

PWH Speaking Notes

Meeting Structure

- **Welcome – members of the public observing the meeting tonight.**
- **Overview meeting structure**
 - **Public Agenda – Community Lands Vote proposals**
 - **Then move to operational elements – Public can leave**
 - **Open to one-on-one discussions with anyway at the close of the meeting or some time over the week.**
- **Run through agenda**
- **Summarise the Community Lands discussion.**
 - **Two views, one commercial one community.**
 - **Commercial**
 - **Realise the rentals and value of the lands**
 - **Impact would be sale of the lands for development**
 - **Trade off community use for commercial gain**
 - **Community**
 - **Lands held in /trust for Community use**
 - **Deliver community benefits and valuable greenspace within the town**
 - **Deliver enduring community benefits as health and wellbeing, sport and rec, culture and heritage but not commercial dollars**
 - **We all agree that increasing the use of the lands is a good idea.**
 - **Proposals before Trustees culminate 6 years of discussion, and in particular the last 12 -m 18 months with a number of options presented and discussed.**
 - **There proposals presented last Dec and after consideration Trustees are now to vote.**

Key Messages

- They are Community Lands for the benefit of the Community
- Not commercial
- If we sell the land the land is gone for ever
- The proposals create an enduring community benefit, places to connect, reflect exercise.

PWH Summary of Proposals

In essence the Community Lands issue is simple. The Trusts operations consist of three elements:

- Commercial Property
- Managed Funds
- Community Lands

The first two aspects of the Trusts operations are clear and understood, the third is also clear but not understood. In thinking this issue through, the guiding principle for me is that the community lands are just that, community lands, entrusted to the Trust to provide the long-term guardianship and stewardship of those lands for the benefit of the Community.

- The Community lands lessees are representatives of our community. They provide, health, wellbeing, sport and recreation, culture and heritage benefits to our community.
- They serve our community, the same community that GDTLT serves.
- It was the Community of Greytown that spoke strongly and overwhelming in the Annual Planning process of their support for protecting the community lands for the benefit of the community whilst increasing the utilisation of those lands and faculties for the benefit of the community.

The land valuations and subsequent rentals are based on a residential zoning methodology that presents a theatrical value. This is at the heart of the issue. Those rentals and values are an unintended consequence of a change in zoning that does not recognise the community tenants and the actual usage,

The presentation of a reduction in Trust value of 23% is misleading.

- That view suggests that the Trust currently enjoys the value of those land, and any change is a reduction in value. This is incorrect.
- If we in act on the proposals today, there will be no change to the level of grants made to the community. There will not be a 23% reduction.
- To realise the theatrical value of those lands, GDTLT would need to enforce the rents. Put all the tenants in financial stress and effectively remove them from the land.
- GDLT would then need to develop those lands in some form to realise the value.
- If we did this the lands are gone for good, we would never get them back.

I do not support that thinking and approach.

- I see these lands as Community Lands and their tenants as delivering wider benefits to the community, benefits that can be grown, enhanced and to ultimately deliver an enduring benefit for the community.
- What is needed is a solution where the rights of the Community Lands for the broader benefit and use of the Greytown Community are enshrined whilst protecting the rights of the Trust should the use of the lands change.

I see the four proposals in front of us as delivering on that premise and providing a solution that provides security for the Community Tenants whilst protecting the inters of the Trust in the long term. I see the proposals delivering on the wishes of the community.

1. Cobblestones Museum Trust – I support

- GDTLT write up a new non-assignable ground lease – net \$1pa, perpetual tenure.
- Tenure to be contingent on the existing use (historic/cultural/educational) remaining as per current, in the event the existing use ceases, lease will terminate.
- Naming – GDTL to have naming rights – as a suggestion, the site to become known as:

Greytown District Trust Lands Trust Historic Precinct

With highly visible signage facing SH2 both directions, on that part of the site owned by GDTLT

- Given the proposed nominal rental and perpetual tenure, from a valuation perspective, the commercial value of the site will effectively become zero until such time the lease is terminated.
- The proposed arrangement can be affected within a short timeframe, once approved by Trustees. This could align nicely with Trust's 150th anniversary celebrations.

2. Greytown Bowling Club – I Support

- Effect the subdivision, carving off No. 2 Green.
- Write new non-assignable ground lease with GBC, net \$1pa, perpetual. Tenure to be contingent on existing use remaining as per current. (Lawn Bowls & associated Bowling Club activities). GDTLT will incur legal & subdivision fees.
- Trustees to decide ultimate use of space – community or otherwise, however subdivision can progress prior to any agreement as to final use.
- Engage with SWDC & Greytown Community as to the ultimate best use of site. SWDC have indicated an in principle a willingness to take on a perpetual lease over green No. 2 and develop a community focused greenspace facility. Lease terms would be as per 123 East Street.
- In the event Trustees elect to retain the No. 2 green for community use, given the nominal rental and tenure, from a valuation perspective, the commercial value of the site will effectively become zero until such time the lease(s) is (are) terminated.
- Alternatively, Trustees could opt for sale to a developer.

3. Royal NZ Plunket Trust – I support

Since my last update, Helga has had constructive dialogue with Plunket. Plunket are open to exiting the site provided suitable alternative arrangements can be secured.

- St Johns have indicated they are looking to exit all sites in the region, including 123 East St where they occupy via an arrangement with GRFC. I suggest this site as an option for Plunket, the Toy Library & the Playgroup. Alternatively, the space currently used by the gym could potentially be used under an arrangement with GRFC.
- In the event terms are reached with Plunket, I suggest site is cleared and either retained for community recreation space or it is sold. Trustees to decide and this too could be done via community consultation.
- The commercial valuation impact will depend on the direction taken by Trustees.

4. Greytown Rugby Football Club – I support I believe through my recent conversations with the GRFC that they understand clearly the need for increased utilisation of the lands and equally the community leadership they need it demonstrate in order to deliver on the principles of this proposal.

My previous update suggested a trial period as an option. In hindsight, a trial period does little other than to continue the delay in reaching a permanent solution. It is fair to state that all parties have struggled with the existing arrangements for some years and the desire to move forward is clear.

SWDC have indicated a willingness to assume a perpetual lease over the playing fields, taking on the ground and infrastructure costs etc. Therefore, I propose my original draft solution involving SWDC be pursued, albeit without the Greytown Sports & Leisure underwrite. Co-ordination of the shared playing fields to be undertaken by SWDC as they currently do in both Featherston & Greytown (they may in fact look to engage GS&L, but this is not a given).

Given the nominal rental and tenure, from a valuation perspective, the commercial value of the site will effectively become zero until such time the proposed lease(s) is (are) terminated.