bylaw.
24. Shona Sangster (submission 84) addressed the meeting in relation to the draft Stewart Island/Rakiura Visitor Levy Policy and Bylaw.
25. Letitia McRitchie representing Stewart Island Rakiura Community and Environment Trust (submission 118) addressed the meeting in relation to the draft Stewart Island/Rakiura Visitor Levy Policy and Bylaw.

The meeting concluded at 1.40pm
on Friday 30 November 2018.

CONFIRMED AS A TRUE AND CORRECT RECORD AT A
MEETING OF THE COUNCIL HELD ON THURSDAY 29
AND FRIDAY 30TH NOVEMBER 2018.

DATE:.....

CHAIRPERSON:.....

APPENDIX 1

Bill Moffat - Stewart Island Flights

Stewart Island Visitor Levy Submission

I don't see any need to categorise the proportion of funding as every application should be treated on its own merit.

It does state in the policy that it's only a guide and the committee has complete discretion.

I have a major problem with handing the allocation process over to the council.

Page 10 of the policy states "Local and central government can make applications for funding". Surely this is a complete conflict of interest. How could any of the committee vote on their own applications? It was also mentioned in the draft that it would make the allocation process more transparent. I think public opinion would beg to differ on that point.

Page 14 Appendix B states, "A representative recommended by each of the approved operators" and then says "Approved operators will nominate a person". This is badly drafted. Does this mean only one person will represent all approved operators?

Leave the current allocation sub committee as it is. It's been working very well over the last five years. *and was the original preferred option.*
TAG streamline the allocation process by weeding out the applications that don't meet the required criteria. But they also assist applicants who may have made errors on their applications.

They can also help in securing alternative funding to applicants that do not meet the prerequisites or require larger amounts of funding.

I see the government has just made the Tourism infrastructure fund easier to access for councils seeking funding. *It will also introduce the international tourism levy next year.* Levy Increase threefold. How has this process occurred? There was no mention of this in the draft policy on 5th September.

But this figure seemed to be plucked out of thin air with no justification at all. Apparently, the figures bandied around the table on the day were significantly higher. This just indicates the scant regard this council has towards Stewart Island tourism in general. Unlike the rest of the district which it seems to promote and pursue tourism opportunities.

One councilor stated on the 25th September that "most of his peers subscribed to the principle of user pays". This is where SDC policy is totally inconsistent. Some examples of this are the Lumsden freedom camper upgrade, Catlin's road upgrade for safety and commercial opportunities, The Cycle Trail, Car park upgrade Manapouri. What users are paying for any of this??

Furthermore, as a lot of this increase is apparently to fund repairs on the Ulva Is and Golden Bay wharves, we have looked into this.

We sell Ulva Island trips as an add on option when customers purchase an airfare online or through an agent. In the last 12 months out of all the visitor levy applicable fares less than 5% have purchased Ulva Island trips. That means 95% of the levy payers are not users. Why should they be charged for something they're not using? The Golden Bay wharf is used by a multitude of users from locals, crib owners, yachting's, marine farms, water taxis. The required repairs are due to damage caused by a non-tourist vessel.

The users of these structures are simply not paying enough.

Visitor numbers in the draft policy are also misleading.

They imply that visitor numbers are increasing at a great rate when, in reality, they are only returning to pre 2011 Christchurch earthquake GFC levels.

In the early 90s there were approx. 30000 visitors per year. Now 25 years later there is 44000. This needs to be put into perspective.

It's ^{about 2 1/2} ~~less than 3~~ buses per day and it's exactly half the number of people who visited the pay toilets in Te Anau in a year.

Where is the overwhelming influx we keep hearing about?

Increasing this levy and cost of getting there will only reduce visitor numbers further. Locals and our staff rely on these visitors for their income. Please don't destroy it.

Please also note that one of the disadvantages listed in the draft documents was that approved operators may withdraw from their arrangements if they ^{are} ~~were~~ no longer willing to collect the levy.

This is a very real option for our company.

Thank you for your time.

APPENDIX 2

Manfred Herzhoff

Manfred&Ulrike Herzhoff, JensenBayHouse, Stewart Island 29.11.2018

Submission regarding the Visitor Levy / Hearing at SDC in Invercargill

1/4 pages

My submission is about the changes to the Visitor levy to Stewart Island.

But: The Visitor levy is the most telling and crucial issue in the relationship between Southland District Council and Stewart Island.

Stewart Island is one of the three constituent islands of New Zealand.

