

CLARIFICATION/CONTEXT ADDED: This document includes Q&A from February 2024 up to 17 July 2024. Some answers/information provided in response may now be out of date due to Council's decisions on at its 24 July 2024 meeting Council with Council now being in a further engagement process with licensees. Please go to this page <https://www.selwyn.govt.nz/property-And-building/upper-selwyn-huts-management-and-licencing> for further details or contact [huts@selwyn.govt.nz](mailto:huts@selwyn.govt.nz) if you have any questions.

This document records feedback to the USH DoL upto 17 July 2024		
Submitter Name	SECTION 1 - FEEDBACK TO THE LTP (Submitted but not considered during deliberations*)  [*Insertion for context/clarity: The following section includes the public submissions made during the Council's Long Term Plan 2024-2034 consultation process. Given the separate and ongoing process outside of the Long-Term Plan, which will inform a decision to be made by Council regarding the future Deed of Licence, LTP submissions relating to Selwyn Huts will be taken into consideration as part of the ongoing work with Selwyn Huts]	
Withheld	Why are the Selwyn huts people being made homeless, these are historical buildings some of them from pioneers, one was a schoolhouse etc. always a good place to take children to enjoy the last 60 years for me and my kids, and the hunting and fishing, what a waste, it's a beautiful wee community, along a riverbank, why does the good old kiwi batch have to suffer,	
Keith Morrison	First, I wish to congratulate the council on taking the necessary bold step to address the inevitable effects of climate change on the Upper Selwyn Huts community. Moreover, I commend the council on acting wisely to maximise the resilience of the waste management system by choosing to put in a pipeline, for the council's compassion to be willing to be the banker for the costs incurred, and for the council's decision to only seek partial recovery of the costs from the affected residents. I believe that the council is on the right track but consider, based on my international expertise as a researcher into climate change adaptation of communities, that there is room to improve the council's plan, by tweaking it in places. I humbly make the following suggestions about how to do so, along with my main reasons. The suggestions have to do with how to best ensure the well-being of the community as they face the inevitable changes coming to them. My first overarching point is that the inevitable change being forced onto the Upper Selwyn Huts community is not of their own making. They share no more responsibility for climate change than other residents of the district, and indeed of New Zealand. Notwithstanding that as a concerned resident I have been trying largely unheeded for 15 years to alert the community to the inevitable changes afoot, Upper Selwyn huts community members are victims of climate change and cannot be merely thrown to the wolves, and especially not criminalised if they react to trauma they are incapable of coping with due to their vulnerability. I know of no other country in the world that currently treats its climate change victims in such a callous manner. It would be far from international best practice. I am certain that New Zealand will come to see it as unacceptable behaviour by territorial authorities once climate change adaptation policies are fully developed. Therefore, I believe the council must be careful to avoid unwittingly doing so during this period of learning and exploring ways to address the need to assist communities adapt to climate change. There are five main groups of affected licensees: speculators, recreational hut owners, young families, elderly retirees, and those with health issues. My concern is for the well-being of the latter three groups, whose well-being risks being grievously affected by the current plan, but which a slight adjustment to the plan could address. The effects on speculators and recreational hut owners are addressed first. (i) Speculators Several licensees have made irrational business decisions out of ignorance. Unfortunately, the earthquake disaster and subsequent council (unwise in my opinion) decisions to allow all residents to stay for 12 months of the year, to allow renting, as well as to allow people to obtain more than one licence to occupy Springston South Reserve, resulted in speculation by new and absentee licensees. I put the grievances of these affected pretend 'landlords' to the side. They made unwise business decisions. I do not believe that the council should be overly concerned about these licensees' failures to carry out due diligence. These licensees sought to exploit a loophole that enabled them to seek exorbitant rents for cheap 'properties' outside the mortgage market and got caught out. There has nevertheless been a clear breach of responsibility by both the council and real estate agents to have allowed such a situation to develop. It is not my place or concern to comment further, except to say that the historically unwise decisions (in my opinion) by the council have resulted in overcrowding of huts that are very close together and will make transitioning toward abandonment of the settlement difficult because of some licensees trying to maximise their investments. (ii) Recreational hut owners Some families have held licences over generations. They are who the licence was originally designed for. They were not affected by the original licence that required residents to vacate their baches for at least 3 months of each calendar year. They all have homes elsewhere. It is a sad loss of heritage for these families that they will not have their ancestral bach to visit any longer, but they are well able to adapt. I also put their grievances to the side. (iii) Elderly retirees For many decades the licence allowed up to 12 licensees to live for the full 12 months of each year in their hut. These licensees tended to be retirees because there was a waitlist. With the relaxing of the licence to allow all licensees to stay for 12 months of the year there has been an increase in such retirees who value the peace and quiet of the Springston South reserve and the adjacent natural environment. For many, who are poorer members of society, they spent all their capital to be able to do so. As it stands, with a 15-year horizon, a recent retiree will at 80 years of age be made homeless and largely destitute, having become evicted from their home, with their only major capital asset demolished at their own expense, and forced out of their social support and connections they have established within Selwyn District. This will have a drastic effect on their well-being. As a recent retiree, who now carries out volunteer work as a research associate professor mainly supervising Pasifika doctoral students and writing up research for publication, as well as volunteer support for youth with special learning needs at a local high school, in 15 years I will have spent 55 years of my life in the Selwyn district, with 40 of those at our bach at Upper Selwyn Huts. As a Samoan family our priorities are to our extended family and village obligations, not maximising our capital. Even though my wife could return to our family ancestral village in Samoa, I will not be able to and will be forced, homeless without capital, to leave the Selwyn district and my support networks. If, however, the horizon is extended to 30 years, it would enable this group to live/die as we have planned in good faith, to maintain our well-being. (iv) Children/youth of younger families There have always been younger families who sought to make the most of access to excellent schools and local universities, and who were happy to follow the rule of vacating their hut for 3 months each year. They rationally determined that by doing so they could also seek to escape the poverty trap facing lower-income families having to pay for rental accommodation. They planned to eventually purchase a property as they managed to save money for a deposit, made possible without the rental burden, or enable their children to do so while they hoped to retire in their bach at Selwyn Huts on the waitlist. With the relaxing of the licence to allow all licensees to stay for 12 months of the year, there has been an increase in younger families who have obtained licences for these excellent reasons. My family is an example from the period when we still had to vacate for three months each year. It has worked well for us, especially as we had a family ancestral home in Samoa to return to for a period each year. We remain grateful for the opportunity it has given our children. Our eldest is now a dean at Scots College in Wellington and a New Zealand rep. elite sportsman, mentoring New Zealand's young up-and-coming elite sportsmen and sportswomen. However, with the currently planned 15-year horizon, children and youth of younger families will become torn from their support networks, schools, and plans to attend university from home. But once again, with a tweak to a 30-year horizon, it would allow all current younger families to ensure their children can have the best opportunity to develop into independent successful adults through maintaining their current support networks within the Selwyn district. (v) Those with health issues Several licensees have inherited licences from families who used their baches for recreational purposes. These licensees suffer from health issues, and for them their licences are lifelines. An extension of the horizon to 30 years will most likely ensure that all of these current licensees are able to spend their days in the best possible well-being, by maintaining a connection not only to their childhood memories, but also to the benefits from a relatively safe community environment and established district-wide support networks. In conclusion, I argue that there are only three tweaks to the current plan that are necessary, namely: to increase the horizon to 30 years, to stop renting, and to stop the opportunity to hold more than one licence. The current plan to charge a targeted rate for 15 years to cover the cost of the wastewater upgrade through a pipeline should be kept. Also, the plan to stop the transfer of licences after 10 years to other than one's own immediate family, should also be kept, or perhaps extended to 15 years. If renting were stopped, those currently with more than one licence would most likely transfer their extra licences to others, and absent speculators would likely divest themselves of theirs. This will take pressure off the community and enable graceful transitioning toward the inevitable abandonment of the settlement. I also wish to make three comments. My first comment is on a reason given by the council for the current plan; that of the inordinate time and cost to the council to manage the reserve. This appears to be the reason for the currently planned 15-year horizon. Both climate change and the upgrade to a pipeline for waste management would enable a longer horizon. The reason given by the council is nonetheless understandable. As a victim of bullying and vandalism within the community, I can well understand the council's frustration, as it also brings despair to me to see it continue: the latest being the removal and dumping of no-parking signage from along the stop bank. But I wish to suggest that the council risks carrying out inappropriate collective punishment if this is a/the reason to implement a 15-year horizon rather than say a 30-year horizon. I suggest that the main cause of the bullying and vandalism that has wasted so much of the council's time and resources was the relaxing of the licence and the subsequent emergence of speculation, which the council has to take some responsibility for. With the removal of the opportunity for speculation, I argue that the inappropriate use of the reserve will also evaporate because once again the community values of family life, peace and quiet, and recreation and conservation, will reign, in keeping with the long-term vision that Ngai Tahu and the Department of Conservation have for the area. I argue that this would be the best possible transition and would not need to be rushed through a 15-year horizon. A 30-year horizon would be fine.	
	[Continued] My second comment is on the planned investigation to ensure all huts associated with licences are compliant. This is mainly relevant to ensure rental 'properties' are up to standard and renters are not being taken advantage of by licensees. Of course, if the council decides to not continue to allow renting, this rationale becomes obsolete. But I believe it is crucial for the council to recognise that if the investigation becomes focused instead on the huts of the elderly, younger families, and those with health problems, they do so to help these vulnerable people enable their huts to come up to standard, and NOT to do so as a means by which to evict them, make them homeless and destitute; having to leave the district and their support networks. To evict such vulnerable people would only throw them into further ill-being and impose unnecessary serious social and psychological hazards onto them. It would be contemptuous behaviour on the part of the council to do so and be a failure to live up to basic tenets of cultured and civilised life. Rather the council should use an investigation into compliance of the huts as a basis with which to plan how to best assist these most vulnerable members of the Selwyn district community. It will most likely be to assist with them getting their huts up to standard. My third comment is on the planned inclusion of a code of conduct clause into the licence. This is well overdue. It will empower the council to address the bullying and vandalism that has plagued the community since the relaxing of the licence. Care will however be necessary in the implementation of the clause because of the inevitable attempt by those who are currently bullying to use the clause to further their bullying of vulnerable people. The council will need to seek professional guidance about how to proceed best to investigate complaints that are made.	
Trudy Sykes	My long-term plan for the district would be to somehow work with the council on how we keep the Selwyn huts, I do not want to see them be demolished in 15 years as the council has purposed. This is a beautiful well-kept historic large community from all walks of lives young and old that looks after and cares about each other. Residents have spent their life savings on these homes. How do you remove 96 homes with the way the housing shortage is? Where will these old residents and young families go? Emergency housing is not an option there are tens of thousands on the waiting list now let alone in 15 years. Some families have been here 4 and 5 generations. The whole hut community contributes financially to the businesses in the district. There has to be a way we can move forward together which would include managing climate change figuring out the best way for the sewage system.	
Danni Hodges	I would like to address the issue of evicting people from the Selwyn huts. I was a resident down there for almost a year and in this time found it to be an amazing community where values and respect for others was a common thing. I have read the councils proposed plan and to say I am disgusted is an understatement. These are people's lives we are talking about and with the housing shortage in Canterbury you are expecting 100 households to uproot their lives and try and find affordable housing elsewhere. I feel the council need to go and visit these people who have chosen to live at the huts and see what a health and natural environment they live in.	
Alan Miller	I live at Upper Selwyn Huts and believe the long term plan 4 them is very bad. People and housing is a very important part of the area. The selwyn huts provide an essential place in the area as low cost housing & accommodation for alot of people any house is better than no house and climate warning affects are there but the huts are way above lake Ellismere lots others flood lot	
Karen Gardener	please keep the upper selwyn huts as these houses are part of our community history. They were built there for a reason. Just dont scrap them dont bulldoze our history dont bulldoze history	
Mark Alexander	Stand firm on your decision regarding the Upper Selwyn Huts.	
Withheld	Do not get rid of the Selwyn Huts! These small Lakeside communities embody the very history of the Selwyn district. Your apparent desire to remove these iconic settlements demonstrates Councils complete disconnect with what's important within our communities	
Withheld	Upper Selwyn huts settlement are paying for a pipeline should be under the DWR, if the residence pay for it, we should be allowed to stay for longer than 15+ years USH is a Historical Selwyn District settlement history is important to all of us, and the Selwyn Area. One of the earliest settlements, imported fish into River. They are part of all history of settlements around the lake. Council have claimed that The Lake Settlements will NOT be effected for 25+ years with Climate Change. Leave the settlements until then and reassess. Seems that Climate Change is used as a excuse to be used for all areas around water, to be used for a reason. ; 1. Historical value The Mayor says in the Long Term Plan that "we're focussed on looking after what we already have" - how about you look after us! An 1881 plan shows the reserve on which the huts would come to be established was in existence and by the 1890's at the latest there were huts established there, mainly for fishing and hunting. Given this pre-1900 date, the huts are an archaeological site under the Heritage Pouhere Taonga New Zealand Act. There is a long historic and cultural association with the huts and community over the three centuries of occupation. The Reserve is Crown Land, administered by the Selwyn District Council. In 2015 the purpose was changed (by the Department Conservation) from recreation reserve to Local Purpose – Hut Settlement. On 8 May 2019, the Council unanimously determined that 'Hut licences and subsequent renewals are short term and ultimately for a finite period'. At its 13 March 2024 meeting Council resolved to accept option 2 (of 4 options) and offered Residents a final 15 year term for occupation of their huts. We need to submit requesting this historical significance be recognised and for the Selwyn Huts to be listed as an historical site on the District Plan and for the term for us being here to be extended to protect this history. 2. District wide rates Everyone needs to submit on the LTP asking for us to be put on DWR for Water and Sewer. The reasons being: (a) We will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston who pay DWR and we have previously paid for our sewer ourselves and a subsequent upgrade, the requirement we were told for being put on DWR. (b) We have already paid for the water upgrade. (c) We should not be discriminated against and should be treated like everyone else in the district. (d) We already pay DWR for Recreation Reserve Rate; General Purpose Rate; Library Charge; Community Centre Rate; Uniform Annual General Rate; Water Race (Amenity) Rate; Area Board; Swimming Pools; Canterbury Museum Levy; and Land Drainage. We should also be added to the DWR for Sewer and Water like everyone else. (e) Towards 25 LTP Document stated: "The Council is proposing to introduce a new way of funding water and wastewater, community centres/halls and recreation reserves. These services are currently funded through targeted rates and the Council is proposing to meet the costs of these services by introducing standard district-wide rates. Underpinning this proposal is the view that Selwyn should be seen as one integrated district, rather than simply a series of detached townships. The Council acknowledges that where residents across the district receive a similar level of service for key infrastructure, the cost to residents should also be consistent. In the case of water and wastewater this proposal will also help keep these services affordable for smaller communities." This document also has USH specifically listed in the "Proposed district-wide rate for urban water compared with existing targeted rates" table. From this we conclude there was a clear intention to include USH in the DWR for sewer and water. This is even more relevant now we will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston. (f) Buddie Findlay's Legal Opinion dated 04/03/2019 states "We note that the Council has recently tended to move to a model where the costs of provision of network infrastructure (such as waste water infrastructure) are spread across the district (ie under district wide targeted rates). It would go against the trend for the Council now to look to recover the greater costs of continuing to provide water services to the [Upper Selwyn] Huts solely from that community." (g) Council has already agreed to fund 70% of the sewer upgrade, indicating the district is prepared to pay towards USH sewer upgrade. There is no good reason why the Council couldn't find the full amount. This was proposed in 4.12.4 of the "Upper Selwyn Huts Future Occupancy Strategy" report dated 04/03/2024. (h) The cost and operational charges for the pipeline continue to change so being on the DWR would give the community certainty. It would also mean that if people choose to leave the settlement early the cost will not increase for the remaining owners. (i) Additionally we also request that our reticulation system be replaced by SDC as they have been responsible for this since 1989 and have had ample time to replace this. Given the reasons above there is no reason why USH Can not be put on the DWR for Sewer and Water like everyone else.	



Withheld	<p>Upper Selwyn huts settlement are paying for a pipeline should be under the DWR, if the residence pay for it, we should be allowed to stay for longer than 15+ years USH is a Historical Selwyn District settlement history is important to all of us, and the Selwyn Area. One of the earliest settlements, imported fish into River. They are part of all history of settlements around the lake. Council have claimed that The Lake Settlements will NOT be effected for 25+ years with Climate Change. Leave the settlements until then and reassess. Seems that Climate Change is used as a excuse to be used for all areas around water, to be used for a reason 1. Historical value The Mayor says in the Long Term Plan that "we're focussed on looking after what we already have" - how about you look after us! An 1881 plan shows the reserve on which the huts would come to be established was in existence and by the 1890's at the latest there were huts established there, mainly for fishing and hunting. Given this pre-1900 date, the huts are an archaeological site under the Heritage Pouhere Taonga New Zealand Act. There is a long historic and cultural association with the huts and community over the three centuries of occupation. The Reserve is Crown Land, administered by the Selwyn District Council. In 2015 the purpose was changed (by the Department Conservation) from recreation reserve to Local Purpose – Hut Settlement. On 8 May 2019, the Council unanimously determined that 'Hut licences and subsequent renewals are short term and ultimately for a finite period' . At its 13 March 2024 meeting Council resolved to accept option 2 (of 4 options) and offered Residents a final 15 year term for occupation of their huts.</p> <p>We need to submit requesting this historical significance be recognised and for the Selwyn Huts to be listed as an historical site on the District Plan and for the term for us being here to be extended to protect this history.</p> <p>2. District wide rates Everyone needs to submit on the LTP asking for us to be put on DWR for Water and Sewer.</p> <p>The reasons being :</p> <p>(a) We will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston who pay DWR and we have previously paid for our sewer ourselves and a subsequent upgrade, the requirement we were told for being put on DWR.</p> <p>(b) We have already paid for the water upgrade.</p> <p>(c) We should not be discriminated against and should be treated like everyone else in the district.</p> <p>(d) We already pay DWR for Recreation Reserve Rate; General Purpose Rate; Library Charge; Community Centre Rate; Uniform Annual General Rate; Water Race (Amenity) Rate; Area Board; Swimming Pools; Canterbury Museum Levy; and Land Drainage. We should also be added to the DWR for Sewer and Water like everyone else.</p> <p>(e) Towards25 LTP Document stated: "The Council is proposing to introduce a new way of funding water and wastewater, community centres/halls and recreation reserves. These services are currently funded through targeted rates and the Council is proposing to meet the costs of these services by introducing standard district-wide rates. Underpinning this proposal is the view that Selwyn should be seen as one integrated district, rather than simply a series of detached townships. The Council acknowledges that where residents across the district receive a similar level of service for key infrastructure, the cost to residents should also be consistent. In the case of water and wastewater this proposal will also help keep these services affordable for smaller communities." This document also has USH specifically listed in the "Proposed district-wide rate for urban water compared with existing targeted rates" table. From this we conclude there was a clear intention to include USH in the DWR for sewer and water. This is even more relevant now we will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston.</p> <p>(f) Buddle Findlay's Legal Opinion dated 04/03/2019 states "We note that the Council has recently tended to move to a model where the costs of provision of network infrastructure (such as waste water infrastructure) are spread across the district (ie under district wide targeted rates). It would go against the trend for the Council now to look to recover the greater costs of continuing to provide water services to the [Upper Selwyn] Huts solely from that community."</p> <p>(g) Council has already agreed to fund 70% of the sewer upgrade, indicating the district is prepared to pay towards USH sewer upgrade. There is no good reason why the Council couldn't find the full amount. This was proposed in 4.12.4 of the "Upper Selwyn Huts Future Occupancy Strategy" report dated 04/03/2024.</p> <p>(h) The cost and operational charges for the pipeline continue to change so being on the DWR would give the community certainty. It would also mean that if people choose to leave the settlement early the cost will not increase for the remaining owners.</p> <p>(i) Additionally we also request that our reticulation system be replaced by SDC as they have been responsible for this since 1989 and have had ample time to replace this.</p> <p>Given the reasons above there is no reason why USH Can not be put on the DWR for Sewer and Water like everyone else.</p>	
Sandra Lagrosse	Regarding Upper Selwyn Huts.A 25 to 30 year lease, also Hut settlement to be included in the Selwyn district-wide rating plan, to reflect fairness and reduce the licence fee to affordable level. The settlement also to be recognised, as an historical site.	
Graham Evans	<p>District Wide Rates for Water and SewageFor 114 years the Upper Selwyn Huts were self-administered with an annual licencefee to cover our internal expenditure. From this fund we were able to construct twosuccessful sewer schemes the first in 1920 which included a holding tank thateffluent was truck away, the second in 1987 which was a boarder dyke system.In 2011 the SDC took over the administration of the settlement. The SDC council hascontinued to claim the payment of this Licence Fee and now we are faced with anhorrific invoice to gain compliance with the installation of a pipe line to the Pines inBurnham.The District Wide Rates for water and sewage; for the settlement I believe shouldhave been moved on to this in 2011; following the transfer from the self-administeredsystem.I have made three attempts as a speaker at the council meetings to have thischange made, the only response I have received is that other rate payers would notbe happy to approve this move. I am not happy the be faced with paying for ourportion of the pipeline, when I can only use it for possibly 1 year or 5 years as thenew draft Deed of Licence indicates.This issue was put to the SDC at the last Long Term Plan, and I spoke to thesubmission.From the Council meeting the only input was from Debra Hasson commenting thatwould not be fair on all the other SDC Rate payers if the Upper Selwyn Huts wereadded to the District Wide Rates.As a rate payer I am paying rates towards the following:General Purposes RateLibrary ChargeRecreation Reserve RateCommunity Centre RateUniform Annual General ChargeWater Race 9Amenity) RateSwimming PoolsCanterbury MuseumLand DrainageWith the latest attack on the Upper Selwyn Huts from the SDC related to the DraftDeed of Licence, it is amazing that there could be savings made in administration, ifthe Water and Sewage charges were added to the District Wide rates.When this Pipe to Pines scheme was initially proposed it was estimated to be \$3M,now it is estimated at \$4M on a total scheme estimated at \$35M. It was expected tobe completed by 30 June 2024 the date the ecan consent extension expires.Why is the Upper Selwyn Huts being made to pay anything towards this scheme?When will the pipe line to the Upper Selwyn Huts.If we refuse to sign the Deed of Licence or pay for the 30% of the \$2M loan or thesuggested bond, then we will be evicted, this is unacceptable for all families who calthis place their home and you are not offering any compensation.On 19/04/2024 2:33 pm, Selwyn Huts wrote:Hi Graham,Thank you for your email. Council has reviewed this issue on several occasions anddecided that it is not appropriate for the Upper Selwyn Huts to be part of the district wide rates for water and sewage. As he Huts were never intended for full-timeresidence, it would not have made sense to have rated huts for these services whenthey were only occupied for a limited number of days each year. This historicalprecedence continued once the 365 day a year occupation was permitted.Thanks, TimHi TimI am not impressed by this historic reply. The reason for not being included I believeis due to it being administered by a board and committee for 114 years and theassociated cost came from license fees.Forward on to 2011 when the SDC took over administration that would have been the time to reassess the rates and include the water and waste within the DistrictWide RatesYour reply as to non-permanent residents has got nothing to do the reasons forexcluding the USH. That was the case until 2015 when the DOL indicates that alldwellings are classed as permanent; I request that the SDC review their decision not to include the Upper Selwyn Huts of the District Wide Rates for water and sewage.The reason given most recently referred to Upper Selwyn Huts as follows:"Huts were never intended for full-time residence, it would not have made sense to have rated huts for these services when they were only occupied for a limited number of days each year."My current Deed of Licence refers to Licence Type: Permanent. This came about while Kelvin Coe was Mayor and under his direction, we were informed that the council under advice from council lawyers; could not restrict the occupancy to other than that being permanent. The reference made in the past as to the change in occupancy was not as a result of people being made homeless post the 2011 Christchurch Earthquakes, there were some properties of hut owners who were using their huts for recreation purposes that made requests for family or friends to stay over due to their homes being red carded. This was not why huts became more populated but due to the change of status from non-permanent to permanent status prior to 2011.</p>	
Susan Rogers	<p>An 1881 plan shows the reserve on which the huts would come to be established was in existence and by the 1890's at the latest there were huts established there, mainly for fishing and hunting. Given this pre-1900 date, the huts are an archaeological site under the Heritage Pouhere Taonga New Zealand Act. There is a long historic and cultural association with the huts and community over the three centuries of occupation. The Reserve is Crown Land, administered by the Selwyn District Council. In 2015 the purpose was changed (by the Department Conservation) from recreation reserve to Local Purpose – Hut Settlement. On 8 May 2019, the Council unanimously determined that 'Hut licences and subsequent renewals are short term and ultimately for a finite period' . At its 13 March 2024 meeting Council resolved to accept option 2 (of 4 options) and offered Residents a final 15 year term for occupation of their huts. We need this historical significance be recognised and for the Selwyn Huts to be listed as an historical site on the District Plan and for the term for us being here to be extended to protect this history.</p>	
Withheld	<p>Historical valueThe Mayor says in the Long Term Plan that "we're focussed on looking after what we already have" - how about you look after us !An 1881 plan shows the reserve on which the huts would come to be established was in existence and by the 1890's at the latest there were huts established there, mainly for fishing and hunting. Given this pre-1900 date, the huts are an archaeological site under the Heritage Pouhere Taonga New Zealand Act. There is a long historic and cultural association with the huts and community over the three centuries of occupation. The Reserve is Crown Land, administered by the Selwyn District Council. In 2015 the purpose was changed (by the Department Conservation) from recreation reserve to Local Purpose – Hut Settlement. On 8 May 2019, the Council unanimously determined that 'Hut licences and subsequent renewals are short term and ultimately for a finite period' . At its 13 March 2024 meeting Council resolved to accept option 2 (of 4 options) and offered Residents a final 15 year term for occupation of their huts.; (Selwyn Huts)(a) We will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston who pay DWR and we have previously paid for our sewer ourselves and a subsequent upgrade, the requirement we were told for being put on DWR. (b) We have already paid for the water upgrade.(c) We should not be discriminated against and should be treated like everyone else in the district. (d) We already pay DWR for Recreation Reserve Rate; General Purpose Rate; Library Charge; Community Centre Rate; Uniform Annual General Rate; Water Race (Amenity) Rate; Area Board; Swimming Pools; Canterbury Museum Levy; and Land Drainage. We should also be added to the DWR for Sewer and Water like everyone else. (e) Towards25 LTP Document stated:"The Council is proposing to introduce a new way of funding water and wastewater, community centres/halls and recreation reserves. These services are currently funded through targeted rates and the Council is proposing to meet the costs of these services by introducing standard district-wide rates. Underpinning this proposal is the view that Selwyn should be seen as one integrated district, rather than simply a series of detached townships. The Council acknowledges that where residents across the district receive a similar level of service for key infrastructure, the cost to residents should also be consistent. In the case of water and wastewater this proposal will also help keep these services affordable for smaller communities."This document also has USH specifically listed in the "Proposed district-wide rate for urban water compared with existing targeted rates" table. From this we conclude there was a clear intention to include USH in the DWR for sewer and water. This is even more relevant now we will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston. (f) Buddle Findlay's Legal Opinion dated 04/03/2019 states "We note that the Council has recently tended to move to a model where the costs of provision of network infrastructure (such as waste water infrastructure) are spread across the district (ie under district wide targeted rates). It would go against the trend for the Council now to look to recover the greater costs of continuing to provide water services to the [Upper Selwyn] Huts solely from that community." (g) Council has already agreed to fund 70% of the sewer upgrade, indicating the district is prepared to pay towards USH sewer upgrade. There is no good reason why the Council couldn't find the full amount. This was proposed in 4.12.4 of the "Upper Selwyn Huts Future Occupancy Strategy" report dated 04/03/2024. (h) The cost and operational charges for the pipeline continue to change so being on the DWR would give the community certainty. It would also mean that if people choose to leave the settlement early the cost will not increase for the remaining owners.(i) Additionally we also request that our reticulation system be replaced by SDC as they have been responsible for this since 1989 and have had ample time to replace this.Given the reasons above there is no reason why USH Can not be put on the DWR for Sewer and Water like everyone else.Please think about all of this seriously. I really hope you remember to what it was like as a kid...i hope ur childhood was like mine growing up out here free to roam free to be a kid!!! My children do, they have an absolute ball out here, they're never inside they are always out and about on some adventure and for me, it brings peace, safety, community togetherness!! A life style i love and adore. If i wanted to live in town i would but i would never do that. This is home, its honestly not just some chuck away place!! Theres so much more to the Upper huts we have so much heart here. ??????</p>	
Leigh Rossiter	<p>1. Submission to recognise Upper Selwyn Huts as a Historical SiteThe Mayor says in the Long Term Plan that "we're focussed on looking after what we already have" - how about you look after Upper Selwyn Huts!An 1881 plan shows the reserve on which the huts would come to be established was in existence and by the 1890's at the latest there were huts established there, mainly for fishing and hunting. Given this pre-1900 date, the huts are an archaeological site under the Heritage Pouhere Taonga New Zealand Act. There is a long historic and cultural association with the huts and community over the three centuries of occupation. The Reserve is Crown Land, administered by the Selwyn District Council. In 2015 the purpose was changed (by the Department Conservation) from recreation reserve to Local Purpose – Hut Settlement. On 8 May 2019, the Council unanimously determined that 'Hut licences and subsequent renewals are short term and ultimately for a finite period'. At its 13 March 2024 meeting Council resolved to accept option 2 (of 4 options) and offered Residents a final 15 year term for occupation of their huts.I am submitting to request that this historical significance be recognised and for the Upper Selwyn Huts to be listed as an historical site on the District Plan and for the term for us being here to be extended to protect this history. ; 2. Submission to Include Upper Selwyn Huts on the District Wide Rates for Sewer and Water The reasons being : (a) We will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston who pay DWR and we have previously paid for our sewer ourselves and a subsequent upgrade, the requirement we were told for being put on DWR. (b) We have already paid for the water upgrade.(c) We should not be discriminated against and should be treated like everyone else in the district. We are tired of being treated as separate from the rest of the district and as second class citizens. This treatment is not fair nor reasonable.(d) We already pay DWR for Recreation Reserve Rate; General Purpose Rate; Library Charge; Community Centre Rate; Uniform Annual General Rate; Water Race (Amenity) Rate; Area Board; Swimming Pools; Canterbury Museum Levy; and Land Drainage.We should also be added to the DWR for Sewer and Water like everyone else. (e) SDC Towards25 LTP Document stated:"The Council is proposing to introduce a new way of funding water and wastewater, community centres/halls and recreation reserves. These services are currently funded through targeted rates and the Council is proposing to meet the costs of these services by introducing standard district-wide rates. Underpinning this proposal is the view that Selwyn should be seen as one integrated district, rather than simply a series of detached townships. The Council acknowledges that where residents across the district receive a similar level of service for key infrastructure, the cost to residents should also be consistent. In the case of water and wastewater this proposal will also help keep these services affordable for smaller communities."This document also has USH specifically listed in the "Proposed district-wide rate for urban water compared with existing targeted rates" table. From this we conclude there was a clear intention to include USH in the DWR for sewer and water. This is even more relevant now we will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston. (f) Buddle Findlay's Legal Opinion dated 04/03/2019 states "We note that the Council has recently tended to move to a model where the costs of provision of network infrastructure (such as waste water infrastructure) are spread across the district (ie under district wide targeted rates). It would go against the trend for the Council now to look to recover the greater costs of continuing to provide water services to the [Upper Selwyn] Huts solely from that community." (g) Council has already agreed to fund 70% of the sewer upgrade, indicating the district is prepared to pay towards USH sewer upgrade. There is no good reason why the Council couldn't find the full amount. This was proposed in 4.12.4 of the "Upper Selwyn Huts Future Occupancy Strategy" report dated 04/03/2024.(h) The cost and operational charges for the pipeline continue to change so being on the DWR would give the community certainty. It would also mean that if people choose to leave the settlement early the cost will not increase for the remaining owners.(i) Additionally, we also request that our reticulation system be replaced by SDC as they have been responsible for this since 1989 and have had ample time to replace this.Given the reasons above there is no reason why USH Can not be put on the DWR for Sewer and Water like everyone else.</p>	



Jeremy Meiklejohn	<p>n regards to the upper Selwyn huts.1. Historical valueThe Mayor says in the Long Term Plan that "we're focussed on looking after what we already have" - how about you look after us!An 1881 plan shows the reserve on which the huts would come to be established was in existence and by the 1890's at the latest there were huts established there, mainly for fishing and hunting. Given this pre-1900 date, the huts are an archaeological site under the Heritage Pouhere Taonga New Zealand Act. There is a long historic and cultural association with the huts and community over the three centuries of occupation. The Reserve is Crown Land, administered by the Selwyn District Council. In 2015 the purpose was changed (by the Department Conservation) from recreation reserve to Local Purpose – Hut Settlement. On 8 May 2019, the Council unanimously determined that 'Hut licences and subsequent renewals are short term and ultimately for a finite period' . At its 13 March 2024 meeting Council resolved to accept option 2 (of 4 options) and offered Residents a final 15 year term for occupation of their huts.The upper selwyn huts should be on the district wide rates.; i2. District wide rates The reasons being : (a) We will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston who pay DWR and we have previously paid for our sewer ourselves and a subsequent upgrade, the requirement we were told for being put on DWR. (b) We have already paid for the water upgrade.(c) We should not be discriminated against and should be treated like everyone else in the district. (d) We already pay DWR for Recreation Reserve Rate; General Purpose Rate; Library Charge; Community Centre Rate; Uniform Annual General Rate; Water Race (Amenity) Rate; Area Board; Swimming Pools; Canterbury Museum Levy; and Land Drainage. We should also be added to the DWR for Sewer and Water like everyone else. (e) Towards25 LTP Document stated: "The Council is proposing to introduce a new way of funding water and wastewater, community centres/halls and recreation reserves. These services are currently funded through targeted rates and the Council is proposing to meet the costs of these services by introducing standard district-wide rates. Underpinning this proposal is the view that Selwyn should be seen as one integrated district, rather than simply a series of detached townships. The Council acknowledges that where residents across the district receive a similar level of service for key infrastructure, the cost to residents should also be consistent. In the case of water and wastewater this proposal will also help keep these services affordable for smaller communities." This document also has USH specifically listed in the "Proposed district-wide rate for urban water compared with existing targeted rates" table. From this we conclude there was a clear intention to include USH in the DWR for sewer and water. This is even more relevant now we will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston. (f) Buddie Findlay's Legal Opinion dated 04/03/2019 states "We note that the Council has recently tended to move to a model where the costs of provision of network infrastructure (such as waste water infrastructure) are spread across the district (ie under district wide targeted rates). It would go against the trend for the Council now to look to recover the greater costs of continuing to provide water services to the [Upper Selwyn] Huts solely from that community." (g) Council has already agreed to fund 70% of the sewer upgrade, indicating the district is prepared to pay towards USH sewer upgrade. There is no good reason why the Council couldn't find the full amount. This was proposed in 4.12.4 of the "Upper Selwyn Huts Future Occupancy Strategy" report dated 04/03/2024. (h) The cost and operational charges for the pipeline continue to change so being on the DWR would give the community certainty. It would also mean that if people choose to leave the settlement early the cost will not increase for the remaining owners.(i) Additionally we also request that our reticulation system be replaced by SDC as they have been responsible for this since 1989 and have had ample time to replace this.</p>	
Kirriily Fea	<p>1. Protect the Historical value of Upper Selwyn HutsThe Mayor says in the Long Term Plan that "we're focussed on looking after what we already have" - how about you look after us!An 1881 plan shows the reserve on which the huts would come to be established was in existence and by the 1890's at the latest there were huts established there, mainly for fishing and hunting. Given this pre-1900 date, the huts are an archaeological site under the Heritage Pouhere Taonga New Zealand Act. There is a long historic and cultural association with the huts and community over the three centuries of occupation. The Reserve is Crown Land, administered by the Selwyn District Council. In 2015 the purpose was changed (by the Department Conservation) from recreation reserve to Local Purpose – Hut Settlement. On 8 May 2019, the Council unanimously determined that 'Hut licences and subsequent renewals are short term and ultimately for a finite period' . At its 13 March 2024 meeting Council resolved to accept option 2 (of 4 options) and offered Residents a final 15 year term for occupation of their huts.I am requesting this historical significance be recognised and for the Upper Selwyn Huts to be listed as an historical site on the District Plan and for the term for us being here to be extended to protect this history. ; 2. District wide rates I'm asking for Upper Selwyn Huts to be put on DWR for Water and Sewer.For the following reasons:(a) We will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston who pay DWR and we have previously paid for our sewer ourselves and a subsequent upgrade, the requirement we were told for being put on DWR.(b) We have already paid for the water upgrade.(c) We should not be discriminated against and should be treated like everyone else in the district. We are tired of being treated differently and as second class citizens.(d) We already pay DWR for Recreation Reserve Rate; General Purpose Rate; Library Charge; Community Centre Rate; Uniform Annual General Rate; Water Race (Amenity) Rate; Area Board; Swimming Pools; Canterbury Museum Levy; and Land Drainage. We should also be added to the DWR for Sewer and Water like everyone else. (e) Towards25 LTP Document stated: "The Council is proposing to introduce a new way of funding water and wastewater, community centres/halls and recreation reserves. These services are currently funded through targeted rates and the Council is proposing to meet the costs of these services by introducing standard district-wide rates. Underpinning this proposal is the view that Selwyn should be seen as one integrated district, rather than simply a series of detached townships. The Council acknowledges that where residents across the district receive a similar level of service for key infrastructure, the cost to residents should also be consistent. In the case of water and wastewater this proposal will also help keep these services affordable for smaller communities." This document also has USH specifically listed in the "Proposed district-wide rate for urban water compared with existing targeted rates" table. From this we conclude there was a clear intention to include USH in the DWR for sewer and water. This is even more relevant now we will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston. (f) Buddie Findlay's Legal Opinion dated 04/03/2019 states "We note that the Council has recently tended to move to a model where the costs of provision of network infrastructure (such as waste water infrastructure) are spread across the district (ie under district wide targeted rates). It would go against the trend for the Council now to look to recover the greater costs of continuing to provide water services to the [Upper Selwyn] Huts solely from that community." (g) Council has already agreed to fund 70% of the sewer upgrade, indicating the district is prepared to pay towards USH sewer upgrade. There is no good reason why the Council couldn't fund the full amount. This was proposed in 4.12.4 of the SDC "Upper Selwyn Huts Future Occupancy Strategy" report dated 04/03/2024. (h) The cost and operational charges for the pipeline continue to change so being on the DWR would give the community certainty. It would also mean that if people choose to leave the settlement early the cost will not increase for the remaining owners.(i) Additionally we also request that our reticulation system be replaced by SDC as they have been responsible for this since 1989 and have had ample time to replace this.Given the reasons above there is no reason why USH Can not be put on the DWR for Sewer and Water like everyone else.</p>	
Graeme Young	<p>1. Submission to recognise Upper Selwyn Huts as a Historical SiteThe Mayor says in the Long Term Plan that "we're focussed on looking after what we already have" - how about you look after Upper Selwyn Huts!An 1881 plan shows the reserve on which the huts would come to be established was in existence and by the 1890's at the latest there were huts established there, mainly for fishing and hunting. Given this pre-1900 date, the huts are an archaeological site under the Heritage Pouhere Taonga New Zealand Act. There is a long historic and cultural association with the huts and community over the three centuries of occupation. The Reserve is Crown Land, administered by the Selwyn District Council. In 2015 the purpose was changed (by the Department Conservation) from recreation reserve to Local Purpose – Hut Settlement. On 8 May 2019, the Council unanimously determined that 'Hut licences and subsequent renewals are short term and ultimately for a finite period'. At its 13 March 2024 meeting Council resolved to accept option 2 (of 4 options) and offered Residents a final 15 year term for occupation of their huts.I am submitting to request that this historical significance be recognised and for the Upper Selwyn Huts to be listed as an historical site on the District Plan and for the term for us being here to be extended to protect this history. ; 2. Submission to Include Upper Selwyn Huts on the District Wide Rates for Sewer and Water The reasons being : (a) We will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston who pay DWR and we have previously paid for our sewer ourselves and a subsequent upgrade, the requirement we were told for being put on DWR. (b) We have already paid for the water upgrade.(c) We should not be discriminated against and should be treated like everyone else in the district. We are tired of being treated as separate from the rest of the district and as second class citizens. This treatment is not fair nor reasonable.(d) We already pay DWR for Recreation Reserve Rate; General Purpose Rate; Library Charge; Community Centre Rate; Uniform Annual General Rate; Water Race (Amenity) Rate; Area Board; Swimming Pools; Canterbury Museum Levy; and Land Drainage.We should also be added to the DWR for Sewer and Water like everyone else. (e) District Wide Rates is already being applied to fund maintenance of sections of the Upper Selwyn Huts Local Purpose Reserve including maintenance of the tennis courts, the reserve's toilets and community library, and mowing around the dwellings. This sets a precedent that DWR can be applied to our settlement.(f) SDC Towards25 LTP Document stated: "The Council is proposing to introduce a new way of funding water and wastewater, community centres/halls and recreation reserves. These services are currently funded through targeted rates and the Council is proposing to meet the costs of these services by introducing standard district-wide rates. Underpinning this proposal is the view that Selwyn should be seen as one integrated district, rather than simply a series of detached townships. The Council acknowledges that where residents across the district receive a similar level of service for key infrastructure, the cost to residents should also be consistent. In the case of water and wastewater this proposal will also help keep these services affordable for smaller communities." This document also has USH specifically listed in the "Proposed district-wide rate for urban water compared with existing targeted rates" table. From this we conclude there was a clear intention to include USH in the DWR for sewer and water. This is even more relevant now we will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston. (g) Buddie Findlay's Legal Opinion dated 04/03/2019 states "We note that the Council has recently tended to move to a model where the costs of provision of network infrastructure (such as waste water infrastructure) are spread across the district (ie under district wide targeted rates). It would go against the trend for the Council now to look to recover the greater costs of continuing to provide water services to the [Upper Selwyn] Huts solely from that community." (h) Council has already agreed to fund 70% of the sewer upgrade, indicating the district is prepared to pay towards USH sewer upgrade. There is no good reason why the Council couldn't find the full amount. This was proposed in 4.12.4 of the "Upper Selwyn Huts Future Occupancy Strategy" report dated 04/03/2024.(i) The cost and operational charges for the pipeline continue to change so being on the DWR would give the community certainty. It would also mean that if people choose to leave the settlement early the cost will not increase for the remaining owners.(j) Additionally, we also request that our reticulation system be replaced by SDC as they have been responsible for this since 1989 and have had ample time to replace this.Given the reasons above there is no reason why USH Can not be put on the DWR for Sewer and Water like everyone else.</p>	
Pam Tyler	<p>1. Submission to recognise Upper Selwyn Huts as a Historical SiteThe Mayor says in the Long Term Plan that "we're focussed on looking after what we already have" - how about you look after Upper Selwyn Huts!An 1881 plan shows the reserve on which the huts would come to be established was in existence and by the 1890's at the latest there were huts established there, mainly for fishing and hunting. Given this pre-1900 date, the huts are an archaeological site under the Heritage Pouhere Taonga New Zealand Act. There is a long historic and cultural association with the huts and community over the three centuries of occupation. The Reserve is Crown Land, administered by the Selwyn District Council. In 2015 the purpose was changed (by the Department Conservation) from recreation reserve to Local Purpose – Hut Settlement. On 8 May 2019, the Council unanimously determined that 'Hut licences and subsequent renewals are short term and ultimately for a finite period'. At its 13 March 2024 meeting Council resolved to accept option 2 (of 4 options) and offered Residents a final 15 year term for occupation of their huts.I am submitting to request that this historical significance be recognised and for the Upper Selwyn Huts to be listed as an historical site on the District Plan and for the term for us being here to be extended to protect this history. ; 2. Submission to Include Upper Selwyn Huts on the District Wide Rates for Sewer and Water The reasons being : (a) We will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston who pay DWR and we have previously paid for our sewer ourselves and a subsequent upgrade, the requirement we were told for being put on DWR. (b) We have already paid for the water upgrade.(c) We should not be discriminated against and should be treated like everyone else in the district. We are tired of being treated as separate from the rest of the district and as second class citizens. This treatment is not fair nor reasonable.(d) We already pay DWR for Recreation Reserve Rate; General Purpose Rate; Library Charge; Community Centre Rate; Uniform Annual General Rate; Water Race (Amenity) Rate; Area Board; Swimming Pools; Canterbury Museum Levy; and Land Drainage.We should also be added to the DWR for Sewer and Water like everyone else. (e) District Wide Rates is already being applied to fund maintenance of sections of the Upper Selwyn Huts Local Purpose Reserve including maintenance of the tennis courts, the reserve's toilets and community library, and mowing around the dwellings. This sets a precedent that DWR can be applied to our settlement.(f) SDC Towards25 LTP Document stated: "The Council is proposing to introduce a new way of funding water and wastewater, community centres/halls and recreation reserves. These services are currently funded through targeted rates and the Council is proposing to meet the costs of these services by introducing standard district-wide rates. Underpinning this proposal is the view that Selwyn should be seen as one integrated district, rather than simply a series of detached townships. The Council acknowledges that where residents across the district receive a similar level of service for key infrastructure, the cost to residents should also be consistent. In the case of water and wastewater this proposal will also help keep these services affordable for smaller communities." This document also has USH specifically listed in the "Proposed district-wide rate for urban water compared with existing targeted rates" table. From this we conclude there was a clear intention to include USH in the DWR for sewer and water. This is even more relevant now we will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston. (g) Buddie Findlay's Legal Opinion dated 04/03/2019 states "We note that the Council has recently tended to move to a model where the costs of provision of network infrastructure (such as waste water infrastructure) are spread across the district (ie under district wide targeted rates). It would go against the trend for the Council now to look to recover the greater costs of continuing to provide water services to the [Upper Selwyn] Huts solely from that community." (h) Council has already agreed to fund 70% of the sewer upgrade, indicating the district is prepared to pay towards USH sewer upgrade. There is no good reason why the Council couldn't find the full amount. This was proposed in 4.12.4 of the "Upper Selwyn Huts Future Occupancy Strategy" report dated 04/03/2024.(i) The cost and operational charges for the pipeline continue to change so being on the DWR would give the community certainty. It would also mean that if people choose to leave the settlement early the cost will not increase for the remaining owners.(j) Additionally, we also request that our reticulation system be replaced by SDC as they have been responsible for this since 1989 and have had ample time to replace this.Given the reasons above there is no reason why USH Can not be put on the DWR for Sewer and Water like everyone else.</p>	
Fay Risdon	<p>1. Submission to recognise Upper Selwyn Huts as a Historical SiteThe Mayor says in the Long Term Plan that "we're focussed on looking after what we already have" - how about you look after Upper Selwyn Huts!An 1881 plan shows the reserve on which the huts would come to be established was in existence and by the 1890's at the latest there were huts established there, mainly for fishing and hunting. Given this pre-1900 date, the huts are an archaeological site under the Heritage Pouhere Taonga New Zealand Act. There is a long historic and cultural association with the huts and community over the three centuries of occupation. The Reserve is Crown Land, administered by the Selwyn District Council. In 2015 the purpose was changed (by the Department Conservation) from recreation reserve to Local Purpose – Hut Settlement. On 8 May 2019, the Council unanimously determined that 'Hut licences and subsequent renewals are short term and ultimately for a finite period'. At its 13 March 2024 meeting Council resolved to accept option 2 (of 4 options) and offered Residents a final 15 year term for occupation of their huts.I am submitting to request that this historical significance be recognised and for the Upper Selwyn Huts to be listed as an historical site on the District Plan and for the term for us being here to be extended to protect this history. ; 2. Submission to Include Upper Selwyn Huts on the District Wide Rates for Sewer and Water The reasons being : (a) We will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston who pay DWR and we have previously paid for our sewer ourselves and a subsequent upgrade, the requirement we were told for being put on DWR. (b) We have already paid for the water upgrade.(c) We should not be discriminated against and should be treated like everyone else in the district. We are tired of being treated as separate from the rest of the district and as second class citizens. This treatment is not fair nor reasonable.(d) We already pay DWR for Recreation Reserve Rate; General Purpose Rate; Library Charge; Community Centre Rate; Uniform Annual General Rate; Water Race (Amenity) Rate; Area Board; Swimming Pools; Canterbury Museum Levy; and Land Drainage.We should also be added to the DWR for Sewer and Water like everyone else. (e) District Wide Rates is already being applied to fund maintenance of sections of the Upper Selwyn Huts Local Purpose Reserve including maintenance of the tennis courts, the reserve's toilets and community library, and mowing around the dwellings. This sets a precedent that DWR can be applied to our settlement.(f) SDC Towards25 LTP Document stated: "The Council is proposing to introduce a new way of funding water and wastewater, community centres/halls and recreation reserves. These services are currently funded through targeted rates and the Council is proposing to meet the costs of these services by introducing standard district-wide rates. Underpinning this proposal is the view that Selwyn should be seen as one integrated district, rather than simply a series of detached townships. The Council acknowledges that where residents across the district receive a similar level of service for key infrastructure, the cost to residents should also be consistent. In the case of water and wastewater this proposal will also help keep these services affordable for smaller communities." This document also has USH specifically listed in the "Proposed district-wide rate for urban water compared with existing targeted rates" table. From this we conclude there was a clear intention to include USH in the DWR for sewer and water. This is even more relevant now we will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston. (g) Buddie Findlay's Legal Opinion dated 04/03/2019 states "We note that the Council has recently tended to move to a model where the costs of provision of network infrastructure (such as waste water infrastructure) are spread across the district (ie under district wide targeted rates). It would go against the trend for the Council now to look to recover the greater costs of continuing to provide water services to the [Upper Selwyn] Huts solely from that community." (h) Council has already agreed to fund 70% of the sewer upgrade, indicating the district is prepared to pay towards USH sewer upgrade. There is no good reason why the Council couldn't find the full amount. This was proposed in 4.12.4 of the "Upper Selwyn Huts Future Occupancy Strategy" report dated 04/03/2024.(i) The cost and operational charges for the pipeline continue to change so being on the DWR would give the community certainty. It would also mean that if people choose to leave the settlement early the cost will not increase for the remaining owners.(j) Additionally, we also request that our reticulation system be replaced by SDC as they have been responsible for this since 1989 and have had ample time to replace this.Given the reasons above there is no reason why USH Can not be put on the DWR for Sewer and Water like everyone else.</p>	



