

#29

Submission form

This form can also be completed online at www.mackenzie.govt.nz

YOUR CONTACT DETAILS (these must be provided for us to consider your submission)

Full name: DAVID MORGON COMPTON

Name of organisation (if applicable): _____

Postal address: PO Box 292

Twizel Post code: 7944

Telephone: _____ Mobile: 021 849 296

Email: david.compton@actrix.co.nz

HEARINGS (submission hearings will take place on 3 May 2018 in the Council Chambers in Fairlie and on 4 May 2018 at the Events Centre Community Lounge in Twizel.)

Do you wish to present your submission to Council in person?

Yes ☐

No ☒

Fairlie 3 May or Twizel 4 May (please circle)

Do you wish to present your submission to Council by telephone conference call on 3 May?

Yes ☐

No ☒

If you answered 'yes', the hearings will start at 9am on 3 and 4 May. You will be allocated 10 minutes to speak. You don't need to read out your written submission as councillors will have read it prior to the hearing. If you plan to present your submission by phone, we will make every reasonable effort to contact you at the number/s you have provided. If you're unable to speak due to unavailability or technical issues, we may not be able to allocate you another time.

Would you prefer to present your submission in the morning or afternoon?

Morning ☐

Afternoon ☐

Note: We will do our best to give people their preferred time to present, but we can't guarantee everyone will get their preferred time.

HOW MUCH SHOULD WE INVEST IN ROADS?

☐

I/we prefer Option 1: Set aside a maximum budget of \$300,000 for each year of the plan for roading improvement projects, and borrow to fund Council's 49% share of this amount.

☒

I/we prefer Option 2: Include budgets in each year of the plan for all roading improvement projects that attract NZTA co-funding, and borrow to fund Council's 49% share.

☐

I/we prefer Option 3: Borrow for all roading improvements projects whether they are co-funded or not.

Why is this your preferred option?

The cost of repairs or upgrades will never get cheaper if they are held over for lack of funding. Further deterioration equals more cost.

Submission on Long Term Plan 2018-2028.

Tourism

I support the general approach to Tourism promotion and the retention of ChristchurchNZ for this purpose for 2 more years but recommend the brief be broadened on 3 fronts;

- a. Aim to grow the length of stay for each guest. A longer stay will support the establishment and growth of small companies and activities
- b. Incorporate Fishing into the mix of activities. Twizel is regarded by those in the know as the "new Taupo". There is considerable room for more international exposure of this activity. The season for fishing the canals is a long one. Fishermen fit the goal of lifting visitor numbers during the off-peak seasons and longer stays.
- c. Incorporate product from our agriculture and aquaculture industries. While the advantage of tourism to these industries may not be as direct as it is to accommodation and hospitality providers, today's visitors become tomorrow's customers once they get home. It also makes the tourism promotion spend more applicable to the wider rate base.

Development

I can't identify the brief given to the South Canterbury Chamber of Commerce. Any report I've seen concentrates on numbers of visits and companies "helped". I suspect it's probably more helpful to the bigger companies which can afford the membership description of \$385pa than to the numerous small companies which proliferate in the Mackenzie. SCCC do bring training to the district but at an exorbitant rate. For example a recent 2 Business Planning course was \$325 for non members. I believe the money paid to SCCC would be better spent subsidising training for small businesses. If the organisation is to be retained then it also needs to be briefed on the needs of the District. The seminar held last year on changes to Immigration legislation was entirely aimed at immigrant workers looking for residency when the majority of the audience was interested in seasonal workers. Instead of this "window dressing" approach to development is it possible to channel the money towards the salary of someone who can identify the scale of need in some areas of the District like worker housing? Quantify the need and potential return for 2 or 3 approaches then advertise for investors. A similar approach could be taken on a number of tourism ventures where a gap can be seen.

I have a number of potential investors come through my office (Twizel Holiday Homes) but I can only give them an indication of demand as we find it. There's no clear statement from Council of its view on the need and potential, nor how it may be able/willing to help.

It's easy to push items like worker housing aside as being "the companies'" problem. But the District would be better off if the companies invest in their business expansion rather than worker accommodation needed just to stand still. Leave the worker accommodation to a different investor.

Rating Holiday Home Owners

Last year MDC imposed a targeted rate on holiday home owners as secondary accommodation providers. This was generally accepted by owners. 2 houses were withdrawn from a portfolio of 70. However, it's important that if further changes are made to rating of secondary accommodation providers that a more informed approach is taken than that indicated by some of the conversation I have heard.

I am happy to provide indicative information if that will help inform considered outcomes rather than let the Queenstown experience or press reports from AirBnB be the foundation of MDC policy.