When I came to the island in 1987 and 1989 to purchase our property:

Everybody on the island was of the opinion, that Stewart Island was an island where only New Zealanders could buy property... and we had to prove otherwise.

I remember when the electricity scheme came in and the Stewart Island group

'Stewart Island 2000' with their ideas and plans for the island... But this was an easy roll over for the bureaucratic and government institutions like Southland District Councils et al.

We had to transfer our electricity scheme to SDC as we couldn't pay an electrical engineer, the rules and restrictions let us submit to be overtaken and financially rescued by SDC...

SDC, Southland District Council, is the area- largest Council of New Zealand and has to look after so called 'remote' communities. And Stewart Island with its less than 400 people is one of those and still commands unproportionable more financial support despite its very small electorate numbers. We on Stewart Island are on the fringes and are to be happy to have achieved at least one seat at this Council despite our remoteness and electorate small community. This is the story we must accept: according to the Southland District Council.

We have also to accept to be seen as too diverse, as too fragmented to speak with one united voice, and therefore become exploited by any consultation that the decision makers of the Council make.

It can choose between the various fractions and opinions voiced during those so called consultations.

But the truth is: Southland District Council except for the member of Stewart Island has no idea what the island is really about and what their issues are, as you are based on the mainland and

2/4

travel at most for a break or short holiday to the island.

The island's issue is to survive and keep its community and integrity intact despite becoming less and less populated and skills leaving the island instead of being attracted to come here.

- I have been recently spending more time up in the Far North, Bay of Islands and Hokianga,
- finding out that they have a far more advanced infrastructure, a far more subsidized
- transport for locals than we have here and politicians like Winston Peters have been
- really looking after the North including its remote communities.

The picture down South is far more dismal. Our Major Gary Tong spends lip-service to the island and mentioning it to be the end of Highway One, instigating big research and consultation on the island if in regard to Aquafarming in Pegasus or in regard to wharfs and jetties of the Island.

- The costs of this research as well on the consultation could have been saved as it was very
- evident to the islanders from the onset: they didn't want further exploitation of the natural
- uniqueness of their island by outsiders nor did they accept the current state of their jetties...

But fact is: Stewart Island is totally lacking in infrastructure to handle the increased numbers of tourists, and Stewart Island hasn't got any comprehensive plan for its future and sustainability especially when it comes to income opportunities of its residents and attracting a larger skill base. Stewart Island has been totally dismissed in its own interest for its community and residents, but all the way being treated as an appendix or as a nuisance, but never with respect and with very little constructive intentions. We are on the island in the 'too hard basket'.

The Island powers to be are now the big four:

Department of Conservation, Real Journeys, Sanford and SDC.

They dominate each their field: DoC the landmass of the Island, Real Journeys the tourism, Sanford the aquaculture and SDC the administration including funding.

The locals are mere folklore.

The latest proposal of the visitor levy is a blatant power-grab and money-making scheme by SDC. They don't want to have to spend the money on necessary infrastructure, having it to come out of their own budget: so, why not making the island an excuse to get their own tax, called visitor levy?! Furthermore: why don't we take this visitor levy from the decisionmakers of the island community board and make it instead administered and decided by the SDC?!

3/4

Why don't we even disguise this act of cheating on their own responsibility more plausible by transferring the costly and always subsidized assets back to the community and its board and tell them: this Visitor levy can help you to fund these unwelcome so-called assets?!

Southland District Council has taken over the jetties from South Port since years and thereby picked up the responsibility of managing and maintaining structures which don't make any money. But when an additional structure like Golden Bay is offered, Southland District Council all of a sudden decides to spend tens of thousands for a consultation process on the island when its outcome was evident for everybody prior to the consultation:

The island residents are appalled by the neglect of their structure by South Port and rather want it in public ownership, but conditionally that the structure is integer and fit for purpose and fully functioning. The community also stipulates that they don't want a so-called asset costing ongoing funding from the ratepayers, but a viable business not losing, but rather making money for the community.

The sad fact is: Southland District Council has already several jetties in their possession, Butnot the money making and financially viable main wharf, and has neglected and failed their obligation under the coastalpermits for Ulva Island, for Millar's Beach and even for Fred's Camp.

Fred's Camp is even a matter for the Attorney General as Southland District Council has blatantly breached their coastal permit and consent by building a structure well beyond their existing permit, i.e. Southland District Council has shown that it breaches the law at their convenience and Environment Southland is standing by without taking action.

Now we really like to ask for your attention:

How trustworthy is a so called regulatory body, i.e. a government institution to control an observation of rules by everybody in their domain, but doesn't observe those rules themselves?

