



NOTICE OF MEETING

Notice is hereby given that the Newfield Park, JG Ward and 38 Suir Street Hearings Deliberations to be held in the Council Chamber, First Floor, Civic Theatre, 88 Tay Street, Invercargill on Thursday 24 September 2026 at 10.00 am

Cr P M Boyle
Cr A L de Vries
Cr L Tou-McNaughton
Ms J Eruera

MICHAEL DAY
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

Newfield Park, JG Ward and 38 Suir Street Hearings Deliberations - Public

24 September 2026 10:00 AM

Agenda Topic	Page
1. Apologies	
2. Declaration of Interest	
a. Members are reminded of the need to stand aside from decision-making when a conflict arises between their role as an elected representative and any private or other external interest they might have.	
b. Elected members are reminded to update their register of interests as soon as practicable, including amending the register at this meeting if necessary.	
3. <u>Major Late Item - Minutes of the Newfield Park, JG Ward and 38 Suir Street Hearings held on 15 September 2026</u>	3
4. <u>Major Late Item - Newfield Park Revocation Deliberations</u>	7
4.1 <u>Appendix 1 – Summary of Submissions</u>	12
4.2 <u>Appendix 2 - Let's Talk Content</u>	18
4.3 <u>Appendix 3 - DOC Revocation Process</u>	19
5. <u>Major Late Item - Proposed sale of JG Ward / 38 Suir Street Deliberations</u>	21
5.1 <u>Appendix 1 - Summary of Submissions</u>	24
5.2 <u>Appendix 2 - Let's Talk Content</u>	26
5.3 <u>Appendix 3 - Carbon Credits Report</u>	27
5.4 <u>Appendix 4 - ICC Disposal Policy</u>	33

**MINUTES OF NEWFIELD PARK, JG WARD AND 38 SUIR STREET HEARINGS, HELD IN THE
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, FIRST FLOOR, CIVIC THEATRE, 88 TAY STREET, INVERCARGILL ON
TUESDAY 15 SEPTEMBER 2026 AT 12.00 PM**

Present: Cr P M Boyle (Chair)
Cr A L de Vries
Cr L Tou-McNaughton
Ms J Eruera

In Attendance: Cr A H Crackett
Matua M Bain – Pou Manawhenua – Waihōpai Rūnaka
Ms C Rain – Manager – Parks and Reserves
Ms C Horton – Manager – Strategy Parks and Recreation
Mrs P Christie – Group Manager – Finance and Assurance
Ms C Manera – Engagement Coordinator
Mr A Eng – Team Leader – Communications
Ms L Matua Kuresa – Executive Support

1. Apologies

Nil.

2. Declaration of Interest

Nil.

3. Hearings Timetable

3.1 Hearings Slot 1 - Carolyn Weston (via Teams)

The submitter spoke to her submission and commented that she opposed the option that the Invercargill City Council either sell or gift to the Government.

A query was raised, if the submitter would consider selling or gifting part of Newfield Park. The submitter commented that she did note that there was a section where it could be used for housing development and she would be happy with that, as long as they were not institutionalised housing for the elderly or for people with disabilities.

The submitter was thanked for taking the time to submit on this matter.

3.2 Hearings Slot 2 - Caleb Honiss

The submitter spoke to his submission and commented that he fully endorsed the idea of the land at Wilford Street being used for property development.

A query was raised, if there was a possibility of having a parking area in that section, but not at the front end of it. The submitter confirmed that would be a possibility.

The submitter was thanked for taking the time to submit on this matter.

3.3 Hearings Slot 3 – Lacey Bragg (via Teams)

The submitter spoke to the submission and highlighted that the purpose of the Reserves Act included the consideration for recreational potential, and was not aware through the material any specific meaningful attempts by Council to invest in, promote or enhance this particular area. She also highlighted that any future development could have significant impacts on the school and local community. Those concerns relate largely to three key areas being, drainage and storm water impacts, increased traffic and parking pressures around the school, changes to pedestrian access and general movement through the area. The School Board recognised the value of additional housing and the information available to the Board and the community did not provide enough information to properly understand the likely effects of options one or two. For that reason, the Board supports option 3 at this time, until further information was provided.

A query was raised, that if Council was to look at road safety improvements and if development was to succeed, would that be something the Board would consider as being a positive benefit. The submitter agreed it would be of a positive nature, but it was largely related around the certainty of a development. This consultation was in two parts, so the Reserves Act was one thing and revoking the status was another, it was notified because of a development. It was difficult to separate the two potential processes appearing, so it was largely related to uncertainty about what it would look like.

A query was raised, if there were any limitations on children or members of the public being able to utilise the school playground after school or out of school hours. The submitter clarified that most schools do not open until 8.30 am, as that was the time staff were on-site to supervise children. In terms of school grounds, there were no specific limitations there after school and after hours and part of that related with ease of pick up. She agreed that there were a number of the playground items situated behind the school that the school had some responsibility for within the Reserves Act situation.

A query was raised, that it was noted in the submission the increase of vandalism and graffiti, did the submitter agree that it referred to any development or was it from the revocation process. The submitter commented that was related to, not from the development, but from the revocation and that particular land being, not public land.

A query was raised, as to whether the school collaborated with the parks team to utilise the walkway as part of school projects, it was clarified that the submitter was not aware of that.

The submitter was thanked for taking the time to submit on this matter.

3.4 Hearings Slot 4 - Invercargill Youth Council

The submitters spoke to their submission.

A query was raised, as to what would improve a walkway to make it safer for public access. The submitter commented that it would be good if the walkways were cleaner and they were uneven, which made it unsafe for the elderly to use.

The submitters were thanked for taking the time to submit on this matter.

3.5 Hearings Slot 5 - John Winter

The submitter spoke to his submission.

A query was raised, as what access the submitter had to Suir Street. The submitter clarified that his property had access of Suir Street, but his vehicle access was at the rear.

A query was raised, as to whether the water flowed off the reserve into the submitter's property. The submitter clarified that the driveway got very wet and looks like a lake when there was a lot of rain. There were times where it was not practical to use the driveway, as it was not suitable for vehicles.

A query was raised, as to whether right of access was the submitter's primary concern around this matter and it was clarified that it was.

The submitter was thanked for taking the time to submit on this matter.

3.6 Hearings Slot 6 - Kylie Fowler

The submitter spoke to her submission.

A query was raised, if there had been any progress around the submitter contacting Environment Southland regarding the hazardous substance, potentially for a hazardous area. The submitter commented that an officer was going to be looking into that site and others around Bluff, but they had not had the paperwork to do much in Bluff and local knowledge was paramount for them. She had passed on the paperwork from the library, archives division, but it had not progressed any further, but it takes research and time.

A query was raised, if there were any concerns around other like commercial development as well. The submitter commented that it was residential zone and that would be offensive.

The submitter was thanked for taking the time to submit on this matter.

Moved Cr Tou-McNaughton, seconded Cr de Vries and **RESOLVED** that the Hearings Panel:

1. Receives the Hearings Timetable.

4. Newfield Park - Hearings

Moved Cr Tou-McNaughton, seconded Cr de Vries and **RESOLVED** that the Hearings Panel:

1. Receives the report "Newfield Park - Hearings".
2. Receives the submissions, Summary of Submissions and Social Media Report.
3. Notes the Hearings Timetable (Doc ID: 11282275).

5. JG Ward and 38 Suir Street - Hearings

Moved Cr Tou-McNaughton, seconded Cr de Vries and **RESOLVED** that the Hearings Panel:

1. Receives the report "JG Ward and 38 Suir Street - Hearings".
2. Receives the submissions, Summary of Submissions and the Social Media Report.
3. Notes the Hearings Timetable (Doc ID 11282275).

There being no further business, the meeting finished at 1.05 pm.

NEWFIELD PARK REVOCATION DELIBERATIONS

To: Hearings Panel

Meeting Date: Thursday 24 September 2026

From: Cassie Horton – Interim Manager Strategy – Parks and Recreation

Approved: Rex Capil - Group Manager - Community Spaces and Places

Approved Date: Tuesday 22 September 2026

Open Agenda: Yes

Public Excluded Agenda: No

Purpose and Summary

This report presents to the Hearings Panel the submissions received on the revocation proposal, with Council officer responses, along with an analysis of the submissions and hearings, for deliberation on whether to proceed with revocation.

Recommendations

That the Hearings Panel:

1. Receives the report 'Newfield Park Revocation Deliberations'
2. Receives the summary of submissions with Council officer responses.
3. Considers the matters raised by objectors to the proposal.
4. Notes that Council is required to determine whether objections to the proposed revocation will be allowed/accepted or disallowed/not accepted, in part or whole, and the reasons for Council's decision.
5. Notes the Council Officer responses within the summary of submissions and, utilising this information, accepts / declines objections (*delete one*)

(Editorial Note: The Hearings Panel will recommend a course of action to Community and Regulatory Committee, the same course of action will be adopted to for the Community and Regulatory Committee to Recommend to Council in order for the decision to comply with the delegations to the Committee.)

Recommends that the Community and Regulatory Committee:

6. Proceeds with, for Newfield Park Reserve Status: (*choose one of the following*)
 - A. Partial revocation
 - B. Full revocation

Document Set ID 11286834
A3570419

Page 1 of 5

C. No revocation

7. Acknowledges that If Council chooses to remove the reserve status from some or all of Newfield Park, and the Department of Conservation approves that removal, Council is agreeing that the affected land is no longer needed as reserve land and can be sold.