Wendy Risdon	<p>1. Submission to recognise Upper Selwyn Huts as a Historical SiteThe Mayor says in the Long Term Plan that “we’re focussed on looking after what we already have” - how about you look after Upper Selwyn Huts!An 1881 plan shows the reserve on which the huts would come to be established was in existence and by the 1890’s at the latest there were huts established there, mainly for fishing and hunting. Given this pre-1900 date, the huts are an archaeological site under the Heritage Pouhere Taonga New Zealand Act. There is a long historic and cultural association with the huts and community over the three centuries of occupation. The Reserve is Crown Land, administered by the Selwyn District Council. In 2015 the purpose was changed (by the Department Conservation) from recreation reserve to Local Purpose – Hut Settlement. On 8 May 2019, the Council unanimously determined that ‘Hut licences and subsequent renewals are short term and ultimately for a finite period’. At its 13 March 2024 meeting Council resolved to accept option 2 (of 4 options) and offered Residents a final 15 year term for occupation of their huts.I am submitting to request that this historical significance be recognised and for the Upper Selwyn Huts to be listed as an historical site on the District Plan and for the term for us being here to be extended to protect this history. ; 2. Submission to Include Upper Selwyn Huts on the District Wide Rates for Sewer and Water The reasons being : (a) We will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston who pay DWR and we have previously paid for our sewer ourselves and a subsequent upgrade, the requirement we were told for being put on DWR. (b) We have already paid for the water upgrade.(c) We should not be discriminated against and should be treated like everyone else in the district. We are tired of being treated as separate from the rest of the district and as second class citizens. This treatment is not fair nor reasonable.(d) We already pay DWR for Recreation Reserve Rate; General Purpose Rate; Library Charge; Community Centre Rate; Uniform Annual General Rate; Water Race (Amenity) Rate; Area Board; Swimming Pools; Canterbury Museum Levy; and Land Drainage.We should also be added to the DWR for Sewer and Water like everyone else. (e) District Wide Rates is already being applied to fund maintenance of sections of the Upper Selwyn Huts Local Purpose Reserve including maintenance of the tennis courts, the reserve’s toilets and community library, and mowing around the dwellings. This sets a precedent that DWR can be applied to our settlement. (f) SDC Towards25 LTP Document stated:“The Council is proposing to introduce a new way of funding water and wastewater, community centres/halls and recreation reserves. These services are currently funded through targeted rates and the Council is proposing to meet the costs of these services by introducing standard district-wide rates. Underpinning this proposal is the view that Selwyn should be seen as one integrated district, rather than simply a series of detached townships. The Council acknowledges that where residents across the district receive a similar level of service for key infrastructure, the cost to residents should also be consistent. In the case of water and wastewater this proposal will also help keep these services affordable for smaller communities.”This document also has USH specifically listed in the “Proposed district-wide rate for urban water compared with existing targeted rates” table. From this we conclude there was a clear intention to include USH in the DWR for sewer and water. This is even more relevant now we will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston. (g) Buddle Findlay’s Legal Opinion dated 04/03/2019 states “We note that the Council has recently tended to move to a model where the costs of provision of network infrastructure (such as waste water infrastructure) are spread across the district (ie under district wide targeted rates). It would go against the trend for the Council now to look to recover the greater costs of continuing to provide water services to the [Upper Selwyn] Huts solely from that community.” (h) Council has already agreed to fund 70% of the sewer upgrade, indicating the district is prepared to pay towards USH sewer upgrade. There is no good reason why the Council couldn’t find the full amount. This was proposed in 4.12.4 of the “Upper Selwyn Huts Future Occupancy Strategy” report dated 04/03/2024.(i) The cost and operational charges for the pipeline continue to change so being on the DWR would give the community certainty. It would also mean that if people choose to leave the settlement early the cost will not increase for the remaining owners.(j) Additionally, we also request that our reticulation system be replaced by SDC as they have been responsible for this since 1989 and have had ample time to replace this.Given the reasons above there is no reason why USH Can not be put on the DWR for Sewer and Water like everyone else.</p>	
Erika Koderich	<p>They should have better consolidation process with upper hut residents.; 1. Submission to recognise Upper Selwyn Huts as a Historical SiteThe Mayor says in the Long Term Plan that “we’re focussed on looking after what we already have” - how about you look after Upper Selwyn Huts!An 1881 plan shows the reserve on which the huts would come to be established was in existence and by the 1890’s at the latest there were huts established there, mainly for fishing and hunting. Given this pre-1900 date, the huts are an archaeological site under the Heritage Pouhere Taonga New Zealand Act. There is a long historic and cultural association with the huts and community over the three centuries of occupation. The Reserve is Crown Land, administered by the Selwyn District Council. In 2015 the purpose was changed (by the Department Conservation) from recreation reserve to Local Purpose – Hut Settlement. On 8 May 2019, the Council unanimously determined that ‘Hut licences and subsequent renewals are short term and ultimately for a finite period’. At its 13 March 2024 meeting Council resolved to accept option 2 (of 4 options) and offered Residents a final 15 year term for occupation of their huts.I am submitting to request that this historical significance be recognised and for the Upper Selwyn Huts to be listed as an historical site on the District Plan and for the term for us being here to be extended to protect this history. 2. Submission to Include Upper Selwyn Huts on the District Wide Rates for Sewer and Water The reasons being : (a) We will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston who pay DWR and we have previously paid for our sewer ourselves and a subsequent upgrade, the requirement we were told for being put on DWR. (b) We have already paid for the water upgrade.(c) We should not be discriminated against and should be treated like everyone else in the district. We are tired of being treated as separate from the rest of the district and as second class citizens. This treatment is not fair nor reasonable.(d) We already pay DWR for Recreation Reserve Rate; General Purpose Rate; Library Charge; Community Centre Rate; Uniform Annual General Rate; Water Race (Amenity) Rate; Area Board; Swimming Pools; Canterbury Museum Levy; and Land Drainage.We should also be added to the DWR for Sewer and Water like everyone else. (e) District Wide Rates is already being applied to fund maintenance of sections of the Upper Selwyn Huts Local Purpose Reserve including maintenance of the tennis courts, the reserve’s toilets and community library, and mowing around the dwellings. This sets a precedent that DWR can be applied to our settlement.(f) SDC Towards25 LTP Document stated:“The Council is proposing to introduce a new way of funding water and wastewater, community centres/halls and recreation reserves. These services are currently funded through targeted rates and the Council is proposing to meet the costs of these services by introducing standard district-wide rates. Underpinning this proposal is the view that Selwyn should be seen as one integrated district, rather than simply a series of detached townships. The Council acknowledges that where residents across the district receive a similar level of service for key infrastructure, the cost to residents should also be consistent. In the case of water and wastewater this proposal will also help keep these services affordable for smaller communities.”This document also has USH specifically listed in the “Proposed district-wide rate for urban water compared with existing targeted rates” table. From this we conclude there was a clear intention to include USH in the DWR for sewer and water. This is even more relevant now we will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston. (g) Buddle Findlay’s Legal Opinion dated 04/03/2019 states “We note that the Council has recently tended to move to a model where the costs of provision of network infrastructure (such as waste water infrastructure) are spread across the district (ie under district wide targeted rates). It would go against the trend for the Council now to look to recover the greater costs of continuing to provide water services to the [Upper Selwyn] Huts solely from that community.” (h) Council has already agreed to fund 70% of the sewer upgrade, indicating the district is prepared to pay towards USH sewer upgrade. There is no good reason why the Council couldn’t find the full amount. This was proposed in 4.12.4 of the “Upper Selwyn Huts Future Occupancy Strategy” report dated 04/03/2024.(i) The cost and operational charges for the pipeline continue to change so being on the DWR would give the community certainty. It would also mean that if people choose to leave the settlement early the cost will not increase for the remaining owners.(j) Additionally, we also request that our reticulation system be replaced by SDC as they have been responsible for this since 1989 and have had ample time to replace this.Given the reasons above there is no reason why USH Can not be put on the DWR for Sewer and Water like everyone else.</p>	
Withheld	<p>Upper Selwyn Huts Historical valueThe Mayor says in the Long Term Plan that “we’re focussed on looking after what we already have” - how about you look after us!An 1881 plan shows the reserve on which the huts would come to be established was in existence and by the 1890’s at the latest there were huts established there, mainly for fishing and hunting. Given this pre-1900 date, the huts are an archaeological site under the Heritage Pouhere Taonga New Zealand Act. There is a long historic and cultural association with the huts and community over the three centuries of occupation. The Reserve is Crown Land, administered by the Selwyn District Council. In 2015 the purpose was changed (by the Department Conservation) from recreation reserve to Local Purpose – Hut Settlement. The huts aren’t currently affected by flooding and are part of many families histories. so why only give them such a short renewal period? Why put them on notice at all? They aren’t being affected by adverse climate change as yet so why are they being called out?</p>	
Alan Miller	<p>1. Submission to recognise Upper Selwyn Huts as a Historical SiteThe Mayor says in the Long Term Plan that “we’re focussed on looking after what we already have” - how about you look after Upper Selwyn Huts!An 1881 plan shows the reserve on which the huts would come to be established was in existence and by the 1890’s at the latest there were huts established there, mainly for fishing and hunting. Given this pre-1900 date, the huts are an archaeological site under the Heritage Pouhere Taonga New Zealand Act. There is a long historic and cultural association with the huts and community over the three centuries of occupation. The Reserve is Crown Land, administered by the Selwyn District Council. In 2015 the purpose was changed (by the Department Conservation) from recreation reserve to Local Purpose – Hut Settlement. On 8 May 2019, the Council unanimously determined that ‘Hut licences and subsequent renewals are short term and ultimately for a finite period’. At its 13 March 2024 meeting Council resolved to accept option 2 (of 4 options) and offered Residents a final 15 year term for occupation of their huts.I am submitting to request that this historical significance be recognised and for the Upper Selwyn Huts to be listed as an historical site on the District Plan and for the term for us being here to be extended to protect this history. 2. Submission to Include Upper Selwyn Huts on the District Wide Rates for Sewer and Water The reasons being : (a) We will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston who pay DWR and we have previously paid for our sewer ourselves and a subsequent upgrade, the requirement we were told for being put on DWR. (b) We have already paid for the water upgrade.(c) We should not be discriminated against and should be treated like everyone else in the district. We are tired of being treated as separate from the rest of the district and as second class citizens. This treatment is not fair nor reasonable.(d) We already pay DWR for Recreation Reserve Rate; General Purpose Rate; Library Charge; Community Centre Rate; Uniform Annual General Rate; Water Race (Amenity) Rate; Area Board; Swimming Pools; Canterbury Museum Levy; and Land Drainage.We should also be added to the DWR for Sewer and Water like everyone else. (e) District Wide Rates is already being applied to fund maintenance of sections of the Upper Selwyn Huts Local Purpose Reserve including maintenance of the tennis courts, the reserve’s toilets and community library, and mowing around the dwellings. This sets a precedent that DWR can be applied to our settlement.(f) SDC Towards25 LTP Document stated:“The Council is proposing to introduce a new way of funding water and wastewater, community centres/halls and recreation reserves. These services are currently funded through targeted rates and the Council is proposing to meet the costs of these services by introducing standard district-wide rates. Underpinning this proposal is the view that Selwyn should be seen as one integrated district, rather than simply a series of detached townships. The Council acknowledges that where residents across the district receive a similar level of service for key infrastructure, the cost to residents should also be consistent. In the case of water and wastewater this proposal will also help keep these services affordable for smaller communities.”This document also has USH specifically listed in the “Proposed district-wide rate for urban water compared with existing targeted rates” table. From this we conclude there was a clear intention to include USH in the DWR for sewer and water. This is even more relevant now we will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston. (g) Buddle Findlay’s Legal Opinion dated 04/03/2019 states “We note that the Council has recently tended to move to a model where the costs of provision of network infrastructure (such as waste water infrastructure) are spread across the district (ie under district wide targeted rates). It would go against the trend for the Council now to look to recover the greater costs of continuing to provide water services to the [Upper Selwyn] Huts solely from that community.” (h) Council has already agreed to fund 70% of the sewer upgrade, indicating the district is prepared to pay towards USH sewer upgrade. There is no good reason why the Council couldn’t find the full amount. This was proposed in 4.12.4 of the “Upper Selwyn Huts Future Occupancy Strategy” report dated 04/03/2024.(i) The cost and operational charges for the pipeline continue to change so being on the DWR would give the community certainty. It would also mean that if people choose to leave the settlement early the cost will not increase for the remaining owners.(j) Additionally, we also request that our reticulation system be replaced by SDC as they have been responsible for this since 1989 and have had ample time to replace this.Given the reasons above there is no reason why USH Can not be put on the DWR for Sewer and Water like everyone else. Additionally i believe SDC should upgrade what USH already has for sewer so we dont have to spend large amounts of money for infrastructure we are not able to use indefinitely. If we do spend that amount of money we should be able tomstay indefinitely. Climate change hasn’t affected us yet and SDC should wait until it is definitely affecting us before deciding our future. The are lots of alternative solutions other than eviction that can counteract future climate change effects such as stop bank changes to redirect the water away from the settlement. SDC are being premature with SDCs reckless finite decisions for this settlement.</p>	
Withheld	<p>1. Historical valueThe Mayor says in the Long Term Plan that “we’re focussed on looking after what we already have” - how about you look after us! An 1881 plan shows the reserve on which the huts would come to be established was in existence and by the 1890’s at the latest there were huts established there, mainly for fishing and hunting. Given this pre-1900 date, the huts are an archaeological site under the Heritage Pouhere Taonga New Zealand Act. There is a long historic and cultural association with the huts and community over the three centuries of occupation. The Reserve is Crown Land, administered by the Selwyn District Council. In 2015 the purpose was changed (by the Department Conservation) from recreation reserve to Local Purpose – Hut Settlement. On 8 May 2019, the Council unanimously determined that ‘Hut licences and subsequent renewals are short term and ultimately for a finite period’. At its 13 March 2024 meeting Council resolved to accept option 2 (of 4 options) and offered Residents a final 15 year term for occupation of their huts. We need to submit requesting this historical significance be recognised and for the Selwyn Huts to be listed as an historical site on the District Plan and for the term for us being here to be extended to protect this history. ; 2. District wide rates Everyone needs to submit on the LTP asking for us to be put on DWR for Water and Sewer.The reasons being : (a) We will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston who pay DWR and we have previously paid for our sewer ourselves and a subsequent upgrade, the requirement we were told for being put on DWR. (b) We have already paid for the water upgrade.(c) We should not be discriminated against and should be treated like everyone else in the district. (d) We already pay DWR for Recreation Reserve Rate; General Purpose Rate; Library Charge; Community Centre Rate; Uniform Annual General Rate; Water Race (Amenity) Rate; Area Board; Swimming Pools; Canterbury Museum Levy; and Land Drainage. We should also be added to the DWR for Sewer and Water like everyone else. (e) Towards25 LTP Document stated:“The Council is proposing to introduce a new way of funding water and wastewater, community centres/halls and recreation reserves. These services are currently funded through targeted rates and the Council is proposing to meet the costs of these services by introducing standard district-wide rates. Underpinning this proposal is the view that Selwyn should be seen as one integrated district, rather than simply a series of detached townships. The Council acknowledges that where residents across the district receive a similar level of service for key infrastructure, the cost to residents should also be consistent. In the case of water and wastewater this proposal will also help keep these services affordable for smaller communities.”This document also has USH specifically listed in the “Proposed district-wide rate for urban water compared with existing targeted rates” table. From this we conclude there was a clear intention to include USH in the DWR for sewer and water. This is even more relevant now we will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston. (f) Buddle Findlay’s Legal Opinion dated 04/03/2019 states “We note that the Council has recently tended to move to a model where the costs of provision of network infrastructure (such as waste water infrastructure) are spread across the district (ie under district wide targeted rates). It would go against the trend for the Council now to look to recover the greater costs of continuing to provide water services to the [Upper Selwyn] Huts solely from that community.” (g) Council has already agreed to fund 70% of the sewer upgrade, indicating the district is prepared to pay towards USH sewer upgrade. There is no good reason why the Council couldn’t find the full amount. This was proposed in 4.12.4 of the “Upper Selwyn Huts Future Occupancy Strategy” report dated 04/03/2024. (h) The cost and operational charges for the pipeline continue to change so being on the DWR would give the community certainty. It would also mean that if people choose to leave the settlement early the cost will not increase for the remaining owners.(i) Additionally we also request that our reticulation system be replaced by SDC as they have been responsible for this since 1989 and have had ample time to replace this.Given the reasons above there is no reason why USH Can not be put on the DWR for Sewer and Water like everyone else. Thankyou [name withheld].</p>	
Withheld	<p>Review the 15 year finite period to a longer more fair period and remove the inhumane conditions with the 24 hour eviction policy listed on the new DOL for the selwyn Huts community.</p>	



Char Webb	<p>1. Submission to recognise Upper Selwyn Huts as a Historical SiteThe Mayor says in the Long Term Plan that “we’re focussed on looking after what we already have” - how about you look after Upper Selwyn Huts!An 1881 plan shows the reserve on which the huts would come to be established was in existence and by the 1890’s at the latest there were huts established there, mainly for fishing and hunting. Given this pre-1900 date, the huts are an archaeological site under the Heritage Pouhere Taonga New Zealand Act. There is a long historic and cultural association with the huts and community over the three centuries of occupation. The Reserve is Crown Land, administered by the Selwyn District Council. In 2015 the purpose was changed (by the Department Conservation) from recreation reserve to Local Purpose – Hut Settlement. On 8 May 2019, the Council unanimously determined that ‘Hut licences and subsequent renewals are short term and ultimately for a finite period’. At its 13 March 2024 meeting Council resolved to accept option 2 (of 4 options) and offered Residents a final 15 year term for occupation of their huts.I am submitting to request that this historical significance be recognised and for the Upper Selwyn Huts to be listed as an historical site on the District Plan and for the term for us being here to be extended to protect this history. 2. Submission to Include Upper Selwyn Huts on the District Wide Rates for Sewer and Water The reasons being : (a) We will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston who pay DWR and we have previously paid for our sewer ourselves and a subsequent upgrade, the requirement we were told for being put on DWR. (b) We have already paid for the water upgrade.(c) We should not be discriminated against and should be treated like everyone else in the district. We are tired of being treated as separate from the rest of the district and as second class citizens. This treatment is not fair nor reasonable.(d) We already pay DWR for Recreation Reserve Rate; General Purpose Rate; Library Charge; Community Centre Rate; Uniform Annual General Rate; Water Race (Amenity) Rate; Area Board; Swimming Pools; Canterbury Museum Levy; and Land Drainage.We should also be added to the DWR for Sewer and Water like everyone else. (e) District Wide Rates is already being applied to fund maintenance of sections of the Upper Selwyn Huts Local Purpose Reserve including maintenance of the tennis courts, the reserve’s toilets and community library, and mowing around the dwellings. This sets a precedent that DWR can be applied to our settlement.(f) SDC Towards25 LTP Document stated:“The Council is proposing to introduce a new way of funding water and wastewater, community centres/halls and recreation reserves. These services are currently funded through targeted rates and the Council is proposing to meet the costs of these services by introducing standard district-wide rates. Underpinning this proposal is the view that Selwyn should be seen as one integrated district, rather than simply a series of detached townships. The Council acknowledges that where residents across the district receive a similar level of service for key infrastructure, the cost to residents should also be consistent. In the case of water and wastewater this proposal will also help keep these services affordable for smaller communities.”This document also has USH specifically listed in the “Proposed district-wide rate for urban water compared with existing targeted rates” table. From this we conclude there was a clear intention to include USH in the DWR for sewer and water. This is even more relevant now we will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston. (g) Buddle Findlay’s Legal Opinion dated 04/03/2019 states “We note that the Council has recently tended to move to a model where the costs of provision of network infrastructure (such as waste water infrastructure) are spread across the district (ie under district wide targeted rates). It would go against the trend for the Council now to look to recover the greater costs of continuing to provide water services to the [Upper Selwyn] Huts solely from that community.” (h) Council has already agreed to fund 70% of the sewer upgrade, indicating the district is prepared to pay towards USH sewer upgrade. There is no good reason why the Council couldn’t fund the full amount. This was proposed in 4.12.4 of the “Upper Selwyn Huts Future Occupancy Strategy” report dated 04/03/2024.(i) The cost and operational charges for the pipeline continue to change so being on the DWR would give the community certainty. It would also mean that if people choose to leave the settlement early the cost will not increase for the remaining owners.(j) Additionally, we also request that our reticulation system be replaced by SDC as they have been responsible for this since 1989 and have had ample time to replace this.Given the reasons above there is no reason why USH Can not be put on the DWR for Sewer and Water like everyone else.</p>	
Anne de la Cour	<p>2. District wide rates I wish to make a further submission that the Upper Selwyn Huts be put on the district wide rates for water and sewer like all other communitites within the Selwyn District. The Council has agreed to fund 70% of the Upper Selwyn Huts sewer upgrade, however the Council acknowledges that where residents across the district receive a similar level of service for key infrastructure, the costs to residents should also be consistent. Given that the Council has recently tended to move to a model where the costs of provision of infrastructure to the network (such as waste water infrastructure) are spread across the district via the district wide rates it would go against the trend for the Council to look to recover the greater costs of continuing to provide water, waste water, and sewage services to the Upper Selwyn Huts solely from that community.; 1. Historical Value of the Upper Selwyn Huts. I wish to make a submission requesting the historical significance of the Upper Selwyn Huts be recognised and listed as a historical site in the District Plan and the term of the huts be extended for an infinite time to protect this history. Our hut is one of the earlier huts built in the late 1890s and my family has a long historic and cultural association with the huts and community over our 3 generations of occupancy.</p>	
Daniel Curtis	<p>Dear Selwyn District Council,Please reconsider your plan to only give the Upper Selwyn Huts another 15 years. I’m 41 years old now and I along with my siblings spent nearly all our summers staying at the Selwyn Huts at our family’s hut.It’s actually Crown Land and on 22 March 1895 the Governor General of the Colony of New Zealand declared the area “a reserve made for public recreation in the Land District of Canterbury and to be known as The Lake Ellesmere Recreation Ground.” This followed an application by Mr Spackman (Secretary of the Canterbury Angling Society) to set aside 20 acres of Reserve No: 959.The Upper Selwyn Huts was where our holiday bach was when we were kids, now we’re taking our own children out there to visit their Nanna, my mum owns a Hut there still and she planned to retire there and no doubt see out the rest of her years living in that community that we all love so dearly. My family and I have such good memories of the Selwyn Huts community from all of the events held every year, encouraging everyone to give it a go and get the community together.It was here where I learnt to play tennis, caught my first trout, eel and perch, climbed throughout the hedges and making tree huts.We used to have so much fun here, in the playground and in the paddocks, running races, darts, tennis matches, swimming races, smoking eels with neighbours and good old get togethers. It was so much fun and we always eagerly anticipated our Christmas holidays there.All of the community love their homes and the spirit and upkeep of the place was always in the best spirit of the huts and surrounding community.I will dearly miss this place as will so many others if the Huts are to be destroyed in 15 years or less. Please consider a much longer maximum term than 15 years for Upper Selwyn Huts. The Selwyn Hut owners and residents have been paying towards many of the Selwyn District Community assests, but yet they have not been included in the district wide rating scheme, which is discrimination in my view. Council should be looking to repair and replace the reticulation system. They have been in charge of this since 1989 and have not done any maintenance. It’s not the residents fault that Council have dropped the ball!The Upper Selwyn Huts is a historic place and should be treated as such. The Upper Selwyn Huts have little to no impact on Te Taumutu Runanga’s mana whenua, their ability to practice mahinga kai and on the health of Te Waihora/Lake Ellesmere. For 130 Years the Selwyn Huts hasn’t bothered anyone. Why now? You should all be ashamed, maybe look to reducing cow numbers in the catchment before you kick people out of their homes for no good reason. Ngai Tahu has no right to this land, how many of you would sacrifice your own homes to honor their ancestors and return your farm land to what it once was in the 1800’s. I bet, none of you. Please reconsider the maximum 15 year term and your discrimination against the Upper Selwyn Huts. You have nearly gone down a path where you will be embarrassed in the High Court of you try to execute your barbaric treatment of this historic Selwyn District place, the Upper Selwyn Huts.</p>	
Jo Glynn	<p>1. Historical Value The Mayor says in the Long Term Plan that “we’re focused on looking after what we already have” - how about you look after us!An 1881 plan shows the reserve on which the huts would come to be established was in existence and by the 1890’s at the latest there were huts established there, mainly for fishing and hunting. Given this pre-1900 date, the huts are an archaeological site under the Heritage Pouhere Taonga New Zealand Act. There is a long historic and cultural association with the huts and community over the three centuries of occupation. The Reserve is Crown Land, administered by the Selwyn District Council. In 2015 the purpose was changed (by the Department Conservation) from recreation reserve to Local Purpose – Hut Settlement. On 8 May 2019, the Council unanimously determined that ‘Hut licences and subsequent renewals are short term and ultimately for a finite period’. At its 13 March 2024 meeting Council resolved to accept option 2 (of 4 options) and offered Residents a final 15 year term for occupation of their huts.I request the historical significance of the Upper Selwyn huts be recognised and the Selwyn Huts to be listed as a historical site on the district plan and the term for us being here to be extended to protect this history.; 2. District Wide Rates (a) We will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston who pay DWR and we have previously paid for our sewer ourselves and a subsequent upgrade, the requirement we were told for being put on DWR. (b) We have already paid for the water upgrade.(c) We should not be discriminated against and should be treated like everyone else in the district. (d) We already pay DWR for Recreation Reserve Rate; General Purpose Rate; Library Charge; Community Centre Rate; Uniform Annual General Rate; Water Race (Amenity) Rate; Area Board; Swimming Pools; Canterbury Museum Levy; and Land Drainage. We should also be added to the DWR for Sewer and Water like everyone else. (e) Towards25 LTP Document stated:“The Council is proposing to introduce a new way of funding water and wastewater, community centres/halls and recreation reserves. These services are currently funded through targeted rates and the Council is proposing to meet the costs of these services by introducing standard district-wide rates. Underpinning this proposal is the view that Selwyn should be seen as one integrated district, rather than simply a series of detached townships. The Council acknowledges that where residents across the district receive a similar level of service for key infrastructure, the cost to residents should also be consistent. In the case of water and wastewater this proposal will also help keep these services affordable for smaller communities.”This document also has USH specifically listed in the “Proposed district-wide rate for urban water compared with existing targeted rates” table. From this we conclude there was a clear intention to include USH in the DWR for sewer and water. This is even more relevant now we will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston. (f) Buddle Findlay’s Legal Opinion dated 04/03/2019 states “We note that the Council has recently tended to move to a model where the costs of provision of network infrastructure (such as waste water infrastructure) are spread across the district (ie under district wide targeted rates). It would go against the trend for the Council now to look to recover the greater costs of continuing to provide water services to the [Upper Selwyn] Huts solely from that community.” (g) Council has already agreed to fund 70% of the sewer upgrade, indicating the district is prepared to pay towards USH sewer upgrade. There is no good reason why the Council couldn’t find the full amount. This was proposed in 4.12.4 of the “Upper Selwyn Huts Future Occupancy Strategy” report dated 04/03/2024. (h) The cost and operational charges for the pipeline continue to change so being on the DWR would give the community certainty. It would also mean that if people choose to leave the settlement early the cost will not increase for the remaining owners.(i) Additionally we also request that our reticulation system be replaced by SDC as they have been responsible for this since 1989 and have had ample time to replace this.Given the reasons above there is no reason why USH Can not be put on the DWR for Sewer and Water like everyone else.</p>	
Suzanne Allen	<p>I would like the Upper Selwyn Huts to be included in the District Wide rates for sewer and water.Upper Selwyn Huts to be listed as a historical site on the SDC website.To reconsider the 15yr term for occupancy at Upper Selwyn Huts.</p>	
Glenda Hope	<p>i forgot to add this: living at the Selwyn Huts means no more mortgages, what a freeing feeling. My house, my jome is now worth nothing. I had thought if keaving it to my neice but now feel i couldnt put that burden on her. Feels like i have been stabbed in the back twice</p>	
Withheld	<p>Selwyn Huts - even though this decision has been made I feel they should be kept as part of Selwyns history and heritage. Batch settlements like this one at Selwyn Huts are unique and iconic to New Zealand and if SDC were serious about its Heritage Strategy they would actually start doing things that illustrate this. In the recent District plan there were no heritage protection actions taken. In fact the opposite was documented. It is amazing to uphold the tangata whenua history but the reality is that places such as Lincoln have a strong and still important colonial history and this should be maintained as well. Lincoln has its roots as an agricultural town and this should be celebrated. Maintaining our valuable highly productive land should have been and should be in the future a high priority as it cannot be replaced once lost. We need to maintain the food security of the community for the future - especially in the face of cimate change.</p>	
Danielle Beecroft	<p>Selwyn Huts ongoing 1. Historical value The Mayor says in the Long Term Plan that “we’re focussed on looking after what we already have” - how about you look after us! An 1881 plan shows the reserve on which the huts would come to be established was in existence and by the 1890’s at the latest there were huts established there, mainly for fishing and hunting. Given this pre-1900 date, the huts are an archaeological site under the Heritage Pouhere Taonga New Zealand Act. There is a long historic and cultural association with the huts and community over the three centuries of occupation. The Reserve is Crown Land, administered by the Selwyn District Council. In 2015 the purpose was changed (by the Department Conservation) from recreation reserve to Local Purpose – Hut Settlement. On 8 May 2019, the Council unanimously determined that ‘Hut licences and subsequent renewals are short term and ultimately for a finite period’. At its 13 March 2024 meeting Council resolved to accept option 2 (of 4 options) and offered Residents a final 15 year term for occupation of their huts. We need to submit requesting this historical significance be recognised and for the Selwyn Huts to be listed as an historical site on the District Plan and for the term for us being here to be extended to protect this history. 2. District wide rates Everyone needs to submit on the LTP asking for us to be put on DWR for Water and Sewer. The reasons being : (a) We will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston who pay DWR and we have previously paid for our sewer ourselves and a subsequent upgrade, the requirement we were told for being put on DWR. (b) We have already paid for the water upgrade. (c) We should not be discriminated against and should be treated like everyone else in the district. (d) We already pay DWR for Recreation Reserve Rate; General Purpose Rate; Library Charge; Community Centre Rate; Uniform Annual General Rate; Water Race (Amenity) Rate; Area Board; Swimming Pools; Canterbury Museum Levy; and Land Drainage. We should also be added to the DWR for Sewer and Water like everyone else. (e) Towards25 LTP Document stated: “The Council is proposing to introduce a new way of funding water and wastewater, community centres/halls and recreation reserves. These services are currently funded through targeted rates and the Council is proposing to meet the costs of these services by introducing standard districtwide rates. Underpinning this proposal is the view that Selwyn should be seen as one integrated district, rather than simply a series of detached townships. The Council acknowledges that where residents across the district receive a similar level of service for key infrastructure, the cost to residents should also be consistent. In the case of water and wastewater this proposal will also help keep these services affordable for smaller communities.” This document also has USH specifically listed in the “Proposed district-wide rate for urban water compared with existing targeted rates” table. From this we conclude there was a clear intention to include USH in the DWR for sewer and water. This is even more relevant now we will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston. (f) Buddle Findlay’s Legal Opinion dated 04/03/2019 states “We note that the Council has recently tended to move to a model where the costs of provision of network infrastructure (such as waste water infrastructure) are spread across the district (ie under district wide targeted rates). It would go against the trend for the Council now to look to recover the greater costs of continuing to provide water services to the [Upper Selwyn] Huts solely from that community.” (g) Council has already agreed to fund 70% of the sewer upgrade, indicating the district is prepared to pay towards USH sewer upgrade. There is no good reason why the Council couldn’t find the full amount. This was proposed in 4.12.4 of the “Upper Sekwyn Huts Future Occupancy Strategy” report dated 04/03/2024. (h) The cost and operational charges for the pipeline continue to change so being on the DWR would give the community certainty. It would also mean that if people choose to leave the settlement early the cost will not increase for the remaining owners. (i) Additionally we also request that our reticulation system be replaced by SDC as they have been responsible for this since 1989 and have had ample time to replace this. Given the reasons above there is no reason why USH Can not be put on the DWR for Sewer and Water like everyone else.</p>	



Withheld	<p>existence and by the 1890's at the latest there were huts established there, mainly for fishing and hunting. Given this pre-1900 date, the huts are an archaeological site under the Heritage Pouhere Taonga New Zealand Act. There is a long historic and cultural association with the huts and community over the three centuries of occupation. The Reserve is Crown Land, administered by the Selwyn District Council. In 2015 the purpose was changed (by the Department Conservation) from recreation reserve to Local Purpose – Hut Settlement. On 8 May 2019, the Council unanimously determined that 'Hut licences and subsequent renewals are short term and ultimately for a finite period'. At its 13 March 2024 meeting Council resolved to accept option 2 (of 4 options) and offered Residents a final 15 year term for occupation of their huts. We need to submit requesting this historical significance be recognised and for the Selwyn Huts to be listed as an historical site on the District Plan and for the term for us being here to be extended to protect this history. ; The Mayor says in the Long Term Plan that "we're focussed on looking after what we already have" - how about you look after us!An 1881 plan shows the reserve on which the huts would come to be established was in existence and by the 1890's at the latest there were huts established there, mainly for fishing and hunting. Given this pre-1900 date, the huts are an archaeological site under the Heritage Pouhere Taonga New Zealand Act. There is a long historic and cultural association with the huts and community over the three centuries of occupation. The Reserve is Crown Land, administered by the Selwyn District Council. In 2015 the purpose was changed (by the Department Conservation) from recreation reserve to Local Purpose – Hut Settlement. On 8 May 2019, the Council unanimously determined that 'Hut licences and subsequent renewals are short term and ultimately for a finite period'. At its 13 March 2024 meeting Council resolved to accept option 2 (of 4 options) and offered Residents a final 15 year term for occupation of their huts. We need to submit requesting this historical significance be recognised and for the Selwyn Huts to be listed as an historical site on the District Plan and for the term for us being here to be extended to protect this history.</p>	
Clare Ryan	<p>"We're focused on looking after what we already have" 2024GREAT???? the council needs to look after the community of Upper Selwyn Huts.Two Main Reasons:the Huts Communities have historical value and given the fast pace of change in the Selwyn District so much heritage is disappearing under new development. Upper Selwyn Huts has significant historic value to our district for- hosting the Future King George in 1927- for being one of the earliest recreational reserves in Canterbury- for having the first community water and sewerage scheme in the district (1927 for the sewerage)- for being the home of one of the most famous fly fishing lures invented at Upper Selwyn Huts- for many other reasons associated with a history of sport and recreation in SelwynEquity, Justice &amp; FairnessIn 2020 SDC Councillors voted to destroy the Upper Selwyn Huts Community against Council advice. Council advice was a new 30 year licence to occupy and district wide rating to fund required upgrades to water &amp; sewerage infrastructure. The Mayor received a 'Please Explain' letter from MP Amy Adams of which I received a copy. In 2024 it appears the Mayor and Councillors are doubling down on their 2020 decision. This is not honourable, not legitimate behaviour from representatives of the voters. Having snit for being reprimanded for poor decision making is not a justification for doubling down on said poor decision making. Upper Selwyn Huts should be treated the same as every other community in the Selwyn District, that being :-(a) We will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston who pay DWR and we have previously paid for our sewer ourselves and a subsequent upgrade, the requirement we were told for being put on DWR. (b) We have already paid for the water upgrade.(c) We should not be discriminated against and should be treated like everyone else in the district. (d) We already pay DWR for Recreation Reserve Rate; General Purpose Rate; Library Charge; Community Centre Rate; Uniform Annual General Rate; Water Race (Amenity) Rate; Area Board; Swimming Pools; Canterbury Museum Levy; and Land Drainage. We should also be added to the DWR for Sewer and Water like everyone else. (e) Towards25 LTP Document stated:"The Council is proposing to introduce a new way of funding water and wastewater, community centres/halls and recreation reserves. These services are currently funded through targeted rates and the Council is proposing to meet the costs of these services by introducing standard district-wide rates. Underpinning this proposal is the view that Selwyn should be seen as one integrated district, rather than simply a series of detached townships. The Council acknowledges that where residents across the district receive a similar level of service for key infrastructure, the cost to residents should also be consistent. In the case of water and wastewater this proposal will also help keep these services affordable for smaller communities."This document also has USH specifically listed in the "Proposed district-wide rate for urban water compared with existing targeted rates" table. From this we conclude there was a clear intention to include USH in the DWR for sewer and water. This is even more relevant now we will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston. (f) Buddle Findlay's Legal Opinion dated 04/03/2019 states "We note that the Council has recently tended to move to a model where the costs of provision of network infrastructure (such as waste water infrastructure) are spread across the district (ie under district wide targeted rates). It would go against the trend for the Council now to look to recover the greater costs of continuing to provide water services to the [Upper Selwyn] Huts solely from that community." (g) Council has already agreed to fund 70% of the sewer upgrade, indicating the district is prepared to pay towards USH sewer upgrade. There is no good reason why the Council couldn't find the full amount. This was proposed in 4.12.4 of the "Upper Selwyn Huts Future Occupancy Strategy" report dated 04/03/2024. (h) The cost and operational charges for the pipeline continue to change so being on the DWR would give the community certainty. It would also mean that if people choose to leave the settlement early the cost will not increase for the remaining owners.(i) Additionally we also request that our reticulation system be replaced by SDC as they have been responsible for this since 1989 and have had ample time to replace this. Given the reasons above there is no reason why USH Can not be put on the DWR for Sewer and Water like everyone else.</p>	
Withheld	<p>1. My first question would be WHY is SDC so determined to close down an entire community. The land belongs to the Crown, and I understand, is only administered by SDC. At any point in time, has the Crown given any indication of wanting to dispose of the land? Does the Crown have a hidden agenda? What possible purpose would it serve The Crown to close an entire community?The Huts have been occupied since the 1890's, mainly for fishing. Given this pre-1900 date, the huts are an archaeological site under the Heritage Pouhere Taonga New Zealand Act, and as such, should be protected. 2. The reason given by SDC, and now bandied about in the press coverage is all about Climate change, in particular rising sea levels and the danger of flooding. If you were to research this supposition, you would see that Leeston and other surrounding areas would be flooded long before Upper Selwyn Huts. I would pose the question here, Are you threatening to evict these communities as well? In addition to this, if you have been so worried about rising sea-levels, why as a council, do you continue to grant building consents to these areas? 3. The stumbling block in all this seems to be the issue of water and sewerage. It is understood that we will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston who pay District Wide Rates. We were told that a requirement for being put on the DWR was to pay for our sewer ourselves and a subsequent upgrade, which we did. Why then are we being discriminated against as we already pay DWR for Recreation Reserve Rate; General Purpose Rate; Library Charge; Community Centre Rate; Water Race (Amenity) Rate; Area Board; Swimming Pools; Canterbury Museum Levy; and Land Drainage? Why have we not been added to the DWR for Sewer and Water? Quoting 'Towards25 Long Term Planning Document "The Council is proposing to introduce a new way of funding water and wastewater, community centres/halls and recreation reserves. These services are currently funded through targeted rates and the Council is proposing to meet the costs of these services by introducing standard district-wide rates. Underpinning this proposal is the view that "Selwyn should be seen as one integrated district", rather than simply a series of detached townships. The Council acknowledges that where residents across the district receive a similar level of service for key infrastructure, "the cost to residents should also be consistent". In the case of water and wastewater this proposal will also help keep these services affordable for smaller communities.' This document also has USH specifically listed in the "Proposed district-wide rate for urban water compared with existing targeted rates" table. From this we conclude there was a clear intention to include USH in the DWR for sewer and water. This is even more relevant now we will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston. The council took charge of the reticulation system in 1989, I believe, and to my knowledge have done NO maintenance. It is high time that we were moved onto the District wide water/sewerage system and put an end to these arguments 4. Another question is why was consent given to build new properties, and to improve older existing properties, if the council had these current plans in mind? When we applied for consent to build s7(2)(a) s7(2)(a) We had to commission engineers and specialists to take into account sea levels, wind speeds, snow bearing loads of the roof etc. We complied with everything and were granted our CCC. What has changed in the meantime? 5. My final point is that post-quake, saw the move of people from Christchurch whose home had been destroyed, using their insurance payouts to fund the upgrades to their Hut, with a view to living out their lives in comfort. Not only are you wanting to evict people, but insulting them by telling them to destroy their homes at their own cost. With no compensation, how on Earth do you think that they are going to be able to even rent a place to live, or are you proposing to build homes to rehouse an entire community? As elected Councillors, you have a duty to represent your electorate. Showing your absolute lack of compassion in this case, I would put forward that you are not fit to govern.Yours sincerely [name withheld]</p>	
Kerry Glynn	<p>The Selwyn Huts have been an established recreational reserve for an extended period, greater than 100 years. The Selwyn District Council has had responsibility for management of this area as a reserve since 1989 and have not done any of the legally required activities since then. Now they want to terminate the reserve by limiting the licence available to leaseholders. The SDC failure is now being foisted onto the residents there and that should not be done. The Selwyn Huts should be listed as a history site on the District Plan. It pre-dates the 1900s so is an archaeological site under Heritage Pouhere Taonga Act. All homes and all people should be protected. It's unfair to cease offering a licence to the Selwyn Huts leaseholders. Review the 15 year finite term and let us stay. This also helps preserve our kiwi history! It's unfair not to include Selwyn Huts on the District Wide Rate for water and sewer. Excluding a community in the district goes against the purpose of introducing the DWR in the first place. The legal opinion from Council's own lawyers have highlighted this. Leaseholders should not be discriminated against and should be treated like everyone else in the district. Replace the reticulation system. Council have been in charge of this since 1989 and dropped the ball by not doing any maintenance and upgrades over the last 35 years. Don't use your incompetence as an excuse to make us pay or to kick leaseholders out. With the current difficulties with affordable housing availability the councils statements on page 12 of the plan, "looking for modern, affordable housing, with good amenities and services" should also consider that many people, not necessarily young, thrive in an environment like the Selwyn Huts. The SDC should reflect and protect the Selwyn Huts environment. Of course climate change may have an impact and this can be factored into a licence and be triggered by a threshold that directly affects the Selwyn Huts, not by some unspecified event.</p>	
Erin Smyth	<p>hello, My comments are about the Upper Selwyn Huts (USH) 1. Historical valueThe Mayor says in the Long Term Plan that "we're focussed on looking after what we already have" - how about you look after us!An 1881 plan shows the reserve on which the huts would come to be established was in existence and by the 1890's at the latest there were huts established there, mainly for fishing and hunting. Given this pre-1900 date, the huts are an archaeological site under the Heritage Pouhere Taonga New Zealand Act. There is a long historic and cultural association with the huts and community over the three centuries of occupation. The Reserve is Crown Land, administered by the Selwyn District Council. In 2015 the purpose was changed (by the Department Conservation) from recreation reserve to Local Purpose – Hut Settlement. On 8 May 2019, the Council unanimously determined that 'Hut licences and subsequent renewals are short term and ultimately for a finite period'. At its 13 March 2024 meeting Council resolved to accept option 2 (of 4 options) and offered Residents a final 15 year term for occupation of their huts.We need to submit requesting this historical significance be recognised and for the Selwyn Huts to be listed as an historical site on the District Plan and for the term for us being here to be extended to protect this history. 2. District wide rates Everyone needs to submit on the LTP asking for us to be put on DWR for Water and Sewer.The reasons being :-(a) We will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston who pay DWR and we have previously paid for our sewer ourselves and a subsequent upgrade, the requirement we were told for being put on DWR. (b) We have already paid for the water upgrade.(c) We should not be discriminated against and should be treated like everyone else in the district. (d) We already pay DWR for Recreation Reserve Rate; General Purpose Rate; Library Charge; Community Centre Rate; Uniform Annual General Rate; Water Race (Amenity) Rate; Area Board; Swimming Pools; Canterbury Museum Levy; and Land Drainage. We should also be added to the DWR for Sewer and Water like everyone else. (e) Towards25 LTP Document stated:"The Council is proposing to introduce a new way of funding water and wastewater, community centres/halls and recreation reserves. These services are currently funded through targeted rates and the Council is proposing to meet the costs of these services by introducing standard district-wide rates. Underpinning this proposal is the view that Selwyn should be seen as one integrated district, rather than simply a series of detached townships. The Council acknowledges that where residents across the district receive a similar level of service for key infrastructure, the cost to residents should also be consistent. In the case of water and wastewater this proposal will also help keep these services affordable for smaller communities."This document also has USH specifically listed in the "Proposed district-wide rate for urban water compared with existing targeted rates" table. From this we conclude there was a clear intention to include USH in the DWR for sewer and water. This is even more relevant now we will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston. (f) Buddle Findlay's Legal Opinion dated 04/03/2019 states "We note that the Council has recently tended to move to a model where the costs of provision of network infrastructure (such as waste water infrastructure) are spread across the district (ie under district wide targeted rates). It would go against the trend for the Council now to look to recover the greater costs of continuing to provide water services to the [Upper Selwyn] Huts solely from that community." (g) Council has already agreed to fund 70% of the sewer upgrade, indicating the district is prepared to pay towards USH sewer upgrade. There is no good reason why the Council couldn't find the full amount. This was proposed in 4.12.4 of the "Upper Selwyn Huts Future Occupancy Strategy" report dated 04/03/2024. (h) The cost and operational charges for the pipeline continue to change so being on the DWR would give the community certainty. It would also mean that if people choose to leave the settlement early the cost will not increase for the remaining owners.(i) Additionally we also request that our reticulation system be replaced by SDC as they have been responsible for this since 1989 and have had ample time to replace this.</p>	
7(2)(a)	<p>To the Selwyn District Councillors, I wish to oppose two of your recent decisions regarding the Upper Selwyn Huts. The first is the charge for connection to the new sewer pipeline; the second is the closing of the village in 2039. Regarding the sewer, this community installed, and paid for its own sewer as far back as the 1920's. Granted, it is no longer fit for purpose, but for 100 years this treatment system served a purpose, and, this is my main point, relieved the council of theresponsibility and expense of providing something similar. For the council to now turn around and ask 100 mainly low income households to stump up even 30% of the cost of the upgrade is not only patently unfair, but ungrateful. The cost of the upgrade should be spread across the entire district, in the same way an improvement to a library or sports facility would be. This seems especially obvious when one considers that the leases for occupying the huts will end in 15 years. The council is asking the residents to pay for something which will be used long after they have been evicted from their homes. This is wrong. Moreover, a yearly rates/fees/sewer combined cost of nearly \$5,000 is far too much for most people. It makes us think the council's agenda is more about lower class socioeconomic cleansing than supposed climate change. But it brings me to the next point. The reasons for the 15 year lease are neither compelling nor clear, but seem to centre around climate change and consequent sea level rise. The council's own modelling, however, shows sea level rise will not be a problem for at least 25 years. And this is modelling. Given that modelling can be wrong (either way), surely it would be fairer to let nature, and the market, decide. If the lake level threatens the settlement, people will move. If they don't THEN is the time to signal the ending of the leases. It's not something that will happen overnight, like an earthquake. There will be plenty of warning. Everyone at the huts will be severely financially affected by your 15 year closure. The retired people cannot afford to rent; the young folk have lost value from their houses. Given the problems of homelessness in this country I cannot see how your 15 year lease fits with the image of "consultation" and "listening" you promote on your website. A 30 year lease would significantly relieve the stress and tension which has arisen since your announcement, while still acknowledging your concerns around climate change. It would not not be a big change for ten councillors, but it would make a huge difference to 100 residents. [name withheld]</p>	
Glenda hope	<p>Save the Selwyn HutsI have lived in my home at the Selwyn Huts since 2013. I have lived here for eleven happy years. I was in Lyttelton and had the opportunity to buy here. I spent all of my savings buying my home (you need to be a cash buyer). I feel proud of my lovely house and I have always felt safe and secure here. My home is warm and dry and it is the first home I have bought. It is full of personality with beautiful tongue and groove walls and ceilings. It has its own personality, its my sanctuary and like every other place here it is full of history. The thought of it being demolished breaks my heart - what will I do and where will I go? I have no family here and my friends are at the Huts - it is like a family here. When you return it to an 'open space', can I pitch a tent here for myself because that is the only option for me that I can see. There are a lot of bloody good people here and you - the SDC - are causing so much grief, uncertainty and anxiety for us. I thought you were FOR the people but you are not. Save the Selwyn Huts. Why are we not going to be included on the district wide rate? That is not fair to discriminate against us when you let all the other towns be on this.</p>	