We have been asked multiple times by the Major Gary Tong and by its Chief Executive Steve Ruru to sign their proposed drafts of agreements in relation to Golden Bay wharf.

4/4

When we told them that we regard their proposal as illegal and therefore couldn't sign it, I was shown the door.

We had to employ legal counsel for tens of thousands of dollars to fight and become acknowledged that we were within our legal rights and they were wrong.

But except for the temporary acknowledgement we still wait for reimbursement of our legal costs which were totally unnecessary and only incurred by the actions of Southland District Council, i.e. Gary and Steve.

If Southland District Council on one hand neglects and disregards the rules of management and funding of their assets, I have no confidence in SDC and could even stipulate further embarrassing reasons not to trust Southland District Council with using the Visitor levy as a funding tool for infrastructure which should be funded by SDC independently. Southland District Council has shown itself at this point in time incompetent in managing the island's affairs and having spent vast amounts of money unnecessary and not for the cause but for the bureaucracy.

Therefore, I urge the decision makers to reject the current proposal regarding the Visitor levy, but instead start and initiate a different path for Stewart Island outside of the realms of Southland District Council.

APPENDIX 3

Heather McCracken

My name is Coke McCracken and my family own two properties on Stewart Island. We run short term rental accommodation. Also we are operators of fishing charters in the Stewart Island and Foveaux Strait area based in Riverton. We have a daughter who lives and works in tourism on the island.

The controversy of the visitor Levy pricing seems to have taken precedence in the news but my submission is more than just the visitor Levy. The pricing of the levy is an important issue and I feel a jump of 300% is very harsh and would prove detrimental to the flow of the tourism dollar in the immediate future.

Although it is considered to be a destination of overseas visitors, a large number of the visitors are New Zealanders. Most of the rentals I received over the year from my properties are New Zealand families. We have had little information on why do we need to increase the Levy, there have been amounts bandied about but no concrete information on costing and also what we may expect from government funding. Yes there are projects that will need a great deal of capital input but a series of projects relating to the replacement of wharves and some infrastructure has been an issue for some years.

Multi-year funding is an option that looks favourable is it opens a pathway to obtaining loans for larger projects. As far as the guidelines to proportion funds to a percentage in different categories I am object to this

change. I believe it is unnecessary to restrict funding to a percentage for each area as the original allocation criteria gives a clear description of the responsibilities of the committee. In allocating percentages we restrict the original intent of the levy proposal in the future.

I object to operational costs being allocated. In some areas this would be a doubling of funding of operational costs covered by district and environmental rates an example being the Heritage rates.

As to the question of a council committee deciding grant applications I am opposed to this p The current representation of the committee is even and is a general representation of the operators involved in tourism, the council having it's input by appointing their own member and a representative from the community board. The only change I would like to see is one more member to represent the general community
The levees original intent is to fund activities used by visitors

activities on the
island for the benefit of visitors

and to mitigate the
adverse effects of visitors on the environment. How can a council make the decisions to the betterment of the area if the people involved do not have a direct knowledge or the involvement in the tourism of the Island. The representation we have now has personal and professional knowledge of the visitors needs.I

noted there was no comment area-specific to this proposal that are council committee decide on grant applications

The Levee has proved a bonus in the upkeep and past funding for much needed projects. To restrict such funding to narrow percentages and to move responsibility of allocation offshore is detrimental to the overall Tourist Health of the area

The spirit of the original thought of the levy, I feel was to be managed and applied by participants in the everyday investment in the tourism industry

APPENDIX 4



DRAFT STEWART ISLAND/RAKIURA VISITOR LEVY POLICY AND BYLAW

Hearing 29 November 2018

1. By way of introduction I am Paul Norris the General Manager of Real Journeys
2. Thank you for the opportunity to speak to Real Journeys submission on the Draft Stewart Island/Rakiura Visitor Levy Policy and Bylaw.
3. Real Journeys is the operator of the Stewart Island Ferries hence we will be directly affected by any significant change in the Stewart Island visitor levy.
4. Moreover Real Journeys spends more than any other organisation promoting Stewart Island as a visitor destination. Consequently we contend that we need to have input into decisions that impact the management of Rakiura as a visitor destination.
5. Real Journeys supports a change in the visitor levy framework and the revision of the visitor levy policy however we believe:
 - Such a significant “one off” increase in the visitor levy has the potential to “price Stewart Island off the market” particularly in winter months, as Rakiura is already a relatively expensive holiday destination;
 - the visitor levy should be able to be adjusted up or down depending on what the funds need to be used for, and contingent on the buoyancy of the visitor industry;
 - the Visitor Levy funds should be collected for specific purposes; and
 - provide for the visitor levy funds to be used service loans, with the proviso that a project that requires a loan has been fully costed.
6. From our experience of attempting to increase the Stewart Island ferry fares to recovery more costs during the Global Financial Crisis we believe proposed 200% increase (\$5 to \$15) in the visitor levy is too great.