That Community and Regulatory Committee Recommends that Council:

8. Proceeds with, for Newfield Park Reserve Status: *(choose one of the following)*
- A. Partial revocation
 - B. Full revocation
 - C. No revocation

(Editorial Note: Will be automatically updated depending on the decision of the Panel in line with Recommendation 6 above)

Background

Consultation was undertaken 3 July – 7 August 2026. Following the closing of submissions, hearings were held. This report provides an analysis of submissions and hearings, as well as council officer responses for the hearings panel to deliberate on whether to proceed with revocation.

Issues and Options

Analysis

Public notification on the proposal for revocation was undertaken in the Southland Times twice to comply with the Reserves Act 1977. Information was made available on Let's Talk and submission boxes were located at Council buildings.

Consultation was also undertaken with the Commissioner (Department of Conservation) and requested with Mana Whenua though a submission was not provided.

Three options were presented.

Option One - Revoke reserve status on some of the land (1.3ha), retaining 0.5 ha.

Option Two - Revoke Reserve status on all the land (1.8ha).

Option Three - Do nothing.

60 submissions were received. Option three - do nothing was the most preferred option (33 responses), followed by option one - revoke status on some of the land (23 responses). Option two – revoke reserve status on all the land was the least preferred (four responses). Submissions are now being reported back through this report to the hearings panel, to make a recommendation to Council for a final decision regarding the intention to remove reserve status.

Hearings

Four submitters presented their feedback to a hearings panel on 15 September 2026.

Submissions

Option 1 - Key matters raised in relation to 'retain reserve status on some of the land'

1. Desire to Retain Part of the Reserve

18 (78%) Option 1 submitters viewed this as a compromise.

- Retain the playground and some open space.
- Preserve public ownership of part of the site.
- Maintain a community recreation area.
- Keep a buffer between the school and any housing development.
- Balance housing needs with open-space values.
- Improve accessibility and disability-inclusive play opportunities.
- Ensure future generations still have a place to play.

2. Support for Community / Accessible Housing

13 submitters (57%) supported housing, particularly for:

- Older people (kaumātua/seniors).
- People living with disabilities.
- Affordable and inclusive housing.
- Housing close to schools and services.
- Long-term community benefit from the proposed development.
- Existing grassed areas are rarely used.
- Housing would provide greater social benefit.
- The school grounds already provide recreation opportunities nearby.
- The site could serve a greater community purpose if partly developed.

3. School Safety and Separation

5 (22%) submitters of Option 1 preferred it over Option 2 because it maintained a separation from the school.

- Create a buffer between homes and the school.
- Reduce safety risks to children.
- Minimise impacts on learning and school operations.
- Maintain a safer environment than full-site development.

Option 2 – Key matters raised in relation to 'revoke reserve status on all the land' (1.8ha).

The four submissions supporting all the land being revoked raised the following key matters:

1. Reserve is Underutilised
2. Support for Maximum Housing Yield
3. Financial Efficiency and Ratepayer Value
4. Proximity to Amenities Supports Housing and nearby alternative parks exist

Option 3 – Key matters raised in relation to 'Do Nothing / Retain the Reserve'

The strongest and most frequently raised matters by Option 3 submitters were:

1. **Retention of public reserve land and green space** was the most common theme, with 21 submitters (63%) raising the following matters:
 - Reserve land should remain reserve land and not be sold or developed.
 - Once open space is lost it cannot be recovered.
 - The Park provides important green space within the neighbourhood.

- Green areas contribute to wellbeing, recreation, biodiversity, cooling, and amenity values.
 - Concern that Invercargill is gradually losing green space.
 - Suggestions that the reserve be enhanced rather than removed.

2. 36% (12) submitters opposed residential use in principle.

- Alternative locations should be considered for housing.
- Concern regarding cumulative infrastructure impacts.
- View that other land should be developed before reserve land.
- Concern about creating additional pressure on services and infrastructure.

3. Value of the Park for Children and Families was raised by 33% (11) submitters

- Children use the playground before and after school.
- Families play informal sports, throw balls, and picnic.
- The Park is important for local children who may not have easy access to larger parks.
- Concern that future generations would lose a valued community asset.
- The Park is seen as part of local childhood memories and community identity.
- Construction activity could disrupt learning.
- Concern about housing directly adjoining a primary school and kindergarten.

4. Insufficient information to justify reserve revocation.

18% (6) submitters challenged the rationale for disposal.

- Council has not invested in upgrading the park.
- Smaller neighbourhood parks receive less attention than larger parks.
- The park's condition may discourage use.
- Underuse should not automatically justify disposal.
- Reserve potential should be considered, not just current use.

5. Preference for park improvements rather than development.

Multiple enhancement suggestions were made by 15% (5) submitters.

- Upgrade playground equipment.
- Install a pump track.
- Improve drainage.
- Add native trees and landscaping.
- Create wetlands.
- Add picnic facilities, walking tracks, rubbish bins, and seating.
- Develop additional recreation opportunities.

6. 9% (3) submitters highlighted Environmental and biodiversity benefits.

- Birds use the reserve for habitat and nesting.
- Green space supports urban biodiversity.
- Suggestions for habitat restoration, native planting, wetlands, and tree planting instead of housing.
- Parks provide environmental benefits that will become increasingly important with climate change.

General matters raised by all submitters

1. Traffic, safety, and access impacts were raised by 21% (11) submitters

- Existing streets are already busy during school hours.
- Additional vehicle movements could worsen congestion.
- Increased traffic could create safety issues around school drop-off and pick-up times.

- Requests to protect children's safety and maintain separation between any development and the school.
- Children use the walkway and surrounding area daily.
- Increased traffic could reduce pedestrian safety.
- Concern regarding access routes through residential streets and along key walking paths.
- Residents use the route for walking and exercising dogs.
- Importance of retaining safe pedestrian links through the area.
- Concern that development could affect access and safety.
- Existing school traffic is already congested.
- Vehicle access should be carefully designed.
- Concerns about Wilfrid Street becoming unsafe during school periods.

2. Existing drainage/stormwater issues were raised by 15% (5) submitters

- The reserve is known to be wet and poorly drained.
- Concern that development could worsen flooding and runoff impacts on nearby properties.
- Suggestions that the reserve currently functions as a stormwater "sponge."
- Development should not worsen flooding of neighbouring properties.

Council officer response

Officer responses to submissions are provided in the attached summary of submissions. Regarding the quality of the drainage of the land, which was brought up during the hearings, the Stormwater pipe was installed in 1989 and has a 100-year lifespan. It was laid there as the shortest route and benefit for Council requirements at the time. Nothing can be built on top of the pipe, and an easement would be required if the land was sold. There is the opportunity to re-lay the pipe in a different location at the purchaser's cost, providing it meets needs and design requirements of Council.

Next Steps

Once the Hearings Panel agrees on the recommendations to Council, Council will make a final decision.

Attachments

Attachment 1 – Summary of Submissions (Doc Set ID 10921936)
Attachment 2 - Let's Talk Content (Doc Set ID 11287135)
Attachment 3 - DOC revocation process (Doc Set ID 2651509)

Newfield Park, JG Ward and 38 Suir Street Hearings Deliberations - Public - Major Late Item - Newfield Park Revocation Deliberations