s7(2)(a)	s7(2)(a)	
Nikau Te Ngaru	<p>1) HISTORICAL VALUEAn 1881 plan shows the reserve on which the huts would come to be established was in existence and by the 1890's at the latest there were huts established there, mainly for fishing and hunting. Given this pre-1900 date, the huts are an archaeological site under the Heritage Pouhere Taonga New Zealand Act. There is a long historic and cultural association with the huts and community over the three centuries of occupation. The Reserve is Crown Land, administered by the Selwyn District Council. In 2015 the purpose was changed (by the Department Conservation) from recreation reserve to Local Purpose – Hut Settlement. On 8 May 2019, the Council unanimously determined that 'Hut licences and subsequent renewals are short term and ultimately for a finite period' . At its 13 March 2024 meeting Council resolved to accept option 2 (of 4 options) and offered Residents a final 15 year term for occupation of their huts.Put the Selwyn Huts on the DWR. The reasons being(a) We will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston who pay DWR and we have previously paid for our sewer system twice before, the requirement for being put on DWR. (b) We have already paid for the water upgrade in 2018(c) We should not be discriminated against and should be treated like everyone else in the district. (d) We already pay DWR for Recreation Reserve Rate; General Purpose Rate; Library Charge; Community Centre Rate; Uniform Annual General Rate; Water Race (Amenity) Rate; Area Board; Swimming Pools; Canterbury Museum Levy; and Land Drainage. We should also be added to the DWR for Sewer and Water like everyone else. (e) Towards25 LTP Document stated:“The Council is proposing to introduce a new way of funding water and wastewater, community centres/halls and recreation reserves. These services are currently funded through targeted rates and the Council is proposing to meet the costs of these services by introducing standard district-wide rates. Underpinning this proposal is the view that Selwyn should be seen as one integrated district, rather than simply a series of detached townships. The Council acknowledges that where residents across the district receive a similar level of service for key infrastructure, the cost to residents should also be consistent. In the case of water and wastewater this proposal will also help keep these services affordable for smaller communities.”This document also has USH specifically listed in the “Proposed district-wide rate for urban water compared with existing targeted rates” table. From this we conclude there was a clear intention to include USH in the DWR for sewer and water. This is even more relevant now we will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston. (f) Buddle Findlay’s Legal Opinion dated 04/03/2019 states “We note that the Council has recently tended to move to a model where the costs of provision of network infrastructure (such as waste water infrastructure) are spread across the district (ie under district wide targeted rates). It would go against the trend for the Council now to look to recover the greater costs of continuing to provide water services to the [Upper Selwyn] Huts solely from that community.” (g) Council has already agreed to fund 70% of the sewer upgrade, indicating the district is prepared to pay towards USH sewer upgrade. There is no good reason why the Council couldn’t find the full amount. This was proposed in 4.12.4 of the “Upper Selwyn Huts Future Occupancy Strategy” report dated 04/03/2024. It. Is. The. Right. Thing. To. Do !!!!Given the reasons above there is no reason why USH Can not be put on the DWR for Sewer and Water like everyone else. Additionally we also request that our reticulation system be replaced by SDC as they have been responsible for this since 1989. It is not our fault that you have dropped the ball and neglected us</p>	
Withheld	It makes me really angry to hear about the way this council is treating the Selwyn Huts. This place has historical significance and should be recognised and protected. Let the residents stay, they are the kaitiaki and will help preserve our New Zealand history!!Let them go on the District Wide Rate. It's bad enough what you are doing to them, evicting them with no compensation, and then you're increasing their fees by over 200%!!! They are part of the district. Put them on the District Wide Rates.	
Withheld	I have cried for the people of the selwyn huts, hearing their stories. I have happy memories of this place and would hate to see it all burned to the ground. Sick!!!! Change your mind!!! let them stay!!! with an agreement that they will go when it is actually not safe anymore. thats totally reasonable for them to ask that. and pay them out when its not!!!!!! live in the district and i for one would be happy to pay a little extra on my rates for their sewer and water. i am moving to leeston soon, they will be paying for mine. its only fair and what the district wide rate is all about!!!!!!	
Withheld	The Upper Selwyn Huts should be listed as a history site on the District Plan. It pre-dates the 1900s so is an archaeological site under Heritage Pouhere Taonga Act All homes and all people should be protected. It's inhumane and disgusting to evict the Selwyn Huts residents from their home. Review the 15 year finite term and let us stay. This also helps preserve our kiwi history!!!! It's unfair not to include Selwyn Huts on the District Wide Rate for water and sewer. Excluding a community in the district goes against the purpose of introducing the DWR in the first place. The legal opinion from Council's own lawyers have highlighted this. We should not be discriminated against and should be treated like everyone else in the district Replace the reticulation system. Council have been in charge of this since 1989 and dropped the ball by not doing any maintenance and upgrades over the last 35 years.	
Charlie Dillimore	What you are doing to the Upper Selwyn Huts (USH) is wrong for so many reasons. I just can't believe you are planning on wiping us off the map while you smile and wave to the masses, telling them "We are working for you", or "We care about you." During the last meeting at the Springston Hall, all you big wigs was smile and avoid answering the questions put to you. I just hope you actually take the time to consider fully what you are planning. The USH were there before 1900 - 1895 to be precise, so that surely qualifies them to be labelled a archaeological site under the Heritage Pouhere Taonga Act.These are peoples' homes for goodness sake and should be treated as such. It is not as if you are going to put a high speed train track through the area or a rocket launch site on the spit.We pay so many of the districts rates, why can't we be put on the district wide rate for water and sewer? Why are we not being included? You should listen to your own lawyers - that's what you use the rate payers money to pay for, isn't it?It is not our fault you have let the articulation system go to the dogs. Apparently you have been "looking after it" since 1989 and have done very little to maintain it. Replace it or fix it- don't run us off the land because of your inaction.A five year lease with the hope of renewing it for another 5 and then maybe for another 5 years sucks. Would you do that to someone living in Lincoln or Rolleston? I don't think so.If I were to come on to your property for the aim of complying for an obscure reason, I'd think you would see me off quick smart. Would you look through the windows of houses of those people who have refused to let you in? Better bloody nry. Try it in Lincoln or better yet, a certain individual living at the Rakaia Huts. The rumour is the Rakaia Huts are next. Good luck with that.The climate warming / rising sea level scenario. Apparently you 'learned' people have been using the wrong model. The flooding at the Lower Selwyn Huts is a given and it is only a matter of time before it happens again. Being on sea level, that is understandable. The USH is at least 2 metres above sea level and has never flooded. Why not wait until the sea has actually risen half that height before smiling at us and tell us the sky is falling.No one is denying or stopping anyone to use the lake for their food source. There is only one fisherman at the USH and he is planning to give it up. Maori might like to say they are the guardians of the lake but maybe they should have thought of that sooner before driving the moa and Haast eagle to extinction. I like to think everybody out at the Lower and Upper Selwyn huts are also the guardians of the lake.The people have spoken about the continued existence of the USH and you people at the SDC should listen - because you are suppose to be looking after everybody in the district while at the same time focusing on what we already have.	
Dan Te Ngaru	I fell in love with the Selwyn Huts the very first time I visited this beautiful place. It's where I fell in love with my wife, where I proposed to her, where our son was born and where he was raised. The news has hit us all hard, but the worst part is knowing that Council made the decision in May 2019 for the short-term finite licence but owners weren't made aware until March 2024. We bought late 2020, us, like the 48 other buyers since 2019, were not made aware. We could have saved our hard earned money and put it towards a deposit. Now you want to make us pay to destroy the homes that we love and tear apart our community, and not even have the decency to offer us any compensation. We don't want to be bought out, we want to stay for as long as it's safe to stay, but at least if there was compensation on the table the situation wouldn't be so stressful. And while on the subject of money, making us pay even more (for sewer and water) makes it even harder to save and secure any kind of future for us and for our family! In 15 years, I will be at retirement age. My wife and I will have to use all of the savings we can scrape together, reducing our quality of life over the next 15 years, and both our KiwiSaver to even get a foot in the door. Is a bank going to give a retired couple a big mortgage? So we will be starting from square 1 when we are meant to be enjoying our golden years. What a shitty position to be put in. Have some heart, review the 15 year term. Let us stay. Offer compensation if it's no longer safe to be here. Put us on the District Wide Rate. (1) HISTORICAL VALUEAn 1881 plan shows the reserve on which the huts would come to be established was in existence and by the 1890's at the latest there were huts established there, mainly for fishing and hunting. Given this pre-1900 date, the huts are an archaeological site under the Heritage Pouhere Taonga New Zealand Act. There is a long historic and cultural association with the huts and community over the three centuries of occupation. The Reserve is Crown Land, administered by the Selwyn District Council. In 2015 the purpose was changed (by the Department Conservation) from recreation reserve to Local Purpose – Hut Settlement. On 8 May 2019, the Council unanimously determined that 'Hut licences and subsequent renewals are short term and ultimately for a finite period' . At its 13 March 2024 meeting Council resolved to accept option 2 (of 4 options) and offered Residents a final 15 year term for occupation of their huts.Put the Selwyn Huts on the DWR. The reasons being(a) We will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston who pay DWR and we have previously paid for our sewer system twice before, the requirement for being put on DWR. (b) We have already paid for the water upgrade in 2018(c) We should not be discriminated against and should be treated like everyone else in the district. (d) We already pay DWR for Recreation Reserve Rate; General Purpose Rate; Library Charge; Community Centre Rate; Uniform Annual General Rate; Water Race (Amenity) Rate; Area Board; Swimming Pools; Canterbury Museum Levy; and Land Drainage. We should also be added to the DWR for Sewer and Water like everyone else. (e) Towards25 LTP Document stated:“The Council is proposing to introduce a new way of funding water and wastewater, community centres/halls and recreation reserves. These services are currently funded through targeted rates and the Council is proposing to meet the costs of these services by introducing standard district-wide rates. Underpinning this proposal is the view that Selwyn should be seen as one integrated district, rather than simply a series of detached townships. The Council acknowledges that where residents across the district receive a similar level of service for key infrastructure, the cost to residents should also be consistent. In the case of water and wastewater this proposal will also help keep these services affordable for smaller communities.”This document also has USH specifically listed in the “Proposed district-wide rate for urban water compared with existing targeted rates” table. From this we conclude there was a clear intention to include USH in the DWR for sewer and water. This is even more relevant now we will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston. (f) Buddle Findlay’s Legal Opinion dated 04/03/2019 states “We note that the Council has recently tended to move to a model where the costs of provision of network infrastructure (such as waste water infrastructure) are spread across the district (ie under district wide targeted rates). It would go against the trend for the Council now to look to recover the greater costs of continuing to provide water services to the [Upper Selwyn] Huts solely from that community.” (g) Council has already agreed to fund 70% of the sewer upgrade, indicating the district is prepared to pay towards USH sewer upgrade. There is no good reason why the Council couldn't find the full amount. This was proposed in 4.12.4 of the “Upper Selwyn Huts Future Occupancy Strategy” report dated 04/03/2024. It. Is. The. Right. Thing. To. Do !!!!Given the reasons above there is no reason why USH Can not be put on the DWR for Sewer and Water like everyone else. Additionally we also request that our reticulation system be replaced by SDC as they have been responsible for this since 1989. It is not our fault that you have dropped the ball and neglected us	
s7(2)(a)	s7(2)(a)	
	<p>It really is a magical place, with a rich history and holds many fond memories for people all over the globe. So many people that I have met over the years, when they find out where I live, share stories of their summers out here, or the great times that they had when they lived here, or visiting friends and family. What a shame to erase this beautiful piece of New Zealand history.(1) HISTORICAL VALUEAn 1881 plan shows the reserve on which the huts would come to be established was in existence and by the 1890's at the latest there were huts established there, mainly for fishing and hunting. Given this pre-1900 date, the huts are an archaeological site under the Heritage Pouhere Taonga New Zealand Act. There is a long historic and cultural association with the huts and community over the three centuries of occupation. The Reserve is Crown Land, administered by the Selwyn District Council. In 2015 the purpose was changed (by the Department Conservation) from recreation reserve to Local Purpose – Hut Settlement. On 8 May 2019, the Council unanimously determined that 'Hut licences and subsequent renewals are short term and ultimately for a finite period' . At its 13 March 2024 meeting Council resolved to accept option 2 (of 4 options) and offered Residents a final 15 year term for occupation of their huts.Put the Selwyn Huts on the DWR. The reasons being(a) We will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston who pay DWR and we have previously paid for our sewer system twice before, the requirement for being put on DWR. (b) We have already paid for the water upgrade in 2018(c) We should not be discriminated against and should be treated like everyone else in the district. (d) We already pay DWR for Recreation Reserve Rate; General Purpose Rate; Library Charge; Community Centre Rate; Uniform Annual General Rate; Water Race (Amenity) Rate; Area Board; Swimming Pools; Canterbury Museum Levy; and Land Drainage. We should also be added to the DWR for Sewer and Water like everyone else. (e) Towards25 LTP Document stated:“The Council is proposing to introduce a new way of funding water and wastewater, community centres/halls and recreation reserves. These services are currently funded through targeted rates and the Council is proposing to meet the costs of these services by introducing standard district-wide rates. Underpinning this proposal is the view that Selwyn should be seen as one integrated district, rather than simply a series of detached townships. The Council acknowledges that where residents across the district receive a similar level of service for key infrastructure, the cost to residents should also be consistent. In the case of water and wastewater this proposal will also help keep these services affordable for smaller communities.”This document also has USH specifically listed in the “Proposed district-wide rate for urban water compared with existing targeted rates” table. From this we conclude there was a clear intention to include USH in the DWR for sewer and water. This is even more relevant now we will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston. (f) Buddle Findlay’s Legal Opinion dated 04/03/2019 states “We note that the Council has recently tended to move to a model where the costs of provision of network infrastructure (such as waste water infrastructure) are spread across the district (ie under district wide targeted rates). It would go against the trend for the Council now to look to recover the greater costs of continuing to provide water services to the [Upper Selwyn] Huts solely from that community.” (g) Council has already agreed to fund 70% of the sewer upgrade, indicating the district is prepared to pay towards USH sewer upgrade. There is no good reason why the Council couldn't find the full amount. This was proposed in 4.12.4 of the “Upper Selwyn Huts Future Occupancy Strategy” report dated 04/03/2024. It. Is. The. Right. Thing. To. Do !!!!Given the reasons above there is no reason why USH Can not be put on the DWR for Sewer and Water like everyone else. Additionally we also request that our reticulation system be replaced by SDC as they have been responsible for this since 1989. It is not our fault that you have dropped the ball and neglected us</p>	
Withheld	. Selwyn huts residents should be apart of distric wide rates as they are apart of the Selwyn community. If SDC truly cares about the people you will not be taking away their homes and money, it is not fair.	
Blanche Fryer	1, I am making a submission to the long term plan that the Council includes the Upper Selwyn Huts in the district wide rates for water and sewer like every one else.I have made submissions before for the Towards25 that they should be included as the document stated 'The Council proposed..... this proposal will also help keep these services affordable for smaller communities.I feel the UPH has been discriminated against. There is a culture of dislike from from several of the councilors who just want to see the back of them!2, The Huts are a Historic Settlement since 1889, and the have become substantial homes over the years and especially in the last 20 years.Many of them still display the charm of the historical Selwyn District which is an unusual sight amongst the tsunami of development. I request that the USH be recognized as place of Historical Significance and listed as a historical site on District Plan.	



Withheld	<p>The Selwyn Huts should be listed as a history site on the District Plan. It pre-dates the 1900s so is an archaeological site under Heritage Pouhere Taonga Act. All homes and all people should be protected. It's inhumane and disgusting to evict the Selwyn Huts residents from their home. Review the 15 year finite term and let us stay. This also helps preserve our kiwi history!!!! It's unfair not to include Selwyn Huts on the District Wide Rate for water and sewer. Excluding a community in the district goes against the purpose of introducing the DWR in the first place. The legal opinion from Council's own lawyers have highlighted this. We should not be discriminated against and should be treated like everyone else in the district. Replace the reticulation system. Council have been in charge of this since 1989 and dropped the ball by not doing any maintenance and upgrades over the last 35 years. Don't use your incompetence as an excuse to make us pay or to kick us outThankyou [name withheld]</p>	
Withheld	<p>selwyn huts , if residents pay 30% of pipeline they can stay 30 years (6 lots of 5 years )and then look at gobal warming effects on there homes..look after all people in your area.....be fair to all rate payers, theres people who wish to live there life out there with a home they put alot of love, savings and care into.Council have know about sewer update being needed since 1989 and have left it till consent is lapsing then tell home owners to pay for it, you could have planned better and been saving over those many years for the future sewer requirements. the home owners have in last 120 years had there rights/lease renewed without a end date, why put a end date on this time different from last 24 times ..... be fair ....moral ....understanding</p>	
Kevin Keeler	<p>The Selwyn Huts should be listed as a historic site on the District Plan. It pre-dates the 1900s so it is an archaeological site under heritage pouhere taonga act. All homes and all people should be protected. It's inhumane and disgusting to evict the Selwyn Huts residents from their home. Review the 15 year finite term and let them stay. This also helps preserve our kiwi history!!!! It is unfair not to include Selwyn Huts on the District Wide Rate. Excluding a community in the district seems to contradict the name "District Wide Rate" and goes against the purpose of introducing the DWR in the first place. Replace their reticulation system. Council have been in charge of this since 1989 - you dropped the ball by not doing any maintenance and upgrades over the last 35 years. Don't use your incompetence as an excuse to make these people pay or to kick them out.</p>	
Rory Keeler	<p>The Selwyn Huts should be listed as a historic site on the District Plan. It pre-dates the 1900s so it is an archaeological site under heritage pouhere taonga act. All homes and all people should be protected. It's inhumane and disgusting to evict the Selwyn Huts residents from their home. Review the 15 year finite term and let them stay. This also helps preserve our kiwi history!!!! It is unfair not to include Selwyn Huts on the District Wide Rate. Excluding a community in the district seems to contradict the name "District Wide Rate" and goes against the purpose of introducing the DWR in the first place. Replace their reticulation system. Council have been in charge of this since 1989 - you dropped the ball by not doing any maintenance and upgrades over the last 35 years. Don't use your incompetence as an excuse to make these people pay or to kick them out.</p>	
Withheld	<p>1. My first question would be WHY is SDC so determined to close down an entire community. The land belongs to the Crown, and I understand, is only administered by SDC. At any point in time, has the Crown given any indication of wanting to dispose of the land? Does the Crown have a hidden agenda? What possible purpose would it serve the Crown to close an entire community?The Huts have been occupied since the 1890's, mainly for fishing. Given this pre-1900 date, the huts are an archaeological site under the Heritage Pouhere Taonga New Zealand Act, and as such, should be protected. 2. The reason given by SDC, and now bandied about in the press coverage is all about Climate change, in particular rising sea levels and the danger of flooding. If you were to research this supposition, you would see that Leeston and other surrounding areas would be flooded long before Upper Selwyn Huts. I would pose the question here, Are you threatening to evict these communities as well? In addition to this, if you have been so worried about rising sea-levels, why as a council, do you continue to grant building consents to these areas? 3. The stumbling block in all this seems to be the issue of water and sewerage. It is understood that we will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston who pay District Wide Rates. We were told that a requirement for being put on the DWR was to pay for our sewer ourselves and a subsequent upgrade, which we did. Why then are we being discriminated against as we already pay DWR for Recreation Reserve Rate; General Purpose Rate; Library Charge; Community Centre Rate; Uniform Annual General Rate; Water Race (Amenity) Rate; Area Board; Swimming Pools; Canterbury Museum Levy; and Land Drainage? Why have we not been added to the DWR for Sewer and Water? Quoting 'Towards25 Long Term Planning Document "The Council is proposing to introduce a new way of funding water and wastewater, community centres/halls and recreation reserves. These services are currently funded through targeted rates and the Council is proposing to meet the costs of these services by introducing standard district-wide rates. Underpinning this proposal is the view that "Selwyn should be seen as one integrated district", rather than simply a series of detached townships. The Council acknowledges that where residents across the district receive a similar level of service for key infrastructure, "the cost to residents should also be consistent". In the case of water and wastewater this proposal will also help keep these services affordable for smaller communities." This document also has USH specifically listed in the "Proposed district-wide rate for urban water compared with existing targeted rates" table. From this we conclude there was a clear intention to include USH in the DWR for sewer and water. This is even more relevant now we will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston. The council took charge of the reticulation system in 1989, I believe , and to my knowledge have done NO maintenance. It is high time that we were moved onto the District wide water/sewerage system and put an end to these arguments 4. Another question is why was consent given to build new properties, and to improve older existing properties, if the council had these current plans in mind? When we applied for consent to build 67(2)(a) [REDACTED] s/(2)(a) [REDACTED] We had to commission engineers and specialists to take into account sea levels, wind speeds, snow bearing loads of the roof etc. We complied with everything and were granted our CCC. What has changed in the meantime? 5. My final point is that post-quake, saw the move of people from Christchurch whose home had been destroyed, using their insurance payouts to fund the upgrades to their Hut, with a view to living out their lives in comfort. Not only are you wanting to evict people, but insulting them by telling them to destroy their homes at their own cost. With no compensation, how on Earth do you think that they are going to be able to even rent a place to live, or are you proposing to build homes to rehouse an entire community? As elected Councillors, you have a duty to represent your electorate. Showing your absolute lack of compassion in this case, I would put forward that you are not fit to govern. Yours sincerely [name withheld]</p>	
Withheld	<p>hello, In regards to the Upper Selwyn Hutts (USH) 1. Historical valueThe Mayor says in the Long Term Plan that "we're focussed on looking after what we already have" - how about you look after us! 2. District wide rates for USH. The reasons being :(a) We will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston who pay DWR and we have previously paid for our sewer ourselves and a subsequent upgrade, the requirement we were told for being put on DWR. (b) We have already paid for the water upgrade.(c) We should not be discriminated against and should be treated like everyone else in the district. (d) We already pay DWR for Recreation Reserve Rate; General Purpose Rate; Library Charge; Community Centre Rate; Uniform Annual General Rate; Water Race (Amenity) Rate; Area Board; Swimming Pools; Canterbury Museum Levy; and Land Drainage. We should also be added to the DWR for Sewer and Water like everyone else. (e) Towards25 LTP Document stated:"The Council is proposing to introduce a new way of funding water and wastewater, community centres/halls and recreation reserves. These services are currently funded through targeted rates and the Council is proposing to meet the costs of these services by introducing standard district-wide rates. Underpinning this proposal is the view that Selwyn should be seen as one integrated district, rather than simply a series of detached townships. The Council acknowledges that where residents across the district receive a similar level of service for key infrastructure, the cost to residents should also be consistent. In the case of water and wastewater this proposal will also help keep these services affordable for smaller communities."This document also has USH specifically listed in the "Proposed district-wide rate for urban water compared with existing targeted rates" table. From this we conclude there was a clear intention to include USH in the DWR for sewer and water. This is even more relevant now we will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston. (f) Buddle Findlay's Legal Opinion dated 04/03/2019 states "We note that the Council has recently tended to move to a model where the costs of provision of network infrastructure (such as waste water infrastructure) are spread across the district (ie under district wide targeted rates). It would go against the trend for the Council now to look to recover the greater costs of continuing to provide water services to the [Upper Selwyn] Huts solely from that community." (g) Council has already agreed to fund 70% of the sewer upgrade, indicating the district is prepared to pay towards USH sewer upgrade. There is no good reason why the Council couldn't find the full amount. This was proposed in 4.12.4 of the "Upper Sekwyn Huts Future Occupancy Strategy" report dated 04/03/2024. (h) The cost and operational charges for the pipeline continue to change so being on the DWR would give the community certainty. It would also mean that if people choose to leave the settlement early the cost will not increase for the remaining owners.(i) Additionally we also request that our reticulation system be replaced by SDC as they have been responsible for this since 1989 and have had ample time to replace this. The Selwyn Huts should be listed as a history site on the District Plan. It pre-dates the 1900s so is an archaeological site under Heritage Pouhere Taonga Act. All homes and all people should be protected. It's inhumane and disgusting to evict the Selwyn Huts residents from their home. Review the 15 year finite term and let them stay. This also helps preserve our kiwi history!!!! It's unfair not to include Selwyn Huts on the District Wide Rate for water and sewer. Excluding a community in the district goes against the purpose of introducing the DWR in the first place. The legal opinion from Council's own lawyers have highlighted this. We should not be discriminated against and should be treated like everyone else in the district. Replace the reticulation system. Council have been in charge of this since 1989 and dropped the ball by not doing any maintenance and upgrades over the last 35 years. Don't use your incompetence as an excuse to make them pay or to kick them out Thank You [name withheld]</p>	
June Keeler	<p>The Selwyn Huts should be listed as a historic site on the District Plan. It pre-dates the 1900s so it is an archaeological site under heritage pouhere taonga act. All homes and all people should be protected. It's inhumane and disgusting to evict the Selwyn Huts residents from their home. Review the 15 year finite term and let them stay. This also helps preserve our kiwi history!!!! It is unfair not to include Selwyn Huts on the District Wide Rate. Excluding a community in the district seems to contradict the name "District Wide Rate" and goes against the purpose of introducing the DWR in the first place. Replace their reticulation system. Council have been in charge of this since 1989 - you dropped the ball by not doing any maintenance and upgrades over the last 35 years. Don't use your incompetence as an excuse to make these people pay or to kick them out.</p>	
Fiona Ngakuru	<p>As a resident of the Upper Selwyn Huts I am asking Council to consider the attached file. Thank you.1. Historical value The Mayor says in the Long Term Plan that "we're focussed on looking after what we already have" - how about you look after us! An 1881 plan shows the reserve on which the huts would come to be established was in existence and by the 1890 's at the latest there were huts established there, mainly for fishing and hun ng. Given this pre-1900 date, the huts are an archaeological site under the Heritage Pouhere Taonga New Zealand Act. There is a long historic and cultural associa on with the huts and community over the three centuries of occupa on. The Reserve is Crown Land, administered by the Selwyn District Council. In 2015 the purpose was changed (by the Department Conserva on) from recrea on reserve to Local Purpose – Hut Se lement. On 8 May 2019, the Council unanimously determined that 'Hut licences and subsequent renewals are short term and ul mately for a finite period'. At its 13 March 2024 mee ng Council resolved to accept op on 2 (of 4 op ons) and offered Residents a final 15 year term for occupa on of their huts. I request this historical significance be recognised and for the Selwyn Huts to be listed as an historical site on the District Plan and for the term for us being here to be extended to protect this history. 2. District wide rates I request that the Upper Selwyn Huts be put on DWR for Water and Sewer. The reasons being : (a) We will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston who pay DWR and we have previously paid for our sewer ourselves and a subsequent upgrade, the requirement we were told for being put on DWR. (b) We have already paid for the water upgrade. (c) We should not be discriminated against and should be treated like everyone else in the district. (d) We already pay DWR for Recreation Reserve Rate; General Purpose Rate; Library Charge; Community Centre Rate; Uniform Annual General Rate; Water Race (Amenity) Rate; Area Board; Swimming Pools; Canterbury Museum Levy; and Land Drainage. We should also be added to the DWR for Sewer and Water like everyone else. (e) Towards25 LTP Document stated: "The Council is proposing to introduce a new way of funding water and wastewater, community centres/halls and recreation reserves. These services are currently funded through targeted rates and the Council is proposing to meet the costs of these services by introducing standard district-wide rates. Underpinning this proposal is the view that Selwyn should be seen as one integrated district, rather than simply a series of detached townships. The Council acknowledges that where residents across the district receive a similar level of service for key infrastructure, the cost to residents should also be consistent. In the case of water and wastewater this proposal will also help keep these services affordable for smaller communities." This document also has USH specifically listed in the "Proposed district-wide rate for urban water compared with existing targeted rates" table. From this we conclude there was a clear intention to include USH in the DWR for sewer and water. This is even more relevant now we will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston. (f) Buddle Findlay's Legal Opinion dated 04/03/2019 states "We note that the Council has recently tended to move to a model where the costs of provision of network infrastructure (such as waste water infrastructure) are spread across the district (ie under district wide targeted rates). It would go against the trend for the Council now to look to recover the greater costs of continuing to provide water services to the [Upper Selwyn] Huts solely from that community." (g) Council has already agreed to fund 70% of the sewer upgrade, indicating the district is prepared to pay towards USH sewer upgrade. There is no good reason why the Council couldn't find the full amount. This was proposed in 4.12.4 of the "Upper Sekwyn Huts Future Occupancy Strategy" report dated 04/03/2024. (h) The cost and operational charges for the pipeline continue to change so being on the DWR would give the community certainty. It would also mean that if people choose to leave the settlement early the cost will not increase for the remaining owners. (i) Additionally we also request that our reticulation system be replaced by SDC as they have been responsible for this since 1989 and have had ample time to replace this. Given the reasons above there is no reason why USH Can not be put on the DWR for Sewer and Water like everyone else.</p>	
Nathan Ngakuru	<p>As I resident of the Upper Selwyn Huts, I request the attached document be considered by Council.1. Historical value The Mayor says in the Long Term Plan that "we're focussed on looking after what we already have" - how about you look after us! An 1881 plan shows the reserve on which the huts would come to be established was in existence and by the 1890 's at the latest there were huts established there, mainly for fishing and hun ng. Given this pre-1900 date, the huts are an archaeological site under the Heritage Pouhere Taonga New Zealand Act. There is a long historic and cultural associa on with the huts and community over the three centuries of occupa on. The Reserve is Crown Land, administered by the Selwyn District Council. In 2015 the purpose was changed (by the Department Conserva on) from recrea on reserve to Local Purpose – Hut Se lement. On 8 May 2019, the Council unanimously determined that 'Hut licences and subsequent renewals are short term and ul mately for a finite period'. At its 13 March 2024 mee ng Council resolved to accept op on 2 (of 4 op ons) and offered Residents a final 15 year term for occupa on of their huts. I request this historical significance be recognised and for the Selwyn Huts to be listed as an historical site on the District Plan and for the term for us being here to be extended to protect this history. 2. District wide rates I request that the Upper Selwyn Huts be put on DWR for Water and Sewer. The reasons being : (a) We will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston who pay DWR and we have previously paid for our sewer ourselves and a subsequent upgrade, the requirement we were told for being put on DWR. (b) We have already paid for the water upgrade. (c) We should not be discriminated against and should be treated like everyone else in the district. (d) We already pay DWR for Recreation Reserve Rate; General Purpose Rate; Library Charge; Community Centre Rate; Uniform Annual General Rate; Water Race (Amenity) Rate; Area Board; Swimming Pools; Canterbury Museum Levy; and Land Drainage. We should also be added to the DWR for Sewer and Water like everyone else. (e) Towards25 LTP Document stated: "The Council is proposing to introduce a new way of funding water and wastewater, community centres/halls and recreation reserves. These services are currently funded through targeted rates and the Council is proposing to meet the costs of these services by introducing standard district-wide rates. Underpinning this proposal is the view that Selwyn should be seen as one integrated district, rather than simply a series of detached townships. The Council acknowledges that where residents across the district receive a similar level of service for key infrastructure, the cost to residents should also be consistent. In the case of water and wastewater this proposal will also help keep these services affordable for smaller communities." This document also has USH specifically listed in the "Proposed district-wide rate for urban water compared with existing targeted rates" table. From this we conclude there was a clear intention to include USH in the DWR for sewer and water. This is even more relevant now we will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston. (f) Buddle Findlay's Legal Opinion dated 04/03/2019 states "We note that the Council has recently tended to move to a model where the costs of provision of network infrastructure (such as waste water infrastructure) are spread across the district (ie under district wide targeted rates). It would go against the trend for the Council now to look to recover the greater costs of continuing to provide water services to the [Upper Selwyn] Huts solely from that community." (g) Council has already agreed to fund 70% of the sewer upgrade, indicating the district is prepared to pay towards USH sewer upgrade. There is no good reason why the Council couldn't find the full amount. This was proposed in 4.12.4 of the "Upper Sekwyn Huts Future Occupancy Strategy" report dated 04/03/2024. (h) The cost and operational charges for the pipeline continue to change so being on the DWR would give the community certainty. It would also mean that if people choose to leave the settlement early the cost will not increase for the remaining owners. (i) Additionally we also request that our reticulation system be replaced by SDC as they have been responsible for this since 1989 and have had ample time to replace this. Given the reasons above there is no reason why USH Can not be put on the DWR for Sewer and Water like everyone else</p>	
Gary Watson	<p>"Waikirikiri Selwyn is a district of opportunity where families thrive. We are a great place to bring up children and to grow old." The above is the opening statement by the Mayor Sam Broughton in the LTP consultation document. Maybe the proviso that this excludes the Upper Selwyn Huts community needs to be added as many residents are elderly and there are also several families. I would also like to know where our MP Nicola Grigg stands on the intention of SDC to bankrupt and make homeless many residents of the Upper Selwyn Huts. Her opinion regarding the situation at the Lower Huts and Greenpark Huts would also be of interest.</p>	



Withheld	<p>1. Historical valueThe Mayor says in the Long Term Plan that “we’re focussed on looking after what we already have” - how about you look after us!...An 1881 plan shows the reserve on which the huts would come to be established was in existence and by the 1890’s at the latest there were huts established there, mainly for fishing and hunting. Given this ..... are short term and ultimately for a finite period’ . At its 13 March 2024 meeting Council resolved to accept option 2 (of 4 options) and offered Residents a final 15 year term for occupation of their huts. We request this historical significance be recognised and for the Selwyn Huts to be listed as an historical site on the District Plan and for the term for us being here to be extended to protect this history. ....</p> <p>2. District wide ratesSelwyn Huts need to be put on DWR for Water and Sewer. The reasons being :(a) We will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston who pay DWR and we ..... pay towards USH sewer upgrade. There is no good reason why the Council couldn’t fund the full amount. This was proposed in 4.12.4 of the “Upper Sekwyn Huts Future Occupancy Strategy” report dated 04/03/2024. (h) The cost and operational charges for the pipeline continue to change so being on the DWR would give the community certainty. It would also mean that if people choose to leave the settlement early the cost will not increase for the remaining owners. (i) Additionally we also request that our reticulation system be replaced by SDC as they have been responsible for this since 1989 and have had ample time to replace this. Given the reasons above there is no reason why Selwyn Huts cannot be put on the DWR for Sewer and Water like everyone else.</p> <p>The Selwyn Huts should be listed as a history site on the District Plan. It pre-dates the 1900s so is an archaeological site under Heritage Pouhere Taonga ActAll homes and all people should be protected. It’s inhumane and disgusting to evict the Selwyn Huts residents from their home. Review the 15 year finite term and let us stay. This also helps preserve our kiwi history!!!!It’s unfair not to include Selwyn Huts on the District Wide Rate for water and sewer. Excluding a community in the district goes against the purpose of introducing the DWR in the first place. The legal opinion from Council’s own lawyers has highlighted this. We should not be discriminated against and should be treated like everyone else in the districtReplace the reticulation system. Council have been in charge of this since 1989 and dropped the ball by not doing any maintenance and upgrades over the last 35 years. Don’t use your incompetence as an excuse to make us pay or to kick us out; The mayor’s introduction to the online LTP submissions, states “When we were preparing this plan, you told us you wanted a sustainable Selwyn, a place where people could live without needing to go anywhere else and we want to deliver this.”Then he and the councillors need to decide that the residents at Selwyn Huts can continue to live here. With the sewer system being upgraded - not entirely at the council’s expense - the Hut owners should be permitted to live there for at least the next 50 years, not the insulting potential offer of 15 years. Add the Selwyn Huts to the District Wide Rating for their water and sewer. (a) We will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston who pay DWR and we have previously paid for our sewer ourselves and a subsequent upgrade, the requirement we were told for being put on DWR. (b) We have already paid for the water upgrade.(c) We should not be discriminated against and should be treated like everyone else in the district. (d) We already pay DWR for Recreation Reserve Rate; General Purpose Rate; Library Charge; Community Centre Rate; Uniform Annual General Rate; Water Race (Amenity) Rate; Area Board; Swimming Pools; Canterbury Museum Levy; and Land Drainage. We should also be added to the DWR for Sewer and Water like everyone else. (e) Towards25 LTP Document stated:“The Council is proposing to introduce a new way of funding water and wastewater, community centres/halls and recreation reserves. These services are currently funded through targeted rates and the Council is proposing to meet the costs of these services by introducing standard district-wide rates. Underpinning this proposal is the view that Selwyn should be seen as one integrated district, rather than simply a series of detached townships. The Council acknowledges that where residents across the district receive a similar level of service for key infrastructure, the cost to residents should also be consistent. In the case of water and wastewater this proposal will also help keep these services affordable for smaller communities.”This document also has USH specifically listed in the “Proposed district-wide rate for urban water compared with existing targeted rates” table. From this we conclude there was a clear intention to include USH in the DWR for sewer and water. This is even more relevant now we will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston. (f) Buddle Findlay’s Legal Opinion dated 04/03/2019 states “We note that the Council has recently tended to move to a model where the costs of provision of network infrastructure (such as waste water infrastructure) are spread across the district (ie under district wide targeted rates). It would go against the trend for the Council now to look to recover the greater costs of continuing to provide water services to the [Upper Selwyn] Huts solely from that community.” (g) Council has already agreed to fund 70% of the sewer upgrade, indicating the district is prepared to pay towards USH sewer upgrade. There is no good reason why the Council couldn’t find the full amount. This was proposed in 4.12.4 of the “Upper Selwyn Huts Future Occupancy Strategy” report dated 04/03/2024.(h) The cost and operational charges for the pipeline continue to change so being on the DWR would give the community certainty. It would also mean that if people choose to leave the settlement early the cost will not increase for the remaining owners.(i) Additionally we also request that our reticulation system be replaced by SDC as they have been responsible for this since 1989 and have had ample time to replace this.Given the reasons above there is no reason why USH Can not be put on the DWR for Sewer and Water like everyone else.</p>	
Steven McLintock	Put the Upper Selwyn Huts on the historical list. They have existed since 1870.Allow Upper Selwyn Huts to be put onto the district wide rates for water and sewer. It was proposed in 4.12.4 of the Upper Selwyn Huts future occupancy strategy report. 04.03.2024.The reticulation system at Selwyn Huts should be replaced by SDC as you have been responsible for this since 1989 and done nothing. Give Selwyn Huts the same or similar managed retreat that Hurinui offer their settlement owners.	
Eunice McLintock	Treat Selwyn Huts as the Hurinui Council has and enable a proper managed retreat when needed. Selwyn Huts are historical and should be on SDC historical list!Selwyn Huts deserve to be put on district wide rating scheme!	
Michael McLintock	Repair the water system at Selwyn Huts and find a better solution for their departure when and not before it is needed.Put Selwyn Huts on the district wide rates for sewer and wastewater.	
Samuel McLintock	Selwyn Huts is a historical site and should be included in SDC historical list. Put them on district wide rating for sewer and water and let them stay until it is imminent that they must move because of climate change. Compensate them on their departure.	
Ann Thomson	er Selwyn Huts is a historical Selwyn District settlement dating from the early 1900's. Early part of historical settlement which Heritage NZ is investigating. Close community, we all know each other help support families and children. This is unique and does not happen in Rolleston Lincoln or the modern subdivisions the council seems to be enamored by.Upper Selwyn Huts need to be retained for perpetuity as important part of the history of Selwyn District. Many families have association with this settlement for many generations. History needs to be retained and restored not destroyed as many have been.	
Eric Collis	<p>1. Historical valueThe Mayor says in the Long Term Plan that “we’re focussed on looking after what we already have” - how about you look after us! An 1881 plan shows the reserve on which the huts would come to be established was in existence and by the 1890’s at the latest there were huts established there, mainly for fishing and hunting. Given this pre-1900 date, the huts are an archaeological site under the Heritage Pouhere Taonga New Zealand Act. There is a long historic and cultural association with the huts and community over the three centuries of occupation. The Reserve is Crown Land, administered by the Selwyn District Council. In 2015 the purpose was changed (by the Department Conservation) from recreation reserve to Local Purpose – Hut Settlement. On 8 May 2019, the Council unanimously determined that ‘Hut licences and subsequent renewals are short term and ultimately for a finite period’ . At its 13 March 2024 meeting Council resolved to accept option 2 (of 4 options) and offered Residents a final 15 year term for occupation of their huts. We need to submit requesting this historical significance be recognised and for the Selwyn Huts to be listed as an historical site on the District Plan and for the term for us being here to be extended to protect this history. 2. District wide rates Everyone needs to submit on the LTP asking for us to be put on DWR for Water and Sewer. The reasons being : (a) We will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston who pay DWR and we have previously paid for our sewer ourselves and a subsequent upgrade, the requirement we were told for being put on DWR. (b) We have already paid for the water upgrade. (c) We should not be discriminated against and should be treated like everyone else in the district. (d) We already pay DWR for Recreation Reserve Rate; General Purpose Rate; Library Charge; Community Centre Rate; Uniform Annual General Rate; Water Race (Amenity) Rate; Area Board; Swimming Pools; Canterbury Museum Levy; and Land Drainage. We should also be added to the DWR for Sewer and Water like everyone else. (e) Towards25 LTP Document stated:“The Council is proposing to introduce a new way of funding water and wastewater, community centres/halls and recreation reserves. These services are currently funded through targeted rates and the Council is proposing to meet the costs of these services by introducing standard district-wide rates. Underpinning this proposal is the view that Selwyn should be seen as one integrated district, rather than simply a series of detached townships. The Council acknowledges that where residents across the district receive a similar level of service for key infrastructure, the cost to residents should also be consistent. In the case of water and wastewater this proposal will also help keep these services affordable for smaller communities.” This document also has USH specifically listed in the “Proposed district-wide rate for urban water compared with existing targeted rates” table. From this we conclude there was a clear intention to include USH in the DWR for sewer and water. This is even more relevant now we will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston. (f) Buddle Findlay’s Legal Opinion dated 04/03/2019 states “We note that the Council has recently tended to move to a model where the costs of provision of network infrastructure (such as waste water infrastructure) are spread across the district (ie under district wide targeted rates). It would go against the trend for the Council now to look to recover the greater costs of continuing to provide water services to the [Upper Selwyn] Huts solely from that community.” (g) Council has already agreed to fund 70% of the sewer upgrade, indicating the district is prepared to pay towards USH sewer upgrade. There is no good reason why the Council couldn’t find the full amount. This was proposed in 4.12.4 of the “Upper Sekwyn Huts Future Occupancy Strategy” report dated 04/03/2024. (h) The cost and operational charges for the pipeline continue to change so being on the DWR would give the community certainty. It would also mean that if people choose to leave the settlement early the cost will not increase for the remaining owners. (i) Additionally we also request that our reticulation system be replaced by SDC as they have been responsible for this since 1989 and have had ample time to replace this. Given the reasons above there is no reason why USH Can not be put on the DWR for Sewer and Water like everyone else.</p>	
Colin Giddens	Selwyn Huts, no paper trail from landowner Govt where is the printed matter from the government.Is it legal, what the council are doing? Probably no.narcissistic behavior	
Denise Carrick	Long-Term Plan 2024-2034 from Lincoln VoiceSelwyn Huts - even though this decision has been made we feel they should be kept as part of Selwyns history and heritage. Batch settlements like this one at Selwyn Huts are unique and iconic to New Zealand and if SDC were serious about its Heritage Strategy they would actually start doing things that illustrate this. In the recent District plan, there were only token heritage protection actions taken. It is amazing to uphold the tangata whenua history, but the reality is that places such as Lincoln have a strong and still important colonial history, and this should be maintained as well. Lincoln has its roots as an agricultural town, and this should be celebrated.	
Jack Pearcy	Springston South Reserve or Upper huts Why is there a plan to connect the reserve to the Rolleston Sewerage Plant (at a discounted rate)? When the council says climate change would mean they could no longer live there in the future. How are you going to stop water infiltrating the sewer system? Better communication is required especially when lives, public health and properties are involved.	



Kirrily Fea Hearings Letter	<p>14 May 2024</p> <p>I'm going to talk about The Significance and Engagement Policy; Recognising and Protecting the Selwyn Huts History; and District Wide Rates.</p> <p>(1) The significance and engagement policy is a powerful document as long as you assess the significance level of a project correctly. If you get this wrong, the policy can be hugely detrimental to the process and the desired outcome.</p> <p>Case in point. You have assessed the Upper Selwyn Huts Future Occupancy Strategy as medium significance and consequently engaged with us at the Consult level only.</p> <p>Possibly because you believed this was consistent with the 2019 resolution of a short finite term for the Huts, however this decision was based on Ecan not renewing the old waste water resource consent which is no longer relevant.</p> <p>Our significance level is high based on community interest. Using the policies own criteria, there's 97 home owners, as well as their families, affected by the loss of their homes, the loss of their life savings, lack of housing alternatives and the emotional and financial impact of having to demolish their homes at their own costs with no compensation. With TV1 and Radio NZ airing this story at prime time, the level of public interest is high; and community opinion seems to be unanimous on this being a significant social issue. This covers all of the Community Interest criteria for high significance.</p> <p>If you had determined this issue correctly at this level, you would have had to engage with us at the Involve or Collaborative method of participation. Where proper consultation would have taken place, alternatives to eviction identified and solutions to the issues recommended.</p> <p>Pre 2019 the Council involved us at the collaborative level where members of our community helped the council identify alternative waste water solutions and put forward recommendations.</p> <p>We should have been involved at this level again for our future occupancy strategy where we could have discussed the alternatives to eviction, such as how we can future proof our settlement from possible effects of climate change. There are other options. Eviction should only be a last resort.</p> <p>You have not assessed the significance level of the Huts Strategy correctly, and due to this you have failed to engage with us adequately which has angered us, created distress, loss of trust, and harboured resistance to your decisions. If you continue down this track you will leave the community feeling dictated to and bullied.</p> <p>With this in mind we suggest you reclassify our Future Occupancy Strategy as high significance and restart a collaborative engagement with our community for the next 12 months, or as long as it takes to come up with a strategy and Deed of Licence all parties can agree on. Let us be part of the solution. We do not understand the urgency.</p> <p>(2) Historical Significance</p> <p>We ask the council to list the Upper Selwyn Huts on the District Plan as an archeological site for its historical significance as defined by the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 and as confirmed by Heritage NZ. Our history is significant and should be preserved. Buddle Findlay advised the Council in March 2019 that our pre 1900 activity is relevant as an archeological site. The Selwyn Strategic Heritage Plan 2023-2027 aims to: identify, protect, enhance and promote Selwyn's history. We have a significant amount of information about the huts history, we had a recent meeting with Heritage Nz who advised us to reapply, and we continue to gather information about the settlements story, in an attempt to protect this settlements cultural and social history.</p> <p>I don't have time to go into detail about this history today unfortunately, except just to say, Our history matters.</p> <p>I'd like to suggest that the council buy one of the huts for the purpose of a museum. Where we can display and protect this history. We also need to include Ngai Tahu pre European settlement history, and how they were significantly disadvantaged after the Kemp land purchases. It is not a perfect story, but it's a story worth telling and protecting.</p> <p>We have many day trippers that go down to the lake, who would be interested in learning about the area's history, current projects and challenges.</p> <p>We are part of this story and we want to share it.</p> <p>Environmental science states the worst thing you can do is disconnect the people from an area, because if you do, then no one will be left to advocate for it.</p> <p>Help us to protect and continue to tell the story of the Upper Selwyn Huts for generations to come.</p> <p>We request that the Council Schedule the huts as heritage items on the District Plan.</p> <p>It's not just Our history it's Selwyn's history.</p> <p>As Sam's statement on the LTP states, you're focused on looking after what we already have.</p> <p>(3) Include Upper Selwyn Huts on the District Wide Rates for water and sewer. For the following reasons:</p> <p>The Council's Towards25 LTP document states "where residents across the district receive a similar level of service for key infrastructure, the cost to residents should also be consistent." We will be on the same sewer system as other DWR payers. We should be paying the same as them.</p> <p>This document also specifically lists us on the table showing DWR for water. This is a clear intention to include us on all DWRs.</p> <p>This is supported by your own legal advice from Buddle Findlay March 2019.</p> <p>The effect on rate payers will now be minimal as they are already contributing 70%. We are only talking 4% of the total project cost.</p> <p>We are already on the DWR for Reserves. Why should we be on this rate for one thing, but not others.</p> <p>Douglas Marshall from the Council, upon his departure, recommended that we are put on the DWR.</p> <p>We are the only collective sewer scheme that are not on this rate in all of Selwyn.</p> <p>It will mean less administration costs to the Council as you would no longer have to set a licence fee each year and field objections from us to any increases.</p>	
	<p>[Continued]</p> <p>That is at least 7 good reasons for USHs to be on DWRs. Yet we have never been given one adequate reason why we shouldn't be on them.</p> <p>We are tired of feeling like second class citizens of the Selwyn District, and we feel we are being discriminated against. We'd like to be treated the same as every other rate payer in Selwyn including those on the same sewer scheme.</p> <p>So in summary, reclassify our significance as high, Collaborate with us, allow us to be part of the solution, help us protect and share our history and treat all rate payers equally by putting us on DWRs.</p> <p>Thank you</p>	
	<p><b>FEEDBACK FROM PUBLIC MEETING AUDIENCE 23 April 2024</b></p>	
No name notes	<p>We should be allowed to break the DoL at anytime, holding us to the five years is unfair</p>	
	<p>The bond should be deleted. Many of us have paid rates and licence fees regularly and we should be trusted to remove the huts.</p>	
	<p>What happens if we want to break the DoL, we should not be bound to the full five years</p>	
	<p>We should be on district wide rates for water and sewage</p>	
	<p>We want a 30 year term, the current term is only for five years with fish hooks that does not offer us and guarantee of a full 15 years.</p>	
	<p>My resource consent for my new build in 2008 was indefinite, not that you are restricting me to 15 years I should be compensated for loss</p>	
	<p>In the LTP there is no mention of USH however in Mayor Sams forward it states that " we are looking after what we already have", what about our history, why are you doing this.</p>	
	<p>This week a home valued at \$140 was offered for sale at \$40K. This is effecting people. Your support team are not going to help with financial loss. We should not have to fight and we have also not been given the time to fight. You are creating Internally Displaced Persons in your own country</p>	
	<p>Your report states that you want owners to feel supported and engaged and that the process is transparent. This is not transparent, getting information is hard, I don't feel supported. Engagement does not help, we just want to keep our homes. With the DoL code of conduct, if you break any of the rules you can be kicked out. We have been asked to consider an alternative venue if holding a gathering of more than a few people. The Code of conduct should be removed.</p>	
	<p>Receiving the Report and the DoL before the council meeting was not enough time to respond and to get ready to talk at Council. The meeting was a shambles. Some councillors suggested a 30 year licence and then one changes their mind. In the meeting a councillor said "if we give them 30 they will want more"</p> <p>Finite does not mean 15 years. Our current licence says permanent. In 2015 a survey divided the site with 1/2 the reserve listed as a local purpose reserve. This allows us to stay. You have gone to Buddle Findlay and asked then to provide a licence that makes us feel like prisoners. You will not be coming into my hut, you are not the landlord of my hut just the section. You have treated people in the huts a horrible way with no concern of the health of people there. You have taken our equity and reduced it to zero. Patronisingly told us to see our Dr for help. This has all happened sine the new CEO has been in place.</p>	
	<p>I'm shaky seeing my friend crying. Climate change there is little difference between 15 and 30 years according to your report.</p>	
	<p>You state reticulation is a reason for 25 years, you have owned this and are responsible to fix the reticulation, this is what our rates are for.</p>	
	<p>You say that the huts were never meant to be permanent, but you let this happen, it was your decisions and fault.</p>	
	<p>You have collectively decided with Nga Tahu and DOC to push out, why 15 years when 25 is possible.</p>	
	<p>Will we get to see a new DoL which includes the feedback before it goes to Council in August.</p>	
	<p>I am struggling with uncertainly we don't even have the guarantee of a 5 year term as the DoL is slanted against us. You say you have our best interest at heart, you do not.</p>	
	<p>Getting the DoL 1 week before the Council meeting is not enough time.</p>	
	<p>Selwyn campsites do not contribute to the cost of the new pipeline, campers stay there free of charge. They should pay and contribute to the pipeline costs.</p>	
	<p>We are not Green park or Lower Selwyn Huts, we are different. You have served up an appalling DoL which we should not have to sign. Our feedback should be taken account of sooner and we should have the opportunity to see a new DoL well before it goes to Council not just a week before. That is unacceptable.</p>	
	<p>Finite can mean any time. We should have a trigger to leave the site like a certain lake level, this is better than a notional date. Finite is not an end. You have an obligation to give us a good licence.</p>	
	<p><b>FEEDBACK DRAWN FROM EMAILS SENT TO THE HUTS EMAIL INBOX (Many questions that do not constitute feedback have been omitted)</b></p>	
[Name redacted - privacy s7(2)(a)]	<p>Good morning,</p> <p>Following the meeting last night can I please ask..</p> <p>Can the decision of 2019 to set a finite date on licences be revoked? If not, why not?</p>	<p>Apologies for late response. It is unusual for a Council to change its position established by resolution, it would only do so if there were compelling reasons or a significant change of circumstances.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy s7(2)(a)]	<p>Will you also be inspecting other older homes in the district? There are a number of homes that would be even older than many of ours. What part of the building code will you be looking at? My understanding is that houses need to comply with the code of when they were built.</p>	<p>We address compliance issues across the District, however Council has an extra layer of responsibility as it is the one issuing the Deed of License. To your last point yes I believe that is the case.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy s7(2)(a)]	<p>What is the Council funded inspection programme</p>	<p>As part of the proposed Deed of Licence we will be considering inspections to ensure huts meet regulations under the building code. The aim of this is to make sure that people are safe in events such as a fire or an earthquake. Council will consider this at the 13th March meeting and further details will be confirmed as part of the licence process.</p>