7. In particular, we are concerned about the price sensitive domestic and international cruise ship markets. As stated in our submission we are concerned that significant hike in the levy will turn New Zealanders away, especially in winter, when every operator needs as much business as possible. Hence deferential levy structure might need to be considered; however as the collector of such a levy we are not in favour of additional complexity.
8. With cruise ships, passengers currently paying \$5 per passenger regardless of whether they go ashore on Rakiura or not, consideration should be given to retaining this model, rather than increasing the levy to \$15 and risk only those cruise ship passengers going paying the levy.
9. As the visitor numbers to the island have increased in recent years (including a greater number of larger cruise ships visiting) the pool of funds collected has increased accordingly; which must, in a large part provided additional resources to address any “strains” created by visitors.
10. Real Journeys has been in the tourism industry for in excess of 60 years and over the decades we have seen the fortunes of the tourism industry wax and wane. The most recent setback was the Global Financial Crisis followed by the Christchurch Earthquakes which resulted in our Stewart Island Ferry passenger numbers falling by 28% over a 5 year period. Hence it is important to us that the visitor levy is able to be adjusted down in the event of another significant tourism down turn.
11. Real Journeys is involved with a couple of organisations which raise funds from a visitor levy: Milford Sound Tourism (MST); the Wilmot Pass Road User Group; and Fiordland Marine Mammal Liaison Group. These organisations charge a fee per adult paying passenger and the fee is set each year, taking into consideration many factors, including the “tourism climate”, planned CAPEX work that needs to be funded in the near future.
12. The Wilmot Pass Road User Group sets it’s per paying adult levy annually based on a road inspection, stocks of available gravel and proposed road improvements. The fee is set in the first quarter of each year to allow tourism operators sufficient notice to incorporate the road user fee into their pricing schedules for the coming summer tourism season. A similar regime could be used with respect to setting the Stewart Island visitor levy.

13. In all of the above cases Real Journeys is actively involved in making key decisions relating to the allocation of the visitor fee funds and we assert that because of the significant contribution we make to promoting Stewart Island we should have a say in how the Stewart Island visitor Levy funds are spent.
14. Real Journeys is not in favour of Council's existing Community and Policy Committee approving applications for funding and allocating moneys from the S.I. Rakiura Visitor Levy Fund.
15. We believe the council needs to run a transparent fund allocation process as exists with the current technical advisory group or the Stewart Island/ Rakiura Community Board proposal to create an independent allocations subcommittee to approve and allocate funds. With a subcommittee consisting of:
 - 1x Councillor as Chair,
 - A local Councillor,
 - 3 approved transport operators (Real Journeys, Stewart Island Flights and ISS McKay); and
 - 2 Community Board representatives.
16. We support the policy providing guidance as to the funding categories however we doubt that having firm categories including the percentages of funds to be allocated to these categories will allow enough flexibility.
17. Nevertheless the purpose of the Stewart Island/Rakiura Visitor Levy Empowering Act is to set and collect levies and obtain revenue from passengers travelling to Stewart Island/Rakiura, in order to better provide services, facilities, and amenities for those persons while they are on the Island. Therefore the much bandied around projects like wharf repairs may not fulfil the purpose of the Act as the wharves are used by a large cross section of the island community including diverse commercial and recreational interests.
18. Real Journeys wants it noted that aspects of the policy and bylaw are not what occurs in practice. Stewart Island Experiences maintains a list of "excluded" visitors. This list is created by sighting the likes of residents' rates bills, employment tenancy agreements and knowing the island residents and we doubt that anyone has ever applied for "proof of exemption".

CONCLUSION

19. We are opposed to increasing the visitor levy from \$5.00 to \$15.00 in one step; as we contend that this will be ultimately counter productive for the Stewart Island economy as a whole. If it is to increase it should be based on a staged increase over the years ahead.
20. The levy should not necessarily increase as a matter of course.
21. The funds collected should for a specific purpose and the levy rate set based on projects to be undertaken in the foreseeable future.

Thank you for your time.

Paul Norris