Submission Number	Q1 (Name:)	Q2 (Do you represent a club or organisation that currently uses Newfield Park Reserve?)	Q3 (Club or Organisation Name)	Q4 (Postcode:)	Q8 (Would you like to receive emails from Council about future consultations?)	Q9 (Would you like to speak to Elected Members about your submission at a hearing?)	Q10 (Which option do you support?)	Q11 (Why do you support that option?)	Q12 (Is there anything else you would like to tell us?)	Council Officer Response
NPR001	Stacey McGimpsey	No		9812	No	No	3	Although I do believe that Newfield Park can be utilised more for our community, using the land for subdivision would put more strain on the infrastructure of an already populated area while also taking away some of the limited green space that is used by our school and kindergarten, as well as causing potential safety issues for our children. Newfield Park's location would be put to better use providing more for our existing community, rather than just trying to expand it.		
NPR002	Alice Jamieson	No		9812	Yes	Yes	3	Newfield park is used by local residents to play and exercise. Birds nest there. It is a much smaller and quieter space than Elizabeth Park and easier to keep eyes on people and animals. It is also flat.	I often use Newfield park and see kids playing or families throwing a ball around or playing cricket. The school next door does not allow dogs so people with dogs cannot use that area. It would be nice if drainage could be improved.	
NPR003	Valerie Dearman	No		9812	Yes	No	1	Only support if it is used for supported housing for seniors a and people living with a disability Play area retained with focus on disability equipment Retain walkway access which is used by primary and secondary school students.	The play area could be developed in partnership with the housing development with full access for all public users	If the Minister approves the revocation, the Council will not be able to decide what happens to the land. If the Council chooses to keep part of the land, we will carry out community consultation to understand what the community would like to see happen with that retained area.
NPR004	Riva Noble	No			No	No	1	Still giving children a place to play but also allowing invercargill to grow		
NPR005	Campbell	No		9812	No	No	3	It doesnt need to be changed, just leave it as it is.		
NPR006	Emily Muir	Yes	Newfield Primary and Sense Rugby	9812	Yes	No	3	This is the only decent size green area in Newfield. The local kids deserve somewhere nice to go and play. At best I would support option 2 but the idea of turning this into council housing scares me for this community.		
NPR007	Sharna	No		9812	No	No	1	Still would like to have a green belt	Have used this area for the last 18 yrs. While it is very wet and muddy at times I would still like to use it in future but understand the need to add more housing.	
NPR008	David Noble	No		9812	Yes	No	1	Option one helps with community growth and still allows room for our kids to play in a save space	I would like a small portion of the sale price to be used to upgrade some of the equipment at the park as I feel an upgrade would make the park more usable for family's and draw more kids to want to play and usualize the park.	If the land is revoked, it will return to Crown ownership. While Council can apply to receive funding from any future sale of the land, approval is at the Minister's discretion and is not guaranteed.
NPR009	Nicole Lankshear	No			No	No	3	People still use that area, children waiting for school to start or parents waiting with there little kids waiting for siblings if anything you should build a better playground there instead of tearing it down and creating more traffic and risk to the children there.		
NPR010	Levi Tipu	No		9812	Yes	No	1	Makes sense		
NPR011	Sarah M	No		9812	No	No	3	I suggest the council leave the land alone, it is reserve land for a reason and should stay that way. You say it's underutilised but never upgrade smaller parks only the main Queens Park and rich area playgrounds, but never the one's where kids go to kick a ball or run around. Yet another selling off of land to developers, we don't want more land developers wrecking our reserves. The only one's benefitting are the crown and council, people lose out because the gentrification of our city is out of control, which fuels antisocial behaviour, etc. Housing sounds great in theory, but if it's little cramped flats and two storey 1-2bedroom places it's not a home, that's a cramped apartment with no outdoor space, no indoor space, no yard, no privacy, too close to others so noise becomes terrible and adds to the decline in happy neighbours and increases irritability, aggression, etc with others because there's no peace and no privacy. Leave the reserve alone.	Stop trying to sell our reserves to gentrify our city and cram everyone in like sardines, a house has a proper yard, is not in such close proximity to others and has privacy. Land developers can find somewhere else to buy up, or buy houses that are already built and do them up instead of taking our reserves away. Council only say they're underutilised as a way to sell off land that doesn't belong to them.	If the land is revoked, it will return to Crown ownership. While Council can apply to receive funding from any future sale of the land, approval is at the Minister's discretion and is not guaranteed.
NPR012	Francie	No		9810	No	No	3	Dont want it to be developed. Please leave as it is		
NPR013	Ashleigh hill	Yes	Newfield park school	9812	No	No	3	The kids absolutely love playing on that park after school. It builds up their mana and they are excited to go there. It would be sad to take it away.		
NPR014	Skye	No			No	No	3	Because kids still use this space and it's too close to the school for a housing development		
NPR015	John Johnstone	No		9810	No	No	3	Reserve are reserves full stop.Should not be sold.especially if it's for an exclusive ethnicity, racist obviously if this is intended. This should not be developed full stop.	The council has neglected these reserves, only basically maintained.The good old train and tank were great years ago.but removed by the woke brigade and fun police.The good days have been destroyed by council staff .	

Newfield Park, JG Ward and 38 Suir Street Hearings Deliberations - Public - Major Late Item - Newfield Park Revocation Deliberations

NPR016	John-William Barrow	No		9810	No	No	3	Keeping our reserves and play spaces is important, and I don't like to see it get sold off, especially to no profit to the council. I would support Option 1 over Option 2 however if anything were to go ahead.		
NPR017	Matthew Milner	No			No	No	3	I think we need to keep our open spaces and playgrounds		
NPR018	Genna Hayward	No		9879	No	No	1	We definitely need more housing although I'm not sure we need that many houses for disabled people (I'm not in the know in that area to know demand). But keeping some play space and building houses is a win win in an under used space that costs to upkeep.	If this is the option to go ahead I think the play equipment needs updating to ensure it is used.	If the Minister approves the revocation, the Council will not be able to decide what happens to the land. If the Council chooses to keep part of the land, we will carry out community consultation to understand what the community would like to see happen with that retained area.
NPR019	Carl McKenzie	No		9810	No	No	1	Low income families deserve decent housing & proximity to a school makes this a good site. The school fields should be able to fulfil any function the field is currently being used for as long as the playground is retained.	Please place a covenant on the land to ensure it will always be used for community housing & never sold to private real estate investors.	A covenant could be considered as an option
NPR020	Adena	No		9812	Yes	No	1	Because more housing is needed and im a disabled person with major health issues waiting on heart surgery and I may need one of these units at some stage		
NPR021	Courtney	No			Yes	No	3	Building on that land would disrupt the learning of the children at the school right next door. It took 4 months for a company to build 2 houses across the road from me and the noise was so freaking loud and disruptive. So if 20 or more houses were to be built there it would take what a year? How is that fair to the children at the school?	Get the tramway/Rockdale rd subdivision finished first!!! Thats a better idea	
NPR022	Kerstyn Dolamore	No		9812	No	No	1	Kids enjoy this space, would be nice to continue to have access to the playground. Some additional items would be great too.		
NPR023	Bronnie Jeynes	No		9812	Yes	No	3	Green spaces are incredibly important in urban environments and should be maintained and better utilised not disposed of Newfield Park provides well utilised walking access between local residential streets and a busy play area. It's green space provides a quiet area away from traffic as well as ecosystem services such as absorbing rain water and some limited habitat for native birds. A number of native birds (including ones who's names are used on the walkway system surrounding the park) utilise it over winter. Either disposing of the park or developing the majority of it would severely impact all of these aspects. As a local resident having this nearby green space is part of what attracted us to buy in the area and are looking to raise a family here. We regularly walk through and around Newfield Park with our dog and are certainly not the only ones who do. The numerous quiet cul-de-sac surrounding it make for great family living with kids often playing in the street when the park is too wet. Increased traffic through development would reduce the livability of the area and increase risk to the many kids who walk to the school and neighbouring kinder. Multiple studies have shown the importance of green spaces as sponges for water, cooling effects in warming urban environments and significant mental benefits to those who live nearby. These only become more important in the face of a growing urban population and climate change. Green spaces like Newfield Park should be treasured, not disposed of. I'd love to see the space better utilised, perhaps through planting and development of a wetland system, as the park is very wet already for large parts of the year, and would create great urban habitat for a wide range of native birds which is very much lacking in this part of Invercargill. Development would also likely severely impact drainage and cause signity issues for surrounding properties, many of which are low lying. Development would push the run off into these properties making their backyards unusable. Currently Newfield Park acts as a reasonable sponge holding a lot of water (much to the enjoyment of the ducks and plovers currently using it). In conclusion, while I agree that the space is underutilised, I believe that disposing of		
NPR024	Jill Sinclair	No		9810	No	No	1	Keeps some green space for recreational purposes, and access would not be from Wilfred Street which is a busy enough street with school traffic. More traffic to access subdivision would make this small street too busy for current residents.	Concerns of increased traffic (foot and vehicle traffic to access subdivision mixing with school traffic and parking which is busy enough with school traffic.	
NPR025	Marc	No			Yes	No	1	Parent of disabled teen, would love to see spaces created for those with disabilities to live a semi normal adult life		

Newfield Park, JG Ward and 38 Suir Street Hearings Deliberations - Public - Major Late Item - Newfield Park Revocation Deliberations