[Name redacted - privacy s7(2)(a)]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Presumably climate change and flooding remain a dominant factor in determining a finite tenure of any new Deed of Licence or if in fact, one should be issued. Lives will be at risk if residents refuse to self evacuate or leave when ordered to do so.</li><li>• The issues associated with the Huts are now many and complex.</li><li>• One assumes all hut owners have signed the Deed of Licence, albeit the ‘rolled over licence’</li></ul> <p>So it was concerning last week to hear a new hut owner state that when purchasing her property, “she hoped she was buying her forever home”.</p> <p>This suggests that the Deed of Licence and its legal status being - A Licence to Occupy - had not been understood or that the purchaser had been ill informed. Considering the number of transfers in the last few years and also multiple ownerships - one wonders what legal advice purchasers sought or whether they read the information freely available on the Council’s website relating to purchasing a hut.</p> <p>Poor decisions by purchasers is not the council’s problem.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Bond:</li></ul> <p>Whatever tenure and Licence council decides for The Huts, it is imperative that the Bond Clause be re instated and implemented immediately.</p> <p>We believe it should not have been removed from the last draft.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Re proposed wastewater pipe to the Pines:</li></ul> <p>We have always been told that the cost of any new scheme would be met by hut owners - a fact conveyed by council in correspondence and mail outs. (Reference, a letter sent to all hut owners dated May 10, 2019, following a SDC meeting on May 8, 2019, “that the wastewater solution will be funded by the Selwyn Huts community”.) Unfortunately some people have mistakenly believed that the proposed scheme would be funded by the now repealed Three Waters.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• If affordability is an issue with some residents despite a 50% contribution, will council be reviewing outstanding rates and arrears in order to determine the viability of the project?</li></ul> <p>To date there have been no costings for connecting individual hut owners to the scheme - something that won’t come cheap and likely to reveal a few surprises like easements over neighbouring properties.</p> <p>None of the above takes into account the age and state of dwellings, some derelict others suffering from deferred maintenance due to tenure uncertainty .</p> <p><b>Out of scope</b> Unlike those seeking their forever home, time is running out for us at our age and we await early answers so we can plan how best to dispose of our hut.</p> <p><b>Sadly, in has not felt the safest place to be in recent times</b></p>	Staff met with hut owner and feedback recorded and acknowledged
[Name redacted - privacy s7(2)(a)]	<p>Why are we not included in the district wide rating for water and sewage?</p> <p>How long will the consent be given for the whole of the new pipeline between Leeston and Rolleston, including the line from the Upper huts, Coes Ford and Chamberlains ford campgrounds ?</p> <p>What is the life expectancy of the new pipeline ?</p> <p>Why can't the finality of the lease of the upper huts be dictated by the conditions of the day pertaining to climate change, rather than a finite time decided upon by councilors who it seems would rather see the huts gone anyway ?</p> <p>Who are these councilors and what right do they have to make a decision that will affect 100 homes ?</p>	<p>Why are we not included in the district wide rating for water and sewage?</p> <p>This is a decision that Council has made. Individual Councillor’s would have had their individual and collective reasons for supporting this direction.</p> <p>How long will the consent be given for the whole of the new pipeline between Leeston and Rolleston, including the line from the Upper huts, Coes Ford and Chamberlains ford campgrounds ? /</p> <p>The consent is for the construction of the pipeline. The main consents going into the future will be for the operation of the Pines WWTP.</p> <p>What is the life expectancy of the new pipeline ?</p> <p>A 50 year lifetime has been adopted for planning and accounting purposes.</p> <p>Why can't the finality of the lease of the upper huts be dictated by the conditions of the day pertaining to climate change, rather than a finite time decided upon by councilors who it seems would rather see the huts gone anyway ?</p> <p>The Councillors have already made resolutions concerning the length of occupation in what is a very sensitive environment and what is on public land</p> <p>Who are these councilors and what right do they have to make a decision that will affect 100 homes ?</p> <p>I don't know if I can answer those questions. However The site is on public land managed by the Council and it is the Council building the communities supporting infrastructure.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy s7(2)(a)]	<p>We are shocked after reading the Selwyn Times yesterday - yet another emotive headline!</p> <p>For the record, the Hut Owners’ Assn may be entitled to views but cannot speak for everyone.</p> <p>Furthermore, since its formation in about 2020, it has never forwarded Minutes, never sought subscriptions and never held subsequent annual general meetings.</p> <p>To my knowledge, the only other publicly advertised meeting was one held on Sunday, 7 August 2022, when <b>s7(2)(a)</b> reported on a meeting he’d had with a now former council officer.</p>	Staff met with hut owner
[Name redacted - privacy s7(2)(a)]	<p>I really appreciate your reply, thank you.</p> <p>Would the council be willing to consider that these are our homes and our children’s homes as a compelling enough reason to allow the possibility of renewal beyond the next licence?</p> <p>Please consider revoking the 2019 decision regarding a finite date and give the people here as long as is humanly possible to remain in their homes.</p>	Your position is noted and it is one that many Hut owners are advancing.
[Name redacted - privacy s7(2)(a)]	<p>Would like to confirm my vote if need be for the proposed new DOL proposed favoured eg, 5 years from 30TH June with right of renewal for another 5 years until 2034 then another 5 years for family only until 2039.</p> <p>So if it comes to a vote I would like to add that as my preference at least yes if that DOL could be extended to 25-30 years that would be preferable as you have or are spending a lot of monies on sewage and water reconstruction and seems a waste of resources fo only 10 to 15 years when you seem to have based all your findings for climate change changes and there effects over 100 year period hence you will not be able to control water levels in lake Ellismere after 100 years seems a bit early to be closing and pulling Everything down after only 15 years.</p> <p><b>s7(2)(a)</b></p> <p><b>s7(2)(a)</b></p> <p>We are very proud of our home and has it valued at between <b>s7(2)(a)</b> but this will most likely be affected by the latest DOL decisions <b>s7(2)(a)</b></p> <p><b>s7(2)(a)</b> and aare now in a situation where we could lose everything and at our age we are worried scared frightened what will happen to us?</p>	Feedback acknowledged







[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Would you please advise the date that the LIM report for the Huts signalled a finite end. Would you please reply by Thursday 28th March.</p>	<p>Council has added information on the LIMS since the early 2020's. The comment refers to a letter issued to each licence holder with regard to proposed changes to the Deed of Licence and that any potential purchaser of any of the huts should be made aware by the hut owner of the proposed changes in the current situation in relation to the tenure of the licence.</p> <p>The Council also advised on the LIM notices from this time that it would not be processing any transfer of a Deed of Licence to a new owner without first checking that they had received a copy of the letter and understood the proposed changes.</p> <p>I do note however that matters of tenure aren't strictly required to be included in LIM's and that information was also included on our website in the early 2020's.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>I wish to ask for some answers to issues that have come up in the report tabled at the SDC meeting on the 23 th March and also the draft deed of licence.</p> <p>1: When is the sewer line expected to be granted resource consent ?</p> <p>2: When is the pipe work projected to start and finish ?</p> <p>3: Is resource consent for the existing sewer system at the huts going to roll over until the pipeline is completed and functional ?</p> <p>4: What is the proposed use for the reserve once the huts are removed ?</p> <p>5: On expulsion in 2039, what does the term Cleared Site mean by SDC standards ?</p> <p>6: What remediation work has to be done to the huts sites and reserve after the huts are removed and who pays</p> <p>7: I would like a copy of the draft deed of license posted to me as ours in the community have received one.</p> <p>The apologies and acknowledgments from councillors that the SDC did not keep us informed regularly or consult with us enough throughout the process was one small step in the right direction but does not make it RIGHT or take away the harm it has caused to all involved.</p> <p>That said, because of the time constraints imposed on all stakeholders to review the draft deed, seek legal advise, review all Acts quoted at the SDC meeting, I would expect a reply to the above questions within two days please. Thus showing the commitment from SDC to be seen to be trying to do things right for the people!</p>	<p>1. This is expected to be early April 2024</p> <p>2. Starting time of April 2024 and be completed by December 2024 or earlier. This is dependent on a number of variables, but the aim is to complete as soon as practically possible.</p> <p>3. No there is no existing consent. It is on continuance from Environment Canterbury on the expectation that this pipeline will be complete as soon as possible.</p> <p>4. Future use will be determined by the Council of the day.</p> <p>5. A cleared site is a site that is cleared of all foundation, buildings, vehicles and other items that are owned by or have been introduced to the reserve by Licence holders.</p> <p>6. It is not possible to know what remediation will be required until the site is cleared.</p> <p>7. A copy of the revised DOL will be sent to all hut owners as soon as possible.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>I have a couple of questions. Firstly at what date did the Lim reports for the Upper Selwyn Huts indicate limited "finite" terms or date, on the LIM reports?</p> <p>We are paying for 30% of the new Sewage pipe and it has 50+ years, and as we are paying for a small portion of its life, what is the future plan for this and the surrounding area?</p> <p>Will there be any Compensation if the pipeline does not advance? or built?</p> <p>DOL 30 years is the best solution for all of us, and the solution to work together. Three days to look over 174 pages, to agree to any conditions and to be able to understand all on the DOL, before the council meeting was unjustifiable.</p> <p>I would like to put forward again if we can defer a decision for us to do due diligence for both parties.</p> <p>thank you for your time</p>	<p>Apologies for the late response.</p> <p>1.Council added information on the LIMS since the early 2020's. The comment refers to a letter issued to each licence holder with regard to proposed changes to the Deed of Licence and that any potential purchaser of any of the huts should be made aware by the hut owner of the proposed changes in the current situation in relation to the tenure of the licence.</p> <p>The Council also advised on the LIM notices from this time that it would not be processing any transfer of a Deed of Licence to a new owner without first checking that they had received a copy of the letter and understood the proposed changes.</p> <p>I do note however that matters of tenure aren't strictly required to be included in LIM's and that information was also included on our website in the early 2020's.</p> <p>2.Future use for the reserve will be determined by the Council of the day.</p> <p>3.The pipeline is advancing as planned.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Me te whakaute.</p> <p>Regarding the council decision to evict us all from the upper Selwy huts. We were at the meeting held last week ( Wednesday 13th of March ) Your absence was noted.</p> <p>The meeting did not go well, and felt like a shambles. The vote was pre determined and I feel it was not a legal democratic vote. There were councilors that seemed to be on our side, suggesting a 30 year lease instead of the 'suggested' 15 years by your advisors. But, they were visibly shut down and forced to tow the line, very unprofessional.</p> <p>I am wondering which side of the fence you sit on Sam. Are you the boss and do you have the final say, or are you subject to your advisors views ?</p> <p>Were you not at the meeting because of internal pressure by the executive committee ? knowing that you may have a more compassionate view ?</p> <p>The executive committee seem desperatte to evict us from our homes for reasons that have not been explained to us, which will cause the eviction of 100 plus people from their homes.</p> <p>There are people at the huts that have saved money and borrowed to buy one of these cheaper houses, and the thought of being evicted after 15 years is incredibly stressful. There are over 30 children living there, many of whom go to school in Springston or Lincoln. They will come out with nothing at all with nowhere to live. There are also retired people who, if they did not have their place at the huts, would have nowhere to live.</p> <p>By giving us a 15 year eviction notice the houses have become worthless. I know that the huts have had bad press over the years but they are essentially good people that live there.</p> <p>There is a plan to connect us to the sewage scheme from Leeston but the hutties will pay a huge amount only to be evicted after a relatively short time. We have not been given a reason for the demise of the huts and we reject the decision as bad management. I implore you to reconsider the council's decision to reverse it to a 30 year lease instead of a 15 year lease that was dictated to us by a few entitled councilors who seem to have little compassion. Just a determination to evict 100 people from their homes.</p> <p>This will be a good case for the Human rights commission.</p> <p>I don't think this will be good mana for the council.</p>	<p>Thank you for writing to me about the Selwyn Huts and our Councils recent decision to close the huts in 15 years' time. I will try and answer all your questions, but before I do I want to say that this was a difficult decision for Council to make and one that we took having carefully considered all the evidence and opinions before us as well as the decisions made by organisations that administer the other lake side communities. The outcome of the meeting was certainly not pre-determined and having spoken to the deputy mayor, who chaired the meeting, and watched the meeting online, I know that everybody who wanted to speak did do so, including members of Huts community.</p> <p>I do not have the final say on Council decisions, we make decisions as a group. My role now is to ensure the breadth of work required is completed following the councils decision.</p> <p>During the meeting Councillors agreed that over the next 15 years Hut owners and residents would be supported by a community reference group to assist Council in the wider programme of work. This group will be made up of members of the Upper Selwyn Huts community and other organisations and agencies that will work through the 15-year transition period to support the interests of all Hut owners and residents. I can assure you that Hut owners and residents will not be left on their own.</p> <p>The cost of the waste water pipeline is expensive, however the consequences of not installing a way of dealing with the Huts waste water would have resulted in Environment Canterbury not allowing continued occupation of the Huts beyond 30 June this year. In recognition of the high cost of the waste water pipe Council agreed to reduce the amount that Hut owners would pay for the waste water pipe line by 70 % of the original cost.</p> <p>Feedback on the lease can be done via email huts@selwyn.govt.nz or in person at a drop-in session on Monday 22 April or at a public meeting on Tuesday 23 April at 6pm. Both events will be at Springston South Soldiers Memorial Hall.</p> <p>Thank you again for writing to me.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>I want at least a 30 year DOL that would be fair s7(2)(a) that would make our properties viable for prospective byers whom would be advised before they purchased the DOL terms and conditions hence there would be no if but why and the council and prospective owners would have clarity e.g. 30 years from 2024 would be 2054 no ifs and buts you sign a DOL which specifies your exit time period,</p> <p>Any new owners coming in under a 30 year DOL would have ample time to recoup there investment be it via cheaper accommodation for 30 years saving them probably \$400. A week in rental costs alone or an investor whom rents out the property would make a substantial profit around \$500,000 after DOL costs insurance maintenance tax commitments</p> <p>So yes I need a 30 year DOL s7(2)(a)</p> <p>You the council could buy me out s7(2)(a) I don't know the government normally pay out compensation when they reclaim land don't they well you obviously want the land for something otherwise you would not be rushing this through so I think there is a claim for compensation</p>	<p>Thank you for your emails explaining your situation. The advice you received before you bought your house was correct that the DOL was being issued year by year while we investigated the potential waste water solution.</p> <p>You do not say the exact date you bought your hut, however it is important to know that on 8 May 2019 the Council unanimously determined that 'Hut licences and subsequent renewals are short term and ultimately for a finite period'.</p> <p>Council also decided at the recent meeting that they would establish a community project group that would manage the 15 year period before the huts are closed. The project group will work with all hut owner to manage the transition period and explore possible options at the end of the Deed of Licence. As the project group have not yet been formed it is not possible for me to speculate on how they will support future house options beyond the 15 years.</p>



[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Good morning</p> <p>I just want to clarify a couple of things from the report that went to the councillors about why you are proposing we have a finite term of 15 years.</p> <p>1. The main reason seems to me to be the concerns about climate change and the possibility in the future of being unable to open the lake.</p> <p>2. The inability to renew a lease based on the Reserves Act stating a lease can only be for 33 years.</p> <p>3. Objections from Ngai Tahu to us living here. Please explain these objections.</p> <p>If I have missed anything would you please let me know. I have previously asked for the reasons to be explained so I would appreciate it if you could treat this as urgent. s7(2)(a)</p>	<p>Please see below responses to your questions.</p> <p>1.Climate change was one of the considerations that led to the finite term of 15 years being decided upon.</p> <p>2.The Reserves Act states that a lease cannot be granted for a period of longer than 33 Years <a href="https://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/1977/0066/latest/DLM444767.html?search=sw_096be8ed81df72a6_%2233+years%22_25_se&amp;p=1&amp;sr=1">https://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/1977/0066/latest/DLM444767.html?search=sw_096be8ed81df72a6_%2233+years%22_25_se&amp;p=1&amp;sr=1</a> 2B) A lease granted pursuant to subsection (2A) shall be subject to the following provisions: (a)the lease shall be for a term not exceeding 33 years, with or without a right of renewal, perpetual or otherwise, for the same or any shorter term, but with no right of acquiring the fee simple, and, subject to paragraph (b), shall be on such other conditions as the administering body determines:</p> <p>3.The statement read out at the meeting on 13 March 24 Council meeting was self-explanatory and it would not be for us to expand on the statement. <a href="https://www.youtube.com/live/mZ8QBe5UL7E?si=uwyCgdG2MyftAKy8">https://www.youtube.com/live/mZ8QBe5UL7E?si=uwyCgdG2MyftAKy8</a></p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Thanks for your answers but I still have a question about the objections from Ngai Tahu. The report in the public agenda refers to consultation with Te Taumutu Runanga in 2023 and the consensus being an expectation of a finite time for us. I understand there have also been no to we meetings like this. What reasons were given then for their objections to us being here?</p>	<p>Thank you for you follow up email. I am not in a position to expand on the Te Taumutu Runanga position that was explained in the Council meeting on 13 March 2024.</p> <p>If you would like to explore the Runanga position further, it would be better for you to do so with them directly. Thank you.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>s7(2)(a)</p> <p>Any advice/suggestions would be greatly appreciated.</p>	<p>Apologies for a late response.</p> <p>The information that hut licences were under consideration has been readily available from our Council. When buying any property, the onus is on the buyer to ensure they understand, any conditions associated with the purchase.</p> <p>Council agreed on 13 March 2024 meeting that we intend to establish a community reference group to assist Council in the wider programme of work over the next 15 years. This group will be made up of people and organisation that will support Hut owners, residents, and Council achieve the best possible outcome for all parties. It is hoped that members of the Upper Selwyn Huts community will join this group and work towards collective outcomes. It is not possible to outline what these outcomes are or how they will be achieved until the group is formed. However, the Terms of Reference of this group will be wide ranging and will focus on looking after the welfare interests of hut owners and residents.</p> <p>We will keep hut owners and residents updated with any developments in regards to the community reference group.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Huts,</p> <p>Firstly we do not expect that the council will negotiate in any way through an arbitrary committee. We are all interested parties to a licence / lease and we expect that any negotiations relative to our lease shall be with us. In that context we welcome some recent consultation with us directly. This Can you please advise the councils reasons for termination of occupancy of the lease as we are struggling to understand the reasoning for that decision.</p> <p>We expect more communication on the lease but want to understand some elements to frame comment appropriately.</p> <p>Given I assume this termination is clearly understood by council we'd like a response by COB Monday April 8th 2024. Please advise if you are unable achieve this, which we would expect unlikely.</p>	<p>The decision was made following the linked report to Council which is available on the SDC website: <a href="https://www.selwyn.govt.nz/__data/assets/pdf_file/0004/349861/2019-05-08-REPORT-USH-future-occupancy-strategy-May-Council-2019-with-attachments.pdf">https://www.selwyn.govt.nz/__data/assets/pdf_file/0004/349861/2019-05-08-REPORT-USH-future-occupancy-strategy-May-Council-2019-with-attachments.pdf</a> Recommendation 3. That the huts are located on a reserve and offering licences into the future, with climate change challenges and a desire to return the reserve to an open space area, means that signalling a finite period for licences is the position that the Council wishes to take."</p> <p>The minutes of this meeting are below and the decision regarding a finite Deed of Licence can be seen on page 6 <a href="https://www.selwyn.govt.nz/__data/assets/pdf_file/0007/303838/CONFIRMED-Public-Minutes-Council-meeting-8-May-2019-Copy.pdf">https://www.selwyn.govt.nz/__data/assets/pdf_file/0007/303838/CONFIRMED-Public-Minutes-Council-meeting-8-May-2019-Copy.pdf</a> Decision 3. Council now determines that hut licences and subsequent renewals are short term and ultimately for a finite period.' CARRIED</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Some questions about your reply:</p> <p>1 "Council has added information on the LIMS since the early 2020s" - would you please provide a copy of the information added and the date this happened.</p> <p>2 "Any potential purchaser should be made aware of the proposed changes in the current situation in relation to the tenure of the Licence" ... "not be processing any transfer of a deed of Licence to a new owner without checking first that they had received a copy of the letter and understood the proposed changes" - would you please send me a copy of the letter and advise how the Council checked that a potential new owner had received this and understood it.</p> <p>Thanks</p>	<p>This was LIM note that was available from 2020 and appeared on the first LIM in 2021.</p> <p>"Deed of Licence Renewal</p> <p>Council issued information (April 2020) to each licence holder with regard to proposed changes to the 'Deed of Licence' and the 'Licence and Other Charges Fees'. Any potential purchaser of any of the huts should be made aware, by the hut owner, of the proposed changes and the current situation in relation to the tenure of the hut licence. The Council will not be processing any transfer of a Deed of Licence to a new owner without first checking that they have received a copy of the letter and understood the proposed changes. Depending on when the transfer is to occur will depend on whether the existing licence will apply of the proposed new licence. Further consultation with the huts community will be undertaken on the terms and conditions contained within the licence document."</p> <p>I attach April 2020 letter</p> <p>In regard to how Council checked that a potential new owner had received this and understood it I assume it was during the dialogue that occurred through the license transfer process. WORD Doc attached from 22 April 2020 Renewal of USH DOL</p>



[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>Could I please obtain a copy of the report which outlines the reasons behind putting a finite time frame on the huts settlement.</p> <p>I would appreciate this asap due to the next meeting being so soon.</p>	<p>The decision was made following this report to Council which is available on our website.</p> <p><a href="https://www.selwyn.govt.nz/__data/assets/pdf_file/0004/349861/2019-05-08-REPORT-USH-future-occupancy-strategy-May-Council-2019-with-attachments.pdf">https://www.selwyn.govt.nz/__data/assets/pdf_file/0004/349861/2019-05-08-REPORT-USH-future-occupancy-strategy-May-Council-2019-with-attachments.pdf</a></p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>3. That the huts are located on a reserve and offering licences into the future, with climate change challenges and a desire to return the reserve to an open space area, means that signalling a finite period for licences is the position that the Council wishes to take."</p> <p>The minutes of this meeting are below and the decision regarding a finite Deed of Licence can be seen on page 6</p> <p><a href="https://www.selwyn.govt.nz/__data/assets/pdf_file/0007/303838/CONFIRMED-Public-Minutes-Council-meeting-8-May-2019-Copy.pdf">https://www.selwyn.govt.nz/__data/assets/pdf_file/0007/303838/CONFIRMED-Public-Minutes-Council-meeting-8-May-2019-Copy.pdf</a></p> <p>Decision</p> <p>3. Council now determines that hut licences and subsequent renewals are short term and ultimately for a finite period.'</p> <p>CARRIED</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>So who are you? What is your history &amp; your connection with the Selwyn district?? I see a suit &amp; hear a voice delivering figures, assumptions, predictions based on what actual fact??</p> <p>You and your henchmen continue to use "global warming" &amp; "climate change" as an excuse to vacate the Selwyn Hut Settlement by 2039, but in who's lifetime might this prediction actually happen??</p> <p>At what cost to the Selwyn ratepayers is your consultancy costs on this matter??</p> <p>This land was gifted to the crown and we as hut owners were insured of a 99 yr roll over lease when we purchased our huts. What is your grandiose plans for the site once all the baches have been demolished &amp; we have paid 30% towards "the pipeline?" A camping ground, a reserve for all of the Selwyn district to enjoy???</p> <p>I mean this whole debacle could be avoided by getting each ratepayer in the Selwyn district to pay an extra \$20 per quarter in their rates? I believe the population in the Selwyn district is in excess of 80,000, some being minors &amp; in less than 2yrs this whole project would be paid for!!</p> <p>Coes Ford, Chamberlains Ford, Lakeside Domain all have new facilities which I have contributed to yet never use.</p> <p>All of the abovementioned areas are greatly frequented by freedom campers who don't spend a cent in our district yet enjoy toilets and a free rubbish service. This is revenue the Selwyn Council is happy to ignore!!</p> <p>I am a double ratepayer in the Selwyn District therefore pay more to access the Rolleston Pool than the person that lives next door to it!! Hardly fair when I've never even dipped my big toe into the water, oh and then there is an added cost to actually use it!!</p> <p>You mention the flooding at the Lower Selwyn Huts, now these residents have their own grey water tanks plus it should be up to the individual owners to have insurance to cover damage in times of flooding?? So what actual cost is this to the Selwyn District Council in the event of a natural disaster??</p> <p>Then we have the national housing crisis in New Zealand. Why would you evacuate people from their own homes where they are warm, dry and happy to reside??</p> <p>The wait list for emergency housing is in excess of 6mnths and people are being allocated motels as temporary accomodation with yet another huge cost to the nationa taxpayer!!</p> <p>My Bach at the Upper Selwyn Huts was valued at <b>s/(2)(a)</b> overnight it has plummeted to <b>s/(2)(a)</b> so am I still expected to pay rates on the greater valuation?? I think NOTH!</p> <p>Also I attended the proposed Community Centre meeting in Leeston yesterday with 2 SDC councilors present plus 3 other representatives pertaining to Council administration, planning &amp; finances. It was revealed that \$3million had been paid to the 3 residents who owned the properties where the proposed building would be built and the SDC also absorbed the costs to clear the site!!! I believe this is called "compensation" something that you are failing to offer us hutowners at the Selwyn Huts!!!</p> <p>That brings me to the so called "Code of Conduct" expected at the Selwyn Huts. You, the SDC created this so I say "You fix it" &amp; don't think this will happen by implementing a set of rules equivalent to that of communism!!!</p> <p><b>s/(2)(a)</b></p> <p>I mean this whole scenario could be avoided if some commonsense was applied &amp; I'm no rocket scientist.</p> <p>I propose that a "Vote of No Confidence" be applied to you and the SDC.</p>	<p>Thank you for your e-mail. We acknowledge your frustrations. We will look to include the points you have made as feedback to Councillors when they make the final decision about the Deed of Licence. We recognise that there is a strong sense of community in the Huts, as there is in many other communities across Selwyn.</p> <p>As part of this process, Council will be establishing a group of people who can discover the issues that hut owners and residents will face over the next 15 years and work towards amicable solutions. The composition of this group has yet to be agreed but we hope that hut owners will play a significant part.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>I have a couple of questions I am hoping you can help me with.</p> <p>1) Can you please tell me what discussion there has been around the future use of the Selwyn Upper Huts area?</p> <p>2) As you are not the landlords of our homes, just the landlord of the land, can you legally ask to enter our homes. These are not council flats.</p> <p>I await your response.</p>	<p>Thank you for your email, in answer to your questions.</p> <p>The long-Term future of the site that Upper Selwyn Huts current sit on has not been decided. That will be for the Council of the day to decide. You will be aware that the area is a Reserve and as such that will be a primary concern for the council of the day when they make that decision.</p> <p>You have asked if Council can legally enter your Huts, while the terms in the licence allows Council staff to enter the Lot for the purposes of completing an inspection (clause 12.2), at this point there are no plans to have an inspection that would include access to buildings unless there was a compelling health and safety issue that needed to be addressed. The Dangerous and Insanitary Building provisions of the Building Act 2004, provides Councils authority to take action on dangerous and insanitary buildings in any part of the district.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>For 114 years the Upper Selwyn Huts were self administered with an annual licence fee to cover our internal expenditure. From this fund we were able to construct two successful sewer schemes the first in 1920 included a holding tank that effluent was truck away, the second in 1987 which was a boarder dyke system.</p> <p>In 2011 the SDC took over the administration of the settlement. The SDC council has continued to claim the payment of this Licence Fee and now we are faced with an horrific invoice to gain compliance with the installation of a pipe line to the Pines in Burnham.</p> <p>Please explain why we are not on the District Wide Rates for water and sewage; as the settlement I believe should have been moved on to this in 2011; following the transfer from the self administered system.</p> <p>I have made three attempts as a speaker at the council meetings to have this change made, the only response I have received is that other rate payers would not be happy to approve this move. I am not happy the be faced with paying for our portion of the pipeline, when I can only use it for possibly 1 year or 5 years as the new draft Deed of Licence indicates.</p>	<p>Apologies for a late response on this one:</p> <p>Thank you for your email. Council has reviewed this issue on several occasions and decided that it is not appropriate for the Upper Selwyn Huts to be part of the district-wide rates for water and sewage. As the Huts were never intended for full-time residence, it would not have made sense to have rated huts for these services when they were only occupied for a limited number of days each year. This historical precedence continued once the 365 day a year occupation was permitted.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Good morning</p> <p>I am still waiting for answers to the following questions:</p> <p>1. Would you please give a detailed explanation of the planned inspection process of our homes.</p> <p>We are considering how the inspection process will work. However, as Licensors Council have a responsibility to ensure that our legislative responsibilities are met. This is in relation to a range of legislation from the RMA to Health and Safety, the Building Act and our own Deed of Licence requirements. Currently we do not have certainty around whether we are fulfilling these responsibilities, and the lot inspection is to find out if we are doing so. Council are still developing that plan but in general terms it is about being compliant with various pieces of legislation to ensure that the health and safety of hut owners is not compromised and that Council is meeting its statutory obligations.</p> <p>2. Would you please confirm that the letter from Douglas Marshall in 2022 was provided to all new owners from that date.</p> <p>Please can you specify which letter with a date. Do you mean the letter dated 22 April 2020 from Douglas Marshall ?</p> <p>3. Would you please clarify how the Council confirmed new owners understood there was a finite term to the Licence. The LIM states that the Council will be checking that new owners received the letter (the one from Douglas Marshall?) and would make sure they understood the proposed changes. Saying that you assumed the Council would check is not an answer. If this is stated on the LIM then surely there was a process in place. If this information was first notes on the LIM in 2021 why were prospective owners not advised until 2022?</p> <p>The information that hut Deeds of Licence were under consideration has been readily available from our Council. When buying any property, the onus is on the buyer to ensure they understand, any conditions associated with the purchase of any property across the district.</p> <p>4. Would you please provide minutes or correspondence re the consultation with <b>s/(5)(a)(b)</b> on 9 November 2023 as referred to in the report prepared for the Council meeting on 4 March, 2024.</p> <p>We are considering this request and will respond soon.</p> <p>5. Thank you for sending me a hard copy of both the report and the Licence. I received it on the 9th of April. I would consider my opportunity to consult and get legal advice starts from that day. I can't really do either though until I get answers to questions. Would you please confirm that all owners were sent a hard copy of the report.</p> <p>Reports were made available to those who requested hard copies or who were registered as an owner who wanted to receive hard copies and not emails as their primary form of communication. Hard copies were also provided for your community meeting this past weekend.</p>	<p>1. We are considering how the inspection process will work. However, as Licensors Council have a responsibility to ensure that our legislative responsibilities are met. This is in relation to a range of legislation from the RMA to Health and Safety, the Building Act and our own Deed of Licence requirements. Currently we do not have certainty around whether we are fulfilling these responsibilities, and the lot inspection is to find out if we are doing so. Council are still developing that plan but in general terms it is about being compliant with various pieces of legislation to ensure that the health and safety of hut owners is not compromised and that Council is meeting its statutory obligations.</p> <p>2. Do you mean the letter dated 22 April 2020 from Douglas Marshall ?</p> <p>3. The information that hut Deeds of Licence were under consideration has been readily available from our Council. When buying any property, the onus is on the buyer to ensure they understand, any conditions associated with the purchase of any property across the district.</p> <p>4. We are considering this request and will respond soon. (OIA request).</p> <p>5. Reports were made available to those who requested hard copies or who were registered as an owner who wanted to receive hard copies and not emails as their primary form of communication. Hard copies were also provided for your community meeting this past weekend.</p>



[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>She is confused because she has been told that the licence gives her permission to stay for 15 years, but in reading the deed, it says that the council has the option not to renew the 5-year term for reasons like climate change (cl 5.1).</p> <p>Also, it looks like the council could decide to cancel the licence at any time if it decides it is no longer economically feasible, or lawful, to provide water, wastewater or other infrastructure services to the lot" (cl. 24.1).</p> <p>Overall it looks like there is a lot of uncertainty on whether the residents will get the full 15 years that the council has voted on.</p> <p>Could you please provide some reassurance around whether this will be the case?</p>	<p>Your interpretation of the Deed of licence is correct regarding both Clause 5.1 and 24.1 is correct. These clauses are in place to protect both the owner and the Council if conditions change to the point where a DOL is no longer viable. It offers Council a point to review these conditions at 5 yearly intervals and a provision to respond to a change of legislation or costs associated with the Deed of Licence.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>I am emailing you in response to your statement that you read at the Council meeting 13/3/24.</p> <p>Despite saying that your statement would come to no surprise to our community members, we were all astounded by your speech, and have been confused ever since.</p> <p>We would like to open up a conversation with you to help us understand how we impact your rights to mahinga kai and how we affect the health of Te Waihora, as well as how we can work with you to reduce our impact. Being told you support us being evicted from our homes and demolishing them, for reasons we do not understand is extremely surprising and traumatic.</p> <p>Can you please let us know the meetings ie dates, times, locations, that you refer to, where your views were expressed to our community over many years?</p> <p>I am only aware of one meeting on Thursday, 31 May 2018 where a representative of Ngai Tahu spoke about cultural significance and challenges of the area. I've been told by people who attended that meeting that the only issue discussed was with the current sewer system which will no longer be relevant once the agreed sewer upgrade is in place. No other issues were mentioned.</p> <p>You say that you obtained legal advice on the leases, climate change modelling, environmental impacts on the huts settlements, and on the natural environment, including Te Waihora. And that this supports your view that all leases should end 30 June 2024.</p> <p>The Councils Aqualinc climate change modelling does not have the Upper Selwyn Huts affected by flooding during an extreme event by 2040. Therefore this report does not seem to support a finite 15 year term, let alone the shorter period you suggest, but rather a 15 year licence which could then be reviewed at the end of that term.</p> <p>Can you please explain how our settlement will impact on Te Waihora and your ability to practice mahinga kai once the sewer upgrade is complete?</p> <p>I can see from your statement how Greenpark Huts and Lower Selwyn Huts might have an impact, I am not an expert on those settlements. However we are all at a loss on how the Upper Selwyn Huts impacts on your community, being mana whenua Ngai Te Ruahikihiki hapu Taumutu Rununga as well as on Ngai Tuahuriri.</p> <p>I look forward to hearing from you and to having a meeting at your earliest convenience so we can better understand your position.</p>	<p>Thank you for your e-mail. As your question is for Taumutu rūnanga please can you ask the rūnanga directly.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>For 114 years the Upper Selwyn Huts were self administered with an annual licence fee to cover our internal expenditure. From this fund we were able to construct two successful sewer schemes the first in 1920 included a holding tank that effluent was truck away, the second in 1987 which was a boarder dyke system.</p> <p>In 2011 the SDC took over the administration of the settlement. The SDC council has continued to claim the payment of this Licence Fee and now we are faced with an horrific invoice to gain compliance with the installation of a pipe line to the Pines in Burnham.</p> <p>Please explain why we are not on the District Wide Rates for water and sewage; as the settlement I believe should have been moved on to this in 2011; following the transfer from the self administered system.</p> <p>I have made three attempts as a speaker at the council meetings to have this change made, the only response I have received is that other rate payers would not be happy to approve this move. I am not happy the be faced with paying for our portion of the pipeline, when I can only use it for possibly 1 year or 5 years as the new draft Deed of Licence indicates.</p>	<p>Apologies for a late response on this one:</p> <p>Thank you for your email. Council has reviewed this issue on several occasions and decided that it is not appropriate for the Upper Selwyn Huts to be part of the district-wide rates for water and sewage. As he Huts were never intended for full-time residence, it would not have made sense to have rated huts for these services when they were only occupied for a limited number of days each year. This historical precedence continued once the 365 day a year occupation was permitted.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Good morning</p> <p>I am writing to request two extensions of time regarding the draft Licence for the Selwyn Huts.</p> <p>1. We need an extension of time in which to provide feedback and engage in the consultation process. There are only 18 working days between the date the Licence was provided and the public meeting, and less than two months in total review time before the Council will finalise the Deed. This is an unreasonably short time frame in which to do this, especially considering the dire circumstances this Licence puts us in. We do not have answers to all of the questions that have been asked about the Licence and report.</p> <p>It is also not enough time to seek legal advice on this binding contract. We ask that you extend the time for feedback until 31st July, 2024. This would be a reasonable amount of time to allow owners to seek legal advice on the Licence and to then be in a position to give informed feedback on the proposed Deed.</p> <p>2. We also ask that you extend the date for the final approval by Council from May 2024 to 30th September 2024 and also the date for residents to sign (no less than 30 days after the final Deed has been provided).</p> <p>The current timing gives the Councillors less than one month after the public meeting for the council to review all feedback, make any adjustments to the draft Deed, and vote on the final Licence. This seems insufficient time for the Councillors to read and consider feedback from the residents and to make any changes to the draft Deed.</p> <p>To demonstrate good faith and natural justice, there needs to be sufficient time for decision makers to hear from the affected individuals about the terms in this Deed. Adjusting the deadline for final approval by the Council is also necessary if the public feedback timeline is extended.</p>	<p>Internal note- Feedback was extended</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>What about the farm house owned by Ngai Tahu?</p>	<p>A contribution is payable for all properties that are connected to the new line. Contributions will come from different funding sources depending on the property. If it is from camping ground toilet, it would be funded from a general rating source.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Thank you for the reply but I still wish some further clarity on some aspects please.</p> <p>1. Is SDC intention to also connect Coes ford and Chamberlains ford camping grounds to the proposed pipeline?</p> <p>2. Cleared site: Is it expected that we remove all plantings, trees, fences etc so the reserve is back to pre settlement condition? Many of the large trees have been added over the entire time of habitation in the settlement so who is responsible for their removal?</p> <p>3. If a house is removed before the finite term who is responsible for fences between properties? Do we remove half a fence each?</p> <p>That's it for now.</p>	<p>1. Is SDC intention to also connect Coes ford and Chamberlains ford camping grounds to the proposed pipeline? This has yet to be decided</p> <p>2. Cleared site: Is it expected that we remove all plantings, trees, fences etc so the reserve is back to pre settlement condition? Many of the large trees have been added over the entire time of habitation in the settlement so who is responsible for their removal? The final condition of the site will be determined by Council of the day however to means any structure that has been introduced to the reserve by the hut owner</p> <p>3. If a house is removed before the finite term who is responsible for fences between properties? Do we remove half a fence each? Each case will be considered individually so it is not possible to say.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>As I have been readinf through the draft DOL I had in the back of my mind your answer to my question relating to entering our homes. I came across Clause 26.1. Does this not contradict Clause 12.2? I am sure you will say clause 12.2 states there will be 10 days notice before you will enter the property. However, that doesn't equate to Quite enjoyment.</p> <p>Also, you didn't answer my actual question, what discussions have been around the future use of the Upper Selwyn huts area.</p> <p>Look forward to hearing from you by the 16th April 2024.</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>Please submit this as feedback as we are still considering the inspection. I don't expect that we will be entering huts, just looking at the lot. The future of the reserve will be decided by the council of the day</p>



[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>SDC has issued us with a maximum 15 year finite term on our Licence to Occupy after which we must demolish our perfecting good, warm, dry homes at our cost.</p> <p>Your own report which recommends this decision states that one of the main reasons for this is cultural reasons.</p> <p>It says that one aim of the SDC decision is to support the wellbeing of Te Waihora/Lake Ellesmere. It also states that our closure impacts Te Taumutu rūnanga's Mana Whenua.</p> <p>Additionally, although Megan McKay's statement to the council on 13/3/24 doesn't specifically state her rūnanga's objections to the USH, her statement implies that we have environmental impacts which includes impacts on Te Waihora, and on their ability to practice mahinga kai.</p> <p>Considering:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The devastating effects the SDC maximum 15 finite term will have on our community;</li> <li>2) Our contract is with the Council who administers the Crown land which we occupy, and is not with Taumutu rūnanga;</li> <li>3) The Council's report relies on these cultural reasons to recommend this short finite term;</li> <li>4) Megan McKay is Taumutu rūnanga's representative at the Council, and</li> <li>5) Councillor Dean voted against the 30 year amendment partially due his support for the mana whenua's view,</li> </ol> <p>I believe the Council should be able to answer my question direct and not request that I try to obtain my answer from Taumutu rūnanga myself.</p> <p>Please can you answer my question. How will the Upper Selwyn Hut's affect Mana Whenua; the health of Te Waihora and Te Taumutu rūnanga's ability to practice mahinga kai once the new sewer system is operational?</p>	<p>You have been requested to pose any questions regarding the Taumutu statement to Taumutu. Please pursue this question along those lines. Thank you.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>I have one more question to add to the set I sent over the weekend (below).</p> <p>10. The draft DoL does not seem to include an option for the Licensee to terminate the licence. As far as I can tell, the only time a licensee can terminate is if the hut has been seriously damaged or destroyed (d 23).</p> <p>If ?? decided to move before the expiry of the Licence, there does not seem to be any option for her to terminate, so she would still be obligated to pay for the fees in the deed until its expiry.</p> <p>I would expect that the residents should have the option to leave when they choose to, when they have found a new housing option. I don't think the Council would have intended to prevent this, correct?</p> <p>Could you please let me know if such a clause will be included in the final Deed?</p>	<p>Thank you for your question. We are reviewing the Deed of Licence in light of your question that has been asked by others. Our intention is that the Deed of Licence is fair to both parties and is seems reasonable that either party should have the ability to terminate the licence. The final decision on this will be made when we have feedback form all owners.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Good evening,</p> <p>I am email to request the feedback time to be extended to 31 July 2024.</p> <p>And the final vote to be moved to 30 September 2024.</p>	<p>Thank you for your e-mail. We will consider your request and get back to you.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Request to delete the reference to 7. Bond</p> <p>As per previously discussions with the SDC, I wish to have reference " 7. Bond " deleted from the final Deed of Licence. My family have been owners of ?? that is 101 years of paying Rates and Licence Fees and that should be enough to be trusted to meet the obligations set by the SDC on being evicted, following cancellation of the licence to occupy.</p> <p>I have concerns over the costing listed in the draft DOL as quoted the dollars requested of \$383 per quarter translates to \$1532 per annum and over 15 years a total of \$22980.</p> <p>If this is an error and it was intended to be \$383 per annum it still equates to \$5745.</p> <p>If the bond is enforced is it intended to payout interest on our investment considering the SDC are charging the Upper Selwyn Huts dwellings 6.5% for the loan on the wastewater pipe?</p> <p>It is bad enough to be told that we have a finite length of time to remain at the settlement but to have to made to pay a bond in advance is over the top.</p>	<p>Thank you, this point will be considered as feedback to the Deed of Licence and considered once all the feedback has been received. A response will be provided then.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Huts,</p> <p>Our hut at [withheld] has been in our family for [redacted] generations. In all of that time, we have not been faced with a DOL that we feel we are unable to sign.</p> <p>The deed has significant areas of concern which require clarification and/or amendment:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.The DOL has many different ways for the licensor to give the licensee 20 days' notice to vacate. Is the licensee able to give 20 working days' notice to vacate at any time during the license period? This needs to be included in the DOL along with the/any implications for the Licensee / Licensor. Be aware that the council's own document from 4/03/24 UPPER SELWYN HUTS FUTURE OCCUPANCY STRATEGY Report noted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•6.4 If hut owners decide to leave USH their share of repayments towards the Pines WWTP connection will stop and fall to Council.</li> </ul> We would expect to see that detailed in a revised draft.</li> <li>2. Section 12. The Licensor Inspection Program. Despite our hut having been fine to live in without any such inspection for 101 years, you are now proposing to inspect it. Please advise in detail, exactly what criteria and/or regulations will be applied to this inspection. The same criteria will obviously be applied to all huts and needs to be made public to all and details included in the DOL so that all residents know exactly what they are agreeing to. How could we contract to an unknown requirement? We would expect to see that detailed in a revised draft.</li> <li>3. Section 28. Please explain why our huts must be yielded quietly to the Council on expiry or termination of the term? The hut is the property of the Licensee. If you do not request the hut be removed by the owners, what do you intend to do with our hut? If the licensee elects to remove their hut, when/how will the bond held by the council be returned to them and what is the process for the licensee to claim back the bond? We would expect to see this whole area to be detailed in a revised draft.</li> <li>3a – We would also expect the community to remove the buildings/facilities that were community funded and are part of the reserve. This should be noted in the document.</li> <li>4. Schedule 1 point 13. The bond is referred to as \$383 per quarter. We understand this is the annual amount, please confirm and amend accordingly.</li> <li>5. Section 5 Clause 5.4 (c) 'The Licence Fee so determined must never be less than the Licence Fee payable immediately before the start of the relevant Renewal Term' . Why cannot the licence fee decrease? What reason makes this clause required?</li> <li>6. Section 6: PINES WASTEWATER CONNECTION CONTRIBUTION. Can you please advise of the consent application number for the consent of this activity. We do not expect to start paying a contribution until the pipeline is consented, built and well down Days Road and hence we can see it's completion in sight. This would be manifestly unfair to expect a contribution prior to any work beginning. If we signed this document and it SDC decided it was not economically viable then we have no recourse. We would expect to see this whole area to be detailed in a revised draft.</li> <li>7. Regarding property can you advise if you have reviewed the Reserves Act 1977 and comply with all requirements of property contained therein as there appears to be doubt.</li> <li>8. There is a property past the Selwyn Huts that is not part of the settlement. Can you advise the status of that property relative to wastewater. Will they connect into the pipeline?</li> <li>9. Bond. Please amend the next draft to include interest on funds held by you paid by Licensee and relative to the Bond. If you are holding funds in our name then we fairly expect interest to be paid on those accounts.</li> <li>10. As we will need to have a lawyer involved to before we sign any updated DOL, We request an extension to the Council's proposed time frame in order to facilitate this as clearly this document is not fit for purpose and we do not wish to spend funds getting a legal opinion when so many issues exist with the document.</li> </ol> <p>Further, the council has a social responsibility to the people who live permanently at the Upper Huts. When the decision was made by the council to allow people to reside there permanently, the SDC turned the huts into a suburb of Selwyn. As such, you have a responsibility to facilitate any relocation with support and understanding. Instead you are wanting to issue a limited term license which can be terminated by the council in many different ways and at any time, leaving the residents unsure as to how long they really do have and placing them in a position of total vulnerability. The complete lack of security offered in this DOL is unfair and we would expect better of our local council who profess that Selwyn is a "great place to bring up children and to grow old".</p>	<p>Thank you for your questions, I will answer each one in turn.</p> <p>A hut owner may terminate their licence at any time, we will treat this point as feed back for consideration in the new deed of Licence. Their is nothing further to add regarding the point that a hut owners repayments towards the WWTP connection would cease if an owner decided to leave.</p> <p>Regarding the inspection programme, below are the regulations and legislation all properties in Selwyn are subject to. These also apply to the Upper Selwyn Huts. We will</p> <p>Building Act 2004 Resource Management Act 1991 Reserves Act 1977 Property Law Act 2007 Health and Safety at Work Act 2015</p> <p>We will treat this point as feed back for consideration addition of this list in the new Deed of Licence.</p> <p>The hut is the property of the owner and must be removed by the owner at the end of the licence period.</p> <p>Thank you</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Good Morning</p> <p>In a reply to one of the owners at the Selwyn Huts you said the following:</p> <p>'During the meeting Councillors agreed that over the next 15 years Hut owners and residents would be supported by a community reference group to assist Council in the wider programme of work. This group will be made up of members of the Upper Selwyn Huts community and other organisations and agencies that will work through the 15-year transition period to support the interests of all Hut owners and residents. I can assure you that Hut owners and residents will not be left on their own'</p> <p>Would you please explain what this means.</p>	<p>Over the next 15 years it is anticipated that there will be a great deal of work to ensure the interests of all parties are looked after. Currently we do not understand all the issues that we will encounter or how they will be resolved. The plan is to get together a group of people who can discover the issues and work towards amicable solutions. The composition of this group has yet to be agreed but we hope that hut owners will play a significant part.</p>