NPR026	Chris Malcolm	No			Yes	No	1	I acknowledge the proposed development will provide a positive social outcome for the community and help meet a need for inclusive housing. However, that does not change the fact that this is public reserve land that, once sold, is unlikely to ever be recovered for public use. Te Pare Kauka Ltd approached Council seeking to acquire this land and will be the primary beneficiary of the purchase and development. While the benefits may extend to the wider community, I do not believe ratepayers should be expected to fund subdivision, surveying, legal, or other costs associated with the sale. Those costs should be recovered through the sale price or otherwise met by the purchaser. Land within the city is a finite resource. Once reserve land is disposed of and developed, it is effectively gone forever. For that reason, I support retaining a portion of the reserve while still enabling the proposed development to proceed. Retaining the remaining area would preserve a public connection between the two streets, maintain some open-space value for the neighbourhood, and provide a buffer between the school and the new development. In my view, Option 1 provides a better balance between achieving the housing outcome and retaining public reserve land for future generations.		If the Minister was to approve revocation of the land, it would be handed over to LINZ/Department of Conservation to decide what is done with it. If part is retained Council will undertake public engagement to understand in more detail what the community might like for the area retained.
NPR027	Martyn Grace	No		9810	Yes	No	1	As a prior parent to kids at Newfield park, a prior teacher aide at Newfield park and now a teacher at Newfield kindergarten I have seen this area in used for a decade now. As I see it, it is a massively underused area. The play area at one end is loved and use by whanau and tamariki, but the main grass area seems to exist as a reason to use the large lawn mowing tractor. Diverse open Green spaces are a valuable part of a healthy, urban area. There are plenty of open fields in and around the area. An ideal use of this area would be a regenerative urban forest or low scrub. I understand the financial constraints on planting out every potential wildlife haven instead of moving it into grass clippings. More low cost housing is needed and close to schools, busses, etc. Revoke the reserve status on the main part of the field for low cost housing development, but retain a play area that helps connect the community, perhaps with some more native tree/flaxes.	Question: How much does it cost to mow this area each year verses the cost of subdivision and park equipment movement?	There has been a report done with an analysis of planting Newfield Park and the carbon credits it could gain which is part of the deliberations
NPR028	Kim Brown	No		9812	Yes	No	3	I grew up in Auckland and watched a lot of our green space get filled. It was devastating and now the jumbled, squashed over crowded city is a disgrace. Surely we have plenty of derelict areas we could be cleaning up and repurposing before destroying more. I know growth and development is popular but they come with their own pressures... Invercargill's infrastructure is not ready for the growth that seems to be heading our way..		
NPR029	Jena Young	No		9812	Yes	No	3	Keeps the space as is - for community use. Unsure how new builds will change the area. Also being right by the school.		
NPR030	Bruce and Denise Halligan							This area does seem pretty underutilised. However by the same token when gone from the public estate it's gone forever -there is not much detail on the entity which wishes to acquire this area in the material provided nor their intended use. While it sounds a good use, we consider that if it is going to be preferentially disposed of then the subsequent residential units should be available to all the ethnicities . We also consider that there should be some future guardrails so that it remains for housing for elderly and those living with disabilities . - we would favour Option 1 as it retains some land in public ownership including where the play equipment is currently		If the Minister was to approve revocation of the land, it would be handed over to LINZ/Department of Conservation to decide what is done with it. If part is retained Council will undertake public engagement to understand in more detail what the community might like for the area retained.
NPR031	Richard Little	No		9810	No	No	3	I think reserve land should remain reserve land. Once gone we won't get it back.	No	
NPR032	Amelia	No		9812	No	No	3	This green space is well used by local residents every day, with many people walking and exercising their dogs there. It provides an important open area for the neighbourhood and is especially valuable given its location next to a school. Once this land is developed, it cannot be replaced. I encourage the Council to protect this space and consider alternative locations for housing that do not result in the loss of a well-used community asset.	I believe enhancing this public space would provide long-term benefits for the community and be a worthwhile investment for current and future generations. Like a better playground, pump track, native trees, picnic areas, dog park, paved walking track etc.	
NPR033	Danielle Jenkins	No		9812	Yes	No	3	My child attends the primary school there (Newfield Park school) for 1 the street connecting is already majorly congested at school pick up and drop off time and this would only make it worse and 2 im extremely concerned about the types of people that would be going into these housing as they would be around primary school children and also kindergarten children often the types of people that go into the housing built in my opinion aren't good people to be in such close facility to young children often they smoke drugs drive their cars fast and generally keep these places in awful condition...the list goes on im extremely concerned for the safety of the children who attend the primary school and kindergarten.	Nope i think i've covered if my main concern is the children and rightfully so.	traffic management could be assessed as part of any future development requests
NPR034	Laura Williams	No		9810	Yes	No	1	This is a space a lot of people use to let their dogs have a run. Retaining some of the park would be beneficial for this purpose. The school field and playground is accessible for kids for weekend and after school recreation. For its location and size, it would be great to see affordable housing in this space - though I would not support reduction of reserves like Elizabeth Park or the other small parks that are located further away from the school as every child should be within easy walking distance of a park.	The greatest need for Invercargill's population is housing suitable for our aging population so PLEASE make sure these houses will be wheelchair friendly and suitable for older people long term. Selling off parks for private investment is not worth it as once they are gone they are gone, but if it serves the needs of the community it can sometimes be worth the sacrifice. If the park is to go, make sure it's worth the loss.	If the Minister was to approve revocation of the land, it would be handed over to LINZ/Department of Conservation to decide what is done with it. If part is retained Council will undertake public engagement to understand in more detail what the community might like for the area retained.
NPR035	Alyce Taylor	Yes	Newfield Park School	9812	Yes	No	1	To avoid residential housing bordering the school which is a risk to children safety and learning. Also poses a large traffic and congestion risk to the school traffic which is already quite high.	This is a good use of the space but appropriate area needs left bordering the school as this is a community space and needs protected as council housing would pose its own risk in this area as seen on centre st outside the shop already.	If the Minister was to approve revocation of the land, it would be handed over to LINZ/Department of Conservation to decide what is done with it. If part is retained Council will undertake public engagement to understand in more

Newfield Park, JG Ward and 38 Suir Street Hearings Deliberations - Public - Major Late Item - Newfield Park Revocation Deliberations

NPR036	Mark Doggett	No			No	No	1	I don't think you could have access from Wilfrid st. it would all need to be via centre st. to keep the kids safe entering school as much as you can. We do need more housing, and I don't think that park gets a huge amount of use. Just wouldn't want it to be a slum, as all those streets around there take great pride in their houses.	Why not just sub divide the land and sell it to people who may want to buy a section and build a nice modest house	If the Minister was to approve revocation of the land, it would be handed over to LINZ/Department of Conservation to decide what is done with it. If part is retained Council will undertake public engagement to understand in more
NPR037	Nikki	No		9810	No	No	3	You want to take parks away from our children all so you a build houses that won't even house us. They will be given to immigrants. Do you really think taking land from our children is worth the money you will make from them?!		
NPR038	Olivia	No		9812	No	No	3	This playground was part of my childhood and playing there was so fun I would like to keep the area as it is, so one day I can bring other children to experience what I did. Also I think it's better to have the alleyway without houses along it as there is many children walking down there each day.		
NPR039	Vanessa Witt	No		9812	Yes	No	1	I have spent quite a bit of time staying with family in a rental property near the end of Wilfrid Street. As such, I have been a frequent user of the playground with my grandchildren and other young family members. I also observed other children from the neighbourhood making frequent use of the playground. From what I observed, it is not necessary to retain the entire grassed area for community use, but there is a definite benefit to retaining a portion that includes the playground, as proposed in Option 1. Using the remaining underutilised land for community housing seems like a good use for the land.		If the Minister was to approve revocation of the land, it would be handed over to LINZ/Department of Conservation to decide what is done with it. If part is retained Council will undertake public engagement to understand in more detail what the community might like for the area retained.
NPR040	Abby Prendergast	No		9810	Yes	No	1	I support using part of Newfield Park for Te Kāwai while retaining an area for public recreational purposes. Our community needs both recreational spaces, and housing that provides long-term social benefits. These shouldn't be looked at as competing priorities. I believe there is an opportunity to achieve both in the Newfield Park area. The project by Te Pare Kouiko Ltd appears to have the potential to benefit local people for years to come. Supporting a project like this would demonstrate the council's commitment to meeting the changing needs of both Kaumātua and Rangatahi of our community. At the same time, as a youth mental health nurse, I recognise the importance of parks to provide opportunities for tamariki to play and for the wider community to enjoy. For these reasons, I encourage the council - if possible - to take a balanced approach revoking part of Newfield Park for Te Kāwai but retaining some land to protect the recreational space. I believe this approach best reflects the needs of our community without losing valuable recreational space.		If the Minister was to approve revocation of the land, it would be handed over to LINZ/Department of Conservation to decide what is done with it. If part is retained Council will undertake public engagement to understand in more detail what the community might like for the area retained.
NPR041	Matina	No		9810	Yes	No	3	Council reserves are meant to be just that - reserved from use.		
NPR042	Autumn Walsh	No		9810	Yes	No	3	I believe this land could be used for other purposes, as next to a primary school. Having make it a football field, rugby field etc.	By all means I don't love option one, but I hate option two. Dozens of kids play on the play set after school while waiting for caregivers to pick them up. I believe should be kept.	
NPR043	murray	No		9810	No	No	2	sell and use the funds elsewhere	no	
NPR044	Mark	No		9812	No	No	3	Great for the kids.no need to be so built up in this area		
NPR045	Kimberly McClenaghan	No			No	No	1	I think it is important to keep some of the reserve in place		
NPR046	Caleb Honiss	No		9812	Yes	Yes	2	Invercargill has over 3000ha of parks and reserves. I live close by three of them (within a 800m radius) and out of those three only one is used and even then-not very often. My four children probably use it more than anyone else in the neighbourhood. As a city we have far to many parks and reserves sucking millions of dollars of maintenance every year from the taxpayer. This is not a good outcome for the city or the ratepayer as we could and should be spending this money on necessary infrastructure maintenance or paying off debt. It would be great to see more parks sold off and the money used to upgrade the existing parks that do get used or to be earmarked for paying off debt and or maintenance.	I am a property developer based in Invercargill and have completed multiple small subdivisions throughout the city. I have scoped the property for subdivision. - If you were to complete Option 1 there would be no proper road access to the remainder of the land and you would not be able to yield enough lots to make the subdivision feasible. -The only way to make the subdivision a viable option is to continue the road and infrastructure from Wilfrid St. The road access from Center St is not wide enough to achieve a subdivision other than a small handful of lots. -If you were to sell the site with Option 1, as a developer you would have to pay me to take the land as it would cost more to develop than the potential sale of the sites. Certainly by the time the council removed reserve status and subdivided the front portion you would have cost more money than the sale of the remainder of the site -Therefore the only viable option is to either do everything, or do nothing. Doing nothing however, is not a good result for the city and the already overburdened rate payers.	If the Minister was to approve revocation of the land, it would be handed over to LINZ/Department of Conservation to decide what is done with it. If part is retained Council will undertake public engagement to understand in more detail what the community might like for the area retained.

Newfield Park, JG Ward and 38 Suir Street Hearings Deliberations - Public - Major Late Item - Newfield Park Revocation Deliberations

NPR047	Mary Grant	No		9810	Yes	No	1	I have lived with Newfield Park at the end of my street for over 30 years. Having a swing and a green space at the end of the street has been great for my children, grandchildren and numerous other children of all ages that use the playground equipment, limited as it is, and park area most days. It is useful to have a link through to Lime Street from Wilfrid Street that can be used within school hours. Serious drainage work will need to be done whichever option is chosen with larger water drainage for Wilfrid/Centre Street. Wilfrid Street is a low point in the area so water drains towards Metzger and there is serious water issues at my neighbour's house at 60 Metzger Street with water coming up out of their drains when there is heavy rain. Any work being undertaken at Newfield Park must include larger drainage pipes for Wilfrid Street to stop this happening. If Option 1 is chosen drainage would need to be undertaken in the remaining park area. Historically Newfield School has used the park for some sports events but it has been too wet and is mainly a home for ducks and oyster catchers in the Winter. The Park is part of the "Low Mow" option which is fine but areas around the play equipment can't be allowed to grow and then the longer grass mown and left lying around. There is no rubbish bin in the area so any paper rubbish just gets cut up with the long grass. I picked up a bag of rubbish about 2 months ago, which was left by some of the local teenagers, and took it home and put it in my wheelie bin. There is always rubbish left around the playground area and it would be a good idea to reinstate a rubbish bin in the play area. I would also like the park bench seat retained and maintained.	The Proposal sheet that was dropped in my letterbox didn't make sense. Option 1 says "...retain some land for continued access and play from Nicol Street to Lime Street" I don't think the walkway to Centre Street is included in this proposal as the Newfield Kindergarten still needs access via the walkway and there is direct street access from Lime to Nicol Street.	If the Minister was to approve revocation of the land, it would be handed over to LINZ/Department of Conservation to decide what is done with it. If part is retained Council will undertake public engagement to understand in more detail what the community might like for the area retained. Access and traffic would be addressed through the development proposal process.
NPR048	Katherine Ellen Amos	No		9812	No	No	3	I feel green spaces should be protected in our city. It's nice to have a bit of breathing room and enjoy the fresh air. Also, as a parent with children at both Newfield school and Newfield kindy, I feel the building process (construction vehicles, noise, materials being moved in and out, etc.) would cause distraction and disruptions for the students and their learning. We also walk to school and kindy each morning, and we use the alley way to access them. I'm worried this development would make it harder/unsafe to use with workers/builders around. And lastly, if the project were to go ahead and people were living so close to the school/kindy, I would want to make sure there is no risk to the children.		
NPR049	Alisa Cole	No		9812	Yes	No	3	There isn't any information to make a informed decision. What are you actually asking the community to agree to.		
NPR050	Rob Cole	No		9812	No	No	3	There isn't the information on what you are actually asking. What would you like but not the reason. There could be so many problems especially for the school. Access and drainage would be two concerns as well how would be living there and what impacts that could have.		
NPR051	Linda Stevens	No		9812	Yes	No	3	Because there is so many places that have submissions for subdivision that haven't been actioned (by the Marae for example) we don't need to mess ground next to school. Before we agree to anything some real information would be needed with what the use of the land would actually be. Access would need to be carefully considered with Wilfrid Street not being able to support any extra traffic.		
NPR052	Chelsea Stevens	No		9812	No	No	1	Because its a wasted space otherwise, and I think having a small amount of kaumatua housing or something similar would be good. I also think there needs to be some grass space left to separate the school from whatever new buildings are erected.	If there is to be new building erected in this space, surely the council will work with the school to ensure that it will remain a safe area for children coming and going from school. Perhaps making the new buildings accessible from Centre St only	If the Minister was to approve revocation of the land, it would be handed over to LINZ/Department of Conservation to decide what is done with it. If part is retained Council will undertake public engagement to understand in more detail what the community might like for the area retained. Access and traffic would be addressed through the development proposal process.
NPR053	Bronwyn	Yes	Newfield Primary School	9812	No	No	3	I support this option because it would have a big impact on the children and sounding family that currently occupy this space/area and no good reasons have been given for these decisions.	No	
NPR054	Joanne Carson	No		9810	Yes	No	1	I grew up in Nichol Street I know and appreciate the value of having that park there lots of kids in the area played there after school and in the weekends all the kids in the community would gather there I know lots of friendships were formed. We have fond memories of the Newfield park & we still talk about the Train & Canon & hijinks that we used to get up to they were fun times please retain some community play area for future generations to enjoy.	Retaining some ground for a unique dedicated play area would give the best of both worlds.	
NPR055	Ben Finn	No		9812	Yes	No	2	It's sitting there doing nothing. Might as well build some affordable housing on it and no point keeping some as you'll have to continue to maintain it.		

Newfield Park, JG Ward and 38 Suir Street Hearings Deliberations - Public - Major Late Item - Newfield Park Revocation Deliberations

NPR056	Sonya Carey	Yes	Newfield Park School	9812	Yes	Yes	3	Any changes in the reserve status of Newfield Park and subsequent use of the land as a result will have a direct impact on the school and its operation. Newfield Park School board notes we are not aware of any meaningful attempt by Council to invest in, promote, or enhance the reserve to increase community use. The Reserve Act purpose refers not only to recreational use, but also recreational potential, whether active or passive, as a relevant consideration under the Act. Consultation material does not explain whether the apparent underutilisation of Newfield Park has been influenced by obvious drainage or stormwater issues. The apparent underutilisation of Newfield Park should not, by itself, be treated as evidence that the reserve is no longer required. The proposed change in use of land, including the potential of up to 22 residential units on the site, raises a number of concerns for the board: In the case of any possible future development, there are already significant drainage issues related to this park. How will these be addressed and what impact will this have on the school? There are already significant traffic flow and parking issues that impinge on the school operation connected to Wilfrid Street, Centre Street and also Lime Street, given traffic may increase across all these entrances depending on future plans. The park is used by members of the public for commuting. If this is not available, there is a likelihood that this would increase foot traffic through the school grounds. The potential impact of increased vandalism, graffiti and inappropriate behaviour on the school grounds is both a financial and social cost for the school community. The section of the walkway from Centre Street to Wilfrid Street gets plenty of foot traffic, with both kindergarten and school drop offs, travelling backwards and forwards to high schools, and other recreational uses such as dog walking. It is unclear how any changes in the park would impact on the walkway use. Newfield Park School board recognises potential community benefits of additional housing for kaumātua and tangata whaikaha that are appropriately located. Newfield Park School board notes that the information provided per option is insufficient to make a considered decision about the impact on the community and in particular on the local primary school. Newfield Park School board proposes Option 3. Do nothing until further information can be provided on the	Newfield Park School board acknowledges the purpose of this consultation is in regards to the reserve status of land and many of the concerns held in relation to the justification for option 1 and 2 would also be subject to additional approval processes. The Board wishes to make it clear that if the decision maker is of mind to grant option 1 or 2 in this instance, the Council shall take this as notice that any future development proposed is requested to duly consider Newfield Park School board to be notified as an affected party, providing the opportunity to further input and involvement.	If the Minister was to approve revocation of the land, it would be handed over to LINZ/Department of Conservation to decide what is done with it.
NPR057	Invercargill City Youth Council	No		9810	Yes	Yes	2	Youth Council feel that the current reserve of Newfield Park is "under-utilised" by the surrounding community according to the report to elected members in 2013 listing green spaces for potential disposal. Youth Council understand that the green space is often muddy and impassable/unusable throughout certain times of the year. It is within close proximity to the already popular and amenity-strong Elizabeth Park, Dome Street Reserve, Kinnmont Playground, and a variety of others, therefore providing alternative green spaces nearby. Having Newfield Park School so close, would be a positive convenience for new residents within the proposed community housing development. There are also four secondary schools within the general vicinity of Newfield Park. Rugby Park and multiple churches are also within walking distance, catering to multiple demographics, and therefore contributing to the cultural vibrancy of the city. Compared to Option 1, Option 2 allows for a greater footprint for potential development allowing for the proposed residential buildings to be more spread out, benefitting wellbeing of the residents and eliminate the need for costly subdivision of the land area.	Youth Council would like to suggest that there is purpose given to a natural buffer, such as a tree-line, in-between Newfield Park School/alley way and any future subdivision to reduce potential disturbances and noise pollution. If the Council has the ability to make a recommendation to the Crown/DOC/LINZ on a preferred entity to obtain the land following revocation, Youth Council suggest that Te Pare Kauka, who provided the original proposal for the land, is that entity. It is suggested that the former reserve be zoned for residential use for low density homes only and not commercially zoned.	If the Minister was to approve revocation of the land, it would be handed over to LINZ/Department of Conservation to decide what is done with it.
NPR058	Jess Chalmers			9812	Yes	No	3	We need all the green spaces for future generations and the neighbourhoods		
NPR059	Patrick James Burrows				No	No	3	I feel there are not enough reserves in the town as it is - We are nothing without our bonding with nature - Please leave the Reserve as it is		
NPR060	Carolyn and Tony Weston				Yes	Yes	3	This is the closest park to our house and the only park Carolyn can walk to. It is the largest park in our neighbourhood, the other playgrounds being pocket-sized parks. We first bought a house in Dome St in 1985 and our two sons grew up in Newfield. We have fond memories of Newfield Park and enjoyed the grass, trees and play equipment. We object to the whole or part of Newfield Park being sold to build a subdivision. We need to treasure green areas within our suburbs. Recent research concludes, people need access to green areas and bird songs within their neighbourhood. These parklands decrease the level of stress within individuals. This research showed that when people are in built-up areas with lots of traffic and other noises, their stress levels increase. It also showed having plenty of parks in a city creates a healthy environment. There used to be a line of trees along the lane from Dome St to Centre St but these have been cut-down. We also need to provide some trees to help with climate changes. Recently, we learnt from South Alive, no fruit and nut trees are growing in Newfield. It would be great if the Fruit and Nut Trees Group were able to plant some fruit and nut trees in Newfield Park so those of us living in Newfield can easily access crop from these trees. After rain, when walking over the grass in Newfield Park, the ground was very soft and mucky. Having some trees in the park would help to drain some of the excess water. If this land is subdivided, how much drainage would need to be done, prior to the ground being suitable for building on? Has a land surveyor studied the suitability of building on this land? In your consultation document, you advice that Newfield Park is Crown Land. If the land is no longer required by the Crown we understand Ngai Tahu has the first chance to use the land for their own purposes. Your document suggests that you would sell the land then give Ngai Tahu the funds from the sale. You need to check the law about that. Council must insure that when planning and building social houses for disabled people, these homes are fully accessible, be integrated into a general neighbourhood and comply with UNCRRDP and "Enabling Good Lives ideology".		If the Minister was to approve revocation of the land, it would be handed over to LINZ/Department of Conservation to decide what is done with it.