[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>I make reference to a letter I received from SDC on 28 June 2011 titled Notification of discharge of the Springston South Reserve Management Committee (see attached pdf file of letter)</p> <p>Reasons given for this discharge include: Lack of Consultation, Allegations of favouritism, disorganisation, failure to prepare and provide up to date financial accounts, lack of progress on the preparation of Activity Management Plans, the failure to oversee completion of reserve designation issues, and the failure to address and resolve ongoing Building Act compliance issues.</p> <p>I would like to point out that the SDC has failed to address all the above issues; since taking over the administration post June 2011.</p> <p>In the 13 years that the SDC have been administering the Upper Selwyn Huts the SDC has only managed to produce one Deed of Licence and that was 2015, and we still have not seen a Management Plan.</p> <p>With the latest compressed timeline for addressing the Deed of Licence, we have had no reasonable time to consult and obtain a legal opinion, therefore I ask the SDC to provide until the end of August before finalising the formal Deed of Licence.</p>	<p>Thank you for your feedback. By now you will have received information that we have extended the feedback deadline period to the 15 July and the new Deed of Licence will now come into effect on 30 September 2024.</p> <p>Thank you</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Thank you for the sleepless nights worrying about where I will live in 5, 10 or 15 years time. <span style="background-color: black; color: red;">s7(2)(a)</span> I can not understand nor justify your so-called reason for making over 130 people including children homeless, especially in a housing crisis and with the cost of living increasing every week it seems. We choose to live out here not only for the affordability of the homes but also for the feeling of community. Living next to people that I not only know but also look out for. For the many chats on the side of the road, helping in their gardens and sharing food grown in our community gardens with eachother, watching the kids race around laughing and enjoying just being kids, with not a cellphone in sight.</p> <p>Can any of you name the neighbours in the block you live in, or go help one of them in their garden, mow their lawns while they are away or just because you want to.</p> <p>You all took on the role as councillors to look after the Selwyn District community. But yet you have isolated a whole community, not only by not allowing us to be on district wide rates, expecting us to pay 30% of a sewage system we won't have the use of in 5,10 or 15 years to the unbelievable clauses you have included in the draft DOL. On top of all of this you want us to destroy our warm livable homes in a housing crisis, at our own cost with no compensation from the Council or empathy for the uncertainty we will now live with as it's up to you whether we stay for 5, 10 or 15 years. I hope you have sent letters to the other farms, houses living in the Leeston, Springston, Little River areas of global warming and the issues of the water rising.</p> <p>Have any of you bothered to come out to our community and meet with us as individuals, please don't think having your public meetings is meeting us, or are you just going to base your decisions on what a biased councillor says about "that lot"?</p> <p>Shame on you.</p> <p>To whomever got down this far in the email I thank you for at least reading it.</p>	<p>Thank you for you email and the points you have made. They will all be included as feed back to Councillors when they make the final decision about the Deed of Licence. We recognise that there is a strong sense of community in the Huts, as there is in many other communities across Selwyn.</p> <p>As part of this process Council will be establishing a group of people who can discover the issues that hut owners and residents will face over the next 15 years and work towards amicable solutions. The composition of this group has yet to be agreed but we hope that hut owners will play a significant part.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>We would like the opportunity to continue to provide feedback, discuss and make submissions, and for the council to take another vote on the maximum 15 year term on the Draft Deed of Licence.</p> <p>On the 13th March the Council voted on changing the maximum 15 year term to 30 years. This motion did not pass. We have been told that this clause can no longer be negotiated for this reason.</p> <p>The reasons given to support the 15 year maximum term are complex and new to us.</p> <p>We feel that the Council did not give adequate time for the USH residents to submit feedback prior to this decision. A report with these issues was made available online on 8th March, only 5 days prior to the Council meeting on 13th March. Many people here do not have access to a computer or printer.</p> <p>Many USH residents are on a fixed income or have a disability, and many are extremely vulnerable. A maximum of 15 years does not give us enough time to recover financially from the loss of our life savings nor prepare for adequate housing at the end of the term. We believe the reasons provided do not justify the 15 year term.</p> <p>I ask that you review the time frame we were given for feedback on this clause which has significant consequences, and remove the restriction on the Councillors being able to vote on the maximum 15 year term again.</p> <p>Can you please confirm by this Friday 19th April, before our next community meeting, whether or not the Councillors can revisit the vote on the maximum term in the Draft Deed of Licence?</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>By now you will know that we have extended the feed back period until 15 July and postponed the issues of the final Deed of Licence by three months.</p> <p>The decision to issue a finite licence for the was made on 8 May 2019. In the March Council meeting earlier this year the finite period was defined at 15 years. The feed back we are seeking is specifically on the Deed of Licence. It is not proposed to revisits these decisions at the next Council meeting.</p> <p>You are of course free to ask to speak at the next Council meeting in public forum and make this point.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Huts,</p> <p>Thank you for the response which we find troubling.</p> <p>The process taken relative to the council policies L202 - Renewal of Leases and Licences Policy and L207 - Term of Leases and Licences Policy as per the Selwyn District Council Policy Manual dated December 2021 is flawed.</p> <p>L202, page 93 in my copy section 1(a) notes that "the Council may offer, in the first instance, the right of renewal to the existing lessee provided the land is not required by Council for any other purpose.". And while this does note the council 'may offer' there has been a long history of licences being renewed and offered WITHOUT finite terms indicated. The council is breaking a tradition historically steeped for its own unspecified purpose as it does NOT, by your notes below, have a purpose for the Reserve except a 'desire to return the land to an open space'. That is not required for another purpose, it is an outcome in contradiction to the intent of the reserve as a recreational space. Indeed the council has caused issues by their changing the area into a suburb of Selwyn and should take responsibility for same. As well the Reserve already has ample space for any purposes the council may desire.</p> <p>If there is concern that 'climate change challenges' may impact then a licence that is based on climate events, such as a flooding in the huts would be more appropriate and not terminate years of enjoyment nor rip the social fabric of those residents at the Selwyn Huts. Residents who are there because of decisions made by the SDC.</p> <p>So my specific questions is why did the council not follow it's specified policy and just renew the license as it does not have 'any other purpose' for the reserve? To return it to an open space does not meet that criteria against renewal and force a finite term.</p> <p>I expect there will be further to follow regarding this as well.</p>	<p>Thank you for your question. You have correctly identified that the policy specifically uses the word 'may' in relation to a renewal. Hence the policy does not guarantee a renewal of any existing lease regardless of whether Council has a use for the land or not.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Yesterday I witnessed a terrible heartbreaking moment.</p> <p>The Upper Selwyn Hut community received some free legal advice from a family member of one of our hut owners at a community meeting held specifically to go through the new clauses in the draft Deed of Licence, one by one.</p> <p>By the end the picture was clear. The new deed is for 5 years, not 15, with multiple ways to terminate within those 5 years, for some reasons outside of our control and with little notice. In short, we have no certainty, multiple threats to our housing and no support from our Council. If we sign our licence we can be terminated within a month (24.1(c)), if we don't we could be evicted 1st July this year.</p> <p><span style="background-color: black; color: red;">s7(2)(a)</span></p> <p><span style="background-color: black; color: red;">s7(2)(a)</span></p> <p><span style="background-color: black; color: red;">s7(2)(a)</span></p> <p><span style="background-color: black; color: red;">s7(2)(a)</span></p> <p><span style="background-color: black; color: red;">s7(2)(a)</span></p> <p>Back in 2019/2020 when the finite and 15 years were proposed, the reasons given to us was to align with the expiry of the ECan waste water resource consent. That we could understand. But once the Council advised us they were going to upgrade the waste water system so it no longer needed an ECan consent, we ALL thought the 15 finite years was no longer justified. This is was particularly true because at that stage we were to fund the upgrade 100% ourselves. Why would we assume we could only use this new self funded infrastructure for 15 years?</p> <p>Homes started to sell again, and new buyers were not clearly notified by the Council of the still present 15 finite year term, as they signed the old Deed of Licence and spent their life savings.</p> <p>So on the 8th March when we were given the new proposed Deed, we were ALL stunned to see the maximum 15 finite years still in there and new reasons for this short term. Reasons that justify a finite end sometime in the unknown future maybe, but not the maximum 15 years proposed.</p> <p>Many of you have said we knew this was coming. To say this shows a lack of understanding of the situation and the details of communication that her have been given over the past 7 years.</p> <p>We simply didn't know. We acted in good faith with the Council when we bought during this time and signed the 2015 Deed, and we are being punished for that. Many of our own lawyers advised us we didn't need to get a LIM.</p> <p>Sure there were suggestions of an uncertain future but together with the waste water upgrade and our full funding of that, we believed we could stay, at least for the medium term. Financially it was still worth buying</p> <p>The Council should have been transparent and should have clearly informed new buyers of the short term finite period. It's as simple as that. You failed to do this</p> <p>I have to believe the councillors didn't understand the proposal in full and why we had no idea this was coming, and that the lack of transparency and timing (between the 8th March when we received the 158 page proposed Deed and supporting documents, and the 13th March when your vote took place), wasn't intentional, otherwise I'd lose all faith in the democratic process.</p> <p>In short, no real consultation until now, no clear communication, no transparency and few signs of compassion.</p> <p>We have been told several times that the 15 year term is no longer able to be negotiated due to the Councillors voting outcomes on 13 March. With two working days to prepare submissions on a clause that defines our demise before voting took place, I can't understand how that is a reasonable and fair consultation period. That will be a decision for the ombudsman.</p> <p>To be honest I think most owners here want to leave now, as we can no longer enjoy what was once a peaceful community, but we can not afford to walk away from our life savings and leave our home which is no longer sellable due to the harsh new clauses in the draft deed.</p> <p>The Council has lead us to this point, and you have left us with no choices and hope of recovering financially or psychologically from this. We can't afford the legal fees to ask the Courts to assess if this is fair and reasonable.</p> <p>You know you've been trying to get rid of us for at least 15 years now, and after 7 years of legal advice and planning, you're about to succeed. But at what cost.</p> <p>We feel confused, misled and unsupported. A broken community. An unyielding Council that won't listen.</p> <p>I'm genuinely concerned for the individuals in my community. I fear for their safety. I hope you can change something in what you are doing to help us, to ensure the safety of your rate payers. Yes we pay rates. Your help will need to be more than political rhetoric and lip service to be effective. More than the contact details of a helpline at the bottom of your letters.</p> <p>What can you all do?</p> <p>Ideally give us 15 years with a climate change assessment at the end of that term, or failing that 30 finite years to allow us to financially and psychologically recover. Give us a Deed that is more reasonable so we can sign it and return to enjoying our homes for the time we have left.</p> <p>I'm asking you, please change what you are doing so the wellbeing of the individuals in the community under your administration are not at risk. How you are doing this is inhumane.</p> <p>Or you can take the heartless position of Malcolm Lyall, who told one of our committee members on the phone the day before the vote, "that's what you get when you don't own the land".</p>	<p>Thank you for your email and the points you have made. They will all be included as feedback to Councillors when they make the final decision about the Deed of Licence. We recognise that there is a strong sense of community in the Huts, as there is in many other communities across Selwyn.</p> <p>As part of this process, Council will be establishing a group of people who can discover the issues that hut owners and residents will face over the next 15 years and work towards amicable solutions. The composition of this group has yet to be agreed but we hope that hut owners will play a significant part.</p>



<div>[Name redacted - privacy]</div>	<p>Good afternoon one and all,</p> <p>having read through the draft deed causes me tone of the opinion that the SDC is treating the upper selwyn hut owners no better than the British government treated their postmasters.</p> <p>You as a council hold all the power to terminate our tenure at your will for any of numerous contentious breaches.</p> <p>No where does it give us an option to terminate with you other than death. A contract, which I consider this to be, is between 2 or more parties with equal rights to be considered for each. This license does not show that.</p> <p>1. I wish for you to include a clause that gives us the right to terminate at any stage. Pay any fees due up to the termination date and not include fees beyond that date. This should clearly state you are not liable for fees until the lease end date. ie : if we wish to terminate 12 months into the 5year term, we are not liable for 4 years of the sewer cost.</p> <p>Some owners are concerned that if the inspections take place and owners are being forced to invest vast amounts of money to remediate to your criteria on a property that is basically a worthless liability now. They should have the right to terminate and not incur ongoing debt for the pipeline.</p> <p>I also believe this draft deed, as it stands with all of your "out clauses" and code of conduct schedule has the potential to cause serious mental health stress, family stress and financial burden to many.</p> <p>2. I would ask that you consider allowing the signing of the license to be extended until December 2024 as all home owners have the most life changing decisions to make and need to seek legal advise, housing options, financial assistance etc. None of these things happen quickly.</p> <p>This would go some way to making up for the fact that you had 4 years to consult, Aquire and discuss the deed and table a report that we had 4 days to absorb and reply on. Once again this was done without full consultation with all stake holders.</p> <p>3. What is the tangible reason for the finite date not aligning with the lifetime of the sewer?</p> <p>Sea level rising quoted as a reason: This will not impede our settlement for years and no facts prove different.</p> <p>Nghai Tahu want their people to be able to collect kai from the lake.</p> <p>Our settlement has never stopped anyone from the collecting kai from the lake ever or in anyway.</p> <p>Raising the lake level to ensure an easier lake opening will not impact our settlement in anyway.</p> <p>4.What evidence do you hold that proves it will?</p> <p>I would like answers to the numbered questions I have put forward and would gratefully receive a reply from each of you on each point as your personal opinions may give some clarity as to how you came to your decision to vote for or against the 5by 5by 5 year term that can be terminated at any time at your discretion.</p>	<p>Thank you for your email and your points, these will all be considered by Councillors when they make their final decision on the new Deed of Licence. By now you will have received information that the feedback deadline date has been moved to 15 July and the final date for a new deed of Licence by three months.</p> <p>Regarding your question about the 15 year point not aligning with the new wastewater pipeline end of life projection. This is only one factor that was considered by Council when they agreed the 15 year limit.</p> <p>Thank you</p>
<div>[Name redacted - privacy]</div>	<p>"Acquisitions Disposals and Leasing"</p> <p>"The role of the governing body includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• representing the interests of the people of the district"</li></ul> <p>"These commitments apply when conducting the business of the Council as its representative or the representative of an electorate, and communicating with other members, the media, the public or staff. By adopting this Code of Conduct members agree that they will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. not bully, harass, or discriminate unlawfully against any person;</li><li>2. treat all people fairly"</li></ol> <p>I'm sure that all the language of these statements and declarations above are correct. BUT firstly knowing you and your home are called "Disposals" sets a tone of getting rid of something that is not important. My home is important to me, and so is the community that surrounds me, and I'm sure no one, even you, would call your home a Disposal.</p> <p>Voted in by Us the Selwyn Community, You, My Council Representing me feels like lost words and unsupportive in this situation. You have to live with the fact that You are Not supportive , or listening, or have our best interest in heart, by removing our homes and evicting us for a maximum of 15 years. We are part of Selwyn, we Represent the early communities that came here to Christchurch, you are evicting us from our homes.</p> <p>Do you adopt the Code of Conduct? Discrimination by words spoken by the councillors to the residents of the Upper Selwyn Huts have been noted and heard on many occasions.</p> <p>The USH community, comprising family and individuals, requires an extension needed for Due Dilligence.</p> <p>I would like to support the dates of the 31st July for the consultation period and 30th September for voting.</p> <p>You and the Council have to take responsibility for the lack of communication in this matter, you have let me, and others, buy our homes. This has been and still is being managed badly. I feel that you have already made your decision, we have not been able to negotiate our terms and conditions of the DOL. Where was the communication to the new buyers of the short term "finite" period now used. And once the Council decided to supply the Waste water system , which we are now paying 30%, with a life span of 15+ years, we only get to stay a maximum of 15 years, and two working days to read DOL, how is this fair?</p> <p>A total 30 "finite" year period is the only way to be fair and reasonable to this community.</p> <p>No Compensation : Can you guarantee affordable social housing when our term ends?</p> <p>Homeless : Would we be placed on top of the list for Social housing?</p> <p>Never Flooded : we are NOT Lower Selwyn Huts, or a lakeside settlement.</p> <p>So You at the Council "treat all people fairly", Instead told by Councillor Shane Epiha, at the end of the council meeting " I don't have a house" therefore we shouldn't ?</p>	<p>Thank you for your email and the points you have made. They will all be included as feedback to Councillors when they make the final decision about the Deed of Licence. We recognise that there is a strong sense of community in the Huts, as there is in many other communities across Selwyn.</p> <p>As part of this process, Council will be establishing a group of people who can discover the issues that hut owners and residents will face over the next 15 years and work towards amicable solutions. The composition of this group has yet to be agreed but we hope that hut owners will play a significant part.</p>
<div>[Name redacted - privacy]</div>	<p><b>S7(2)(a)</b></p> <p>The Huts has always been a place where generations of people have owned and lived here.</p> <p>I decided to live here because of the two things I feel that are important to me 1. friends who I have made here at USH, and 2. The affordability of a small, lovely home. We all must pay cash to buy these properties; I used my only savings to have a place of my own. <b>S7(2)(a)</b></p> <p>It is a warm, dry solid home, made to last for now and the future, the thought of demolishing my home, breaks my heart. My overall sadness about this process is that a perfectly good home will be destroyed and someone like me that will need an affordable place to live in the future, will be destroyed. Is that your objective or aim to have people become a burden on the Govt, to find a place to rehome them, or homeless, separate them from family and friends?</p> <p>A perfectly warm home to be destroyed doesn't make sense to me.</p> <p>My surrounding community is made up of families with children and older people, who I can help when required. I have friends who were here for me <b>S7(2)(a)</b> We have combined garden spaces, a community BBQ, New Year races and events, fundraisers, garage sales and general get togethers in our community room/library/centre. Where in any other community of 130 people in suburbia have this?</p> <p>I know the 130 people here. I can call in and have a cuppa with my neighbour. Get stuck on a roof and call out and get help: true story. Live rurally with surrounding farms, swim in the local river. The dream many people want to have, live on shared land, share garden spaces, and fruit trees, and respect each other's space.</p> <p>Here's a thought!?? The council could show that they care about a small community and work with them, maybe there is an opportunity they haven't thought about. We could be supplying our storm water to support the hundreds of tree planting between here and LSU? Make us part of the historical story of the Selwyn Area!</p> <p>We have never flooded, and are constantly lumped in with the LSU, media and otherwise. We are a separate identity.</p> <p>Yes, we have worked with SRT to remove people in case of flooding, like any area of New Zealand, it is usually because our access along Days Road is flooded, but intentionally built this way.</p> <p>I pay Rates and Hut Licence. I am a responsible citizen. Always paid my way and worked hard to have what is mine.</p> <p>I came here with the impression of safety, which is every human's right to have, not to be told that in the maximum 15 years I will be evicted, and my home destroyed, which seems outrageous to me and has no justification, or any good outcome for anyone.</p> <p>I would invite any council member to visit me and come and have a cuppa, come to our events, you are welcome to get to know us.</p> <p>Please listen to us, we love our homes, we need safety and security of having a place to live and it is our choice to leave when we decide.</p>	<p>Thank you once more for your email and the points you've brought up. We'll be sure to review your invitation as part of our ongoing process and will reach out if it aligns with our plans.</p> <p>Kind regards,</p>



<div>[Name redacted - privacy]</div>	<div>Hi I have a few questions for you below.</div> <div>USH Future Occupancy Strategy</div> <div>4.14.4 30 Year : Not recommended?</div> <div>Existing wastewater reticulation will require complete replacement: What is the cost of this? and if we were in DWR would this be covered?</div> <div>Unlikely, we will have a crystal ball for the outcome of Climate change in 15 or 30 years.</div> <div>Owners would be able to recoup their investments , and pay 30% of the sewage line.</div> <div>4.16.1</div> <div>Allowing owners to max 30 years will be able to recoup their investments and money towards a pipeline, would the council like a bit more money towards the cost?</div> <div>4.16.2</div> <div>Removable huts within maximum 15 years will leave a shanty town, or renters paradise? More issues and work for the local Police?</div> <div>Selwyn Council will find a strain on their infrastructure.</div> <div>4.16.3</div> <div>Huts owners will NOT be able to sell. At this stage since the council announcement , our homes are worthless.</div> <div>Would you be ok if you're told to sell within 10years because the council told you so??, and not worth anything now (and we still pay rates and licences)</div> <div>If we know we have finite 30 years, we know the outcome and prepare with this information. 15 years is too short. We can plan and prepare.</div> <div>4.17</div> <div>Value of huts/homes are worth 0 now.</div> <div>Last sale here was over \$1999</div> <div>How does this feel ??</div> <div>5.9</div> <div>Inspection of each hut. How is this going to take place? Letter or just turn up? Legally can you do this as I own my own home? Have you had legal advice on this? a gang of men invading a home.....?? How does this make me feel safe in my home, and trust any council??</div> <div>A tenancy inspection, is this legal if someone owns their own home?</div> <div>DOL</div> <div>5.1</div> <div>Preconditions</div> <div>Can you reassure me that in the maximum of 5+5+5 years you won't change your mind and terminate my DOL, because of a whim ??</div> <div>Can you explain to me 5.4 (c) what a Ratchet clause is please???</div>	<div>Thank you once more for your email and the points you've brought up. We'll be sure to review your invitation as part of our ongoing process and will reach out if it aligns with our plans.</div>
<div>[Name redacted - privacy]</div>	<div>[Continued]</div> <div>12 Licensor Inspection Programme</div> <div>AS clause above 5.9</div> <div>*Just a point for you and the council, all over NZ houses sell with or without consents . These homes do not have to be compiled before placing them on the market. It is up to the individual person buying or selling.</div> <div>How are you going to value these inspections?</div> <div>Isn't this another avenue that you can evict people??</div> <div>22. Consent to Occupation or Transfer</div> <div>You have made it that we cannot sell.</div> <div>Can you tell me ways I can recoup my savings please?</div> <div>You can terminate my Licence , but can I, and would like written in how and what is the cost of doing so?</div> <div>24. Termination</div> <div>you seem to have all the power to cancel or terminate our licences whenever you like with the maximum of 15 years.</div> <div>It would be more economical for the council for us to stay at max 30 years, we pay licence and rates, and the pipeline.</div> <div>Where are my rights to cancel my lease?</div> <div>28 Expiry Of License</div> <div>My Compensation ??</div>	
<div>[Name redacted - privacy]</div>	<div>s7(2)(a)</div> <div>So yes, I want at least a 30-year DOL or even 45-year DOL this would give prospective buyers more time to recoup their investment before the properties were made finite e.g. they could live in them for 30 odd years at cheap rent so to speak or buy a block of land and have them relocated again cheaper and probably no mortgage and or rent them out making a return on investment.</div> <div>s7(2)(a) with your 15-year DOL s7(2)(a) no one is going to buy here with that ridiculous DOL which if it is designed to get rid of us is only going to make it harder for anyone to leave.</div> <div>Think about it you want us to leave but none of us will be able to sell obvious reasons we will need to sell so as we can relocate live elsewhere but if we cannot sell, we will not have the money to relocate</div> <div>Why you ask no investors can recoup their outlay in a 15-year period it is not long enough for them to recoup then they will have to demolish their investment but with at least 30 years they will be able to recoup their investment make a profit and be able to allow for their properties to be demolished at the end of their term.</div> <div>So yes, I need the DOL to be at least 30 years:s7(2)(a)</div> <div>s7(2)(a)</div>	<div>Thank you for your e-mail. We acknowledge your frustrations. Your points regarding the DoL will all be included as feedback to Councillors when they make the final decision about the Deed of Licence.</div> <div>As part of this process, Council will be establishing a group of people who can discover the issues that hut owners and residents will face over the next 15 years and work towards amicable solutions. The composition of this group has yet to be agreed but we hope that hut owners will play a significant part.</div>



[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>I am writing to you with a request on behalf of myself and my community.</p> <p>We understand that there are decisions to be made regarding the future of Selwyn Huts that will have a profound impact on the lives of myself, my neighbours and our families. It is crucial for our voices to be heard, as we are the ones directly affected by any changes that may occur.</p> <p>Therefore, we are kindly requesting the presence of all decision makers and interested parties at the public meeting for consultation with the residents of the Upper Selwyn Huts - Tuesday 23rd April, 6pm at the Springston South Soldier's Memorial Hall. We want the opportunity to express our concerns, share our perspectives, and engage in constructive dialogue about the future of our community and how the proposed Deed of Licence will impact us.</p> <p>We are all struggling to understand the short timeframe for consultation, given the length of time that has been worked on in the background, and the urgency of our end date from the reasons that have been provided. Genuine engagement with residents will help us work through this confusion, and will hopefully alleviate some of the extreme anxiety we have been experiencing, as I'm sure you all can appreciate.</p> <p>This meeting is not just about airing grievances; it's about opening up a 2 way conversation, fostering understanding, empathy, and collaboration between the council and the residents. We believe that by coming together in a spirit of openness and transparency, we can work towards solutions that benefit everyone involved. As this is a complex, multi-faceted case with several agencies involved, we feel that to get answers to our questions, and to truly feel heard, there should be someone present to represent the views of each interested party.</p> <p>We recognise the weight of the decisions that lie ahead, and we want to ensure that everybody is heard before any final decisions are made. We urge you to honor our request and join us in this important discussion and kindly ask that you advise whether you will be present. We appreciate (if you were not intending to participate in the consultation process) that this may be short notice. If you are unable to attend, please consider coming to one of our community meetings prior to the deadline for feedback. If you can advise us of your availability in the coming weeks, we will make ourselves available at your convenience.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to this matter. We look forward to your positive response and the opportunity to engage in meaningful dialogue with you.</p>	<p>Mayor Sam, Councillor Mundt, Councillor Epiha, Councillor McInnes, CEO Sharon Mason, Executive Director – Tim Harris, Sean Tully- Project</p> <p>Other councillors have meetings to attend regarding the Long-term plan community engagement sessions. Taumutu has responded to the community invitation advising that they will not be in attendance.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>In response to your answer, I am not impressed by this historic reply. The reason for not being included I beleave is due to it being administed by a board and committee for 114 years and the associated cost came from license fees. Forward on to 2011 when the SDC took over administration that would have been the time to reassess the rates and include the water and waste within the District Wide Rates</p> <p>Your reply as to non permanent residents has got nothing to do the reasons for excluding the USH. Please review this request?</p>	<p>Thank you for your follow on email. Your request has been acknowledged and will form part of the feedback as we consider the new Deed of Licence.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>We will be seeking clarification around 28 Expiry of Licence (clause 28.1) which links the 'yielding up' of hut with the expiry or termination of the Term. What if the licensee wishes to yield up soon after signing or at any time during the five year term? If one yields up early, presumably there is no legal requirement to pay fees for the remainder of the Licence Term?</p> <p>Will those hut owners with unpaid fees as of 30th June, 2024, be granted a new Licence to Occupy for the period 2024-2029? If so, why?</p> <p>CATS These do not feature in the Draft, but with increasing numbers of cats in and around the settlement, skinks are noticeably absent these days from the Reserve and within the home garden. Should there be a limit of one cat per hut?</p> <p>Minor 'slips' in Draft 5. 5.1(d) remove extra 'that' 6. 6.1. add a d to 'uring' to become during Schedule 1. 13 Bond Payment referred to as 'per quarter. Should be per annum. Schedule 3. DOGS attention needed to make it read properly. (We're sure all of these little 'slips' have already been corrected.</p> <p>We regret being unable to attend on Tuesday night but will look forward to reading council's report on the meeting.</p>	<p>Thanks for your recent e-mail and also your e-mail below. Tim has provided us with your feedback from the drop-in session yesterday and it be included as feedback to Councillors when they make the final decision about the Deed of Licence.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Who will pay for the farmhouse owned by Ngai Tahu?</p>	<p>Ngai Tahu</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>I am a hut owner. I am disabled and plan to move to supported accomodation. I will have to try and sell the hut.</p> <p>I am concerned about fees should I leave without selling. I have read the deed and think demolition charges would apply. Can you confirm this and advise me of any other charges.</p>	<p>If you own the hut, under the proposed Deed of Licence you will be responsible for its removal from the site at your cost. However, if you sell the hut, the new owner will be responsible for the removal at the end of their Deed of Licence period.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Good morning Could you please give more detail on what you mean when you say that climate change might make it impossible to renew the Licence. Would you please reply by Friday 19th April.</p>	<p>This clause states that if climate change results in the huts becoming uninhabitable, it would constitute a reason to not allow a the issue of the second or third five year licence going out to 2039.</p>



[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Selwyn District Council, I am writing with my concerns over your treatment of us all at the Upper Selwyn Huts, and your ideas of what the SDC consider a fair document for us to sign.</p> <p><b>s7(2)(a)</b> I did this thinking it was going to be for a lot longer than the new time frame you have given us ... you say it's 15years but in reality, it could be only 5 years or 10 years. I came here so I could have a home with no mortgage and have a good lifestyle into my retirement. Up until now this has been the case. It is amazing living here.. Can you honestly say that you know nearly 97 of your neighbours personally? We have a fantastic community spirit and most of us are willing to help out anyone who is sick, needs a ride somewhere or just to talk. Walking down the road here, we can chat and quite often get invited in for coffee to quite a number of the residents. I think we are very unique.. and sadly, you want to take this all away from us, with NO COMPENSATION, which leads to "Where do we all go?".. I think whoever is making these choices, needs to do some research into the state of emergency/social housing and the like...THERE IS NONE.. Why make us remove and destroy our perfectly good, comfortable homes in an already existing housing crisis? I, for one, came here for the lifestyle and also for financial reasons. Most of us here can't afford to go elsewhere and pay exorbitant rents, especially now you have made our homes valueless and with no hope of selling them and no compensation. These are our homes.. !!!! We are a community with a high rate of retirees.<b>s7(2)(a)</b>, who will struggle immensely having to move away from where they feel safe and others look out for them. We have also recently had some families move here, so have got quite a few children here now, who support the local schools, university and the community as a whole .. how stressed must they all be feeling now.. Does anyone care about us ???</p> <p><b>s7(2)(a)</b> here and make an effort to know the residents here are all well and safe in an emergency. We have had a few occasions where we have been advised to evacuate for flooding... but we, here, have not flooded. We get isolated at times because Day's Rd becomes impassable, but we have plans in place for these times. I would like to know why SDC has the sole discretion to make these massive decisions about climate change and how it will affect us. Section 5.1 (d) .. I want scientific proof and evidence of who these people are, making such decisions, and I want that clause removed from our DOL</p> <p>Section7 Bond</p> <p>At the termination of our Right to Occupy the Land here, we are obliged to remove everything from our lot. If I remove everything myself, at my expense, you state in the DOL draft the you will refund the bond money...does that include the interest you have accrued during the time you have had MY MONEY????</p> <p>Also, if I chose to walk away before the expiry date , clear my lot and terminate my lease, am I expected to still pay rates and the license fee for the duration of the lease?? Also, because my home is now valueless what will the rateable value be adjusted to?</p> <p>Section 7..7.2.. You say I can get a statement showing the value of the Bond held and any deductions made by the licensor....Why would there be deductions??? This is money paid by me as a bond, surely it remains mine!!!!</p> <p>Schedule 1 (13) We are expected to pay a bond of \$383 inc per quarter, I thought this was going to be per annum... Please clarify!!!!</p> <p>Section 10.8 is quite ambiguous and contradictory.</p> <p>Section 12 This whole section needs to be removed or rewritten to make it far more balanced. I have no rights the way it is. What gives anyone from SDC the right to come into my home and check it? I am being treated like a criminal. Would that happen to anyone else living anywhere else in the district??? I think not !!!</p> <p>Section 14 (e) needs to be removed. Why can't a qualified licensee do work for me?</p> <p>Section 24.1 (c) How do you decide this??? Another one of SDC's experts?????</p> <p>Section 28 What a joke... you have already robbed me blind by making my home valueless, but NO.. you want more, by making me pay more to remove all my assets. If you can now call them that!! How and with what am I expected to move on?</p> <p>28.3... What compensation???</p> <p>Section 31 If I am prepared to stay here at my own risk, why do you feel the need to impose all these restrictions on me??</p> <p>Schedule 2 This whole section is a joke. These rules need to be changed and made fair, most need to be deleted. We are free people trying to live a good life. I feel like a second-rate citizen with you expecting me to sign this DOL. The whole thing needs some serious changes.</p> <p>The whole DOL draft seems extremely one sided. Against us!!!. Where is your humanitarianism?</p> <p>The Sewer System :</p> <p>I want to know:</p> <p>Start date?</p> <p>Cost..30% of how much?, also 30% of interest.. how much?.. We need figures.!!!</p> <p>30% of some unknown figure could change drastically without a time frame of commencement and completion.</p> <p>When do we start paying for something that so far seems like a white elephant?</p> <p>Why should I pay when I am not going to get any advantage?</p> <p>How much is the cost to us, having our sewerage carted away, until the system is completely installed and operating? 30% of something that doesn't exist, on top of this cost seems unfair.</p> <p>Have you thought about what the trucks, carting our sewerage away, are going to do to Spackman Avenue, not to mention Day's Rd? Day's Rd is already in a state of disrepair with continual 2nd rate patch-ups.</p> <p>Why can't the pipes go down the side of Day's Rd instead of under the river.. surely a cheaper option.. also picking up the farmers on Day's Rd.</p> <p>I want answers to my concerns.</p>	<p>Thank you for your email, I am sorry it has taken a short while to respond. I'd like to start by saying that the Deed of Licence you have is still a proposal and yet to be confirmed by Council before it is offered to you for your signature. You email and the feedback from many others will be considered carefully before a final decision is made. I appreciate that the provisional decision has caused concern for you and other home owners at Upper Selwyn Huts. I also recognise that there is a strong community at Upper Selwyn Huts and a demonstration of that is that you volunteer to help keep your community safe through the Civil Defence volunteer programme.</p> <p>Right now I cannot answer your question about where you will live when the Huts close. However as part of the work going forward our Council is building a project team that will look to the future and explore possible solutions as are several other Councils across the Country that are facing similar issues.</p> <p>Thank you again for writing to me and for your feedback</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>[Continued]</p> <p>I thought I would have had something to sell at the end of my time here, to recoup my costs to help pay for whatever lies ahead in my life. But now, all I own is valueless plus the added cost of remediating my lot... It is very stressful living with this hanging over my head.. and not just for me but 96 other hut owners too. A lot have paid their life savings into coming here, to get a very minimal return. It feels like SDC want to just be rid of us like a pest. I thought it was the council's responsibility to take care of their constituents, but I've come to realise that SDC does not. This became very obvious at the meeting, which I attended in Rolleston. I thought the Cr Malcolm Lyall and the CEO acted extremely unprofessionally at that meeting, quickly shutting down and confusing anyone who tried to speak up for us. We can't get any reason from SDC why you so badly want us gone.</p> <p>What is the long-term plan for this reserve??? In all of your Long-Term Plan advertisements you ask the district for ideas... mine is to just leave us alone to live here peacefully.</p> <p>Why make us pay for a sewer system then have us removed??</p> <p>I will not be signing the DOL in its current form. So many questions... so few answers. I look forward to your reply</p>	
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>As an elected councillor of the Selwyn District Council, your decision and vote on the Deed of Licence for our community has a lasting impact on us as home owners, rate payers and extended family of the Selwyn Huts. As Council decisions may set President, there are also ramifications for greater Christchurch and the country.</p> <p><b>s7(2)(a)</b> As keen fisherman, hunters and very family orientated we cherished our leisure time together spent as a family.</p> <p>As the next generations have followed, my family and I have continued on the many traditions, making memories. Embedding a passion for the outdoors, relaxing and family holidays at the Selwyn Huts.</p> <p>My family have generations of precious Selwyn Huts memories.</p> <p>We are grateful and thankful for our safe, close community that nurtures our children and grandchildren to grow, learn and developed into the people they are today, making friends for life.</p> <p><b>s7(2)(a)</b> At no time during this process was there any mention that the licensing period for my home would be finite. Ultimately leaving me homeless and in substantial debt.</p> <p>You, as an elected councillor have voted for me,<b>s7(2)(a)</b> to have to live with the knowledge that I will have to level my home, destroy my memories and annihilate my family history.</p> <p><b>s7(2)(a)</b> I hope you treat them with greater respect and compassion than your decision has provided me.</p>	<p>Thank you for your email. I'd like to start by saying that the Deed of Licence you have is still a proposal and yet to be confirmed by Council before it is offered to you for your signature. You email and the feedback from many others will be considered carefully before a final decision is made.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Can you please explain to me why there has been no indication of compensation for our homes? It isn't like we are choosing to leave.</p> <p>Some of us have put our life savings into our homes with the intention of staying permanently, I for one have no way of recouping what I have invested into my home. Or have the money to "start again" somewhere. Please reply by Wednesday 24th April.</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>There is no provision in previous Deed of Licence for compensation to be paid to hut owners at the end of the Licence period. As council has never indicated that occupation on huts would be in perpetuity it would not be appropriate to offer compensation for the closing of the Huts. Closure was clearly signalled in 2019 when Council decided that future licences would be for a finite period.</p> <p>Once a final decision has been made regarding a Deed of Licence council will use the projects team to investigate possible solutions to assist hut owners with the transition from the site.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>We have been some questions about giving feedback on the draft Licence. Is this process a formal consultation process and how will it work? It has been suggested that after we give feedback then we should expect the Council to come back to us with another draft Licence with another period for consultation. It was suggested that in a true consultation exercise that this could happen a few times until there is some agreement reached. Is this what is planned?</p> <p>Who reads our feedback as part of this consultation process and how much time do those people have to read it?</p>	<p>Thank you for your question. In short the feedback you have been asked to submit to the draft Deed of Licence is not a formal consultative process. Our Council's significance policy dictates when a special consultative process should take place and in this instance, we are simply asking for feedback. That said the time period available for feedback is more than that which would be available for a formal consultation process.</p> <p>Our intention is that we do not repeat the request once this feedback period has finished. The next Deed of Licence you receive will incorporate the feedback and will be offered to you to sign, not to feedback once more.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>5.4 c Ratchet</p> <p>I request that this statement be removed from the draft deed.</p> <p>Licence Fee to remain the same or increase, but never less than .....</p> <p>This takes no account for the expenditure over the last 12 months, we assume that the financials incoming / outgoing are registered. The setting of the annual licence fee should be supported by actual expenditure.</p>	<p>Thanks for your feedback, this is an e-mail to acknowledge your 4 x emails were received Monday 22/4. They will all be included as feedback to Councillors when they make the final decision about the Deed of Licence.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>7.1 a highlights that the Licensor will review not earlier than 3 months but no later than 9 months.</p> <p>The Licensor is in breach of this as the DOL expired in 2020 but was rolled over.</p> <p>Please include a penalty clause that addresses this and includes a reference to the non existing Management Plan</p>	<p>Thanks for your feedback, this is an e-mail to acknowledge your 4 x emails were received Monday 22/4. They will all be included as feedback to Councillors when they make the final decision about the Deed of Licence.</p>



[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>12 Inspection Programme</p> <p>"compete lot assessment with relevant legislation"</p> <p>There needs to have far more expansion of the meaning of "relevant legislation".</p> <p>Is this to be like the previous inspections that looked at storm water disposal as to establish if the storm water is draining into the sewer pipes. I have installed 3 soak pits that have penetrated the clay layer in the ground, they are all filled with large stones and drains well in wet conditions?</p> <p>A compete lot assessment of each household with respect to building distance from boundaries and insulation is to what legislation?</p>	Thanks for your feedback, this is an e-mail to acknowledge your 4 x emails were received Monday 22/4. They will all be included as feedback to Councillors when they make the final decision about the Deed of Licence.
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Remove this clause 24.1 c as the term "economically feasible" could have wild ranging implication's and the SDC could use this for many reasons to evict a hut owner.</p> <p>If a number of hut owners decided to leave and remove their huts due to not being able to agree with the final DOL; that could leave insufficient owners contributing to pay back the pipe line loan. This and many other reason could mean eviction for those left due not being economically feasible</p>	Thanks for your feedback, this is an e-mail to acknowledge your 4 x emails were received Monday 22/4. They will all be included as feedback to Councillors when they make the final decision about the Deed of Licence.
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Good morning</p> <p>It was disappointing not to yet receive answers to the questions I have previously sent through. Once again I have had to postpone getting legal advice. I would hope you will reply to those questions by tomorrow so I can read the answers before the meeting.</p> <p>In the meantime I have some more questions relating to the report you prepared:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The report dated 1 May 2019, stated that there is a desire to return the reserve to an open space - would you please explain why they wanted to do this.</li> <li>2. On the 8th May 2019, the Council voted to make our time here finite. Why was that not put on the LIM at that time?</li> <li>3. Why were we not advised when that information was put on the LIM in 2022? We were advised when the warning that we were in a flood plain was put on the LIM.</li> <li>4. The report states the pipeline will support subsequent future use options - what type of future use options does this refer to, especially when there is a desire to return the reserve to an open space?</li> <li>5. There was a meeting on 24 November 2023, chaired by the head of Regulatory. In this meeting it was said that 'initial conversations indicate a number of lots and structures fall short of the required standards, along with many of the requirements of the DOL'. What does this mean? Conversations with who? How does anyone know this? How many is 'a number' and how was this information arrived at? Please send me the minutes from this meeting.</li> </ol>	<p>Thank you for your further questions, I have answered each one below in turn.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The desire to return the reserve to an open space was a recommendation made by the report author who was a Council staff member. The recommendation would have been made of the basis of the research the staff member had conducted prior to writing the report. The recommendation was supported by the content of the report. The recommendation was accepted by the Council based on discussion and point raised during the meeting.</li> <li>2. This is a question we are still investigating, I'm sorry I cannot answer that right now.</li> <li>3. LIM information is not advertised when it changes, this would be an impossible task for all the LIMs across the district.</li> <li>4. There are no plans for the future, this will be decided by the Council of the day.</li> <li>5. I have checked with person who chaired this meeting there were no minutes taken. Over time Council has been required to visit the Upper Selwyn Huts to resolve issues of compliance. This is normally at the request of hut owners. These issues range from boundary issues, to dog ownership on properties to the requirement for an entire hut to be removed as it was unsanitary. The required standards are stipulated in legislation and in the Deed of Licence, the term 'a number' is used as Council do not have records of how many non-compliant issues there are.</li> </ol>
s7(2)(a)	<p>Good morning</p> <p>I am just a little confused by two different things. The Council expressed a desire in 2919 for the reserve to be returned to being an open space. Why then is clause 28.3 in the Licence?</p>	Paragraph 28.3 need to be read in conjunction with paragraph 28.2. 28.2 request that the site is cleared, 28.3 only applies if the site is not cleared.
s7(2)(a)	<p>My question is more about the details of how we impact on Te Taumutu Runanga as you have used it to justify the maximum 15 year finite term in your report.</p> <p>We note that we have not been able to get the details of how we impact on Te Taumutu Runanga from either Selwyn District Council nor from the runanga direct.</p> <p>We still do not understand why you are using this reason to justify the maximum 15 finite term.</p>	As the statement readout in our Council meeting was on behalf of Te Taumutu Runanga it would be appropriate for you to contact them directly to answer questions regarding their statement.
s7(2)(a)	<p>Good morning</p> <p>I am still waiting for a detailed reply about the inspection process. I and others are a little confused about different replies. I have an email saying the 1947 Act could be applied while another owner was told the current Building Act would be applied. Which is it?</p> <p>Clause 33.1 re our paying all of your costs and fees 'arising out of and associated with steps taken by the Licensor'. Would you please give a detailed explanation of this clause. Would this cover the Council's costs should anyone take legal action against the Council?</p>	We are considering how the inspection process will work. However, as Licensors Council have a responsibility to ensure that our legislative responsibilities are met. This is in relation to a range of legislation from the RMA to Health and Safety, the Building Act and our own Deed of Licence requirements. Currently we do not have certainty around whether we are fulfilling these responsibilities, and the lot inspection is to find out if we are doing so. Council are still developing that plan but in general terms it is about being compliant with various pieces of legislation to ensure that the health and safety of hut owners is not compromised and that Council is meeting its statutory obligations.
s7(2)(a)	<p>s7(2)(a)</p> <p>So have some heart respect for the residents here and at least give them a chance to sell their properties because as it stands you are making it impossible to sell think about it would someone buy your house if they knew they had to demolish it in 15 years i think not 30 years maybe if they got it at a good price but at a 15 years you would have to have a ridiculously cheap price to get a sale.</p> <p>Good job Tim, I hope you sleep well at night s7(2)(a)</p> <p>Thanks for nothing Tim, I Presume you are not interested anyway and will go ahead without any concern for myself and or other residents.</p>	<p>I acknowledge your e-mail and feedback, your feedback will be included to Councillors when they make the final decision about the Deed of Licence.</p> <p>I realise this may be a challenging time, and major changes and big decisions can be stressful. If you're feeling anxious or simply need someone to talk to, you can reach out to either of the below options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Contact 1737 – This free confidential helpline can be called or texted anytime.</li> <li>-Consult your GP – They're there to help with mental as well as physical health.</li> </ul>
s7(2)(a)	<p>Good morning</p> <p>I appreciate that you are having a hard time getting answers to some of my questions. I am sure there staff changes and information often gets lost when this happens.</p> <p>You said last night you haven't been able to establish what the procedure was supposed to have been in checking that new owners understood the finite term. If you can't establish the procedure then just tell me that as your answer.</p> <p>You said last night in regards to the part of the report about 'a number of the structures falling short of the required standards', that no one remembers saying that. If you respond to my email with that as the answer I will accept that.</p> <p>Re the Reserve Management Plan that you are required to have, you will find a draft done a number of years ago. We wasted time in community meetings about this only for nothing to be done with it.</p> <p>If you need more information to answer a question then let me know. If you need to run it by your lawyers then let me know. Happy to wait if there is a reason. I assumed that in writing a report the necessary information would have been made available to you. I also assumed that things like the inspection process would have been thought out before sending out a licence.</p> <p>Thanks for your time last night</p>	<p>Thank you for you further questions. I understand there are frustrations with timing of responses to e-mails, I apologise, and we are working towards providing more administration and project support to help with Upper Selwyn Huts related work.</p> <p>Again, I have answered the question in turn below.</p> <p>The decision to make further licences finite was made public in the minutes of the Council meeting of 8 May 2019.</p> <p>It is not mandatory to prepare a reserve management plan for Local Purpose Reserves (Hut Settlement) Reserve areas unless directed to do so by the Minister of Conservation.</p>
s7(2)(a)	<p>I'd like to request that whenever the Council meeting occurs where the Councillors take a vote on our next draft DOL that we are given unlimited time to make our submissions in person. Being allocated 30 mins for all of our submissions before our future is voted on is woefully inadequate and is not fair nor reasonable.</p> <p>Thank you</p>	Thanks for your feedback. This will all be included as feedback to Councillors.
s7(2)(a)	<p>Hi Tim</p> <p>Was there or should there be an earthquake claim on the reticulation system?</p> <p>Since there hasn't been any notable maintenance on the reticulation system shouldnt we be on district wide rates?</p>	<p>Hi [name withheld],</p> <p>Your e-mails today have been noted by Tim. I am going through outstanding emails and responding. Apologies for the late response.</p> <p>Your first question are you asking if there has been previous earthquake claim on the reticulation system? I will record the last question as feedback to the Deed of Licence.</p>



<div>s7(2)(a)</div>	<p>Good afternoon,</p> <p>I am writing to request another extension of time for feedback on the DOL, the final vote by Councillors and the date the Licence needs to be signed by.</p> <p>We are asking that the date for consultation close on 15th July, 2025 and for the final vote to be at the end of September, 2025. We also ask the date for signing the final DOL be extended to 31st October , 2025.</p> <p>The reasons are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The 174 page document was provided to owners only two working days before the meeting and was not provided in a printed form - it was very hard to read on a phone. It is difficult to imagine how two working days (without a hard copy) can be considered fair or reasonable, particularly when the consequences for us are so serious (homeless with no compensation).</li><li>2. Councillors were also only given two working days to read and understand this long document.</li><li>3. Only a very small number of owners were given the opportunity to speak to this at the Council meeting. We feel we were not able to be heard.</li><li>4. We have been unable to get answers to many questions about the DOL.</li><li>5. Council passed a resolution in 2019 that our Licences would be for a finite term but there was no consultation over what that term would be. We have a 'permanent Licence' - a finite term could be for any length of time, for example 100 years.</li><li>6. It is unreasonable that the Council made a decision on the various options in the report that detrimentally affect our lives. We were not given an opportunity to comment on these options before the report was prepared. Consultation should have started at the beginning of this process - we should not just be asked to comment only on the draft Licence after the options have been decided upon. We should have been given sufficient time to respond to the options.</li></ol> <p>Consultation should be a two way process with both parties engaging from the start. It is important that during this process, accurate information is able to be provided in a timely manner when questions are asked. This has not happened.</p> <p>We would expect the process going forward to consist of:</p> <p>A. To be able to give feedback on the current draft</p> <p>B. Receive another draft</p> <p>C. Have another opportunity for consultation.</p>	<p>Thank you for your request to extend the period for feedback and a date to start the next Deed of Licence. The feedback that we received following the March Council meeting was for an extension to consider the Deed of Licence and submit feedback based on considered opinion. By extending the feedback deadline and final date for the Deed of Licence to start by 10 weeks and 12 weeks respectively we believe we have accommodated that request.</p>
<div>s7(2)(a)</div>	<p>Hi Tim</p> <p>Can you please tell me what portion of the Pines WWTP pipeline we will be contributing towards?</p> <p>Is it from the Leeston Road connection or from after the Coes Ford connection on Selwyn Lake Road?</p>	<p>Staff spoke to hut owner over the phone and provided the following answers:</p> <p>Q1. If the USH lines was going to be connected to Lincoln i.e. was USH paying for the Lincoln extension.</p> <p>A1. Advised No, USH residents were not paying for the Lincoln extension works to Pines. Explained Pines was a common treatment plant.</p> <p>Q2. Requested clarity on Coes Ford connection and cost contribution being charged to USH residents.</p> <p>A2. Coes Ford is not currently getting connected to USH pipeline. USH contribution make up is 100% from Coes Ford to USH and 50% from Leeston road to Coes Ford.</p> <p>Q3. The presentation made earlier in April 24 said the cost for construction has gone up since December 2023 and is now \$5M. Is that due to inflation?</p> <p>A3. Presenter – i.e. Murray E advised that the cost is between \$4- \$5M and the cost has not changed since Dec 2023.</p> <p>Q4. When will the cost be applicable from? Is it still December 2025 as recently advised.</p> <p>A4. Current understanding is December 2025 or earlier. There are current comms regarding this and there will be comms in the future as the build progresses. Wet weather and construction issues plays a part to timelines.</p>
<div>s7(2)(a)</div> <div>(Member of Public)</div>	<p>Having seen on TV the Selwyn Huts community outraged about being evicted from 2039, Council should find another plot of land safe from sea level rise, onto which the residents can shift their dwellings over the next 15 years.ngs</p>	<p>Thank you for your feedback.</p>
<div>s7(2)(a)</div>	<p>What a lode of rubbish I saw on TV about the sea rising through Climate Change flooding Selwyn Huts.</p> <p>This is all being pushed by Ngai Tahu, the Department of Conservation and the Selwyn District Council to remove all permanent residents from the edges of Lake Ellesmere.</p> <p>The whole Council who believe that the Sea will rise at leased 15m to get to the Selwyn Huts should be looking for new employment.</p> <p>Millions of Dollars are being spent on Kaitorete Spit building a runway and Airdrome at the same level as Upper and Lower Selwyn Huts by The Government, various Councils and Ngai Tahu they would not be doing this if the sea was to rise 15m.</p> <p><div>s7(2)(a)</div> and not at all concerned about sea rising, I am 11m above high tide level ( GPS ) This will never happen in my life time or my children.</p> <p>For the sea to reach Selwyn Huts and Greenpark Huts, Kaitorete Spit will have to be breached permanently by the sea, flooding Lake Ellesmere all the way to the Main South Road between Christchurch and Timaru.</p> <p>For the Council to remove the residents, buildings and chattels the Council will have to take all the residents to Court.</p> <p>The Court will then issue eviction Notices to the Council to be able to proceed.</p> <p>There is the Occupiers, Renting, Rateing and Lease Act, that the Council must follow,</p> <p>The occupiers have existing use Rights regardless if the Lease is renewed or not. ,</p> <p>No Judge of any Court will put 500 people out onto the street without full compensation the Council unless reasonable cause can be established.</p> <p>My suggestion to the Council is because the Council has no factual evidence that the sea will rise and flood Selwyn Huts 2038, write to all the residents informing them of the possibility in the next 25 years Climate Change and the Sea rising may permanently flood you property. It would be in your best interest to relocate from Selwyn Huts.</p>	<p>Thank you for your email which we will consider as part of the feedback to the new Deed of Licence.</p>
<div>s7(2)(a)</div>	<p>After receiving the long term plan with the Selwyn Council I thought I would follow up my feelings with recent events that are happening to me personally.</p> <p>I feel completely lost that I can contribute to a long term plan with this Council, but they seem to want me out, pay for it, destroy my home, be relocated or homeless. As most of you are aware, most of us have used our life savings for an affordable warm dry home. Which today, it seems, to be a luxury for some.</p> <p>And it feels like if you're not in the 1% income earners in NZ you are not seen or heard.</p> <p>What I am really saying, what is going to be my outcome with dishoming me from my property in max of 15 years.</p> <p>Everyone here is affected, everyone is sad, and disappointed, everyone is stressed, and you have already started the process of making people, including myself, feel worthless in today's society, we are not part of the Selwyn District anymore, you have started the process eary of removing us mentally, how do you think people here will feel in max 15 years. You have a responsibility to make people feel safe, I certainly don't any more. I don't want to come home.</p> <p>The stress of my future, mentally and economically now lies with you, the Selwyn Council.</p> <p>I have seen other councils working with the homes that already exist in climate change areas, (Kapiti Council raising floor levels for existing homes), if you want to use this as an excuse for your purpose, but I think something lies deep behind this decision. Yes I have gone down the rabbit hole, but are there no surprises in this as you will not share your long term management or plan for the Upper Selwyn Huts.</p> <p>I really hope that you hear me and feel what I am feeling.</p>	<p>Your e-mail is acknowledged and recorded as feedback.</p> <p>The long term future use of the site is yet to be decided and will be decided by the Council of the day.</p> <p>To support the community through the transition period the Council are in the process of developing a support service that will assist hut owners and residents through the transition period. Council are currently in discussions with organisations and it is anticipated that the community support group will form once the final decision regarding a Deed of Licence is agreed. Members of the huts community will be invited to be part of the group.</p>