Council is considering options for partial or full disposal of Newfield Park.

Newfield Park is located in South Invercargill, at 83 Wilfrid Street, and is also accessible via Centre, Totara and Nichol Street's. The 1.8 hectare land parcel is located at the end of a cul-de-sac, with Newfield Park Primary School and Newfield Kindergarten adjoining the northern boundary and residential housing surrounding the remaining parameter of the reserve. It forms part of a walkway network running north to south between Tweed Street and Elizabeth Park.

Acquired through the crown, the reserve is currently classified as a recreation reserve and zoned Residential 1, which is consistent with surrounding housing. The reserve features an open grassed area, with some play equipment installed in the north-west corner of the section. The proposal to revoke some, or all of the site aims to enable alternative community outcomes, including potential housing or other developments. The land has been included on the list of underutilised green spaces for potential disposal, first identified to Elected Members in 2013. In 2025 Council was approached by Te Pare Kauika Ltd with a proposal to build up to 22 residential units on the site, purpose built housing suitable for local kaumātua and tangata whaikaha (those living with disability)

The Options

Public feedback is being sought as part of the decision-making process. The options Council are considering are

Option 1. Revoke approx 1.3 ha and retain approx 0.5 ha (shaded area) - retain some land for continued access and play from Nichol Street to Lime Street. This will enable further activation of the remaining space for recreation purposes, including the existing play items, seat and the access through from Wilfrid to Lime Streets. Subdivision will be required to enable this option, at a cost.



Option 2. Revoke 1.8 ha - revoke all of the reserve land and hand over to DOC/LINZ for processing. This will mean relocating Council assets (play items and seat).



Option 3. Do nothing

For options 1 or 2 to progress, the Council would need to initiate the process to:

- Have its reserve status formally revoked
- Be approved by the Minister of Conservation before any sale or change in use

Following revocation of all, or part of, the reserve, the land would become Crown land available for disposal by LINZ/Crown (via MoC and DOC). If the Crown decides not to retain this land under their ownership, the Rights of First Refusal process under the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998 commences.

Proceeds from sale of lands acquired by the Crown, will be dealt with through Land Information New Zealand (LINZ). LINZ processes the sale of land on behalf of the Crown once Council completes the revocation process (following Council proposal to Minister of Conservation and approval from the Minister). Council does not receive the revenue received from the sale of Crown derived land, however it may be able to apply for compensation.

No final decision has been made – community feedback will help inform whether the proposal proceeds and for Council to consider whether there are any reserve values which will inform the decision making process.

Share your thoughts on the submission form below, consultation closes at 5pm, Friday 7 August

A6378146

Process of revocation of reserve status and disposal

The statutory process for reserve revocation is laid down in section 24 of the Reserves Act 1977 (the Reserves Act).

The information below is intended to assist Councils, outlining the process which meets the requirements of the Reserves Act. It applies where a Council, as an administering body of a reserve, initiates the reserve revocation process under s24(1)(b) of the Reserves Act.

Make decision to begin process

1. Council to consider if there is little or no reserve values of land pursuant to the purposes set out in section 3 of the Reserves Act.
2. Complete a land status check to determine the land is a reserve under the Reserves Act and if it was acquired by Council or if ownership was derived from the Crown.
3. Is the property leased? What are the terms and is there a right to cancel?
4. Determine that the Council is the administering body of the reserve
5. In the case of a reserve not derived from the Crown, Council may dispose of the land after revocation is approved and gazetted (and subject to any conditions therein). If the reserve is derived from the Crown, disposal will be undertaken subject to statutory process and the provisions of the Land Act 1948.
6. Council should consult with iwi/mana whenua at this stage.

Note; if iwi has a right of first refusal as per treaty settlement legislation, make a note of this and advise the Department of Conservation at the application stage (step 13). The Crown will make an offer to iwi at a later date, if the revocation proceeds and the land becomes available for disposal.

Following decision to proceed

7. If Council decides to proceed with revocation, consult the Commissioner as required (s24(1)(b) and (if required) work with DOC on the proposal and process moving forward before proceeding with public notification. The following information should be provided to DOC:

- Location and Land status check/report
- Reason for revocation, assessment of reserve values and Councils reasoning that it is surplus to the purposes of the Reserves Act.
- If Council derived, identify the intended manner and purpose of disposal (s25(1)) – this being a decision under the current MOC delegations to Council.



Department of
Conservation
Te Papa Atawhai

New Zealand Government

8. After response received from the Commissioner, make a recommendation to the Council on the revocation and seek approval to give public notice (s24(2)).
9. Council to resolve as administering body that, for the reasons stated in the resolution, the reservation of the reserve should be revoked (s24(1)(b)) subject to the outcome of public notification.
10. Carry out additional iwi/mana whenua consultation if further consultation is required.
11. Arrange public notice – at least one month (s24(2)(c)).

Note; public notice must be in accordance with s119 of the Reserves Act (in at least one newspaper circulating in the area that the reserve is located). Best practice to also include notice on Council website.

Consideration and disposal process

12. Under s24(2)c Council is to consider feedback from iwi and content of the objections based on Council Officer recommendations and make a resolution.

Note: When considering a reserve revocation application, the Department of Conservation needs to see evidence that the objections have been given fair and reasonable consideration, such as a report or table with objections and responses from a Council Officer or an independent committee to the Council.

13. If Council resolves to proceed with the revocation, fill in Department of Conservation's Statutory Land Management Application Forms. These can be found on Department of Conservation's website: Statutory land management application forms (doc.govt.nz)

Note; there are two forms to complete:

- General application form: <https://www.doc.govt.nz/globalassets/documents/about-doc/slm/statutory-land-management-application-form.docx>
- Reserves Act consent form: <https://www.doc.govt.nz/globalassets/documents/about-doc/slm/statutory-land-management-application-form-1b.docx>

Along with application forms, provide Department of Conservation with the relevant documentation including iwi consultation, a copy of public notification, resolution, any submissions and objections received and a copy of Council's consideration of objections

14. Under s24(2)(e), the Minister is required to consider content of any objections and be able to conclude the administering body has given fair and reasonable consideration to the subject matter, with regard given to the classification and purpose of the reserve and considering the wider function and purposes of the Reserves Act.

15. Receive Department of Conservation's decision. Notify affected parties. If revocation is approved, Department of Conservation arranges for a Gazette Notice and will provide a copy to Council.

Note; if the reserve is Crown derived, the Department of Conservation may wait until further along the LINZ Crown disposal process before publishing the Gazette Notice.

16. If the reserve is Crown derived, the Department of Conservation will engage a LINZ accredited supplier to manage the disposal.

17. If the reserve is Council derived, Council to arrange disposal (if appropriate) in accordance with Council practice and in compliance with the manner and purpose of disposal as specified by MOC or delegated authority in the Gazette Notice.

PROPOSED SALE OF JG WARD / 38 SUIR STREET DELIBERATIONS

To:	Hearings Panel
Meeting Date:	Thursday 24 September 2026
From:	Cassie Horton – Interim Manager Strategy – Parks and Recreation
Approved:	Rex Capil - Group Manager - Community Spaces and Places
Approved Date:	Tuesday 22 September 2026
Open Agenda:	Yes
Public Excluded Agenda:	No

Purpose and Summary

This report provides the Hearing Panel the submissions to the proposed sale of part JG Ward and 38 Suir Street, with Council officer responses, along with an analysis of the submissions and hearings, to assist the hearings panel in their deliberations to sell part of JG Ward and all of 38 Suir Street.

Recommendations

That the Hearings Panel:

1. Receives the report 'Proposed sale of JG Ward / 38 Suir Street Deliberations'.
2. Receives the summary of submissions with Council officer responses.
3. Considers the matters raised by submitters to the proposal.

Recommends to the Community and Regulatory Committee that it:

4. Notes the Council Officer responses within the summary of submissions and, utilising this information, accepts / declines objections (*delete one*)
5. Proceed or not proceed (*delete one*) to sell part of JG Ward and all of 38 Suir Street.
6. Requests the Chief Executive to obtain a registered valuation of Lot 1 DP 15073, Lot 15 DP 4386, and prepare the lots for sale in accordance with Council Disposal Policy.

Background

Consultation on the proposal for the sale of part of JG Ward and 38 Suir Street was undertaken 3 July – 7 August 2026. Following the closing of submissions, hearings were held on 15 September 2026. This report provides an analysis of submissions and hearings, as well as council officer responses for the hearings panel to deliberate on the part sale of JG Ward and all of 38 Suir Street.

Issues and Options

Analysis

Submissions were available online through letstalk.icc.govt.nz, via email, by post, or dropped into Te Hinaki Civic Building, the Public Library, and Bluff Service Centre. Letter drops were undertaken at surrounding residents.

Consultation was also undertaken with Mana Whenua, with no submissions received.

15 (58%) submitters were Bluff residents, while the reminder 11 (42%) were Invercargill residents, or provided no response to the postcode. Submissions were received either via Let's Talk (15), an event held in Bluff (9), or email (2).

Submissions and hearings are now being reported back through this report to Council for a final decision regarding the intention to allow for disposal of land.

Two options were presented to the community:

Option One - Support the proposal to sell the land.

Option Two - Do not support the proposal to sell the land.

Twelve submitters support the proposal and ten do not support the proposal. Four did not answer whether they supported / did not support.

Hearings

Two people presented their feedback to a hearings panel on 15 September 2026.

Submissions

A summary of key points are outlined below. Officer responses to submissions are provided in the summary of submissions:

In Support

Overall, supporters generally accepted the sale of the surplus land on the basis that proceeds would be reinvested into a more attractive, functional, and community-focused reserve, with common requests for playgrounds, toilets, landscaping, visitor amenities and community input into the final design.

Reasons for supporting the proposal are:

- 6 out of 12 (50%) mentioned provision opportunities for community amenities and facilities e.g., toilets, storytelling, play and facilities/amenities
- 4 out of 12 (33%) mentioned matters of reserve activation and beautification

Not in support

Reasons for not supporting the proposal are:

6 out of ten (60%) of objectors mentioned loss of public green space / reserve land, with specific points being

- It would be a loss for Bluff.
- Keep as much land as can – do not get rid of green spaces.

3 (30%) mentioned the reserve should be upgraded rather than sold, with key reasons being

- Keep as reserve and add improvements.
- Community landmark space.
- Find money elsewhere for upgrades – do not use from sale.
- Restore as native bush/wetland.

3 (30%) mentioned environmental or contamination concerns.

Next Steps

Following the deliberations of the hearing panel, recommendations will be presented to the Community and Regulatory Committee for a decision.

Attachments

Attachment 1 - Summary of Submissions (Doc Set ID 9547790)

Attachment 2 - Let's Talk Content (Doc Set ID 11287138)

Attachment 3 - Carbon credits report (Doc Set ID 11287700)

Attachment 4 - ICC Disposal Policy (Doc Set ID 787192)

Newfield Park, JG Ward and 38 Suir Street Hearings Deliberations - Public - Major Late Item - Proposed sale of JG Ward / 38 Suir Street Del...

Submission Number	Source	Q1 (Name)	Q2 (Organisation)	Q5 (Postcode)	Q6 (Do you want to receive emails from council about future consultations?)	Q7 (Do you want to speak to elected members about your submission at a hearing?)	Q8 (Do you support the proposal?)	Q9 (What is your feedback on the proposal?)	Q10 (Is there anything else that you want to tell us?)	Council Officer Response
JGW001	Let's Talk	John Winter	Bluff resident	9814	Yes	Yes	No	This sale will seriously affect my property of 30 Suir Street as the vehicle access to mine and adjacent properties is at the rear and via the proposed sale area. This would decrease the property values. Also major services to properties bordering the sale area including Water, Power and Sewage are fed through this area and relocation of such services would not be cost effective. The sale are is also prone to flooding with no provision for runoff. As such it stays water logged until the water evaporates or sinks into the ground.	An access path or driveway exists entering from Suir Street between 34 and 38 Suir Street and runs between the two properties and across the back of 34; 30; 24 and 20 Suir Street. This provides access to the garage of Number 34; the driveway of Number 30 and access to Numbers 24 and 20. This driveway has existed for many years and is partly graveled. It is visible on Google Maps.	The land would be disposed of via the disposal policy and so all considerations to this would be undertaken as due diligence by both Council and the purchaser. A valuation would be presented to Council as part of this. There are no known records of services under the land, including drainage infrastructure. There are opportunities to place a Right of Way easement over the land on the title if it proceeds to subdivision and sale. The wet conditions may be caused by natural runoff patterns within the area.
JGW002	Let's Talk	Valerie Dearman	Public	9812	Yes	No	Yes	Bluff needs a family picnic space where residents and visitors can gather. Visitors to Bluff including an increasing number of tourists would appreciate a gathering area for rest	Instead of selling the yellow area turn it into an amenities area and park for camper vans etc	
JGW003	Let's Talk	Trinity Goodall	Resident of bluff	9814	Yes	No	No	Leave the area alone fundraiser to make the whole thing a reserve	Leave our reserves alone	
JGW004	Let's Talk	Jimmy Nuetral		9814	No	No	No	While most of the idea is good in theory, mainly the re invigorating of the corner reserve area, I don't believe sale of the land at the rear is a great long term action for Bluff. The current reserve definitely needs a tidy up and replant / landscape to make it a more appealing space from the main road as currently it is just an overgrown eyesore. Perhaps with that area appropriately cleaned up, lights for the statue, bench seats etc it would appeal and attract to more visitors and locals alike. Maybe then the rear reserve could be better utilized down the track as a playground/green space as there is very few of those at the west side of town. Food for thought, would obviously require fundraising and/or council to jump on board to help achieve that over time.	Good luck!	Revitalising the land with greater focus on the statue and amenity improvements is considered a viable option. Funds from the sale of part of the land will contribute to future opportunities for the remaining land.
JGW005	Let's Talk	Bob		9814	No	No	Yes	Get rid of it and build a decent play area for kids. I hope the land attracts a lot of interest and fetches a good price.	There has been little investment in this area apart from mowing lawns for a very long time it seems. About time for an update.	
JGW006	Let's Talk	Jason (Jack) Kini		9814	Yes	No	Yes	Makes sense, the area you are looking to sell has been idle for the 45 years I've lived here	As long as there is transparency about how much it sells for and what happens with the funds I don't see any issue	
JGW007	Let's Talk	John Kissell		9814	Yes	No	Yes	I would hope the Bluff community had a lot of say in how the reserve space was utilised if a sale of the other parcel of land went through.		There will be further consultation with the Bluff Community Board and the community if the decision to sell part and refurbish the balance of the land is made
JGW008	Let's Talk	Nicola		9814	No	No	No	Leave it alone. You closed the boat ramp and build one to make money of the community. Now you want to sell land, to what developers and we all know you won't put that money back into the land. Just like we know you won't put the thousands you make from boat ramp back into it. Why is the community board allowing this. We voted you in for a reason. Fix the stuff that's broken before you brake more stuff	This council and community board I'm not doing the jobs that they voted into today especially the Bluff community board stand for your community not from for the politicians office	Any sale proceeds are intended to be reinvested into upgrading the remaining land. As land was reserved as endowment in aid of Borough funds, Council is required to comply with this.
JGW009	Event	Nicky Fewster			Yes	No	Yes	Public Toilets. Fencing around park. Make it fun, friendly for everyone to use.		
JGW010	Event	Danielle Stanley and Tessa Scobie		9810			Yes			
JGW011	Event	Charlie, Aly						A shore rock and some pictures of the history of waitangi		
JGW012	Event	Lee Fewster		9814	Yes	No	Yes	Great idea. Get ride of unkept sections		
JGW013	Event	Trixie Bull		9812	No	No	Yes	whakaaro pai tenell! (this is a good idea)		
JGW014	Event	Tylah (Age 11)						More toilets. Flying Fox		
JGW015	Event	Hezenlin (Age 10)						More toilets.		
JGW016	Event	Piper (Age 10)						Slides. Indoor swimming pool		
JGW017	Event	Kiri Pudda			Yes	No	Yes	Great idea! Toilets and appropriate fencing would be beneficial		
JGW018	Email	Alison Patrick			no	no	yes	Sell the land and use the money to make a viable space for everyone		
JGW019	Let's Talk	Elaine Goodall		9814	Yes	No	No	Comments on the Bluffys Positive Vibes Only page would suggest the community as a whole are against this proposal. While it would be nice to see this area looking tidier, the council already does not look after other areas in Bluff as it should so why add to the list? We do not need another playground as almost no one uses the one we already have. There is plenty of room along the side of the main road where the foodie vans park, for people to stop and picnic etc so there's no need for this type of space either.	If the sale must go ahead, maybe the money should be used to provide much needed carparking and toilet facilities at the new boat ramp as promised. There are enough empty sections and derelict properties in Bluff now that council should be acting on without providing space for more. There are people who live in that area who were told 'its a Reserve and will never be sold/built on'. So keep that promise!	Suggestion noted that any proceeds be used for alternative community infrastructure improvements. As it is endowment funding, the funds are legally required to comply with the purpose they were set to do. Not all the land will be sold, however in order to make it better for the community there needs to be investment and to ensure the land is able to be prioritised, using funds from the sale can support this

Newfield Park, JG Ward and 38 Suir Street Hearings Deliberations - Public - Major Late Item - Proposed sale of JG Ward / 38 Suir Street Del...