s/(2)(a)	<p>1. Historical value</p> <p>The Mayor says in the Long Term Plan that "we're focussed on looking after what we already have" - how about you look after us!</p> <p>An 1881 plan shows the reserve on which the huts would come to be established was in existence and by the 1890's at the latest there were huts established there, mainly for fishing and hunting. Given this pre-1900 date, the huts are an archaeological site under the Heritage Pouhere Taonga New Zealand Act.</p> <p>There is a long historic and cultural association with the huts and community over the three centuries of occupation. The Reserve is Crown Land, administered by the Selwyn District Council. In 2015 the purpose was changed (by the Department Conservation) from recreation reserve to Local Purpose – Hut Settlement. On 8 May 2019, the Council unanimously determined that 'Hut licences and subsequent renewals are short term and ultimately for a finite period' . At its 13 March 2024 meeting Council resolved to accept option 2 (of 4 options) and offered Residents a final 15 year term for occupation of their huts. We need to submit requesting this historical significance be recognised and for the Selwyn Huts to be listed as an historical site on the District Plan and for the term for us being here to be extended to protect this history.</p> <p>2. District wide rates</p> <p>Everyone needs to submit on the LTP asking for us to be put on DWR for Water and Sewer.</p> <p>The reasons being :</p> <p>(a) We will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston who pay DWR and we have previously paid for our sewer ourselves and a subsequent upgrade, the requirement we were told for being put on DWR.</p> <p>(b) We have already paid for the water upgrade.</p> <p>(c) We should not be discriminated against and should be treated like everyone else in the district.</p> <p>(d) We already pay DWR for Recreation Reserve Rate; General Purpose Rate; Library Charge; Community Centre Rate; Uniform Annual General Rate; Water Race (Amenity) Rate; Area Board; Swimming Pools; Canterbury Museum Levy; and Land Drainage. We should also be added to the DWR for Sewer and Water like everyone else.</p> <p>(e) Towards25 LTP Document stated:</p> <p>"The Council is proposing to introduce a new way of funding water and wastewater, community centres/halls and recreation reserves. These services are currently funded through targeted rates and the Council is proposing to meet the costs of these services by introducing standard district-wide rates. Underpinning this proposal is the view that Selwyn should be seen as one integrated district, rather than simply a series of detached townships. The Council acknowledges that where residents across the district receive a similar level of service for key infrastructure, the cost to residents should also be consistent. In the case of water and wastewater this proposal will also help keep these services affordable for smaller communities."</p> <p>This document also has USH specifically listed in the "Proposed district-wide rate for urban water compared with existing targeted rates" table.</p> <p>From this we conclude there was a clear intention to include USH in the DWR for sewer and water. This is even more relevant now we will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston.</p> <p>(f) Buddie Findlay's Legal Opinion dated 04/03/2019 states "We note that the Council has recently tended to move to a model where the costs of provision of network infrastructure (such as waste water infrastructure) are spread across the district (ie under district wide targeted rates). It would go against the trend for the Council now to look to recover the greater costs of continuing to provide water services to the [Upper Selwyn] Huts solely from that community."</p> <p>(g) Council has already agreed to fund 70% of the sewer upgrade, indicating the district is prepared to pay towards USH sewer upgrade. There is no good reason why the Council couldn't find the full amount. This was proposed in 4.12.4 of the "Upper Sekwyn Huts Future Occupancy Strategy" report dated 04/03/2024.</p> <p>(h) The cost and operational charges for the pipeline continue to change so being on the DWR would give the community certainty. It would also mean that if people choose to leave the settlement early the cost will not increase for the remaining owners.</p> <p>(i) Additionally we also request that our reticulation system be replaced by SDC as they have been responsible for this since 1989 and have had ample time to replace this.</p> <p>Given the reasons above there is no reason why USH Can not be put on the DWR for Sewer and Water like everyone else.</p>	Acknowledgement of email and feedback sent. Writer sent e-mail to both LTP and USH teams at Council.
s/(2)(a)	<p>Some questions that I require answers to, in order to be able to make informed decisions on my future.</p> <p>Why have the Upper Selwyn Huts not been granted historical significance under the Heritage Pouhere Taonga NZ Act?</p> <p>Why are the USH not on the District wide rates for Water and Sewer? The USH have already paid for the water upgrade, and also, have already paid for both the sewer, and the upgrade needed for that system. I understand we will soon be on the same sewer system as Leeston. Shouldn't we therefore be on the DWR scheme?</p> <p>Why are the USH paying rates, as per, and identical to, so many other district residents yet are not included on DWR as those other residents are?</p> <p>In your own words: "Selwyn should be seen as one integrated district, rather than a series of detached townships". Why then, are you specifically trying so hard to 'detach' the USH?</p> <p>"Council acknowledges that where residents across the district receive a similar level of service for key infrastructure , the cost to residents should also be consistent. In the case of water and waste water this proposal will also keep these services affordable for smaller communities."</p> <p>USH is also "specifically listed in the propose district-wide rate for urban water compared with existing targeted rates" table. Why then are some of the current counsellors so determined to see the total demise of the USH?</p> <p>How can any counsellor, in all honesty, say they disagree with the Buddie Findlay statement: "It would go against the trend for the council now to look to recover the greater costs of continuing to provide water services to the (Upper Selwyn) Huts solely from that community" . Further: "Council has already agreed to fund 70% of the sewer upgrade, indicating the district is prepared to pay towards USH sewer upgrade. There is no good reason why the council couldn't fund the full amount. This was proposed in 4.12.4 of the "Upper Selwyn Huts Future Occupancy Strategy" report dated 04/03/2024.</p> <p>Why has the reticulation system not been replaced by SDC? The SDC has been responsible for that system since 1989.</p> <p>Hut resident</p>	<p>Thank you for your email, I have answered each of you questions in turn.</p> <p>Some questions that I require answers to, in order to be able to make informed decisions on my future.</p> <p>The huts do not qualify for the list just because of their age. All nominations for the list are assessed against set criteria and prioritised against other nominations.</p> <p>Thank you for your feedback regarding the district wide rates for water and sewage, this is something that will be considered in the preparation of the new Deed of Licence</p> <p>The Councillors have made resolutions concerning the length of occupation in what is a very sensitive environment and what is on public land.</p> <p>The Buddie Findley statement you refer to is not a statement but advice which councillors consider when making their decisions. This advice was also considered in the full context of the all of the letter. In May 2019 Council had resolved that 100% of the pipeline would be paid for by Upper Selwyn Huts residents. The reduction to 30% was recognition of the high cost of the new pipeline and the financial burden it would place on Hut owners. The report dated 02/03/24 did not propose that the new pipeline be fully funded by Council, this we one of several option that was available to Council. The recommendation was that Hut owners would pay 50%, this was rejected by Councillors in favour of the lessor 30%.</p> <p>The reticulation has an expected life span that will see it last for approximately another 15 years, it would not be economical to replace it before the work is required.</p>
s/(2)(a)	Clause 28.3 says that when the Council doesn't make a direction under 28.2 that we remove our homes, they can direct that our homes become vested in the Council. Am I misunderstanding this clause? If so would you be able to explain clause 28.3 for me.	<p>Thank you for the feedback, we will consider this when we develop the new Deed of Licence. The intention of the Clause is to explain to you that you should remove you hut when the Deed of Licence ends. Council do not want you to leave the hut in place. Council does not want to take ownership of your hut.</p>
s/(2)(a)	Clause 33.1 re our paying all of your costs and fees 'arising out of and associated with steps taken by the Licensor'. Would you please give a detailed explanation of this clause. Would this cover the Council's costs should anyone take legal action against the Council?	<p>Apologies for late response on this one, we are looking at this clause through the feedback process.</p> <p>It was intended to cover costs that Council incurred as a result of licensee breach of the licence terms.</p> <p>We encourage residents to take their own legal advice, if they can.</p>
s/(2)(a)	Will Ngai Tahu pay the same amount as us or will they pay the district wide rate for this?	Each rate payer pays a different amount depending on the RV of their property. Other fees are fixed
s/(2)(a)	<p>So Mister Mayor, do you have anything to say on your intent to destroy people's lives?</p> <p>As you will be aware there are plans in place to evict hundreds of people from the Upper Selwyn Huts, Lower Selwyn Huts and Greenpark Huts communities.</p> <p>The result of which will leave many elderly residents and young families homeless and in financial strife.</p> <p>Although we have heard much from council, as far as I know we are yet to hear the government's stance on this.</p> <p>Please provide guidance on how the government (national &amp; local) are going provide support when this all turns to custard.</p> <p>Rather than just noting my comments, could you please answer the questions.</p> <p>I have also attached a file that I submitted via Selwyn LTP Have Your Say.</p>	<p>Thank you for you email, questions about how Government will respond to any issue should be addressed to the Government. If you would like to listen the our Councils view and how the decision were made you can do so by watching the video recording of the meeting when they made the decision regarding the 15 year deed of Licence offer. Councillors discuss the decision and how this was made. <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mZ8QB8eSUL7E">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mZ8QB8eSUL7E</a></p>
s/(2)(a)	<p>If the writing was on the wall in 2019 that the huts would have a finite term, why then when I brought my house in 2020 and I signed a deed of licence and a transfer of licence where I not informed by SDC that it was not forever? I never received a letter explaining this. Plus the deed I signed said permanent.</p> <p>This, to me is very misleading. If SDC, upon receiving my request to transfer the licence had indicated it wasn't for a finite term, I would not of put my savings into this property.</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>With any purchase of a property in New Zealand, it is the responsibility of the buyer to conduct their own enquiries regarding conditions that might affect their purchase. When you were offered a Deed of Licence it clearly stated that the licence had an end date and there was no guarantee of an ongoing licence.</p>
s/(2)(a)	has the Council is considered putting Taumutu on the district wide rate for sewer. Also how has the water upgrade for Fisherman's Point has been paid for - is it on the district wide rate?	Taumutu are not on the district wide rate for sewer provision. The water upgrade for Fisherman's Point was funded from the District wide targeted water supply rate. Properties at Fisherman's point pay the equivalent of a half minimum charge for their water supply.
s/(2)(a)	<p>Can you please provide detailed information on any liability, insurance or otherwise, that SDC is responsible for in relation to effects of climate change or extreme events, inundation, flooding or other, in relation to USH?</p> <p>What are the implications, financial or other, to SDC if we are affected by climate change / flooding.</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>Council do not have any insurance for properties in the Upper Selwyn Huts Community and this is a private matter for hut owners to arrange if they want to insure their huts.</p> <p>The implications are outlined in paragraph 30 and 31 of the proposed deed of Licence</p>



<div>s7(2)(a)</div>	<p>Can you please provide any information you have regarding Fisherman’s Point, Te Pa o Moki &amp; Te Taumutu Rūnanga’s retreat strategy?</p> <p>This settlement will be well under water before USH is affected by climate change so their retreat strategy is relevant to ours.</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>Any enquiries about the existence of a Te Taumutu Rūnanga retreat strategy should be posed to the Runanga</p>
<div>s7(2)(a)</div>	<p>Hi Tim</p> <p>Can you please provide any reports you have that show the measured height above sea level of all places in USH and related areas you have measurements for.</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>The Aqualinc report that was attached to the Upper Selwyn Huts occupation strategy report to Council on 13 March 2024 has this information (The upper Selwyn Huts (settlement is approximately 2.5 m amsl).</p>
<div>s7(2)(a)</div>	<p>You really have NO IDEA as to my/our frustration and don't pretend to even do so. This is tokenism at its best!!!</p> <p>Please explain the criteria to be on the General Rates in the Selwyn District??</p> <p>Also can you please give reason as to why the Taumutu Marae is being considered to be included in the district wide rates??</p> <p>If you are suggesting it is for "Our Children" then please consider the heritage attached to the Selwyn Huts and the benefits to them!!</p> <p>I believe Ngai Tahu has been paid \$23,0000.00 for Kaitoreke Spit by NASA &amp; if this is your way of making our settlement available to them then bring on the big guns. I mean at least be honest with your future intentions of our settlement!!</p> <p>You have no idea the implications your one sided decision has impacted the residents of Selwyn Huts and I believe you really don't care.</p> <p>The least you could do is offer compensation to these people if you so desperately want to oblige with NASA.</p> <p>I look forward to your reply</p> <p><del>Everybody in NZ is entitled to a warm and safe place to live and you and your henchmen are denying these people that right</del></p>	<p>This is a decision that was made by Councillors and reviewed on several occasions, your feedback will be presented to Councillors, and should they decide that this situation will remain the same they will offer reasons why.</p> <p>I am not aware that this is being considered.</p> <p>Selwyn District Council is not in conversation with NASA</p>
<div>s7(2)(a)</div>	<p>Are the structures on the reserve classified as huts or buildings?</p> <p>Can I disconnect myself from the reticulation and install my own Incineration Toilet in my hut and not pay towards the new pipeline</p> <p>I believe the Huts are heritage-protected and cannot be removed, is this true</p> <p>Why can you not redesignate the land for residential properties and allow the huts to stay for as long as we like.</p>	<p>I following our chat this I provide the following answers to your questions</p> <p>1.Are the structures on the reserve classified as huts or buildings?</p> <p>The only mention of huts in the building code I could find is backcountry hut means a building that—</p> <p>(a) is located on land that is administered by the Department of Conservation for conservation, recreational, scientific, or other related purposes, including any land administered under any of the following:</p> <p>(i) the Conservation Act 1987;</p> <p>(ii) the National Parks Act 1980;</p> <p>(iii) the Reserves Act 1977; and</p> <p>(b) is intended to provide overnight shelter to any person who may visit and who carries his or her own food, bedding, clothing, and outdoor equipment; and</p> <p>(c) contains only basic facilities, which may include (but are not limited to) any or all of the following:</p> <p>(i) sleeping platforms or bunks:</p> <p>(ii) mattresses:</p> <p>(iii) food preparation surfaces:</p> <p>(iv) appliances for heating:</p> <p>(v) appliances for cooking:</p> <p>(vi) toilets; and</p> <p>(d) has been certified by the Director-General as being in a location that wheelchair users are unlikely to be able to visit; and</p> <p>(e) is intended to be able to sleep—</p> <p>(i) no more than 20 people in its backcountry hut sleeping area; and</p> <p>(ii) no more than 40 people in total; and</p> <p>(f) does not contain any connection, except by radiocommunications, to a network utility operator</p> <p>Clearly the structures do not meet this definition so I would say that they are buildings for residential use and in terms of the code will fall within the definition of a household unit. I have copied in the Head of Building so I will update you if her view differs</p> <p>2.Can I disconnect myself from the reticulation and install my own incineration toilet in my hut and not pay towards the new pipeline?</p> <p>This may raise additional issues such as the appropriate discard of grey water, for instance, from sink and shower. Councils approach is that servicing will be implemented as a whole e.g. there is no 'opt out' unless it is to discontinue occupancy.</p> <p>3.I believe the huts are heritage protected and cannot be removed, is this true?</p> <p>The huts are not listed on the Selwyn District Plan as heritage buildings.</p> <p>The huts do not qualify for historical significance under the Heritage Pouhere Taonga NZ Act just because of their age. All nominations for the lists are assessed against set criteria and prioritised against other nominations.</p> <p>4.Why can you not redesignate the land for residential properties and allow the huts to stay for as long as we like?</p> <p>I will list a few reasons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•The Upper Selwyn Huts are located on a reserve, land that is owned by the Crown and several factors make it unsuitable for long-term residential use.</li><li>•There are limitations in terms of the Reserves Act on long term leases.</li><li>•The layout of the settlement was never intended or designed for long term residential use</li><li>•Climate change and extreme weather events will eventually make this location unsuitable for permanent habitation</li></ul>
<div>s7(2)(a)</div>	<p>Can I ask why?</p> <p>The Council is considering/has considered putting Taumutu on the district wide rate for sewer.</p> <p>And how has the water upgrade for Fisherman’s Point has been paid for - is it on the district wide rate?</p>	<p>Taumutu are not on the district wide rate for sewer provision. The water upgrade for Fisherman’s Point was funded from the district wide targeted water supply rate. Properties at Fisherman's point pay the equivalent of a half minimum charge for their water supply.</p>
<div>s7(2)(a)</div>	<p>In the Schedule 1 of 2015 DOL</p> <p>12. Licence Type: Permanent</p> <p>In the draft Schedule of 2024 DOL</p> <p>This reference needs to be included</p> <p>Licence Type: Permanent</p>	<p>Thanks for your feedback.</p>
<div>s7(2)(a)</div>	<p>This is a direct question for you to answer direct.</p> <p>Can you please tell me the reason why your 174 page report Upper Selwyn Huts Future Occupancy Strategy was released only two working days before the Council meeting, via internet link only?</p> <p>This is clearly not enough time for the Councillors to read through and understand, nor the USH community to get a copy, read it, get legal advice on it in order to make a coordinated, well reasoned submissions to the Councillors before they took a vote of the proposed Deed of Licence.</p> <p><div>s7(2)(a)</div> I still do not fully understand the reasons or the recommendations.</p> <p>What date did you actually finish the report?</p> <p>How can the Councillors understand what they are voting on in 2 days?</p> <p>To me it seems the timing of the release was deliberate so the Councillors simply accepted your recommendations and the community appeared disorganised and ill prepared.</p> <p>I suspect I will be getting a response in the form of political rhetoric, however an honest response would be appreciated.</p> <p>Please ensure you share this question and feedback with the councillors also as part of our feedback.</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>1. There were a number of staff involved in preparing the report staff which came at a very busy period for the Council with the LTP with the Representative Review are also underway. Standing orders (which dictates how Council manages its meetings) requires that Council reports be available two days before the Council meeting. We do try to make them available before then but that is not always possible.</p> <p>2.Councillors are often faced with voluminous agendas with many hundreds of pages that they need to try and understand in short timeframes.</p> <p>3.The report was finished towards the end of the week before the Wednesday meeting it was subject to reviews then it is sent to the governance part of the Council for publishing</p> <p>However it was a large report with significant implications which is one of the reasons why timeframes have been extended.</p>



s/(2)(a)	<p>Sorry I can't see in there anything that supports the Council not following a consultation process for this. Would you please highlight the relevant section.</p>	<p>Please see below a link to our significance policy.</p> <p><a href="https://www.selwyn.govt.nz/__data/assets/pdf_file/0003/467634/SEP-Final-Council-23-June-2021-FINAL.PDF">https://www.selwyn.govt.nz/__data/assets/pdf_file/0003/467634/SEP-Final-Council-23-June-2021-FINAL.PDF</a> Please refer to the policy point 3. General approach to determining significance and making decisions.</p>
s/(2)(a)	<p>So does this mean clause 28.3 will be removed? Why was it included I. The first place?</p>	<p>I will add your query to the list of feedback for the DoL for consideration.</p>
s/(2)(a)	<p>I'd like you to disregard the following statement from your Upper Selwyn Huts Future Occupancy Strategy Report dated 4/3/24 in relation to ECan supporting an end state for Upper Selwyn Huts, for reasons explained below.</p> <p>SDC Report 4/3/24:</p> <p>Stakeholders:</p> <p>" Environment Canterbury - Consultation with Environment Canterbury (ECan) chair Peter Scott on 9 November 2023 confirmed that ECans desired end state for USH was for any new DOL to be finite."</p> <p>I have recently received an answer from Peter Scott as follows (attached):</p> <p>Thank you for your email.</p> <p>The decisions surrounding the Deed of Licence were made by Selwyn District Council as the managing authority for Upper Selwyn Huts.</p> <p>Environment Canterbury had no say in the decision.</p> <p>Regards Peter"</p> <p>Furthermore Graeme Young put this question to Peter Scott at ECan's LTP Submissions and asked:</p> <p>"I understand from possibly the chairman Mr Scott that he expressed in November last year maybe it's his opinion but maybe it's the opinion of the whole regional council that you want the people at the settlement of the selwyn huts to be finite. Now I want to know when you made that decision or is that just something that come out as a wish list."</p> <p>Peter's reply:</p> <p>"I don't think this is the right place to do that because this is a submission process but since you've asked the question I will. And I've explained how that was noted in the Selwyn District Council paper was the fact that Environment Canterbury saw the issue at the Selwyn Huts as Selwyns issue and that Selwyn would decide what that was, there was no decision made at this council. It was a comment that I made in passing to Mayor Broughton that we supported what they were going to do. That was their decision. Not my decision. Not our decision. I said we would support what they would want to do, because it's their decision."</p> <p>Listen to Graeme's submission and Peters response from 6:13</p> <p><a href="https://youtu.be/97Y59-CXLeM?si=4gy0Pw1lc2VJnP9z">https://youtu.be/97Y59-CXLeM?si=4gy0Pw1lc2VJnP9z</a></p> <p>ECan has not made any decision regarding an end state for Upper Selwyn Huts.</p>	<p>Thank you for your e-mail below this will be provided again to Councillors with in the list of feedback.</p>
s/(2)(a)	<p>In your answer to 2 you mention that climate change is not the only reason for the 15 year term. Can you please identify all of the reasons?</p>	<p>Apologies for the late e-mail. Staff are pulling together an extensive list to Councillors decision around the why.</p> <p>As well as climate change and extreme weather events that will eventually make this location unsuitable for permanent habitation, I list a few further reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The Upper Selwyn Huts are located on a Reserve, land that is owned by the Crown and several factors make it unsuitable for long-term residential use.</li> <li>•There are limitations in terms of the Reserves Act on long term leases.</li> <li>•The layout of the settlement was never intended or designed for long term residential use.</li> </ul>
s/(2)(a)	<p>We need more time to understand the issues, gather information, plan and inform our community. We can't catch up on your 7 years of planning, four full legal opinions and a full commissioned 100 page climate change report in just a few weeks with a next to nothing budget. We've been reeling about the 15 finite years and the trying to understand the reasons since March but we need to move towards planning and problem solving.</p> <p>You need to reclassify us to high significance and start over this process under a collaborative model.</p> <p>If there are genuine reasons making it challenging for us to stay here long term, then we need time to review those claims, investigate solutions, plan for alternatives and inform the community. It's irresponsible of our committee to be fighting for as long as possible term without knowing all the facts and alternatives and not informing the community about those. We need to protect the well being of our community, and we need to be involved so we can understand and agree with any decision being made.</p> <p>Council wanted to give us certainty, maybe that is why such a short timeframe. But the deed you have proposed and its reasoning has given us even less certainty than we've ever had. We just can't accept it. If we sign any deed with a finite time before researching the reasons properly and investigating solutions to the genuine issues then we are not only letting ourselves and our community down, including 47 new buyers in the last 5 years who didn't know about the short finite resolution, we will be letting the generations of families who lived here before us down, as are the council.</p> <p>The timeframe you have given us is more suited to minor projects, not an eviction notice for an entire 130 year old settlement with significant history.</p> <p>We need to be reclassified as high significance as per my long term plan submission (attached) and given an open ended time to collaborate with the council to find a mutually acceptable outcome.</p>	<p>Thanks for your e-mail. We will consider your request and inform you once a decision by Council has been made.</p>
s/(2)(a)	<p>Good morning</p> <p>You have not followed your Significance and Engagement Policy regarding the above. A decision to make an entire community homeless and wipe them off the map, should have been of high significance. We should have been involved with this from the beginning, not brought in at the end.</p> <p>•Section 3 (general approach to determining significance and making decisions) states the Council will have information about the community's views on the issues and the options and in particular has an understanding of the views and preferences of those likely to be affected by the decision – you did not have this. In making any decision, the Council will be satisfied that it knows enough about and has given adequate consideration to the views and preferences of affected and interested parties – this did not happen before Council voted in March.</p> <p>•Section 4 criteria and procedures for assessing significance Council will be guided by the extent to which the proposal impacts on the community members and the extent to which the community's views are already known - we were not informed of the proposed changes so you were not able to know our view. You determined this proposal to be of medium significance but you did not take the above into consideration when you made this decision. Surely the decision to not only include us on the DWR but to make a community homeless should have have been more than medium significance.</p> <p>Therefore as Council has not followed best practice, we request that you start again. Classify this as high significance and have an open time frame to allow consultation to occur, to achieve a mutually acceptable outcome.</p>	<p>Thanks for your e-mail. We will consider your request/s and will inform you once a decision by Council has been made.</p>

s7(2)(a)	<p>I am still waiting on the licence fee breakdown, however in relation to this, our licence fee has always been set to recover the running costs of sewer and water. Presumably this will be the case going forward.</p> <p>What will our running costs be for water and sewer once the new pipeline is operational?</p> <p>I'm presuming that whatever this cost will be will determine our licence fee. Not the \$1,389 showing in the draft Deed.</p>	<p>Apologies for the late response: \$1,389.00 (inclusive of GST) per annum payable quarterly in advance payable on 1 July, 1 October, 1 January and 1 April in each year. The breakdown is as listed:</p> <p>Licence charges for Annual operating/maintenance costs Water supply\$244 Sewer system\$556 Sewer trucking costs until new system commissioned\$103 Chlorination of water\$34 Opening Account Deficit\$292 Total Cost\$1,229 GST\$160 Total Cost GST Incl.\$1,389 Staff are still in the process of investigating what the 'opening account deficit' encompasses, however this will be worked through with Councillors once the final Deed of Licence is confirmed.</p>
s7(2)(a)	<p>A few Questions, Does the Council have a recourse consent to cross under the river, is there a safety plan in the event of future damage, leakage into the water way. It is noticed you are using corde contractor, what qualifications and skills do they have to carry out this operation, or even lead it. Reading your letter to the hut owners, in the format you have used is not what you would expect from a person with a masters degree, It seems you are being put under the bus, from another power from with in.</p>	<p>Apologies for a late response, staff have provided the following response to your highlighted questions in your e-mail:</p> <p>Council currently holds two consents with Environment Canterbury CRC241907 &amp; CRC241906, to drill underneath the bed of river and to use land to undertake earthworks and to construct specified infrastructure within 100 metres of a natural inland wetland.</p>
s7(2)(a)	<p>Hi Tim If the Selwyn Huts were to be included in the district wide rate for sewer and water, how much would this add to the individual ratepayers in the district?</p>	<p>I will try and get that information but I don't think that the sum would be considerable given that the approx. 1.5 million spend (if Council end up picking up 70% of the cost) would be spread over 30 000 ratable houses over 15 years.</p>
s7(2)(a)	<p>Can you clarify for me please the reasons behind the 2019 finite decision? Please list each reason and give a brief explanation to each one.</p>	<p>The Council say that the huts were never intended for permanent use. However, SDC allowed this to happen. This was to accommodate a lack of housing following the earthquakes.</p> <p>For further information you can read the 2019 Council meeting Agenda and Minutes here: Public Agenda (extract) from Council Meeting 8 May 2019 [PDF, 11980 KB] Public Minutes from Council Meeting 8 May 2019 [PDF, 177 KB]</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Here is our feedback on the proposed draft Deed of Licence.</p> <p>Background: G. 30% of wastewater cost. We do not agree to this cost. This is discrimination, we are a part of the district and should be on the District wide rate. H. States that because the community is being connected to the Pines wastewater treatment plant the community remains viable for 15yrs. We believe that as the pipeline has a 50yr+ lifespan the community should be viable for 50yrs+ also. H. States that we agree no further licence will be granted beyond 2039. We however disagree with this statement. As we purchased in 2022 and were not informed of the 2019 decision regarding the licence being set for a finite period it would be improper for Council to informed this decision. Terms and conditions: 5.1.c. Does this mean that we can't occupy a lot and for example s7(2)(a) occupy another? What is this clause about? 5.1.d. This should be presented and discussed with the community before any decision is made. 5.1.e What if you have a forgetful individual? Can it be that Council make contact to the resident to make them aware 3 months before end of the term. 5.1f This statement is not acceptable as it gives Council the right to refuse without any substantial reason and does not require consultation with residents. Other charges: 6.1 We do not agree to pay a wastewater connection contribution payment. 6.2 Please specify what rates, levies, taxes, duties, assessments, charges and other outgoings you are referring to. Payment 8.1 what default interest rate? Same as the rest of the district? Licence fee review: 9.3 a-h. Do not understand what all these are about. Building works: 10.1 Clarification needed on what is considered an alteration or addition. Existing hut and structures: 11.1 Maintenance of our home is our business and should not be of any concern of Council's. You administer the land, you are not the landlords of our homes, we own our homes so responsibility and liability lies with us, not you. 11.2 View the lot is fine, not our home. Licensor Inspection Programme: 12.1 Should not be inspecting our home. 12.3/4/5 remedial works to our home is our business, not yours. Licensee's further obligations: 13.3 see disagreement under schedule 2. Trees and shrubs: 17.3 It is unrealistic to expect us to check a low flammability species list every time we wish to plant a flower. Termination 24.1c(i) Council can easily say not economically feasible and terminate. A contract between 2 parties should be fair and unbiased. Expiry of licence 28.1 Please explain 'yield up the hut'... thought Council want us to demolish them not surrender them? Costs 33.1 (a) This could be a broad range of things that Council decide to do. We cannot sign a document that puts us in this position i.e. liable for any costs that you see fit.</p>	<p>Feedback, acknowledgement sent</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>[Continued] Schedule 2 Code of Conduct: In general imposing a code of conduct is an absolute joke. We are all grownups here and the only people's behaviour we are responsible for is our own and that of our children. Rules such as no drugs etc is perfectly acceptable but when you add in things like... Asking others to be quiet- This to me is actually quite dangerous. You are telling people they have a responsibility to approach someone in a situation that may appear or turn confrontational. It should be left up to individuals in that moment to assess the situation and make up their own mind. It should not be imposed by you as a responsibility we have to uphold. Another ridiculous one is having to use an external venue for several guests. As was rightly pointed out at one of our meetings, that rule actually means no kids birthday parties, no guests for dinner, no family around at Christmas time. Are you for real? You expect people to sign this and actually abide by it? Also, changes/additions to any rules should always be a consultation process so we ask that you take out the line about 'No obligation for the Licensor to do so'. We would like to put our name to a fair and reasonable document that gives Council the right they require but also allows residents to live.</p>	
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>You mentioned on Friday the approximate number of ratepayers in the Selwyn on District Wide Rates for sewer and water.</p> <p>Can you please let me know what that number is?</p> <p>It is important to know this for our accurate calculations, as well as the amount each rate payer has to pay each year for the new Leeston to Pines sewer upgrade as well as how much each would pay if USH were put on DWRs as previously requested.</p>	<p>Our revenue team have provided the following information:</p> <p>Sewerage 21525 properties Urban water supply 24405.</p> <p>For this 23/24 rating year Sewerage is charged per SUIP at \$610. Urban water supply at \$ 308.</p>



[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Could you please explain the reasons that the Council has made the decision that 'the report (USH March 24) is deemed to have medium significance assessment for Council activity' ?</p> <p>The Council made the USH a suburb when they allowed residents to live there permanently after the earthquakes. This means you are effectively disestablishing a suburb and uprooting 70-80 families. The displacement of these families, whose only asset is likely well devalued, into a difficult housing environment is surely of high significance to the Selwyn District Council? The stress and mental health issues, along with financial issues is likely to result in long-term and severe problems for this community. The Council has a social responsibility to do everything they can to mitigate this situation.</p> <p>The impact of 'medium significance' has resulted in little consultation with the residents and a complete lack of support offered to date.</p> <p>The current DOL in front of the USH residents offers no security to residents that they will indeed have the number of years specified in the document. There are many clauses in the DOL that allow the Council to terminate a licence with 20 working days notice, so many in fact that it is a logical conclusion that the Council intends to terminate the licence of as many residents as possible and as soon as possible.</p> <p>Given the urgency and importance of consultation and support to address these issues, I would like to request details on the support that is apparently to be offered to the residents and when this will occur?</p> <p>Given this scenario, the best way to address these issues is to remove the building inspection clause, the code of conduct and offer residents a reasonable and fair DOL with no finite date.</p>	<p>Thanks for your e-mail and points made. We are considering relooking at the significance assessment. We are still in the process of setting up the support group. We will consider the requests made in your e-mail below and will inform you once a decision by Council has been made.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Could you please confirm that final and definite costings of the wastewater costs and annual licence fee costs will be detailed in the DOL?</p>	<p>You can find this information on our website:</p> <p><a href="https://www.selwyn.govt.nz/property-And-building/upper-selwyn-huts-management-and-licencing/q-and-a">https://www.selwyn.govt.nz/property-And-building/upper-selwyn-huts-management-and-licencing/q-and-a</a></p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>I would like to provide feedback on the Code of Conduct which is currently part of the DOL in front of USH residents.</p> <p>Would you, as a ratepayer, happily accept the narrow and prescriptive Code of Conduct conditions the USH residents are expected to abide by?</p> <p>I strongly suggest you remove the entire Code of Conduct and leave the USH residents to abide by the same rules as the rest of the Selwyn ratepayers.</p>	<p>Thanks for your feedback. Your feedback will all be included as feedback to Councillors when they make the final decision about the Deed of Licence.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>The council have stated that they are paying for 70% of the cost of the pipeline to help the USH residents. As we are only able to use the pipeline for 30% of its life, we are in fact paying for 100% of the pipeline for our usage.</p> <p>Could the council please revisit this and look at supporting this community in the way they have suggested they are?</p>	<p>Thanks for your feedback. Your feedback will all be included as feedback to Councillors when they make the final decision about the Deed of Licence.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Hi,</p> <p>Our hut has been in our family for over <span style="background-color: black; color: red;">s7(2)(a)</span></p> <p>I request the building inspection clause be removed completely from the DOL.</p> <p>We will be unable to sign a DOL if this remains as per our legal advice.</p>	<p>Thanks for your feedback. Your feedback will all be included as feedback to Councillors when they make the final decision about the Deed of Licence.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Letter Submission to SDC Councillor's. Mayor &amp; CEO</p> <p>Submission to Save the Upper Selwyn Huts 2024 A Historical Reserve since 1894/5</p> <p>Kia Ora Sharon (CEO SDC)</p> <p><span style="background-color: black; color: red;">s7(2)(a)</span></p> <p><span style="background-color: black; color: red;">s7(2)(a)</span>. In relation to the 1977 Reserve Act Upper - Selwyn Fishing Huts. And designated part area of the Springston South Reserve. All regulated under the 1977 Reserve Act &amp; underlying. Historical Acts. And vested in the SDC now. Previously by hut owners committee/SDC. And originally by the Springston South (Reserve) Domain Board (Public Domains Board Act 1881 &amp; 1904 ).</p> <p>And also clearly referred to in the SDC REPORT 4th March for the 13th of March 2024 Councillors Meeting. By Tim Harris clause 3.2.</p> <p>-1840 Crown Protection with signing of the Treaty in the same year, Nga Tahu, sth. of Akaroa. -Public Domains Acts 1881 &amp; 1904 etc. -Kemps Purchase from Ngai Tahu 12th June 1848 @ Akaroa, a large section of the S. Is. -Native Land Division Act 1882 (1880) -Land Act 1948 (important mechanisms for lease/sale arrangement by the Crown or Local Authority) -Reserves Act 1977 &amp; updates</p> <p>Please see, Survey Plan attachments 1932 &amp; 1937. All describing numerous LOTS of generally 8 Perch sections (one fifth of a quarter acre 202 sq. metres). All within the Springs County Survey District Subdivisions of Fishing LOTS. SO 6961 &amp; SO 6628 RES 3048. Noting that they appear to be for subdivision purposes. Being Sub 82 (L). And 83 Sub (L). But both struck out</p>	<p>We acknowledge your submission and note that the Council will be discussing the huts issue including a number of the issues that you raise in its July meeting.</p>

<p>[Name redacted - privacy]</p>	<p>[continued]</p> <p>Some 25 years ago Buddle Findlay on request of Selwyn Huts owners Committee. Gave the strong legal opinion. That the Licences to Occupy can &amp; should regarded as Leases. That is in their, learned opinion. And they refer to a Management Plan that should be in place by the SDC. Some 25 years later the SDC has failed in its statutory requirement to undertake the Management Plan beyond an out-of-date DRAFT. And has disregarded the Local &amp; National Heritage value of the Reserve. In lack of any listing in the SDC District Plan. And opposing listing by Heritage NZ.</p> <p>I have sought opinion from a licensed surveyor regards the formation of leases. And local body leasing Reserve Officer. As the lots have been surveyed &amp; held with LINZ. It would be a relatively easy process to change the Licence to Occupy to 33 renewable lease. And possibly 35 year lease dependant on legal set up. Or simply Licence to Occupy 6 terms of 5 years (2054). As a mutual default. But no finite date for further 5-year periods beyond. All to be negotiated by both parties.</p> <p>And it is to be noted the SDC'S Lawyers Buddle Findlay warned the SDC in recent, communications to be cautious in their approach to several items regards the Selwyn Huts amendment of Deed of Licences etc. The SDC hasn't heeded this advice at its own peril. And in fact, the SDC consultation Process has only deemed the level of consultation to be. Medium itself. And hasn't followed a medium level of consultation. As the demolition of a village and dislocation of its occupants in any local authority area would be important. With a HIGH LEVEL OF CONSULTATION being required. As perscribed level local authority determination. The lack of consultation needs needs to have...</p> <p>1. A Judicial Review 2. Investigation under Section 39 Of the Local Government Body Act 3. Internal Review by the SDC etc.</p> <p>Well the SDC has opened a can of worms that I imagine now it wished it hadn't opened. And appears to have exceeded its authority in several ways, Through the proposed 'DRAFT' DOL. And is possibly negligent in some of its duties. Over several issues described above. And or exceeded, its territorial authority.</p> <p>And referring back to the SDC Meeting 13th March. And having never attended a full Council. Meeting before. It appeared to be some what orchestrated meeting with possible intention to dislocate the Selwyn Huts in the near future. All as from the residents view sitting in the gallery. With Mayor departing the council buildings just minutes before the meeting. And Deputy Mayor standing in as Chair. With the DM having a long histpory of dealing with the Upper Selwyn Huts. And with a reported long time suppsedly negative view of the Selwyn Huts in general. And also a reported suppsedly in general,disparging view of some of the Licences.The Deputy Mayor most likely should have excused himself under Section 39 of the Local Government Act 2002. And yourself under Section 40. Should have been briefed on the situation by staff or other councillors. But with the convient switch of chairperson at the last minute of the meeting you wouldn't have been in that position. The video of the meeting requires reviewing under the Section 39. All by an independant government agency. The meeting most likely was technically run correctly with</p>	<p>The video of the meeting requires reviewing under the Section 39. All by an independant government agency. The meeting most likely was technically run correctly with a very experieced Chairman. But at least the spirit was not followed.{'</p>
<p>[Name redacted - privacy]</p>	<p>[continued]</p> <p>SDC Collusion/Hidden Agended with Nga Tahu???</p> <p>As neither the Nga Tahu or SDC have been forthcoming regards there combined position regards the dislocation of the 3 lake settlements. And other combined or individual hidden agendas. Upper &amp; Lower Selwyn Huts/Greenpark Huts. And that the Nga Tahu representative at the SDC Board Meeting of the 13th wanted all three historic settlements removed by the middle of this year!!!!!!!!!!!! And there reason was stated at the meeting as there right to fish. Which doesnt affect there right to fish the Selwyn River &amp; Lake Ellesmere</p> <p>Now yesterday12/06/2024 we get to find out by Canterbury News Media. That unbeleivably the Nga Tahu wish to build on the Greenpark site!!!!!!!!!!!! What do they plan with possibly the SDC. Maybe a large Marae based Sports/Community Centre on the Upper Selwyn Huts. As they can land asset strip our community through the Waitangi Maori Lands Settlement Act. Via there Nga Tahu designation right of refusal on the sites legal title. If the SDC were to 'sell' the land or part of it. And or lease to the Nga Tahu. Even though I understand that the Nga Tahu turned down the offer to 'purchase' the land by Traty Settlement some 25 years ago.</p> <p>How to solve...</p> <p>Easy/Fair &amp; Transparent:</p> <p>1. Draw up 33/35 year renewable leases for each lot held with LINZ. And with right of renewal as per the 1977 Act (no fish hooks no different than any other dwelling in NZ). Or 6 off 5 years licence to occupy with no finite date. Renegotiate at 30 years. 2. Non-Draconian clauses for Lot/Hut owners to be removed. Clauses as existing with minor tweaks if required. All acceptable to the Human Rights Commission &amp; Hut owners/SDC. Or self regulate by code of practice by the Huts current committee. If required by both parties 3. Include the Upper Selwyn Huts in the general rate for all services supplied by SDC.</p> <p>You/we may need up 12 months to engage (real engagement) negotiate &amp; discuss with the Upper Huts Selwyn Dwellers/Committee/Councillor's &amp; other affected parties. Along with input &amp; review by your Lawyers Buddle Findlay. And legal advice generally to be taken on</p>	



<p>[Name redacted - privacy]</p>	<p>[continued] General: Note on voting for maximum of 15 years. The fact is that if the SDC has the negative will &amp; appears to have generally to have a predetermined Agenda. The historic huts settlement could be cleared in 5 years or sooner. All within the proposed New License to Occupy Lots signing. The New proposed Deed of License by the resident license holders . And by way of the extreney long list of Draconian clauses. And there effects</p> <p>Services - Sewer: The sewage system being installed now is essential. And is good move on SDC's part. I congratulate the SDC. On the current installation of a pumped system.</p> <p>Councillors Shanes mis quote at early March SDC Councillors Meeting: Shane has misquoted the 1905 Ellesmere Drainage Act. Regarding at least the Upper Selwyn Huts. As I believe that the Act applies to Green Park Huts &amp; the Lower Selwyn Huts. And all within one chain (20.1 metres) around Lake Ellesmere. Reserve, 682. All for cultural food gathering. And not the Upper Selwyn Huts. Also, the Upper Selwyn Huts has very strong tenure under existing Acts of parliament etc. Completely legally different than the other two settlements.</p> <p>Historical:</p> <p>First Hut 1888. The Fishing Box by way of Mr Spackman and fisherman Friends Pre 1895 a camp site was set up at least on or very near to the existing Selwyn Huts site on Reserve 959. And some eight rudimentary huts erected by 1890. All prior to the Selwyn Huts officially being formed by way of the Gazette Notices 1894/5 &amp; Lease authority in 1896. All By way of the Public Domains Board Act 1881.</p> <p>- Lake Ellesmere Domain Reserve 3048. As part of the underlying Res 959 - You need to refer to the Gazette notice/s of Date of Warrant 30th October 1894. Recorded in Lands &amp; Deeds Survey Record Plan/Schedule Thursday 7th March 1895. All regards the Upper Selwyn Huts. And referred to as the Lake Ellesmere Domain. With name changed to the Springston South Domain in 1927. Public Recreational Reserve 3048 &amp; (Reserve 4349).</p> <p>By 1905, 21 Fishermen Huts had been erected. All with the Domain having watering facilities. For horse transport to and from Christchurch.</p> <p>By 1913, 44 Huts had been erected.</p>	
<p>[Name redacted - privacy]</p>	<p>[continued] As all the issues quoted by of the SDC can easily be repudiated.</p> <p>1.0 Climate change dispelled. (Selwyn Huts ok for average of 35 years) 2.0 Flooding dispelled (high ground never flooded). Note that SDC needs to address the surface water flooding on its road reserve at the entrance to the Upper Selwyn Huts. As an localised drainage issue.. Requiring High Priority for design &amp; installation. And come out of the new national 'pot hole' fund. Please include in your Rooding budget 2024/5/6 Funding as obviously a High Priority. With the Huts isolated when the limited area of the Road Reserve floods (install an improved road drainage system &amp; raise the road level). Why has this not been identified in the yearly road maintenance budgets.</p> <p>3.0 Sewer (SDC is installing currently) 4.0 Interest by local Māori is for only gathering of food (fish) as stated at the Bd. Meeting. 5.0 The Huts on the Domain have never had a finite period. And not intended to. 6.0 PERMANENT stamped on all 'current' licences. 7.0 PERMANANT Reserve (Local Purposes) 23 June 1990 Gazzette Notice 882573 8.0 The Huts are of unique at leaast National Historic Significance. 128 years old. And the Selwyn River used for trout fishing from 1871 on. With release of trout spawning's by The Canterbury Acclimatisation Society, est.1864 (leading politicians of the time including the Govenor of the day. <span style="background-color: black; color: red;">s7(2)(a)</span> <span style="background-color: black; color: black;"> </span> And it is to note that the late Queen Mother &amp; King fished the river on more than one occasion. WWII soldiers camped in the Domain.</p> <p><span style="background-color: black; color: red;">s7(2)(a)</span> Just to name a couple of other historical interest stories.</p> <p>Covering Acts of Parliament re 8.0 above</p> <p>1840 Crown Protection. 1954 Historic Places Act (Historic Places Trust formed) 1991 RMA Historical Sltes &amp; Structures 2014 Heritage Pouhere Taonga Act (HNZ)</p>	

<p>[Name redacted - privacy]</p>	<p>[continued]</p> <p>s/(2)(a)</p> <p>3. RMA 1991:</p> <p>'All persons exercising functions and powers under the RMA are required to "recognise and provide for" matters of national importance in policy statements and plans and in the assessment of resource consent applications. The protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development is listed as a matter of national importance in section 6 of the RMA. Councils are also required to have regard to any relevant entry on the New Zealand Heritage List when preparing or changing a regional policy statement, regional plan or district plan and rules that protect historic heritage in proposed plans take immediate legal effect.'</p> <p>So, to sum up....</p> <p>A. The SDC Councillors hasn't the proven legal or moral authority to close the Selwyn Huts. All as already 'leased' &amp; surveyed with 100 plus Lots &amp; currently 96 Huts. And with the survey plans of allotments are held will LINZ. As firstly approved surveys on 21st November 1932. Undertaken earlier in 1932. And 19th May 1937. Both surveys undertaken earlier in both the year's. Note other plans similar available to show the current and final layout of all Lots undertaken post WWII.</p> <p>B. The Hut sites weren't set up to be finite.</p> <p>C. The 33-year lease under an amendment to reserves Act 1977. Is for the right of renewal can be activated (or 35 years).</p> <p>D. 'SDC' is investing in a new sewerage system, and recently a water purification system. Upgraded playground. Maintenance on the tennis court. New half court. New river flood protection by Ecan &amp; or SDC. Brand new Bus Shelter for resident school children by the local prefab shed maker. Noting a number of the items above have actually been 'paid' by the Upper Selwyn Huts directing &amp; or indirectly</p>	
<p>[Name redacted - privacy]</p>	<p>[Continued]</p> <p>E. The SDC consultation process was nearly nill. With public meeting late in February @ the S.S. Soldiers Memorial Hall. With a confusing hand out on the proposed sewer system. And just a mention of a new DOL &amp; Rules of occupation with a hint of closing us down. I spoke to the CEO at the meeting but was further confused. As most of us were. As we expected the discussion to be about the sewer line. As it was. But extremely confusing as mentioned above with a large semi 'hidden' agenda. As now the sewer line was proposed to go ahead. With 50% costing to bare on the Hut owner, but with the cloud of closure of the 'Huts'. After a about 2-3 weeks the announcement date came with the listing of the DRAFT document on the SDC website. With 2 -3 working days the devastating document was posted. All prior to the mid March SDC councillors scheduled meeting. The document was over 140 pages long. With I am sure 90% councillors would have only read part of it. So councillors certainly weren't informed of the serious issues &amp; consequences on voting. And confirming the 2019 finite vote (5 years old and was for the lack of a new sewage system etc?) . Equally the Hut Owners didn't have a chance to absorb the information. To be able to lobby the councillors in an effective way. Noting no hard copy or email copy of the propped 'new rules' were sent to the Huts owners physical or email address's</p> <p>'Selwyn District Council executive director enabling services Tim Harris said council had signalled in 2019 that hut licences would be for a finite period because of the risks and costs to people living there'.</p> <p>The SDC in general. Is woefully negligent in not listing the Reserve &amp; Huts in its District Plan Historic Section. And discouraged Heritage NZ from the same. And for virtually not communicating effectively to the Hut owners regards finite period etc, over a period of 5 years. Along with not having accurate information to present to the councillors &amp; Hut owners. in a timely fashion.</p> <p>s/(2)(a)</p> <p>s/(2)(c), s/(2)(a), s/(2)(l)</p> <p>Yours [name withheld]</p> <p>Email copies to SDC (CEO Sharon Mason) 10 Councillors &amp; Mayor/Tim Harris/Tim Mason</p> <p>Attachments: 1932 &amp; 1937 Lot Survey (2 plans)</p> <p>s/(2)(a)</p> <p>Gazette Notices 1894 &amp; 1895 Letter from Reg Land Survey Office 21 June 1990 permanant Reserve Gazette Notice 882573 (CT 46A/42 12/01/1999)</p>	
<p>[Name redacted - privacy]</p>	<p>Finally, I'd like to question the fairness of the over 40 new owners since 2019 (nearly half the village) paying for a debt that they weren't told about and incurred by SDC during the ownership of the previous owners. I believe the previous owners didn't know about the details of this debt so we're unable to pass on this information the new owners.</p> <p>For this reason I'd like to request:</p> <p>(1) Clause 9.1(e) should be removed, and</p> <p>(2) The Opening Account Deficit to be removed from the current licence</p>	<p>I will record the other detail in your e-mail as feedback for the Deed of Licence.</p>
<p>[Name redacted - privacy]</p>	<p>One of the residents has informed us that you are in the process of rewriting the Draft DOL to be presented to the Councillors once finished.</p> <p>If this is correct, I'd like to request that you consider postponing this for a few weeks as we have not yet received our legal advice on the DOL due to the time it has taken to query SDCs procedures to date and the reasons for the 15 years finite term.</p> <p>We are currently working on our feedback on the DOL clauses and we expect to have these to you as soon as possible but before the 15/7 deadline.</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>Thanks for your request, these matters are being considered.</p>



[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Can you please clarify the following about clause 5.1:</p> <p>5.1(c) We are challenging the inclusion of this clause s7(2)(a) however if it remains in the DOL what will happen to the current owners that own more than one lot?</p> <p>5.1(d) Many of us have read this clause many times and we still do not understand what this clause is saying. Can you please rewrite this clause so its intentions can be understood?</p>	Thanks for your e-mail. The clauses and matters raised below will be looked at through the feedback process.
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>I following our chat this I provide the following answers to your questions</p> <p>1.Are the structures on the reserve classified as huts or buildings? The only mention of huts in the building code I could find is</p> <p>backcountry hut means a building that— (a)is located on land that is administered by the Department of Conservation for conservation, recreational, scientific, or other related purposes, including any land administered under any of the following: (i)the Conservation Act 1987: (ii)the National Parks Act 1980: (iii)the Reserves Act 1977; and (b)is intended to provide overnight shelter to any person who may visit and who carries his or her own food, bedding, clothing, and outdoor equipment; and (c)contains only basic facilities, which may include (but are not limited to) any or all of the following: (i)sleeping platforms or bunks: (ii)mattresses: (iii)food preparation surfaces: (iv)appliances for heating: (v)appliances for cooking: (vi)toilets; and (d)has been certified by the Director-General as being in a location that wheelchair users are unlikely to be able to visit; and (e)is intended to be able to sleep— (i)no more than 20 people in its backcountry hut sleeping area; and (ii)no more than 40 people in total; and (f)does not contain any connection, except by radiocommunications, to a network utility operator</p> <p>Clearly the structures do not meet this definition so I would say that they are buildings for residential use and in terms of the code will fall within the definition of a household unit. I have copied in the Head of Building so I will update you if her view differs Tim, so is the correct wording going to be put into a new lease.? ie remove the word huts and replace with household unit</p> <p>2.Can I disconnect myself from the reticulation and install my own incineration toilet in my hut and not pay towards the new pipeline? This may raise additional issues such as the appropriate discard of grey water, for instance, from sink and shower. Councils approach is that servicing will be implemented as a whole e.g. there is no 'opt out' unless it is to discontinue occupancy. okay</p> <p>3.I believe the huts are heritage protected and cannot be removed, is this true? The huts are not listed on the Selwyn District Plan as heritage buildings. The huts do not qualify for historical significance under the Heritage Pouhere Taonga NZ Act just because of their age. All nominations for the lists are assessed against set criteria and prioritised against other nominations. I didnt think i asked that but its okay</p>	We will include the points you have made as feedback to Councillors when they make the final decision about the Deed of Licence.
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>[Continued]</p> <p>4.Why can you not redesignate the land for residential properties and allow the huts to stay for as long as we like? i didnt ask that but a residential unit or dwelling in a small township, doesnt need to be redesignated for residential , when its already has residential status.</p> <p>I will list a few reasons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•The Upper Selwyn Huts are located on a reserve, land that is owned by the Crown and several factors make it unsuitable for long-term residential use.</li><li>•There are limitations in terms of the Reserves Act on long term leases. 33 and 1/3 years is max lease correct ?</li><li>•The layout of the settlement was never intended or designed for long term residential use ... its like many small townships but with people working together, people are happy where they are now.</li><li>•</li><li>•Climate change and extreme weather events will eventually make this location unsuitable for permanent habitation ...ecan are giving out finished floor levels and permission to build and building consents can be issued for new buildings to ecan's ffl and the right to build on the land.if new builds are allowed at a certain height, others could lift there dwellings to the same height. many cities in the world have worse climate conditions and have for many years overcome them, with engineers design anything can be overcome in the future.</li></ul>	
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>We see on the Council's Agenda for this weeks extraordinary meeting for the adoption of the LTP 2024-2034 that USH is still not being included on the District Wide Rates for sewer and water.</p> <p>As you know we believe we are being treated unfairly compared to the rest of the district and this is a clear example of discrimination.</p> <p>Can you please provide full details of all reasons given by SDC for Upper Selwyn Huts not to be included on the District Wide Rates for sewer and water?</p> <p>Thank you</p>	Thanks for your e-mail. The matter of District Wide Rates for Upper Selwyn Huts will be discussed at the 24 July 24 Council meeting.
s7(2)(a)	<p>We've been researching climate change mitigation in relation to the risks to our village when river levels are high.</p> <p>We have to at this stage do this on our own as SDC is not engaging with us at the collaboration and empowerment level at this stage.</p> <p>One of the areas of concern to SDC is the closure of our access when the stop bank breaches further up the river, flows over the neighbouring farm, across Days Road, blocking off our access, then flows out over more paddocks to the LIJ without entering our settlement.</p> <p>We believe we can avoid future evacuations if that part of Days road is raised over a causeway or culvert, so the water can continue on its natural path without blocking off our access or needing evacuations.</p> <p>Who would decide on such works?</p> <p>Is this Council or Waka Kotahi or ECAN?</p> <p>I see Waka Kotahi has a Climate Transport Resilience Fund for small to medium projects on local roads and a regional land transport plan process for councils to signal potential projects. I believe they are accepting applications now with decisions due in late July.</p> <p>Would SDC apply to this fund, or others if available, for this climate mitigation project to eliminate the need to evacuate USH when the river levels are high?</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>Staff have provided the below response:</p> <p>In large rain events, overland flow paths are critical to reduce risk to life and property and operate when open channels and culverts are over capacity or get blocked. These flow paths are formed by the topography and historical modification. Adding a culvert to an existing overland flow path adds the risk of it blocking and alternations to an overland flow path has potential to impact other land-owners and dwellings.</p> <p>Typically, the road network in the District has a large amount of redundancy, unfortunately in this case the Upper Selwyn Huts community has no alternative route. The River Engineering Team at Environment Canterbury look after the Selwyn River stopbank. The evacuations of the Selwyn Huts community are based on a range of risk factors that include consideration of access.</p> <p>The Transport Resilience Fund has a small allocation for local roads which is allocated on a national basis. The process for the 2024-27 allocation of funding has completed.</p>

[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>As Hut owners for more than s7(2)(a) , we urge council to hold fast to the decision it made on March 13, this year, setting a finite term of 15 years for the life of the Hut settlement .</p> <p>To learn today that Central Government- through one of its coalition partners (NZ First) is sticking its nose into what is essentially a Local Body matter - is worrying.</p> <p>All the talk of insufficient consultation and information is simply not true.</p> <p>We have already made submissions</p> <p>and attended the Drop- in session at Soldiers Memorial Hall on April 22, but intend to make further submissions due to the mounting opposition from the Huts community group.</p> <p>There are a number of clauses in the proposed Deed of Licence which we believe must NOT be altered or removed.</p> <p>Much has been said about residents' vulnerability and effect on well being - s7(2)(a)</p>	<p>Thank you for your e-mail. We will include the points you have made as feedback to Councillors when they make the final decision about the Deed of Licence.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>I expect you will have received many submissions, responses to the draft Deed of Licence. We received an email to say you have moved back the date for feed back to 26th August, does this mean you are reconsidering parts of the Draft DOL?</p> <p>I have read through it to the best of my abilities and responded to relevant bits.</p> <p>I think that the small length of tenure and not being included in the district wide rates is the main MEAN thing the Council has done. And it is unclear the motive behind them wanting us out and keeping us in the dark as to their long term plans. It seems like we are regarded as vermin by most Councillors, especially the locals like Hasson, Miller and Lyall .</p> <p>Our place at the Selwyn Huts has been a haven for us, s7(2)(a)</p> <p>It is a fab community of people who have found a place to live, spend time and bring up their families , or retire to.</p> <p>There is one or two you can choose to avoid, like in any suburb.</p> <p>Draft Deed of Licence</p> <p>'Background'</p> <p>E. ****That the USH be included in the District wide rates.</p> <p>G. ****That the USH pay costs relevant to the district wide rate.</p> <p>H. ****.....that the USH remains viable for as long as the pipeline remains viable. And as it states in the Reserves Act section 61 .</p> <p>( the bullet points in H I don't accept or are not relevant because it is an historical settlement with old( but generally, well looked after) buildings))</p> <p>1. Terms and Conditions</p> <p>(a) ****No bond</p> <p>(n)***** 30th Sept</p> <p>(t) *****as in the Reserves Act section 61</p> <p>5. Rights of Renewal</p> <p>(a) Erase clause 12.</p> <p>(c) That doesn't make sense as there are many generational families and friends who have many places at the USH.</p> <p>(d) What does that mean????</p> <p>7. Bond</p> <p>No Bond</p> <p>8. Payment</p> <p>Refer to our 2015 Lease, and treat us as Ratepayers 5 % ,as in the district wide rate .</p> <p>11. Existing Hut and Structures.</p> <p>11.1 ****replace the term 'hut' for 'dwelling'****</p> <p>11.2 ****.....enter the lot to view 'the exterior'.....</p> <p>12. Licensor Inspection Programme</p> <p>**** Erase section 12 ****</p> <p>Licensee's Further Obligations</p> <p>13.2 ****What is your definition of a business? These days many people work from home .</p> <p>13.3 ****Do all Selwyn District residents have a 'code of conduct' to sign before moving into the district??</p> <p>This feels very discriminating.</p>	<p>Thank you for your e-mail. Yes, the feedback deadline has been extended, this is to allow Councillors to revisit their March 2024 decisions. There will be a report to the Council meeting 24 July addressing some of the points you have raised in your e-mail below. The report will be available on the Council meeting agenda online from Friday.</p> <p>We will include the points you have made as feedback to Councillors when they make the final decision about the Deed of Licence.</p>
	<p>[Continued]</p> <p>24. Termination</p> <p>24.1</p> <p>(a) *****should be the same as rates 5%</p> <p>(c) ****Remove clause (i) and (ii)</p> <p>26. Quiet Enjoyment</p> <p>****Remove, wastewater connection contribution payment bond.****</p> <p>28. Expiry Of Licence.</p> <p>****Unclear of what it is about. If terminated, why do clauses remain in effect.</p> <p>33. Costs</p> <p>***Remove ( including Council staff and contractors costs, solisters costs etc....</p> <p>36. Entire Understanding and no Representations</p> <p>**** Please simplify****</p> <p>37.1The Licensor Acting As Territorial Authority</p> <p>(b) ****Doesn't make sense****</p>	
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Good morning</p> <p>Should our licence fee be paid late, then as I understand it we would be in breach of our licence and the licence could be cancelled, resulting in a loss of home with no financial reimbursement.</p> <p>When a ratepayer doesn't pay to their rates the Council can arrange for the property to be sold to recoup the money due. At what point would the Council do this?</p> <p>Thanks</p>	<p>Thank you for your enquiry. As the circumstances around why individual rate payers do not pay their rates is different, we take a different approach to each situation. There are options available for ratepayers which are outlined at these links.</p> <p><a href="https://www.selwyn.govt.nz/__data/assets/pdf_file/0011/459506/Rates-Postponement-Policy.pdf">https://www.selwyn.govt.nz/__data/assets/pdf_file/0011/459506/Rates-Postponement-Policy.pdf</a></p> <p><a href="https://www.selwyn.govt.nz/services/rates/rebates-scheme">https://www.selwyn.govt.nz/services/rates/rebates-scheme</a></p> <p>However, setting and collecting rates is completely separate to setting and collecting a licence fee.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Good morning</p> <p>There are a number of public toilets connected to our sewer system. The farmhouse owned by Ngai Tahu next to our village is also connected to it.</p> <p>Would you please advise who will pay the costs for those when the new pipeline goes in.</p> <p>Thanks</p>	<p>A contribution is payable for all properties that are connected to the new line. Contributions will come from different funding sources depending on the property. If it is from camping ground toilet, it would be funded from a general rating source.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Good morning</p> <p>Would you please clarify what is meant in section 5 of the draft Licence 'Rights of renewal' 5.1d</p> <p>Thanks again</p>	<p>5.1d explains that it is possible that climate change might make it impossible to issue a renewal of licence.</p> <p>Thank you</p>



[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Hi again</p> <p>In relation to questions:</p> <p>(4) Sorry I forgot to mention one of the main clarifications on the building inspection we'd need is what are the repercussions on the day of the inspection if our homes fail? We'd like to eliminate the risk that our residents will be red stickered and be made homeless on the day of the inspection as happened to one of our residents in 2023 in relation to two easily fixable issues.</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>On Mon, 22 Jul 2024 at 2:42 PM, &gt; wrote: Hi There a couple of errors in your report as follows:</p> <p>In your report you've mentioned a few times that the current licence expiry date is 26/8/24. However this is the end of the current feedback period I believe and our current licence has been extended to 30/9/24. See attached.</p> <p>Also 3.3.7 Has a title date October 2022 however you've included the March 24 decisions under this title. 3.3.7 (2) onwards should be under a new title heading as this refers to the decisions made in March this year. And it is my understanding that many of these are proposed and not yet decided on.</p> <p>The first line in the indicative timeline says august 2024 - December 2025. Although December 2025 would be much preferred I assume you mean December 2024 on this date range. Page 32.</p> <p>I also have some preliminary questions as follows:</p> <p>(1) Will we be excluded from any stakeholder meetings? One of our big issues is that we do not have face to face time with major stakeholders and we are having trouble or flat refusals to get this time. We need to have representatives at these stakeholder meetings.</p> <p>(2) Nowhere in the report does it say we are reclassified as high significance, only significant. Will we be reclassified as "high" in relation to the Significance and Engagement Policy?</p> <p>(3) Thank you for providing the inspection checklist. We have some questions/clarifications about these before we can agree to this but I see there is no consultation suggested on this. When can we get clarification on these before the programme begins?</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>Thanks for raising the errors below, these are typos and Tim will speak to correct these at the meeting and amend the resolution on Wednesday afternoon.</p> <p>I have answered your questions below in red.</p> <p>To: Subject: Re: Corrections and Questions to Agenda Report 24/7/24</p> <p>Hi again</p> <p>In relation to questions:</p> <p>(4) Sorry I forgot to mention one of the main clarifications on the building inspection we'd need is what are the repercussions on the day of the inspection if our homes fail? We'd like to eliminate the risk that our residents will be red stickered and be made homeless on the day of the inspection as happened to one of our residents in 2023 in relation to two easily fixable issues. We intend to work with any hut owners to resolve issues that may arise from inspections.</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>There a couple of errors in your report as follows:</p> <p>In your report you've mentioned a few times that the current licence expiry date is 26/8/24. However this is the end of the current feedback period I believe and our current licence has been extended to 30/9/24. See attached.</p> <p>Also 3.3.7 Has a title date October 2022 however you've included the March 24 decisions under this title. 3.3.7 (2) onwards should be under a new title heading as this refers to the decisions made in March this year. And it is my understanding that many of these are proposed and not yet decided on.</p> <p>The first line in the indicative timeline says august 2024 - December 2025. Although December 2025 would be much preferred I assume you mean December 2024 on this date range. Page 32.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]		<p>[Continued]</p> <p>I also have some preliminary questions as follows:</p> <p>(1)Will we be excluded from any stakeholder meetings? One of our big issues is that we do not have face to face time with major stakeholders and we are having trouble or flat refusals to get this time. We need to have representatives at these stakeholder meetings.</p> <p>Wherever possible we will look to include residents and stakeholders, however there will be circumstances where individual meetings will be held, if a stakeholder is reluctant to engage.</p> <p>(2)Nowhere in the report does it say we are reclassified as high significance, only significant. Will we be reclassified as "high" in relation to the Significance and Engagement Policy? Tim is suggesting a full consultation process that is triggered by a significant to high significant decision.</p> <p>(3)Thank you for providing the inspection checklist. We have some questions/clarifications about these before we can agree to this but I see there is no consultation suggested on this. When can we get clarification on these before the programme begins? It is intended that the building inspection process will be run as a collaborative process, and we welcome any questions or suggestions form the Upper Selwyn Huts community.</p> <p>Thank you</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Good morning</p> <p>Rendered of licence regulations on page 7 of the handout given out last night - what is the Council funded inspection programme?</p>	<p>As part of the proposed Deed of Licence we will be considering inspections to ensure huts meet regulations under the building code. The aim of this is to make sure that people are safe in events such as a fire or an earthquake. Council will consider this at the 13th March meeting and further details will be confirmed as part of the licence process.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>clarification over the proposed inspection process. Determination of earthquake safe, fire safety how will this be addressed</p>	<p>Afternoon</p> <p>&gt;</p> <p>&gt; For the purposes of conducting condition inspections the Housing Improvement Regulations 1947 will be used as the baseline requirement given the age of the majority of buildings predate the NZ Building Code (1992). We are still working through the details of the inspection process but we will keep you informed on progress.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Out of scope</p>	<p>Below I provide some information status of the Deed of licence for Upper Selwyn Huts:</p> <p>In 2019 the Council made a decision that Hut licences and renewals would be for a finite amount of time. Since 2020, the Deed of licence for Upper Selwyn Huts has been extended annually one year at a time. The current licence extension ends on 30 June 2024. In order to give hut owners some certainty about the process for the future the Council is working through the terms of a new Deed of Licence and considering options from 5-30 years. The proposed option at this stage is for 15 years, but that will up to the Council to decide on the 13th March. What we do want is time to make sure that we can work with the residents on what that means for the future of the site and themselves, and we met with residents on Wednesday to start that conversation.</p> <p>As part of the proposed Deed of Licence we will be considering inspections to ensure huts meet regulations under the building code. The aim of this is to make sure that people are safe in events such as a fire or an earthquake. Council will consider this at the 13th March meeting and further details will be confirmed as part of the licence process. Also in 2019 the Council made a decision that Upper Selwyn Huts residents would need to pay for a new wastewater solution for their community. The resource consent for this work has been delayed, and Councillors will also reconsider options for how this will be funded when they meet on 13th March.</p> <p>Happy to discuss if you would like to call</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Out of scope</p>	<p>Thanks just to be clear the cost repairs or maintenance of the huts following inspections will be met by the hut owners. Give me a call if you would like to discuss.</p>

[Name redacted - privacy]	Wanted information on the Community meeting	<p>Thanks for your e-mail. No minutes were taken of this meeting, but we are in the process of updating the website. I've attached the PowerPoint presentation for you and below are the key points.</p> <p>•In 2019 the Council made a decision that Hut licences and renewals would be for a finite amount of time.  •Since 2020, the Deed of licence for Upper Selwyn Huts has been extended annually one year at a time. The current licence extension ends on 30 June 2024.  •In order to give hut owners some certainty about the process for the future the Council is working through the terms of a new Deed of Licence and considering options from 5-30 years. The proposed option at this stage is for 15 years, but that will up to the Council to decide on the 13th March.  •What we do want is time to make sure that we can work with the residents on what that means for the future of the site and themselves, and the meeting on Wednesday was part of this.  •As part of the proposed Deed of Licence we will be considering inspections to ensure huts meet regulations under the building code. The aim of this is to make sure that people are safe in events such as a fire or an earthquake. Council will consider this at the 13th March meeting and further details will be confirmed as part of the licence process.</p> <p>•Also, in 2019 the Council made a decision that Upper Selwyn Huts residents would need to pay the full cost for a new wastewater solution for their community. The resource consent for this work has been delayed, and Councillors will also reconsider options for how this will be funded when they meet on 13th March.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	Wanted more details from the USH Council meeting 13/3/2024	<p>I am writing on behalf of Tim Harris who is at an external workshop today. I have attached the report that relates to Upper Selwyn Huts for the Council meeting next week.  For information here is the link to the full Agenda for the 13th that is in three parts: <a href="https://www.selwyn.govt.nz/your-council/meetings/agendas-and-minutes/council-agendas">https://www.selwyn.govt.nz/your-council/meetings/agendas-and-minutes/council-agendas</a>  The attached report will be discussed in a public meeting which you are welcome to attend and observe, the meeting starts at 1pm in the Council Chambers on Wednesday.  The meeting will also be live streamed on the SDC YouTube page, and we are in the process of updating the SDC website with communications about the Upper Selwyn Huts.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Why are we not included in the district wide rating for water and sewage?</p> <p>How long will the consent be given for the whole of the new pipeline between Leeston and Rolleston, including the line from the Upper huts, Coes Ford and Chamberlains ford campgrounds ?</p> <p>What is the life expectancy of the new pipeline ?</p> <p>Why can't the finality of the lease of the upper huts be dictated by the conditions of the day pertaining to climate change, rather than a finite time decided upon by councilors who it seems would rather see the huts gone anyway ?</p> <p>Who are these councilors and what right do they have to make a decision that will affect 100 homes ?</p>	<p>Why are we not included in the district wide rating for water and sewage?  This is a decision that Council has made. Individual Councillor's would have had their individual and collective reasons for supporting this direction.</p> <p>How long will the consent be given for the whole of the new pipeline between Leeston and Rolleston, including the line from the Upper huts, Coes Ford and Chamberlains ford campgrounds ? /  The consent is for the construction of the pipeline. The main consents going into the future will be for the operation of the Pines WWTP.</p> <p>What is the life expectancy of the new pipeline ?  A 50 year lifetime has been adopted for planning and accounting purposes.</p> <p>Why can't the finality of the lease of the upper huts be dictated by the conditions of the day pertaining to climate change, rather than a finite time decided upon by councilors who it seems would rather see the huts gone anyway ?  The Councillors have already made resolutions concerning the length of occupation in what is a very sensitive environment and what is on public land</p> <p>Who are these councilors and what right do they have to make a decision that will affect 100 homes ?  I don't know if I can answer those questions. However The site is on public land managed by the Council and it is the Council building the communities supporting infrastructure.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	A question about the Selwyn Huts report - there seemed to be doubt over the costings in 4.9 re what it would cost us on the district wide rate. I recall that Malcolm Lyall said this figure was incorrect. Would you either confirm it is correct or if wrong then please send correct details with costings.	<p>I believe that Malcolm was referring to a potential change in the rate when we strike the new rate in the first financial year of this years Long Term Plan which commences 1 July but I will check</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Hi, i'm sure that you'll have a very busy day today but i hope you can let us know the council's decisions after today's meeting.Unfortunately we can't attend and hope you will be able to supply the following decisions by council.</p> <p>1; The finite end of lease year for the upper hutts</p> <p>2; And any future cost decisions that are finalised regarding the upper huts moving forward.</p> <p>3; And any other information that you consider appropriate for a new owner of one of these huts to know.</p>	<p>Please see the attached media release with the outcome of the Councils decision. Also I share a link to our website which will be kept updated with information regarding the Upper Selwyn Huts.</p> <p><a href="https://www.selwyn.govt.nz/property-And-building/upper-selwyn-huts-management-and-licencing">https://www.selwyn.govt.nz/property-And-building/upper-selwyn-huts-management-and-licencing</a></p> <p>Kind regards,</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	Can you please supply a pdf vision of the current Deed of Licence for <b>s/7(2)(a)</b> , Selwyn Huts	<p>Hi</p> <p>I share a link to our website which will be kept updated with information regarding the Upper Selwyn Huts.  At the link you can also find the report from Wednesdays Council meeting, the report has the Deed of Licence at Appendix 2.  There is only one Deed of Licence being proposed for all the hut owners all the individual owners will be identified on a schedule on the Deed of Licence.  <a href="https://www.selwyn.govt.nz/property-And-building/upper-selwyn-huts-management-and-licencing">https://www.selwyn.govt.nz/property-And-building/upper-selwyn-huts-management-and-licencing</a></p> <p>Kind regards,</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Good afternoon</p> <p>&gt; I have just had a visit from a contractor who had told me the proposed pipeline from Leeston, via the camp grounds and the Huts to the Pines is not going ahead. Would you please confirm one way or another what is happening</p>	<p>&gt; The project is still planned to be completed.  &gt; Our delivery team are just awaiting consents to be granted.  &gt; The comment below that the project is not going ahead - is incorrect.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Thanks for your answers but I still have a question about the objections from Ngai Tahu. The report in the public agenda refers to consultation with Te Taumutu Runanga in 2023 and the consensus being an expectation of a finite time for us. I understand there have also been no to we meetings like this. What reasons were given then for their objections to us being here?</p> <p>Thanks again</p>	<p>Thank you for you follow up email. I am not in a position to expand on the Te Taumutu Runanga position that was explained in the Council meeting on 13 March 2024.</p> <p>If you would like to explore the Runanga position further, it would be better for you to do so with them directly. Thank you.</p>



[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>s/(2)(a)</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>	<p>Apologies for a late response.</p> <p>The information that hut licences were under consideration has been readily available from our Council. When buying any property, the onus is on the buyer to ensure they understand, any conditions associated with the purchase.</p> <p>Council agreed on 13 March 2024 meeting that we intend to establish a community reference group to assist Council in the wider programme of work over the next 15 years. This group will be made up of people and organisation that will support Hut owners, residents, and Council achieve the best possible outcome for all parties. It is hoped that members of the Upper Selwyn Huts community will join this group and work towards collective outcomes. It is not possible to outline what these outcomes are or how they will be achieved until the group is formed. However, the Terms of Reference of this group will be wide ranging and will focus on looking after the welfare interests of hut owners and residents.</p> <p>We will keep hut owners and residents updated with any developments in regards to the community reference group.</p> <p>Kind regards,</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Huts,</p> <p>Firstly we do not expect that the council will negotiate in any way through an arbitrary committee. We are all interested parties to a licence / lease and we expect that any negotiations relative to our lease shall be with us. In that context we welcome some recent consultation with us directly. This Can you please advise the councils reasons for termination of occupancy of the lease as we are struggling to understand the reasoning for that decision. We expect more communication on the lease but want to understand some elements to frame comment appropriately. Given I assume this termination is clearly understood by council we'd like a response by COB Monday April 8th 2024. Please advise if you are unable achieve this, which we would expect unlikely.</p> <p>Regards,</p>	<p>The decision was made following the linked report to Council which is available on the SDC website: <a href="https://www.selwyn.govt.nz/__data/assets/pdf_file/0004/349861/2019-05-08-REPORT-USH-future-occupancy-strategy-May-Council-2019-with-attachments.pdf">https://www.selwyn.govt.nz/__data/assets/pdf_file/0004/349861/2019-05-08-REPORT-USH-future-occupancy-strategy-May-Council-2019-with-attachments.pdf</a> Recommendation 3. That the huts are located on a reserve and offering licences into the future, with climate change challenges and a desire to return the reserve to an open space area, means that signalling a finite period for licences is the position that the Council wishes to take."</p> <p>The minutes of this meeting are below and the decision regarding a finite Deed of Licence can be seen on page 6 <a href="https://www.selwyn.govt.nz/__data/assets/pdf_file/0007/303838/CONFIRMED-Public-Minutes-Council-meeting-8-May-2019-Copy.pdf">https://www.selwyn.govt.nz/__data/assets/pdf_file/0007/303838/CONFIRMED-Public-Minutes-Council-meeting-8-May-2019-Copy.pdf</a> Decision 3. Council now determines that hut licences and subsequent renewals are short term and ultimately for a finite period.' CARRIED</p> <p>Kind regards,</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Hi</p> <p>Some questions about your reply:</p> <p>1 "Council has added information on the LIMS since the early 2020s" - would you please provide a copy of the information added and the date this happened.</p> <p>2 "Any potential purchaser should be made aware of the proposed changes in the current situation in relation to the tenure of the Licence" ... "not be processing any transfer of a deed of Licence to a new owner without checking first that they had received a copy of the letter and understood the proposed changes" - would you please send me a copy of the letter and advise how the Council checked that a potential new owner had received this and understood it.</p> <p>Thanks</p>	<p>This was LIM note that was available from 2020 and appeared on the first LIM in 2021.</p> <p>"Deed of Licence Renewal</p> <p>Council issued information (April 2020) to each licence holder with regard to proposed changes to the 'Deed of Licence' and the 'Licence and Other Charges Fees'. Any potential purchaser of any of the huts should be made aware, by the hut owner, of the proposed changes and the current situation in relation to the tenure of the hut licence. The Council will not be processing any transfer of a Deed of Licence to a new owner without first checking that they have received a copy of the letter and understood the proposed changes. Depending on when the transfer is to occur will depend on whether the existing licence will apply of the proposed new licence. Further consultation with the huts community will be undertaken on the terms and conditions contained within the licence document."</p> <p>I attach April 2020 letter</p> <p>In regard to how Council checked that a potential new owner had received this and understood it I assume it was during the dialogue that occurred through the license transfer process. WORD Doc attached from 22 April 2020 Renewal of USH DOL</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>Could I please obtain a copy of the report which outlines the reasons behind putting a finite time frame on the huts settlement.</p> <p>I would appreciate this asap due to the next meeting being so soon.</p>	<p>Good morning,</p> <p>The decision was made following this report to Council which is available on our website.</p> <p><a href="https://www.selwyn.govt.nz/__data/assets/pdf_file/0004/349861/2019-05-08-REPORT-USH-future-occupancy-strategy-May-Council-2019-with-attachments.pdf">https://www.selwyn.govt.nz/__data/assets/pdf_file/0004/349861/2019-05-08-REPORT-USH-future-occupancy-strategy-May-Council-2019-with-attachments.pdf</a> Recommendation 3. That the huts are located on a reserve and offering licences into the future, with climate change challenges and a desire to return the reserve to an open space area, means that signalling a finite period for licences is the position that the Council wishes to take."</p> <p>The minutes of this meeting are below and the decision regarding a finite Deed of Licence can be seen on page 6 <a href="https://www.selwyn.govt.nz/__data/assets/pdf_file/0007/303838/CONFIRMED-Public-Minutes-Council-meeting-8-May-2019-Copy.pdf">https://www.selwyn.govt.nz/__data/assets/pdf_file/0007/303838/CONFIRMED-Public-Minutes-Council-meeting-8-May-2019-Copy.pdf</a> Decision 3. Council now determines that hut licences and subsequent renewals are short term and ultimately for a finite period.' CARRIED</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Hi again</p> <p>I note that the aqualinc report was not included in the report printed. I think this forms a vital part of this report as it is deemed one of the reasons why the council have voted for a 15 year finite term, despite the aqualinc report not concluding this.</p> <p>Can we get copies of the aqualinc report as well?</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>We appreciate your request to print copies of the 107 page long 'Impact of Climate Cycles and Trends on Council Assets 2023 Update' (Aqualinc) Report. However, in an effort to minimise resource consumption, we kindly encourage you to utilise the digital version for your reference.</p> <p>The document is readily available online for easy access and you can find the report and other general information regarding the Upper Selwyn Huts at this webpage: Selwyn District Council - Upper Selwyn Huts</p> <p>Kind regards,</p>

[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Please can you provide the breakdown of the proposed licence fee and what this covers?</p> <p>The licence fee is supposed to cover the costs of the sewer and water, please can you forward me the breakdown of this fee.</p> <p>Regards</p>	<p>Hi</p> <p>Apologies for the late response:</p> <p>\$1,389.00 (inclusive of GST) per annum payable quarterly in advance payable on 1 July, 1 October, 1 January and 1 April in each year. The breakdown is as listed:</p> <p>Licence charges for Annual operating/maintenance costs</p> <p>Water supply\$244</p> <p>Sewer system\$556</p> <p>Sewer trucking costs until new system commissioned\$103</p> <p>Chlorination of water\$34</p> <p>Opening Account Deficit\$292</p> <p>Total Cost\$1,229</p> <p>GST\$160</p> <p>Total Cost GST Incl.\$1,389</p> <p>Staff are still in the process of investigating what the 'opening account deficit' encompasses, however this will be worked through with Councillors once the final Deed of Licence is confirmed.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Thanks for getting back to us. Can you email through the information and conditions you are referring to.</p> <p>Much appreciated,</p>	<p>Here is a link to our website: <a href="https://www.selwyn.govt.nz/property-And-building/upper-selwyn-huts-management-and-licencing">https://www.selwyn.govt.nz/property-And-building/upper-selwyn-huts-management-and-licencing</a></p> <p>Kind regards,</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>No sorry I was not asking for a link to the website as that is live information.</p> <p>I am asking you to provide the information and conditions you said was available when we purchased our home in 2022.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	<p>For clarification, my previous e-mail has a link on the webpage to past correspondence between Council and Upper Selwyn Huts residents .</p> <p>At the time of any enquiry (either from a member of the public or Lawyer/Solicitor) about the transfer of the hut licences they are advised of the current situation in relation to the tenure of the licence, advised to have a look at the documents relating to this on the SDC website and if they request a copy of the transfer documents, a standard email is sent to them which outlines what the current situation is with the huts future.</p> <p>Any Real Estate Agent acting for the vendor is also made aware of the situation about tenure of the huts community. The following wording from the LIM note that was available from 2020 clearly states that it is the 'hut owner' who is to make any potential purchaser aware of the situation. Any potential purchaser of any of the huts should be made aware, by the hut owner, of the proposed changes and the current situation in relation to the tenure of the hut licence.</p> <p>Kind regards,</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Good morning</p> <p>Would you please advise the cost of our section of the sewer upgrade and how many homes it is being divided over.</p> <p>Who is paying for the house owned by Ngai Tahu to be connected to the system?</p> <p>Would you please reply by Friday 19th April.</p> <p>Thanks</p>	<p>Ngai Tahu will.</p> <p>Thanks</p>
s7(2)(a)	<p>Hi</p> <p>Thank you for the meeting last night, we look forward to seeing the updated draft deed after our feedback.</p> <p>Can I please have a copy of the current waste water upgrade plans including any secondary connections.</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>Hi</p> <p>Wastewater upgrade plan attached.</p> <p>Thanks</p>
s7(2)(a)	<p>Mōrena</p> <p>When will you be able to provide more detail on the inspection program? You mentioned at the public feedback meeting 23/04 that the details would be released soon - but 3 weeks on and we have still heard nothing. Hoping you are able to provide an update, or at the least advise when we can expect this?</p> <p>Ngā mihi</p>	<p>Kia ora</p> <p>Thanks for your e-mail. We are still working to establish details of the inspections process. I can offer you the following information from our Q&amp;A page which has recently been updated.</p> <p><a href="https://www.selwyn.govt.nz/property-And-building/upper-selwyn-huts-management-and-licencing/q-and-a">https://www.selwyn.govt.nz/property-And-building/upper-selwyn-huts-management-and-licencing/q-and-a</a></p> <p>Hut inspections</p> <p>As part of the new Deed of Licences it has been decided that a baseline inspection of each hut Lot will be conducted.</p> <p>1.How will these take place?</p> <p>We are still working to establish the details. Inspections will take place at a mutually agreeable time by a representative from the Council who has the skills and expertise to conduct the inspection. It is not anticipated that the inspector will enter huts.</p> <p>2.What will you be inspecting for?</p> <p>The Council needs to ensure that the lots they lease are compliant with legislation and that the activity on the lots is compliant with legislation and adheres to the Deed of Licence. The legislation the inspections will be referring to are:</p> <p>Building Act 2004</p> <p>Resource Management Act 1991</p> <p>Reserves Act 1977</p> <p>Property Law Act 2007</p> <p>Health and Safety at Work Act 2015</p> <p>3.What happens if you find something that is non-compliant?</p> <p>The Council will work with the owner to agree a plan to make good any identified issue. This will normally be at the cost of the Hut owner.</p> <p>Kind regards</p>
s7(2)(a)	<p>Hi</p> <p>I understand there is an amended code of conduct to go with the Licence. Would you please send me a copy of that.</p> <p>Thanks again</p>	<p>Hi</p> <p>The residence code of conduct is being reviewed and amendments are yet to be confirmed.</p> <p>Thanks</p>



<div>7(2)(a)</div>	<p>Hi Yes,</p> <p>So the huts have got 15 years left on them.</p> <p>After the term had ended</p> <p>1. The hut has to be removed ? 2. What are the consequences if hut not moved? 3.as the licence is only for 15 years. Will there be a grant to help remove the hut?</p> <p>4. Can a hut be rented out like a Bach?</p> <p>Thank you,</p>	<p>1.Yes 2.The proposed deed of license does require that the hut is removed 3.We are still working through what the process might look like 4.No, As set above the hut is required to be removed after the 15 year term (I clarified in another response that it can be rented out and asked 7(2) to send the form )</p>
<div>7(2)(a)</div>	<p>Dear</p> <p>Can you please confirm under which legislation SDC issues our licence for our lots at Upper Selwyn Huts.</p> <p>Is it the Reserves Act 1977 or the Reserves and Other Lands Disposal and Public Bodies Empowering Act 1924 (ROLD Act).</p> <p>Do you agree that the ROLD Act 1924 is the piece of legislation under which the SDC grants us the lease or licence, and that the term of this lease or licence is not limited in this Act?</p> <p>Please respond with urgency as is allowed for in the LGOIMA as we are on a strict deadline of 15 July 2024, and need time to review your response before submitting our final feedback.</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>Morning</p> <p>It is the Reserves Act 1977 Thanks</p>
<div>7(2)(a)</div>	<p>Hi</p> <p>I fail to see how you think the current extension is enough time. We can't take part in the consultation process yet as we don't have answers to many questions. There seems to be no idea when staff will be able to provide the answers we need</p> <p>There is also an expectation that we may need more than one draft copy.</p> <p>We should have been included from the start of the process.</p> <p>I plan to make a complaint to the Ombudsman over this process.</p> <p>Regards</p> <p>Hello</p> <p>Thank you for your request to extend the period for feedback and a date to start the next Deed of Licence. The feedback that we received following the March Council meeting was for an extension to consider the Deed of Licence and submit feedback based on considered opinions. By extending the feedback deadline and final date for the Deed of Licence to start by 10 weeks and 12 weeks respectively we believe we have accommodated that request.</p>	<p>Hi</p> <p>We are taking on board the feedback from the community re the DOL and making amendments. Staff are responsive to email requests; sometimes, the requests require greater in-depth information that we do not have to hand and are required to search for.</p> <p>I understand that you meant to contact the Ombudsman. Please remember we are still in the process, and the council remains open to engaging with the community and receiving feedback.</p> <p>Kind regards</p>
<div>7(2)(a)</div>	<p>Hi again</p> <p>A reserve management plan is required for the recreational reserve. That is the one I was asking about. I would also like a copy of the map showing the boundaries of the two reserves.</p> <p>The term finite was not defined in 2019.</p> <p>I would still like an answer to my question on point 5.4 of the report re the statement from the meeting on 24 November from the meeting chaired by the head of Regulatory - how many houses and how did they know. I would still like the minutes from that meeting</p> <p>Thanks</p> <p>&gt;</p> <p>&gt; u said last night in regards to the part of the report about 'a number of the structures falling short of the required standards', that no one remembers saying that. If you respond to my email with that as the answer I will accept that.</p>	<p>Hello</p> <p>Attached is a draft management plan for the recreational reserve, it was not implemented. It shows the boundaries of the two reserves. The word finite was an indication that future licences would be for a finite period. Councillors decided that the finite Term would be set at a later date. That happened in March this year. There were no minutes of the meeting taken on 24 November 2023. The reason for the inspection is to establish what was articulated at the meeting - that it was not known how compliant lots were with legislation hence no specific number was referenced in the report.</p>
<div>7(2)(a)</div>	<p>Hi</p> <p>As a follow up to this email, it is my understanding that the licence fee is supposed to be the operating expenses for water and sewer.</p> <p>What will those be once the sewer upgrade is operational?</p> <p>Isn't this what the licence fee should be going forward if we are not on district wide rates?</p> <p>Thanks</p>	<p>Hi</p> <p>Apologies for the late response regarding the licence fee breakdown. We are working with our finance team to gather this information and will be in touch.</p> <p>Thanks</p> <p>Hi</p> <p>Apologies for the late response: \$1,389.00 (inclusive of GST) per annum payable quarterly in advance payable on 1 July, 1 October, 1 January and 1 April in each year. The breakdown is as listed:</p> <p>Licence charges for Annual operating/maintenance costs Water supply\$244 Sewer system\$556 Sewer trucking costs until new system commissioned\$103 Chlorination of water\$34 Opening Account Deficit\$292 Total Cost\$1,229 GST\$160 Total Cost GST Incl.\$1,389</p> <p>Staff are still in the process of investigating what the 'opening account deficit' encompasses, however this will be worked through with Councillors once the final Deed of Licence is confirmed.</p> <p>Thanks</p>

s7(2)(a)	<p>Can you please confirm that we are getting at least 30 minutes to speak at the council meeting on the 14th August?</p> <p>Our barrister would like to present, but I am also aware of many others who would like their say.</p> <p>30 minutes for a village of 96 houses was woefully insufficient on 13th March, and many people were declined their opportunity to speak. This being after only two days to prepare.</p> <p>We expect a lot more people wanting to speak on the 14th August.</p> <p>We request a longer period for our community to speak to the councillors about what the Council is calling the final deed before they take their vote on the 14th August.</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>Hi</p> <p>Your e-mail is acknowledged. We aim to provide residents sufficient time to be heard and details of this will be provided closer to the Council meeting date.</p> <p>Kind regards,</p>
s7(2)(a)	<p>Kia ora</p> <p>Thanks for your reply. A little disappointing that you're still unable to explain the full details 2 months on from this being voted on. Also a little confusing to see the 2004 Building Act referenced in your reply - whenever I have heard Tim speak on this, he has mentioned using an older building code such as 1947 Building Act, as you wouldn't expect an older building to comply with modern building standards. Can you please explain why this has changed?</p> <p>Can you please also expand on what parts of the other legislation will be relevant to the inspection process?</p> <p>Nga mihi</p>	<p>Kia ora</p> <p>By way of explanation, no further information exists at this stage, beyond what has been communicated to date (the planned inspection process has not been developed in detail at this stage). [A draft process relating to how to respond to a complaint about or observation of building non-compliance was under development in 2022 – we are investigating the relevance of this to the current proposal].</p> <p>The rights of inspection currently proposed are as set out in the draft Deed of Licence. These are under consideration by Council having regard to feedback received from to date from licensees. You are invited to submit feedback on these terms before 15 July 2024 so that Council may take this into consideration when considering the proposed final form of licence.</p> <p>Kind regards,</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Hello</p> <p>Thank you very much for your reply. This has clarified things considerably.</p> <p>Re [7] and [8], s7(2)(a)</p> <p>Unfortunately, you do not seem to have answered the main question I had, that is [5] - possible noise constructing the wastewater pipeline. All you said was: "the pipeline will be built". One of the main reasons I would buy in the Huts if I did would be to escape the noise of Christchurch and be somewhere that is hopefully quiet. But if there is a lot of noise from constructing this pipeline, that would ruin that. Therefore, is it possible to answer, or give some idea of:</p> <p>1.Is there likely to be a lot of construction noise that will be heard at the Huts?</p> <p>2.About how many months will this noise persist? Will it be likely to be about 40 hours a week?</p> <p>3.How soon will this noise start (eg will the pipeline be started at the Huts end, or the other end?)?</p> <p>4.Will the construction come right into the village/ roads in the village be torn up?</p> <p>5.Presumably, the pipeline will go under the Selwyn River opposite the Huts? Will doing this be a particularly prolonged and noisy part of the operation?</p> <p>6.Is a pump likely to be established in the village to conduct the wastewater into the pipe? If so, where in the village, exactly? (so that I know not to buy a dwelling nearby). If so, will this pump be noisy?</p> <p>The answers to these questions would be very important in my making a decision whether to buy or not.</p> <p>[Comments on one or two of your answers:</p> <p>Question 4(a):</p> <p>(i) There is no pipeline intended to go to the Lower Selwyn Huts. So why aren't ECAN demanding that the Lower Selwyn Huts close in June this year? Why does this only apply to the Upper Huts and not the Lower Huts? The same system that is applied to the Lower Huts, and seemingly acceptable to ECAN, could be applied to the Upper Huts - what's the difference?</p> <p>(ii) I find the estimate that "the cost to build the pipeline will approximately equal 6 to 7 years of trucking" a little difficult to believe. Trucking is done for the Lower Huts, yet their Licence Fee is only \$50 per week - and the trucks have further to go! If trucking was as expensive as you claim, surely the Licence Fee for the Lower Huts would be quite a bit higher.</p> <p>(ii) Question 4(c):</p> <p>You say "initial cost estimate were developed over time and have been subject to inflationary effects". As I said in my query, inflation has not gone up anything like 150% in the period since the estimate was first made. Maybe 50% - so "inflationary effects" would account for less than half this increase. Therefore, again, why was your initial estimate so poor?</p> <p>In particular, given such poor cost estimation on your part, I would like some assurance that there will not be further major blowouts in cost, as nearly always happens with Council projects. A final \$10 million cost would not surprise me. Have what will be considerable interest costs been fully taken into account?</p> <p>Have possible problems not accounted for been considered, eg possible problems in digging under the Selwyn River?</p> <p>Thank you,</p>	<p>Hi</p> <p>Apologies for the late response, Council staff have provided the following:</p> <p>1. Is there likely to be a lot of construction noise that will be heard at the Huts? Construction noise shall vary dependent on the activity onsite; however, noise level shall be within the limits set in Selwyn District Plan requirements.</p> <p>2. About how many months will noise from it in hearing distance of the Huts persist? Will it be likely to be about 40 hours a week? Weather dependent, we anticipate undertaking the different activities at different times. For example, the drilling of Selwyn River is programmed for 27th May 2024 and anticipated to take 2 weeks to complete, if ground conditions permit the trenching of pipeline in the domain will continue after the successful Selwyn river crossing, the construction of pump station is however likely to commence in Summer 2024, and anticipates to take 2 months for construction. Hours of work shall be in accordance with District Plan requirements.</p> <p>3. How soon will this noise start (eg will the pipeline be started at the Huts end, or the other end?)? As above, construction activities vary with weather, site conditions and co-ordination with other project activities and resources availability.</p> <p>4. Will the construction come right into the village / roads in the village be torn up? Plan provided. Only portion highlighted in yellow is to be constructed</p> <p>5. Presumably, the pipeline will go under the Selwyn River opposite the Huts? Will doing this be a particularly prolonged and noisy part of the operation? Relatively lower noise and anticipated to take 2 weeks to complete.</p> <p>6. Is a pump likely to be established in the village to conduct the wastewater into the pipe? If so, where in the village, exactly? (so that I know not to buy a dwelling nearby). If so, will this pump be noisy?Location of pump station provided, the noise level shall be with in the limits set by district plan. (For information – acoustics assessment for the PS is underway).</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]		<p>[Continued]</p> <p>7. Could there be any other disruptive issues? Potentially, but unknown at this point.</p> <p>Also, regarding cost: the original estimate was \$2 million and it is now \$4.4 million. Less than half this increase would be due to inflation (which might be about 50% in this period). So the original estimate was a very poor one. I am concerned, given this poor estimation of costs, that there may be further cost "blowouts", as nearly always happens with Council projects. A final cost \$10 million would not surprise me. If this happened, the amount Upper Huts residents would have to pay for this pipeline would double. What assurance is there that this will not happen? Have what will be considerable interest costs been fully taken into account? Have possible problems not accounted for been considered, eg, possible problems in digging under the Selwyn River? Council has advised of the cost and cannot comment of other Councils or projects.</p> <p>Thanks</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Dear</p> <p>Please note, we are unable to sign any Deed of Licence which includes an inspection programme without receiving a full explanation of how these will be conducted and a copy of the pre inspection checklist.</p> <p>Please provide this before the end of the feedback period.</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>Hi</p> <p>We are aiming to provide residents with an update by the end of this week.</p> <p>Kind regards</p>



<p>[Name redacted - privacy]</p>	<p>Dear Tim</p> <p><b>s/(2)(a)</b></p> <p>As you know, the Council has effectively issued us an eviction notice with a maximum timeframe of 15 years without proper collaboration. The draft Deed of Licence also has multiple new ways to terminate the agreement within that timeframe, many ways outside of our control and all of them with little notice giving us no security of tenure, a basic human right.</p> <p>Even after multiple requests from many owners, you have not been able to provide us with the much needed detail of the proposed Licensor Inspection Programme, clause 12 of the draft DOL.</p> <p>The above has lead USH owners to lose all trust in SDCs administration of the settlement, and until this is addressed with proper collaboration with, and empowerment of, the owners; evidence of community centred decisions; and a reasonable DOL, we cannot sign a deed that includes ambiguous clauses.</p> <p>Unfortunately we now question the motives of all new decisions of the Council that involve us.</p> <p>For that reason we are unable to sign any DOL that includes the inspection programme without full details of what these inspections entail including a pre inspection checklist of what is being assessed.</p> <p>If full details are provided and the inspection programme is deemed acceptable by the owners and our legal representative, I request the following is included in the detail:</p> <p>1.To reduce the cost of the inspection and the stress on the owner, a pre inspection checklist is provided to all owners and enough time given for the community to work together to ensure each owner will pass.</p> <p>2.The timeframe between receiving the checklist and the inspection is acceptable to the owner.</p> <p>3.Only the items included on the checklist will be assessed.</p> <p>4.The checklist is the same as what was agreed upon before signing the DOL.</p> <p>5.An advocate for the owner is present at the inspection<b>s/(2)(a)</b></p> <p>This email does not supersede any feedback on the legality of the inspection program, as at the time of writing this email, advice on this has yet to be obtained.</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>Owner/Resident</p>	<p>Dear</p> <p>Thank you for your email.</p> <p>It is not appropriate for the Council to discuss licence, Building Act or other regulatory matters which affect an individual licence holder with anyone other than that licence holder (or their legal representatives). I am sure you will understand that the Council has obligations as licensor and (separately) as a building and regulatory authority to respect the privacy of individuals.</p> <p>The Council will circulate an inspection by the end of this week.</p> <p>Please understand that the inspection regime under the licence is intended to ensure that the Upper Selwyn Huts community is a safe place to live. As licensor, the Council considers that it bears a degree of responsibility for the safety of residents. The Council will, of course, consider your requests in relation to timeframes etc with this in mind but as general observations I note that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•It seems desirable that licensees have as much notice as possible of likely requirements so that they can attend any necessary works to meet these requirements.</li><li>•Requirements and checklist items may change over time as different needs and issues are identified. In addition, I would expect that anyone carrying out an inspection to note and report any item that raised safety concerns regardless of whether it was on the checklist. The focus here is safety rather than any agreed position with licensees.</li><li>•Licensees are, of course, entitled to have other persons with them at inspections of their huts.</li></ul> <p>Please also note that, in its separate capacity as a building authority under the Building Act 2004, the Council also has an obligation to ensure that all relevant building regulations and codes are observed throughout the Selwyn District.</p> <p>Regards</p>
<p>[Name redacted - privacy]</p>	<p>Hi</p> <p>Just wanted to send you a follow up email on this.</p> <p>We have put our work on our feedback on the draft DOL on hold until after the meeting on 24/7.</p> <p>Just wanted to confirm that our feedback on the draft DOL will not be submitted until after we know what is being decided at next weeks meeting.</p>	<p>Yes that is correct</p>
<p>[Name redacted - privacy]</p>	<p>Good morning</p> <p>Would you please send me through the timeline with all of the dates - from close of feedback etc to date the final licence needs to be signed by.</p> <p>Thanks</p>	<p>Link to website and timeline sent</p>
<p>[Name redacted - privacy]</p>	<p>Good morning</p> <p>1. Schedule 1 of the Licence number 13, states the bond of \$383 is per quarter. Is it per quarter or annually?</p> <p>2. The Council charges 5% interest on late rate payments. Why is it proposed to charge 10% on late Licence fee payments?</p> <p>3. How many days does a ratepayer have to pay from the statement date on a rates demand?</p> <p>4. Clause 5 doesn't seem to give us a 15 year period to stay here. Would you please confirm whether or not it is 15 years.</p> <p>5. Clause 5.4 (c) - what if for some reason the costs went down - the licence fee would not be able to reflect that - what would happen then?</p> <p>6. Clause 5.1 (c) - there are people who own more than one house - what assurances do they have that they can continue to do this? Selling now will be very difficult with this new Licence.</p> <p>7. Will those who rent be able to continue to do so?</p> <p>Thanks</p>	<p>1. Schedule 1 of the Licence number 13, states the bond of \$383 is per quarter. Is it per quarter or annually? This is an error it should read paid per quarter. The \$383 in an annual fee.</p> <p>2. The Council charges 5% interest on late rate payments. Why is it proposed to charge 10% on late Licence fee payments? Rates are governed by the Rates legislation and when rates are not paid, we have legislated collection options. With the Licence fee payment these are different and do not have a statutory regulation for collection. For that reason, the process for collecting Licences arrears is more complex, for that reason the penalty is set at 10%</p> <p>3. How many days does a ratepayer have to pay from the statement date on a rates demand? 5-6 weeks</p> <p>4. Clause 5 doesn't seem to give us a 15 year period to stay here. Would you please confirm whether or not it is 15 years. This is detailed in schedule 1 of the DOL Five (5) years commencing on the Commencement date and two (2) rights of renewal of five (5) years each. Total 15 years</p> <p>5. Clause 5.4 (c) - what if for some reason the costs went down - the licence fee would not be able to reflect that - what would happen then? Any change in licence fee would require a review of the change and its implications.</p> <p>6. Clause 5.1 (c) - there are people who own more than one house - what assurances do they have that they can continue to do this? Selling now will be very difficult with this new Licence. This is a clause that we will be considering as part of the current feedback to the DOL, there have been no decision yet on this matter.</p> <p>7. Will those who rent be able to continue to do so? Yes</p>

[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Thank you for the clarification. I have a few more questions that it would be great if you could help me with.</p> <p>1. When do you expect the new wastewater system to be installed and operational?</p> <p>2. Does the licensee contribution include the costs of connecting each house to the new pipeline?</p> <p>3. If for some reason it was unfeasible economically to continue to provide water, wastewater or infrastructure to a lot, and the Council wishes to terminate under cl 24.1, and if the new wastewater pipe has not yet been installed, or has only been in use for a short time, would the council consider refunding the residents the Wastewater contribution fees already paid?</p> <p>It seems the decision to charge 30% instead of 100% of the cost of the pipeline still assumes that the residents will get 15 years of use (of a useful life of 50+ years). My mother is worried about a situation where the licence is terminated before the pipeline is installed or after only a short time in use, and so she would not have gotten anything out of any payments she would have made up to that point. In that case her funds would have been better off invested so that she could save for relocation costs.</p> <p>4. Could you please explain how the Licence fee is calculated? What does it cover?</p> <p>5. Why is the Licence Fee subject to a ratchet clause (cl. 9.1e)? If the licence fee is reviewed and the registered valuers determine that the Licence Fee should be a lower amount, isn't it unfair to prevent this via the DoL?</p> <p>6. Has the Council received any information about the estimated cost to remove or demolish a USH house? What is the estimated cost?</p> <p>7. Can you please confirm that the Wastewater Connection Contribution payment is per annum, as this is not explicit in the Licence.</p> <p>8. In clause 7 (Bond), there is reference to a maximum limit, but this does not appear to be set out in the DoL. Could you please confirm the maximum limit?</p> <p>9. In clause 7a(i) it says that the bond can be applied towards the cost of "completing such works and operations" but these works and operations are not stated. Could you please clarify which works the bond is intended to cover?</p>	<p>Thank you for your email, I have addressed each one in turn below.</p> <p>1. When do you expect the new wastewater system to be installed and operational? By December 2025</p> <p>2. Does the licensee contribution include the costs of connecting each house to the new pipeline? There is no cost to connect to the new pipeline</p> <p>3. If for some reason it was unfeasible economically to continue to provide water, wastewater or infrastructure to a lot, and the Council wishes to terminate under cl 24.1, and if the new wastewater pipe has not yet been installed, or has only been in use for a short time, would the council consider refunding the residents the Wastewater contribution fees already paid? In this unlikely scenario, we would consider the financial commitments made by hut owners carefully but it is not possible to answer that question right now.</p> <p>It seems the decision to charge 30% instead of 100% of the cost of the pipeline still assumes that the residents will get 15 years of use (of a useful life of 50+ years). My mother is worried about a situation where the licence is terminated before the pipeline is installed or after only a short time in use, and so she would not have gotten anything out of any payments she would have made up to that point. In that case her funds would have been better off invested so that she could save for relocation costs. I will treat this as feedback and it will be reviewed before the next deed of Licence is issued</p> <p>4. Could you please explain how the Licence fee is calculated? What does it cover? This calculation will be available soon and published on our Q&amp;A which is in development.</p> <p>5. Why is the Licence Fee subject to a ratchet clause (cl. 9.1e)? If the licence fee is reviewed and the registered valuers determine that the Licence Fee should be a lower amount, isn't it unfair to prevent this via the DoL? I will treat this as feedback and it will be reviewed before the next deed of Licence is issued</p> <p>6. Has the Council received any information about the estimated cost to remove or demolish a USH house? What is the estimated cost? The huts differ in size and makeup so the cost will vary. We have no estimates.</p> <p>7. Can you please confirm that the Wastewater Connection Contribution payment is per annum, as this is not explicit in the Licence. Yes, per annum</p> <p>8. In clause 7 (Bond), there is reference to a maximum limit, but this does not appear to be set out in the DoL. Could you please confirm the maximum limit? This is in schedule 1 of the Deed of Licence.</p> <p>9. In clause 7a(i) it says that the bond can be applied towards the cost of "completing such works and operations" but these works and operations are not stated. Could you please clarify which works the bond is intended to cover? Any works to clear the lot that are not undertaken by the hut owner when they leave the lot - for example abandoning a hut or vehicle on the lot.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>While those of us who receive the printed copy will appreciate this, it is also important for us to have a hard copy of the report. We feel that we should be able to receive a copy of it from you. Please send a printed copy of the report to all owners who you don't normally email.</p> <p>Thanks</p>	<p>I understand a hard copy of the report was sent from Council to residents on the 8th of March, the report did not include appendices. I have confirmed with the team who did the mail out that a hardcopy was sent to your address.</p> <p>Do you still have this copy available?</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Kia Ora,</p> <p>Thanks for the email and links, the photo below is the bottom of the Report to Council taken from the website link - the last line says "3.The Council agrees to the following significant changes to the DOL " but there is nothing further 🙏 Could you please explain ??</p> <p>PS I think the Upper Selwyn Huts is on Crown Reserve land, not DOC land</p>	<p>[The USH website was updated to reflect Crown Reserve land and not DOC -I understand s7(2)(b) had send s7(2)(b) a response]</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	Wanted confirmation of Council meeting 13/3	Yes there is a meeting at 1pm
[Name redacted - privacy]	Register to talk Council meeting 13/3	Governance Team responded directly
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Good morning</p> <p>Would you please send me the following documents as soon as possible.</p> <p>Either a copy of the Council's consultation policy or a link to it.</p> <p>A copy of all of the asset management plans for the Selwyn Huts waste water system dating back to when the SDC took over the system.</p> <p>A copy of the Reserve Management plan for the recreational reserve that we are next to.</p> <p>I appreciate some documents may take longer than others to forward</p>	<p>Referred to OIA as a LGOIMA request</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Would you please send me a hard copy of the proposed new deed of licence immediately so that I can read it properly and seek advice on its contents if I need to.</p> <p>Please send to s7(2)(a)</p>	<p>Yes the Council will endeavour to post a hard copy of the Deed of Licence to residents. We are working with our legal team on this and aim to have it out as soon as we can.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Hi We were at the meeting and found the meeting to be a shambles and the voting process was definitely pre determined. This decision is a travesty and we will not go without a fight. You do realise that you will be making many families homeless through this decision and at these times where buying a property is out of reach for many, even renting property is difficult to find. Many people have bought at the upper huts because they could save enough to buy them. Your actions have halved if not less the value of their property so they will not be able to go anywhere else. Many will become homeless at the end of the 15 year period. I found the comments of the lady representing Ngai tahu anti colonialist.</p> <p>We still don't know exactly why you are doing this. It is not legal for you to use sea level rise as an excuse but I think that thinking is still there. I would like to think that it is still possible for the council to change its mind and allow us a 30 year timeline so we can at least prepare for the end fairly. I haven't mentioned the financial side of it. That of course is a sore point for us all.</p> <p>s7(2)(a)</p>	<p>Thank you for your email and your points regarding the length of the Deed of Licence. You will now have received the revised Deed of Licence and encourage you to offer feedback formally as well as during the drop-in sessions of the public meeting on Tuesday 23 April.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Consultation meeting in AprilA number of people report they haven't received an email about this. Do you plan to post letters to those owners you don't have an email address for?</p>	<p>Yes letters have been posted to those we do not have an e-mail address for.</p> <p>Thanks</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>In order for owners to be able to be able to consult on the Licence, they first need a copy to read. In previous years this has always been posted to owners in a legible format. The only copy that some people have received is in a font that it so small it is very difficult to read.</p> <p>Would you please organise to send a printed copy of the report and Licence to all owners.</p> <p>Please confirm by Thursday 28th that this will happen and they will be posted to give sufficient time for them to be read before the next meeting in April.</p>	<p>Have sent a response to a more recent email asking for a hard copy of the DOL</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Thanks. I have asked for the Council to send a copy of the report and draft licence in a readable printed format to all owners. Will that be happening? If so then it would be good to wait until you have a new draft licence.</p>	<p>Yes the Council will endeavour to post a hard copy of the Deed of Licence to residents. We are working with our legal team on this and aim to have it out as soon as we can.</p> <p>I can update you further once we have a set post date.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Can you possibly send us a hardcopy via post of the draft Deed of Licence please.</p> <p>We are s7(2)(a)</p>	<p>Yes, the Council will endeavour to post a hard copy of the Deed of Licence to residents. We are working with our legal team on this and aim to have it out as soon as we can.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Unfortunately I am unable to view the information attached to the email.</p> <p>Please forward a hard copy of any correspondence related to my property at s7(2)(a) to me as requested in my previous emails to Council to my address at s7(2)(a)</p> <p>Many thanks</p>	<p>Our team will arrange to send this early this week.</p>



[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Further to my previous email the letter from Heritage NZ to David Ward is dated 5/8/2019.</p> <p>On Sat, 30 Mar 2024 at 11:14 PM, wrote: To whom it may concern</p> <p>I am a resident of USH at s7(2)(a)</p> <p>Please can I have the dates of every transfer of a hut in Upper Selwyn Huts since the year 2000 so I can better understand the trend of buying and selling in the settlement before and after SDC took over the administration of the settlement.</p> <p>I am trying ascertain the pattern of transfers over the years to better understand why the licence holders feel so blindsided by the 15 year finite term that is in the Draft Deed of Licence while the councillors have on multiple occasions stated that we've known about this for a long time. There is a clear misunderstanding between the two parties and I'm trying to understand how that happened.</p> <p>There is clearly a communication issue between SDC and the licence owners especially regarding the new owners of the huts s7(2)(a) This is the worse case that I know of, but there are so many more. How did SDC allow this to happen? Shouldn't SDC take responsibility for putting residents in this position?</p> <p>I have a copy of a letter from Heritage NZ to David Ward stating that "Douglas Marshall, Property and Commercial Manager at the Selwyn District Council, has highlighted that complications around expected sea level rise and issues of storm water management mean that but licences and subsequent renewals will only be issued for a short term finite period"! Why weren't prospective purchasers and current hut owners told about this in a way that was this clear? If they were, the value on those transfers would have been greatly reduced and they would have had a chance to make a better informed decision. Clearly the councillors and SDC staff knew more about our future than we did.</p> <p>I believe the SDC took over the administration of the USH in 2011 so you may only have transfer records from then? If that is the case please provide dates of all the transfers from 2011.</p>	OIA Request
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>I assume mine was posted as I didn't receive an email. Were they sent Friday as that was a public holiday.</p> <p>Did you include the report? Many here are struggling to understand why the term should be finite and would like to read a hard copy of it.</p> <p>&gt; &gt; &gt; On Friday, a hard copy of the Deed of Licence was sent to those who requested their correspondence by post, for those who have requested to receive correspondence via e-mail have received it by email. &gt; &gt; Thanks, . &gt; &gt; Subject: Draft licence &gt; &gt; Hi again &gt; I have asked that all owners get a printed copy of the new draft licence and the report asap. &gt; &gt; Would you please post me a copy asap s7(2)(a) &gt; &gt; Thanks &gt; &gt;</p>	<p>Yes, yours was posted as a hard copy and yes, I can confirm they were sent by a member of staff on Friday afternoon noting it was a public holiday and that mail may take a little longer than usual due to the Easter weekend. For your record I attach a copy of the DOL and the letter sent with the DOL attached below.</p> <p>We did not send the report due to the size of the document and its availability online. If you wish to print a copy, Selwyn District libraries have printing facilities available.</p> <p>Kind regards,</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Please provide me an urgent copy of the current and signed Deed of Licence for s7(2)(a)</p> <p>I am not sure which date this was implemented as it has been rolled over until the latest draft 2024. I need it to compare with the new draft/ Regards</p>	s7(2)(a) to send s7(2)(a) a copy
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Good morning</p> <p>Below is a copy of the email you sent me on 4th April, when I first asked how new owners were informed of the proposed finite term of the Licence. You attached a copy of a letter from Douglas Marshall dated 22.4.20 (Renewal of UpperSelwyn Huts Deed if Licence.</p> <p>I would again refer you back to the part on the LIM that states: 'Council will not be processing any transfer of a deed of Licence to a new owner without first checking they have received a copy of the letter (I assume the one mentioned from Douglas on 22.4.20) and understood the proposed changes'</p> <p>Did this happen or not? If not then why not?</p> <p>If it did happen would you please explain the process.</p> <p>Thanks</p> <p>Hi</p> <p>This was LIM note that was available from 2020 and appeared on the first LIM in 2021.</p> <p>"Deed of Licence Renewal</p> <p>Council issued information (April 2020) to each licence holder with regard to proposed changes to the 'Deed of Licence' and the 'Licence and Other Charges Fees'. Any potential purchaser of any of the huts should be made aware, by the hut owner, of the proposed changes and the current situation in relation to the tenure of the hut licence. The Council will not be processing any transfer of a Deed of Licence to a new owner without first checking that they have received a copy of the letter and understood the proposed changes. Depending on when the transfer is to occur will depend on whether the existing licence will apply of the proposed new licence. Further consultation with the huts community will be undertaken on the terms and conditions contained within the licence document."</p> <p>I attach April 2020 letter</p> <p>In regard to how Council checked that a potential new owner had received this and understood it I assume it was during the dialogue that occurred through the license transfer process.</p>	<p>SEEKING ADVICE BY LEGAL RE LIMS s7(2)(g), s7(2)(a)</p> <p>NOW TREATED AS AN OIA REQUEST</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Good morning</p> <p>I have asked for the minutes of the meeting on 9 November, 2023 with s7(2)(a) (@ Te Taumutu)</p> <p>I would also like the minutes of the meeting on the same day with Peter Brown from Ecan.</p> <p>I would also like minutes from that meeting of any other discussions involving the Selwyn Huts, the Greenpark Huts and the Lower Huts.</p> <p>Thanks</p>	<p>Hello</p> <p>These are the subject of an OIA and being dealt with accordingly.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Good morning</p> <p>I have asked for minutes/information re meetings with s7(2)(a) [Te Taumutu Runanga Representative] and Ecan, as mentioned in the report. I would also request any information re any meetings/correspondence with DOC if they occurred. Also any correspondence with Ngai Tahu/the Runanga and Ecan over our future at the Huts.</p> <p>I am asking that my requests be treated as urgent under Section 10(3) of the LGOIMA Act as we have such a short time frame to engage in the consultation process.</p> <p>Thanks</p>	<p>Hello</p> <p>These are the subject of an OIA and being dealt with accordingly.</p>

[Name redacted - privacy]	<div>s/(2)(a)</div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div>	<div></div> <div>s/(2)(a)</div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div>
[Name redacted - privacy]	Good morning You didn't answer my question. I asked at what point the Council could sell a person's home if they were late with their rates payment.  I would also like to know how many days before a rates payment is considered late and how many days before a Licence fee payment is considered late?  Thanks	LGOIMA - covered off in LGOIMA response 37 [1267]
[Name redacted - privacy]	Good morning You have said that rates are governed by the Rates legislation and when rates are not paid, the Council has legislated collection options. Would you please explain these options.  Clause 5.4 (c) states that the Licence fee cannot go down. If for some reason the cost went down then the licence fee would not be able to reflect this. You have said that ' Any change in licence fee would require a review of the change and its implications' - what does that mean and why include this clause?  Clause 5.1 (c) - there are people who own more than one house - what assurances do they have that they can continue to do this? Selling now will be very difficult with this proposed new Licence. Would you please respond with an answer to this. I have asked before.  Please explain in detail the proposed inspection process. Please include detailed information about the sections of the various Acts you are using to justify this.  Please reply by Friday 19th April.	Answers covered off in LGOIMA request
[Name redacted - privacy]	Hi  Council's letter from Douglas Marshal dated 10/5/19 states that one of the decisions from Council Meeting 8/5/19 was "the council now determines that hut licences and subsequent renewals are short term and ultimately finite".  Can you please provide me with the agenda and the minutes from this meeting as they are not on the Councils website? (See below)  Thank you	Hi  I have sent the requested documents via WeTransfer.  Kind regards,
[Name redacted - privacy]	Hi Tim  This is an OIA Request for all legal opinions received by Selwyn District Council regarding the Selwyn Huts since 1989.  I have seen one from 1999 which has some relevance, so I'd like to see all legal opinions received by SDC since they started administering the Selwyn Huts.  Thank you	OIA Request
[Name redacted - privacy]	Hi  Thank you for the extension of time.  Can you please confirm if Megan McKay will be at the meeting next Tuesday 23/4?  It would be great if she could attend so we can open the conversation on how we are affecting Te Taumutu Runanga and how we can reduce that impact.  She said in her speech that their position has been expressed in meetings with us for many years. But I don't think this is true.  This would be a great time to share their position in more detail so we can fully understand their position.  Thank you	Mayor Sam, Councillor Mundt, Councillor Ephraim, Councillor McInnes, CEO Sharon Mason, Executive Director – Tim Harris, Sean Tully- Project  Other councillors have meetings to attend regarding the Long-Term Plan community engagement sessions. Taumutu has responded to the community invitation advising that they will not be in attendance.  Kind regards,
[Name redacted - privacy]	Hi Tim  Can I please have a copy of the of the SDC Management Plan of the Upper Selwyn Huts Special Purpose Reserve, including any reviews as required by the Reserves Act 1977?  Thank you	OIA Request
[Name redacted - privacy]	Hi  Can I please have a copy of the Minister's Notice of Vesting or Notice to Control & Manage which determined SDC to administer USH?  Thank you	OIA Request
[Name redacted - privacy]	Hi  That is disappointing.  I believe I have to inform you that I will be making a complaint to the ombudsman regarding the SDC procedures leading up to the vote of the 15 year finite term.  Regards	Hello By now you will know that we have extended the feedback period until 15 July and postponed the issues of the final Deed of Licence by three months.  The decision to issue a finite licence for the was made on 8 May 2019. In the March Council meeting earlier this year, the finite period was defined at 15 years. The feedback we are seeking is specifically on the Deed of Licence. It is not proposed to revisit these decisions at the next Council meeting.
[Name redacted - privacy]	Hi  That is disappointing.  I believe I have to inform you that I will be making a complaint to the ombudsman regarding the SDC procedures leading up to the vote of the 15 year finite term.  Regards	No response required
[Name redacted - privacy]	> Hi > Would you please set up the whiteboard that is in the hall for the meeting. Then anyone who has comments/questions/feedback can put their name on it. This way no one misses out on being able to speak. > > Please confirm that you are happy to do this. > > Thanks again >	> Thank you for your questions this morning. We will come back to you with a reply and I am sure we can find a whiteboard or alternative to ensure questions can be left . Thanks



[Name redacted - privacy]	Goodmorning to you I just want to thank you for listening to me after the meeting yesterday (I am the lady who knelt beside you). I know you felt my pain so thank you for that. If it is allowed I'd like to invite yourself (and any of your team) to come to my home for a cuppa and a chat. I understand if you can't. Kind regards	Hi  Thanks for your e-mail. I have sent your e-mail on to Tim Harris.  Kind regards,
[Name redacted - privacy]	Hi  Can you please email all owners the new dates/timeframe, as we are unsure of the dates after 15 July.  I believe you will also be getting an extension request as we all need to see the next draft and have time to time to consult and send feedback on that.  I think there has to be more time and back and forth negotiations if you are to get our community on board with the final deed.  We have lost all faith as you know.  Thank you	Hi  Thanks for your e-mail. Please find below a revised timeline (Image of timeline provided) We will endeavour to have our website updated with this information today.  Selwyn District Council - Upper Selwyn Huts  Kind regards,
[Name redacted - privacy]	Please can we have one copy of all submissions made to the Council at the end of the feedback process, for our files?	Yes, this will be available in the report to Council
[Name redacted - privacy]	Good morning Do you have this information yet?  Thanks    Hi s7(2)(a)  I believe that Malcolm was referring to a potential change in the rate when we strike the new rate in the first financial year of this years Long Term Plan which commences 1 July but I will check  Hi A question about the Selwyn Huts report - there seemed to be doubt over the costings in 4.9 re what it would cost us on the district wide rate. I recall that Malcolm Lyall said this figure was incorrect. Would you either confirm it is correct or if wrong then please send correct details with costings.  Thanks	Hi  Yes the rates for the Upper Selwyn Huts will change depending on what rate is struck in early July 2024.  Thanks
[Name redacted - privacy]	Hi  Is the Deadline to sign DOL supposed to be 30th September and not 30th August? As you have 30th August for the final deed to be sent out as well.  Thanks	Yes apologies it should read 30 Septemeber, this will be updated.
[Name redacted - privacy]	Hi  Thank you for that.  Can I please also have the plans for the whole pipeline from leeston to us to pines?  Thank you	Hi  Overview of plan is attached. The plans for the pipelines are extensive, if you have further questions I can organise one of the project managers to get in touch with you to discuss this.  Kind regards,
[Name redacted - privacy]	A neighbour has just let me know that he read that any Māori owned land will not be charged rates. He wasn't sure if this was at the proposal stage or not. Would you please advise on this and explain why (if this is correct). If it is correct is this something that is being consulted on in the LTP?  Thanks	To help us provide an answer we will need more details. Please ask your neighbour what he read and where he read it, a copy would help us formulate a response. (No reply received by writer)
[Name redacted - privacy]	Hello,  s7(2)(a)  [1] I understand that the Selwyn District Council made a decision on 13 March 2024 not to renew licenses after 15 years' time; and that the huts must then be removed or demolished. I understand that there has been a lot of anger over this decision and that the Council has agreed "to consider the feedback" and possibly revise its proposals in August/September this year. s7(2)(a) would therefore like to have an estimate of how likely the Council is to revise its 15-year deadline, eg to 20 or 30 years (I understand that some Councillors in the original decision voted for 30 years).  [2] The new Deed of Licence is issued for 5 years only. There will then be a "conditional opportunity" to renew that licence for a further 5 years. This "conditional" opportunity presumably means the Council could impose any further "conditions" it decides on. Could you advise the chances of further unwelcome conditions being imposed and what they could be?  [3] It is also said that Transfers of a Deed of Licence after 30 June 2034 can only be to identified family members. What is the reason for this? What does it matter who is there in 2039 if you are going to close it down then anyway?  [4] The intended wastewater pipeline: This is indeed a puzzler. (a) If the Huts are to be removed in 15 years, then what is this pipeline for? With the residents being forced to pay a cost of something like \$30 a week for it, it would be far cheaper for the residents to pay for a sewerage truck to come round and collect the sewerage, as is done in the Lower Selwyn Huts. So again, what is this pipeline for, if in 15 years time it is going to an uninhabited domain?  (b) If there is some other purpose to this pipeline, then why are the Selwyn Huts residents being forced to pay 30% of its cost? They should only be paying what it would cost a sewerage truck to come round. Anything more is unjustified exploitation of the Upper Huts residents.  (c) The estimated cost of this pipeline has jumped from \$2 million to \$5 million. How on earth is this enormous increase justified? - inflation has not gone up 150% in the last few years. If your original estimate was that poor and the cost now so great, one wonders why this mega-expensive project is now going ahead at all. Why is it? At any rate, why should Upper Huts residents be the victims of your gross underestimate? And it is possible it could go up even more. Have interest costs been taken into account?  [5] If this pipeline does go ahead, will this mean a lot of construction noise affecting the Upper Huts for the next year-and-a-half? s7(2)(a) s7(2)(a)  [6] There seems to be a strict rule against allowing having dogs at the Upper Huts. s7(2)(a) Could I ask why the Council is so keen on insisting that supposed "climate change" is a reason for evicting residents in 15 years time, yet will not enforce an actually good rule against dogs?  s7(2)(a) s7(2)(a) s7(2)(a) s7(2)(a) s7(2)(a)	Hello Thank you for you email I have answered each of you questions inturn below  s7(2)(a)  [1] I understand that the Selwyn District Council made a decision on 13 March 2024 not to renew licenses after 15 years' time; and that the huts must then be removed or demolished. I understand that there has been a lot of anger over this decision and that the Council has agreed "to consider the feedback" and possibly revise its proposals in August/September this year. s7(2)(a) I would therefore like to have an estimate of how likely the Council is to revise its 15-year deadline, eg to 20 or 30 years (I understand that some Councillors in the original decision voted for 30 years). This will be a decision for Council which I cannot second guess  [2] The new Deed of Licence is issued for 5 years only. There will then be a "conditional opportunity" to renew that licence for a further 5 years. This "conditional" opportunity presumably means the Council could impose any further "conditions" it decides on. Could you advise the chances of further unwelcome conditions being imposed and what they could be? Again, I can't advise on the chances of any occurance which would change the circumstances which might effect the possibility of a renewal. Earthquake or Tsunami would be one such eventuality  [3] It is also said that Transfers of a Deed of Licence after 30 June 2034 can only be to identified family members. What is the reason for this? What does it matter who is there in 2039 if you are going to close it down then anyway? The intension is that as the licence period draws to a close that Council will seek a reduction in numbers of a period of time to support a transitional reduction of Hut numbers as opposed to a sigle moment when all huts end thier licence period at the same time.  [4] The intended wastewater pipeline: This is indeed a puzzler. (a) If the Huts are to be removed in 15 years, then what is this pipeline for? With the residents being forced to pay a cost of something like \$30 a week for it, it would be far cheaper for the residents to pay for a sewerage truck to come round and collect the sewerage, as is done in the Lower Selwyn Huts. So again, what is this pipeline for, if in 15 years time it is going to an uninhabited domain? The pipline is a requirment to staisfty ECAN resourse consent to dispose of waste water, without the pipline the huts would have to close in June this year. ECAN have offered us a period of grace as they know were are building the new pipline. Council has explored a number of option and consider that the pipline is to most effective. The option to transport wastewater from USH to Pines WWTP. It is estimated this will cost \$61k/month or \$730k/ year with approximately 55 truck movements/ month or 660/ year (truck all waste) on average after June 2024. The cost to build the pipeline will approximately equal 6 to 7 years of trucking  (b) If there is some other purpose to this pipeline, then why are the Selwyn Huts residents being forced to pay 30% of its cost? They should not be paying what it would cost a sewerage truck to come round. Anything more is unjustified exploitation of the

(b) If there is some other purpose to this pipeline, then why are the Selwyn Huts residents being forced to pay 30% of its cost? They should only be paying what it would cost a sewerage truck to come round. Anything more is unjustified exploitation of the Upper Huts residents. If the Huts were not in place the pipeline would not be built

(c) The estimated cost of this pipeline has jumped from \$2 million to \$5 million. How on earth is this enormous increase justified? - inflation has not gone up 150% in the last few years. If your original estimate was that poor and the cost now so great, one wonders why this mega-expensive project is now going ahead at all. Why is it? At any rate, why should Upper Huts residents be the victims of your gross underestimate? And it is possible it could go up even more. Have interest costs been taken into account? The cost of the pipeline is approximately \$4.4M, initial cost estimate were developed overtime and have been subject to inflationary effects.

[5] If this pipeline does go ahead, will this mean a lot of construction noise affecting the Upper Huts for the next year-and-a-half? s7(2)(a)

The pipeline will be built.

[6] There seems to be a strict rule against allowing having dogs at the Upper Huts. s7(2)(a)

Could I ask why the Council is so keen on insisting that supposed "climate change" is a reason for evicting residents in 15 years time, yet will not enforce an actually good rule against dogs? If hut owners are not adhering to their deed of Licence and keeping dogs, this will be investigated and dealt with by our compliance team

[7] s7(2)(a)

These issues should be reported to animal control at SDC.

[8] s7(2)(a)

Again, noise complaints should be sent to SDC for investigation.

[9] s7(2)(a)

Complaints of this nature should be sent to our compliance team who will follow up and establish if action is required.

s7(2)(a)

Thank you,



[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>s7(2)(a) neither the guide, nor the Deed it-self clearly state that a decision had already been made by Council in 2019 not to renew licences and that the next period offered would be finite. The guide is focused largely on the wastewater and the Deed (which is essentially the contract between us) even notes 'renewal' several times. It could have been so easily added to both documents. With that said, I believe it is unfair and would be improper for Council to move forward with the finite decision. Also taking into account the decision was made using what was later found to be flawed climate change modelling, how can Council continue this path? The consequence here of Council's decision being implemented is the loss of 100 homes. Does that even register?!! I am pleading with Council to see sense, overturn the 2019 decision and allow everyone here the right to remain in their homes for as long as it is safe to do so. I believe it is the right thing to do. I am hopeful for an informative response please. Thank you.</p> <p>Kind regards,</p>	<p>Thank you for your further response.</p> <p>Our LGOIMA team has been in the process of preparing a response to your earlier request for information to the extent outstanding.</p> <p>They require some additional days to respond. As we are treating your request as a request for information under the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act (LGOIMA), the final date for a response is today. We are writing to advise that pursuant to section 14(1) of the LGOIMA we need to extend the date for a response to next Wednesday 15 May and will respond earlier if possible, to enable us to carry out the consultations necessary to be able to make a decision on and respond to your request. Contributing factors include that the Council is experiencing a high volume of information requests which require capacity and resource from specialist staff members. Please note that to the extent you have requested further information, that needs to be treated as a new request and is subject to different timeframes.</p> <p>s7(2)(a)</p> <p>Also please do note that it is not the role for Council to provide advice to purchasers and purchasers need to seek independent legal advice if they require assistance in understanding these documents.</p> <p>You have the right to seek an investigation and review by the Ombudsman of this decision and Council's response to your request for information. Information about how to make a complaint is available at <a href="http://www.ombudsman.parliament.nz">www.ombudsman.parliament.nz</a> or 0800 802 602.</p> <p>Kind regards</p> <p>s7(2)(a)</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Hi</p> <p>Can you please let us know how long it took to get your first aqualinc report on climate change effects on Te Waihora and surrounding areas, from the moment you requested it until you received the final report?</p> <p>We may need to commission our own report to corroborate Aqualinc's findings, and will need time to do this.</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>Hi</p> <p>A specific report for Upper Selwyn Huts could take 3 – 6 months. It is dependent on costs and the workload of the consultant.</p> <p>Kind regards,</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Could you please extend the time between the 7th of August dol release and 14th of August for feedback . One again this is a ridiculous amount of time for me to read it and get legal advice and tend to every other detail of my life . This seems quite unreasonable. Why are you giving the whole community one week to review this ??</p> <p>Could u please reply asap</p> <p>Kind regards</p>	<p>At this stage Council will not be calling for feedback once the final Deed of Licence is issued.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Hi Team,</p> <p>Just another quick question.</p> <p>What is the yearly fees / rates for the leasehold at selwyn huts ?</p>	<p>Good morning</p> <p>The rates for s7(2)(a) for FY 2023/2024</p> <p>Thanks</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Hi</p> <p>s7(2)(a)</p> <p>s7(2)(a)</p> <p>s7(2)(a)</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>OIA</p> <p>Hi</p> <p>This request has been sent to our Official Information Act team for a response.</p> <p>Thanks</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Attn</p> <p>I wish to request a meeting with the Mayor and councillors to discuss the draft Deed of Licence for the Upper Selwyn Huts. The preferred meeting date and time is 24th May around 11am. We would expect up to 5 representatives from the Upper Selwyn Hut Owners Association including our s7(2)(a) to be present at this meeting.</p> <p>This is an urgent matter and the USH community has requested us to set up this meeting.</p>	<p>Hello</p> <p>Thank you for your email requesting a meeting between your legal representative, members of the Upper Selwyn Huts community and yourself with Mayor Sam.</p> <p>Regarding your legal representative contacting council. We would prefer any such contact to be conducted through our legal representative s7(2)(a) @buddlefindlay.com and would request that your legal representatives contact s7(2)(a)</p> <p>Regarding a request to meet with the Mayor and Councillors. We are currently receiving feedback to the provisional Deed of Licence. That feedback is being received by staff and prepared for presentation to Councillors. If your meeting request is to provide feedback we would accommodate a meeting with staff. This would in the first instance be Mr Tim Harris Executive Director Enabling Services who is overseeing the Deed of Licence preparation.</p> <p>Tim will be in Long Term Plan Deliberations for the morning of the 24th of May, Tim has availability at 12.15pm on the 24th of May for half an hour, please advise if this suits your group.</p> <p>Kind regards s</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>s7(2)(a)</p> <p>s7(2)(a)</p> <p>Thank you!</p> <p>Hi</p> <p>The current annual licence fee is \$1389.00. Rate values vary between the huts, if your query relates to a specific hut we can provide the current rates for that hut if you provide us with more information.</p> <p>Thanks</p>	<p>The rates for s7(2)(a) for FY 2023/2024</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Hi</p> <p>Maybe you need to speak to your CEO Sharon Mason who has acknowledged the fact that SDC dropped the ball with not letting purchases after 2019 know there was a finite term.</p> <p>When I signed the 2015 DOL it said permanent, which implies to me it would be permanent!</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>No response required</p>

[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Dear</p> <p>I am emailing to request under the LGOIMA copies of all internal and external correspondence, such as but not limited to, agendas, minutes, emails, staff and council briefing minutes, advice received etc. I.e. anything relating to the Upper Selwyn Huts future occupancy strategy, new Deed of Licence, short finite term etc.</p> <p>External communications, including but limited to, ECan, Ngai Tahu, DOC, MBIE, Kaitorete Limited and so on.</p> <p>I am requesting full disclosure of information relating to the Upper Selwyn Huts.</p> <p>We believe there have been other discussions regarding our future occupancy that have not been disclosed.</p> <p>Regards</p>	<p>OIA Hi</p> <p>This request has been sent to our Official Information Act team for a response.</p> <p>Thanks</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Dear</p> <p>Please provide any information you have on any of the Te Waihora/Lake Ellesmere hut settlements including Upper Selwyn Huts and if any of these have an association with or affect on the Tawhaki Joint Venture Project and Kaitorete Limited.</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>OIA Hi</p> <p>This request has been sent to our Official Information Act team for a response.</p> <p>Thanks</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Hi again</p> <p>If there are no minutes from the meeting on 24 November 2023, would you please send me the notes or email containing the information re this meeting that you put in the report.</p> <p>If there are no minutes from the meeting with the head of Regulatory then please send me the notes/ email you used to include this in your report.</p> <p>Thanks</p> <p>finite period. Councillors decided that the finite Term would be set at a later date. That happened in March this year. There were no minutes of the meeting taken on 24 November 2023. The reason for the inspection is to establish what was articulated at the meeting - that it was not known how compliant lots were with legislation hence no specific number was referenced in the report.</p> <p>On 10/05/2024, at 2:13 PM, Selwyn Huts &lt;huts@selwyn.govt.nz&gt; wrote: finite period. Councillors decided that the finite Term would be set at a later date. That happened in March this year. There were no minutes of the meeting taken on 24 November 2023. The reason for the inspection is to establish what was articulated at the meeting - that it was not known how compliant lots were with legislation hence no specific number was referenced in the report</p>	<p>OIA Hi</p> <p>This request has been sent to our Official Information Act team for a response.</p> <p>Thanks</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Dear</p> <p>Please can you send a list of any iwi management plans which impact on, relate to, or makes any reference to USH.</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>OIA Hi</p> <p>This request has been sent to our Official Information Act team for a response.</p> <p>Thanks</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>out of scope, s7(2)(a)</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>	<p>out of scope</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Dear</p> <p>Please provide how much each rate payer in Selwyn is paying each year for the Leeston to Pines new sewer pipeline.</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>OIA request</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Dear</p> <p>This request was sent 7th April.</p> <p>I thought you would get back to me within the 20 working days required under LGOIMA request. It must not have been treated as such.</p> <p>For that reason I'd like to request the breakdown of the \$1,389 licence fee as a LGOIMA Request. Please treat is so with urgency.</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>Hi</p> <p>Apologies for the late response: \$1,389.00 (inclusive of GST) per annum payable quarterly in advance payable on 1 July, 1 October, 1 January and 1 April in each year. The breakdown is as listed:</p> <p>Licence charges for Annual operating/maintenance costs Water supply\$244 Sewer system\$556 Sewer trucking costs until new system commissioned\$103 Chlorination of water\$34 Opening Account Deficit\$292 Total Cost\$1,229 GST\$160 Total Cost GST Incl.\$1,389 Staff are still in the process of investigating what the 'opening account deficit' encompasses, however this will be worked through with Councillors once the final Deed of Licence is confirmed.</p> <p>Thanks</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Dear</p> <p>I'd like to request that all decisions on the costings of the USH wastewater upgrade to be postponed until after the government's 3 Waters replacement policy is announced.</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>Construction of the Upper Selwyn Huts portion of the Ellesmere to Pines connection has just started and is due for completion at the end of 2025. The budget for completion of this work is included in the LTP that has been through public consultation and is due for adoption 3 July 2024.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Kia Ora s7(2)(a) My question to you is this: if the Selwyn Huts Settlements sewerage rates were to be added to the district wide rates then how much would s7(2)(a) Leeston rates increase please?? At the SDC council meeting 01/05/2024 a representative from the local Taumutu Runanga asked Council to consider adding the Marae &amp; Fisherman's point to the General District Wide Rates. Their reasoning for this request was for educational purposes for the betterment of our local children?? Surely if there is a favorable outcome supporting this request then you must consider the heritage of our Selwyn Huts Settlement also with history dating back to 1895?? At the Lincoln District Historical Meeting 21/05/2024 we were advised to make contact with the NZ Historical Society to support our case. There is currently 6 baches for sale at the Upper Selwyn Huts with prices as low as \$50k!!! Since your announcement of the "finite term" the market has plummeted &amp; I myself stand to lose s7(2)(a) with not a cent compensation from the SDC let alone a reduction in rates!!!! I personally do not trust the SDC and believe that the 5+5+5 year clause is an easy out for the council to evacuate us sooner. Now that the prices of our baches have plummeted this will encourage another element of society to purchase there due to the cheaper housing options available to them and we will be faced with yet another dilemma created by the SDC!!! s7(2)(a) I find your actions, rules &amp; regulations highly offensive and you really do need to listen to the people whose lives you are affecting.</p> <p>I look forward to your reply</p> <p>Regards</p>	<p>Kia ora</p> <p>Apologies for the delayed response to your email below. I acknowledge receipt of your email and will collaborate with our Finance &amp; Official Information Act team to provide you with information regarding the Leeston rates increase. Your additional points will be duly considered as feedback for the Deed of Licence, which will be presented to the Councillors for their consideration.</p> <p>Kind regards,</p> <p>OIA for Leeston rates question</p>



[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Kia ora</p> <p>I can't believe I have waited almost a month for this response. I'm not having a go at you but wow, I hope you can appreciate how frustrating this is for us. How on earth am I supposed to give feedback when you can't tell me anything about the program?</p> <p>You have ignored my question re 1947 Building Act vs 2004 Building Act you quoted in your first response to me. Surely the question "why the change" can be answered?</p> <p>Please respond in a timely manner with the answer to this question at the very least</p> <p>Ngā mihi</p>	<p>Hi</p> <p>As per my last email, the inspections process is still being developed and we are still working on what legislation will be used. We expect to get an update to all residents by the end of the week.</p> <p>Kind regards,</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Dear</p> <p>This is a LGOIMA request with urgency for all minutes relating to the "collaborative work with" DOC and Ngai Tahu which "resulted in the date of 30 June 2024 established as a key point in time for the future of all three communities" as noted in your Upper Selwyn Huts Future Occupancy Strategy report, 4 March 2024, section 4.4 "Other Lake Ellesmere/Te Waihora Communities".</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>Sent to OIA for response</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Hi</p> <p>At our meeting on 24 May, you agreed to send us your spreadsheet with all of our LGOIMAs and Q&amp;A.</p> <p>As far as I know, no one has received this yet.</p> <p>Can you please forward this to <b>S7(2)(a)</b> as soon as possible.</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>Hi</p> <p>Our LGOIMA team will look to put the information together and send this to you.</p> <p>Thanks</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Dear</p> <p>I've been asked by some residents to ask you if you could please let us know how many residents are in default past one year after the invoice date?</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>OIA Request</p> <p>Hi</p> <p>This request has been sent to our Official Information Act team for a response.</p> <p>Thanks</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Dear</p> <p>Can you please let us know the topics that are going to be discussed at the Council meeting on the 24/7?</p> <p>Is there plenty of time and speaking time for the USH topic?</p> <p>Is this an extraordinary meeting about us or a public meeting with a full agenda?</p> <p>As soon as you have the agenda, please can you forward it to us.</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>Morning</p> <p>The Council will be discussing the options it voted on at the March meeting, which includes the term for which a licence can be renewed.</p> <p>If you are seeking speaking rights at the public forum then please email <a href="mailto:council.secretary@selwyn.govt.nz">council.secretary@selwyn.govt.nz</a> the meeting will also be Livestreamed on the Council YouTube channel</p> <p>Normally people are given 10 minutes per topic if you are seeking more than that then that would need to be discussed prior with the Chair of the meeting. I suggest that you copy me in so I can facilitate that discussion. Ive sent a similar message to Clare yesterday and it might be useful for you to coordinate the presentations with her.</p> <p>The meeting is a Council meeting with a number of topics on the agenda.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Dear</p> <p>We request a copy of the SDC Governance - Springston South Reserve Management Committee report referred to several times in the 22 June 2011 minutes attached.</p> <p>We also request a copy of the legal advice on this matter also referred to in these minutes.</p> <p>Please treat this as urgent due to the feedback deadline for the USH draft Deed of Licence.</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>Hi</p> <p>I have sent your request to our OIA team.</p> <p>Please note there has been a second extension to the feedback due date which is now the 26 of August 2024. A letter was sent out by Council last week.</p> <p>Kind regards, OIA</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Hi,</p> <p>I have not heard back from you regarding the Council reasons for the decisions on the future of the Selwyn Huts to be of 'medium significance'.</p> <p>As such, I request all documentation relating to consideration of the level of the significance of the decisions made re the Upper Selwyn Huts under the Local Government Official Information Act.</p> <p>Regards,</p>	<p>OIA</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Dear</p> <p>Can I please get a copy of the Local Purpose Reserve survey that was created to establish the reclassification of the two reserves in 2015?</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>OIA</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Good morning</p> <p>Would you please clarify clause 5.1c of the draft licence. I would appreciate it if you could respond by Thursday 28th March.</p>	<p>Your question is being considered by the legal team. Once they have provided advice, we will incorporate that advice into the revised Deed of Licence which is nearing completion. You will then be able to offer feedback on the clause and other aspects of the Deed of Licence. Thank you. <b>ACTION NEEDS FOLLOW UP EMAIL ONCE LEGAL ADVICE RECEIVED</b></p> <p>Our apologies for the delay in responding to your question. A general explanation of this from Council: Clause 5.1c of the draft deed of licence (March 2024 version) provides that, before granting a licensee a renewal of the licence (if provision for a renewal exists), Council may consider and need to be satisfied that the licensee and their family and associates will not have a right to occupy more than one lot on the reserve. Please note that Council's legal advisors are not able to provide legal advice to licensees or other persons. Licensees are encouraged to obtain their own independent legal advice in relation to the draft deed of licence.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Hi <b>S7(2)(a)</b></p> <p>That doesn't really answer my question. My understanding is that all in Selwyn connected to a sewer system pay the same rate - the district wide rate ( except the Selwyn Huts). My question is - is the Ngai Tahu farmhouse next to us paying for sewer on the district wide rate, pay the same amount per annum as we pay or pay nothing at all?</p> <p>Thanks again</p>	<p>I have an answer for this now from <b>S7(2)(a)</b> 9/7/2024 but have not sent a response as yet as I need to run this by Tim. <b>S7(2)(a)</b></p> <p>[Note added - being followed up internally]</p>

[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Hi again</p> <p>How much does Ngai Tahu pay annually to be connected to our sewer system?</p> <p>Thanks</p> <p>S/(2)(a)</p>	<p>I have an answer for this now from S/(2)(a) 9/7/2024 but have not sent a response as yet as I need to run this by Tim. S/(2)(a)</p> <p>[Note added - being followed up internally]</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Would you please send me a breakdown of the cost of the pipe to the Pines - how much for Leeston and how much for the camp grounds?</p> <p>Which ratepayers are paying the cost of the campgrounds? Is it just those who pay a waste water rate or will it include those on rural properties who do not pay a waste water rate?</p>	<p>Murray England responded directly I will need to get the response from Murray [Note added - being followed up internally]</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>S/(2)(a)</p> <p>The Council say</p> <p>"The Council will not be processing any transfer of a Deed of Licence to a new owner without first checking that they have received a copy of the letter ( letter from Douglas Marshall) and understood the proposed changes."</p> <p>How did you check that i understood the proposed changes?</p> <p>S/(2)(a) of this lack in your communication .</p> <p>Regards</p> <p>S/(2)(a)</p>	<p>LEGAL ADVICE FROM S/(2)(a)</p> <p>The term of the licence is recorded in the deed of licence itself. Council requires this to be sighted and signed by new licensees. S/(2)(a) followed this one up with S/(2)(a) 20/6/24</p> <p>We acknowledge your feedback and apologise for the delay in responding to your question. The term of the licence is recorded in the deed of licence. Council requires this to be sighted and signed by new licensees.</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>I don't appear to have had a reply to my question about why we are being asked to vacate our homes in 15 years. Would you please give a detailed explanation.</p> <p>Thanks</p>	<p>FORMULATE A WHY RESPONSE - NO RESPONSE WAS PROVIDED FOR THIS</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>You state "The Upper Selwyn Huts are located on a Reserve, land that is owned by the Crown and several factors make it unsuitable for long-term residential use."</p> <p>What are these several factors exactly? Our biggest issue with this process is the lack of transparency and collaboration, with no time given to us to address SDCs concerns. Please list all of the factors that make it unsuitable for long-term residential use.</p> <p>On 15/05/2024 11:45 NZST S/(2)(a) wrote:</p> <p>In your answer to 2 you mention that climate change is not the only reason for the 15 year term. Can you please identify all of the reasons?</p>	<p>FORMULATE A WHY RESPONSE - NO RESPONSE WAS PROVIDED FOR THIS</p>
[Name redacted - privacy]	<p>Good afternoon, I don't appear to have received reply's to this email other than from Tim Harris. I look forward to your replies please.</p> <p>Good afternoon one and all,</p> <p>having read through the draft deed causes me tone of the opinion that the SDC is treating the upper selwyn hut owners no better than the British government treated their postmasters.</p> <p>You as a council hold all the power to terminate our tenure at your will for any of numerous contentious breaches.</p> <p>No where does it give us an option to terminate with you other than death. A contract, which I consider this to be, is between 2 or more parties with equal rights to be considered for each. This license does not show that.</p> <p>1. I wish for you to include a clause that gives us the right to terminate at any stage. Pay any fees due up to the termination date and not include fees beyond that date. This should clearly state you are not liable for fees until the lease end date. ie : if we wish to terminate 12 months into the 5year term, we are not liable for 4 years of the sewer cost.</p> <p>Some owners are concerned that if the inspections take place and owners are being forced to invest vast amounts of money to remediate to your criteria on a property that is basically a worthless liability now. They should have the right to terminate and not incur ongoing debt for the pipeline.</p> <p>I also believe this draft deed, as it stands with all of your "out clauses" and code of conduct schedule has the potential to cause serious mental health stress, family stress and financial burden to many.</p> <p>2. I would ask that you consider allowing the signing of the license to be extended until December 2024 as all home owners have the most life changing decisions to make and need to seek legal advise, housing options, financial assistance etc. None of these things happen quickly.</p> <p>This would go some way to making up for the fact that you had 4 years to consult, Acquire and discuss the deed and table a report that we had 4 days to absorb and reply on. Once again this was done without full consultation with all stake holders.</p> <p>3. What is the tangible reason for the finite date not aligning with the lifetime of the sewer?</p> <p>Sea level rising quoted as a reason: This will not impede our settlement for years and no facts prove different.</p> <p>Nghai Tahu want their people to be able to collect kai from the lake.</p> <p>Our settlement has never stopped anyone from the collecting kai from the lake ever or in anyway.</p> <p>Raising the lake level to ensure an easier lake opening will not impact our settlement in anyway.</p> <p>4.What evidence do you hold that proves it will?</p> <p>I would like answers to the numbered questions I have put forward and would gratefully receive a reply from each of you on each point as your personal opinions may give some clarity as to how you came to your decision to vote for or against the 5by 5by 5 year term that can be terminated at any time at your discretion.</p> <p>Respectfully</p>	<p>TIM HAS PROVIDED A RESPONSE TO THIS BUT THE WRITER IS AFTER RESPONSES FROM COUNCILLORS</p>



Tēna koe

Thank you for the opportunity to speak on my submission on the Long Term Plan.

Firstly, I would like to talk briefly about the Significance & Engagement Policy. My hope is that you would only look to increase engagement and strengthen collaborative relationships across the entire district going forward. Any decisions that have a direct and serious impact on the people must always be treated as high importance; as s7(2)(a) has aptly said - "nothing about us without us". This must be the guiding principle for all decision-making processes.

Additionally, I urge the council to outline a comprehensive policy for addressing climate change. This policy should outline the processes for all potential managed retreat communities, impact reduction and mitigation strategies. With much of Selwyn facing potential impacts of climate change, including people that live in riverside, lakeside and seaside communities, it is imperative that we plan now and budget accordingly. Rather than relying solely on worst-case scenario science to justify extreme actions, I propose a collaborative approach that involves the community at a high level. I call on the council to:

- Base decisions on accurate monitoring and measurement of changes
- Mitigate risks as much as is practicable, explore all options to offset or reduce the impact of climate change before considering eviction. Ensure budget allocation for these measures
- Establish clear criteria for taking further action as environments do change, with transparent communication along the way
- Allocate funds for financial relief and relocation assistance, when staying is no longer a viable option
- Have a consistent and compassionate approach across all affected areas in the district - no town, suburb, community, home or person should be discriminated against or disadvantaged in this process. Every one of your constituents should feel like they are being heard, understood and supported - this can still be achieved even when there are difficult conversations to be had

In the case of the Upper Selwyn Huts, you have jumped the gun by deciding the eviction date when we are yet to see signs of being impacted. Eviction should be used only as a last resort, not the default solution. The emotional toll on our community cannot be overstated, and I implore the council to learn from this experience and set a better standard now, to protect other communities in the future.

It would break my heart- yet again- to see your first attempt at a managed retreat replicated in the future, subjecting more people to the same emotional torture. I would not wish this stress, this pain, this grief on anyone. 15 years may seem like a long time, but to put it into a different perspective, if you were told you only have a maximum of 15 years to live, suddenly it wouldn't seem like very long and would be difficult to enjoy the time you have left. We only have to look at how fast our children grow up to see how time slips by in the blink of an eye

You had 5 years to communicate and collaborate with us – but there was nothing. Now you have no plan, no answers and no budget for our managed retreat. This is a very dangerous precedent that you are setting. Don't pave the way for other LGB, or a future council of Selwyn to take such harsh action, with such little regard for the safety and wellbeing of the people. Put better guidelines, plans, policies, and a budget in place to better serve and support your district in the future.

Many of you in this room today have apologised, admitted that this process has been flawed and there have been many mistakes made along the way. Learn from these mistakes you have made with my community – and remember it's never too late to correct them.

Lastly, I encourage you all to reconsider, rewind and reset. Start this process over, and *do better*. Don't be the example of what not to do and how not to treat your people – set a good example. Not just for the sake of our future, but for the sake of history, the reputation of the Selwyn District Council, yourselves as councillors and for the sake of not setting this precedent for anyone else in New Zealand, who may have the utter misfortune of finding themselves staring down the barrel of a mismanaged retreat.

Nāku nā

s7(2)(a)

Cara-Marie Te Ngaru Zdrenca (submission #1311)

s7(2)(a)