JGW020	Let's Talk	Thomas Mathiesson-Tutahione	bluff resident	9814	Yes	No	Yes	Sell the section to the not-for-profit buyer wanting to build community housing. When you are working on developing the reserve, please add 32amp 3 phase power. Consider a bluff rotunder. and potentially good hedging or fencing boundry for family use near the busy intersection.		
JGW021	Let's Talk	Helen Mulqueen		9814	No	No	No	My daughter wrote to the Bluff community board years ago when she was only about 6yrs old (shes now 11 yrs old) requesting more playground equipment for Sir Joseph Ward park. Had to chase & chase a response which was no with no explanation. This area is really the only playground area for children west end of Bluff & instead of downsizing it we should be providing a safe play area for our west end living kids. I strongly oppose the sale of any of this land. It backs onto our kids bus stop & is a community landmark space which should be left alone.	Do a door to door survey! Many of our Bluff residents are elderly simple folks who don't do internet. I feel you are not allowing proper consultation with residents of our town by advertising consultation online. But I also believe this is what you rely on to do what you have already made up your mind to do.	Part of the land will remain available for community use and further consultation will capture feedback on what the community wants to use the space for. Consultation was undertaken through different forms of engagement, including letter drops, in person event on site in Bluff and submission boxes.
JGW022	Let's Talk	Richard Little		9810	No	No	No	Keep as much land as we can. It will pay dividends in the future.	No	
JGW023	Let's Talk	Rose Strong		9814	Yes	No	No	I think unused council land should be restored to bush or left as green space. Selling it is a waste and a loss for everyone in Bluff. I've seen comments that part of the park is wetland/bog, all the more reason to plant it out and make a lovely little native reserve. If the park needs upgrades, run a fundraiser or find money elsewhere.	Please don't subdivide and sell off our green spaces!	A report was undertaken to understand the value of planting up the reserve. It suggests land areas less than 1 ha are largely inconsequential. There will still be land retained as a better-quality space that can be made more attractive for public use.
JGW024	Let's Talk	Bruce Pagan	Bluff resident	9814	No	No	Yes	A redevelopment of the reserve pays due respect for one of Bluffs/Southlands historical figures! For years it has languished in a vastly forgotten state. The proposed redevelopment gives meaning and purpose to the existing reserve.		
JGW025	Let's Talk	Britt-Amber Barris		9814	No	No	No	Selling this greenspace does not make any sense. You state one of the reasons being the cost, thats pretty simple you went from mowing this a couple times a year and now you are over maintaining it.. You will need to keep maintaining until sold, and to be honest who would want to live in a gully down a bank. Is this not contaminated land, was this not fuel line in the 70s. Bluff has many empty sections for sale, there is not need to get rid of the small amount of greenspaces we have... Bluff does not need high density housing. Saying you will spend this doing up the other part of this land was always your responsibility. LEAVE OUR GREENSPACES ALONE		Housing was not specified through public consultation. There could be other opportunities to purchase the land which do not involve developers.
JGW026	Email	Kylie Fowler	Bluff resident	9814		Yes	No	Opposes the subdivision of JG Ward and sale of portion of it along with the sale of 38 Suir Street. Reasons are #1 decision originated from a reserve view and was claimed it would save 12k in maintenance costs. Real maintenance is likely less than 4k a year. Reduced maintenance could achieve a reduction in costs. #2 Property used as example in report to the June 25 Bluff Meeting is not comparable to the proposed sections that could be created on the JG Ward site. Proposed properties won't have vehicle access unless 38 Suir Street is sold with them and a significant portion of land will be needed to provide right of way access. Once actual costs of subdivision and surveying are taken off the sale price there is likely very little money available to develop the remaining reserve. Properties are next to SH1, no view and on a site of water pooling. #3. Thinks it is a hazardous site and has recommended it to Environment Southland to add to their list. #4 if it sells, how can we be certain the new Council structure (when consolidated) will commit to spending the funds on this area as promised? #5 Bluff does not have a shortage of properties available for sale with many being far superior than this problematic site. As a property it will have a lot of competition.		The contours indicate that there is a slope down from east to west and GIS mapping illustrates there is no drainage underneath the land. Housing was not proposed within the public consultation messaging. Council would still retain some land and has the opportunity through funds raised to provide a better-quality space that is protected under the Reserves Act 1977, spent in line with the Endowment Fund requirements.

Council has a plan to fund a new future for the JG Ward Reserve

JG Ward Reserve (9,137m²) is located on the corner of Gore Street and State Highway 1, and is the last prominent green space visitors to and residents of Bluff see as they leave the Bluff Township. The space currently features the Joseph George Ward statue, a single piece of play equipment and storage building.

The east end of JG Ward Reserve, closest to Suir Street, changes in appearance and activation, with less visibility from the main road, effectively reducing its value to the community. Council sees there is potential to activate the corner section, taking advantage of its prominent location to encourage people to stay and play in Bluff. Adjacent to the land is 38 Suir Street (769m²), which is a parcel of land also owned by Council, and not currently activated.

What are we proposing?

Council, supported by the Bluff Community Board, are proposing to fund upgrades to the corner section of JG Ward Reserve, via funds generated by sale of the underutilised section. Council is considering designating 5,465m² of the space as Recreation Reserve through the Reserves Act 1977. The remaining balance, as well as the 38 Suir Street parcel, is proposed to be disposed of by sale.

The revenue generated from the disposal and sale would be reinvested within the remaining JG Ward Reserve. This would primarily increase activation, providing opportunity to hear what the community would like to see in this space. This is a cost neutral proposal; therefore, the scale of activation opportunity for the reserve will depend on the value of revenue received from disposal and sale.



- Proposed portion of land to sell - indicative boundary only.
- Proposed area to designate as recreational reserve under the Reserves Act 1977.

Let us know below what you think about this proposal, which may include your vision for how the space is activated in the future.

Feedback closes on 7 August 2026.



Carbon Offset Potential for Proposed Disposal Land

Purpose

This report has been produced to support Invercargill City Council (ICC) processes for review of proposed disposal land, and may be included as an annexure to Council Paper *'Parks land disposal options for consideration'* to the Invercargill City Council Community Wellbeing Committee. The report provides commentary on carbon offsetting and income potential from land earmarked for disposal.

Background

John Turkington Limited (JTL) is Council's newly appointed Forest Manager. JTL has expertise in carbon offsetting and emissions trading. JTL facilitated a workshop for Council staff about the New Zealand Emissions Trading Scheme (NZ ETS) and voluntary carbon market (VCM) opportunities on 14 June 2023. Following this workshop, Council has requested JTL review its proposals for land disposal and comment on potential for carbon offsetting.

Carbon offsetting

Carbon offsetting represents a removal activity of greenhouse gases which is then used to 'offset' an equivalent gross emission elsewhere. In New Zealand the primary mechanism for carbon offsetting is the New Zealand Emissions Trading Scheme (NZ ETS) which functions as the compliance market for New Zealand's main emitting sectors.¹

Majority of offsets under the NZ ETS are from carbon dioxide sequestered and stored in forests. These stored emissions are credited by the NZ ETS with New Zealand Units (NZU), which may be used by emitters to offset their emissions within the NZ ETS. This transaction usually involves units being sold by the forest owner to an emitter(s); generating income from the forest.

Despite an emphasis on plantation forestry, the NZ ETS applies to a range of different forest types and systems, including planted and naturally regenerated forests, and space-planted landscape forests. Forests can also comprise a range of different tree species and compositions, including indigenous species.



Figure 1. Examples for forest systems (from left to right): mature Tōtara forest at Sandy Point Reserve; space-planted exotic trees on pasture land; mixed native ecological plantings at Sandy Point Reserve.

¹ Forestry, stationary energy, industrial processes, liquid fossil fuels, waste. (Excludes agricultural emissions).



Beyond the compliance market, organisations may choose to further reduce or offset their emissions; this is referred to as the voluntary carbon market (VCM), as the action represents an additional and voluntary commitment to the environment. Participation in the VCM is often supported by an overarching organisational strategy and commitment to further reduce emissions within a specified timeframe, e.g., to become carbon neutral.²

VCM projects operate outside of the NZ ETS and New Zealand's international accounting frameworks, and may therefore include offsets not incorporated by those frameworks. This makes the VCM inherently more flexible than the NZ ETS, although VCM projects typically still follow adopted international standards and verification protocols.

Criteria

Forestry participation in the NZ ETS requires several key requirements (including, but not limited to):

- the land must be non-forest land as at 31 December 1989;
- the land must become established as forest land, i.e. planted or regenerated;
- forest land size must be greater than 1 hectare
- the forest land must contain forest species capable of growing to 5m tall and having a greater than 30% canopy cover at maturity³

Additionality is therefore achieved through the establishment of new forests, where there previously were none at 1990, in accordance with international emissions accounting baselines.

These requirements mean that not all proposed disposal land will be suited for inclusion within the NZ ETS, mainly because of the minimum size requirements; whereas forestry in the VCM could include areas less than 1 hectare.

We have therefore established the key criteria for our assessment of carbon offsetting potential as:

1. the size of the land
2. whether the land is presently non-forest

We have not been able to make an assessment of the land cover as at 31 December 1989 within the time available to prepare this report. Council may have records or historic aerial photography that could assist with this verification, which is a further consideration for eligibility under either scheme; however, our assumption is that as managed Reserves, most areas will have been non-forest land as at 31 December 1989, with the exception of parts of Flag Staff Road (Bluff Hill).

We note that the land cover at Flagstaff Road (and surrounding Council-owned land) comprises regenerated indigenous forest. Where these areas have regenerated since 31 December 1989 and the area was not previously forest land at this date, then these areas may be suitable for registration in the NZ ETS without requiring additional planting, and would earn NZU according to the existing forest's age. This could provide a suitably 'passive' income from those lands to setoff existing operational costs.

² 'Carbon neutral' is a state that occurs when net greenhouse gas emissions are equal to zero.

³ These requirements provide considerable flexibility in the design of the forest system, a such species types and spacings.

'Carbon Offset Potential for Proposed Disposal Land', report prepared by John Turkington Limited 2 |



Other considerations for establishing forest land in urban localities, which may assist in Council's assessment of disposal land are outlined in the table below.

Table 1. *Additional considerations, positive and negative, with establishing urban forest land*

Positive	Negative
• carbon sequestration • landscape and visual amenity benefits • habitat and ecological values • recreational uses • timber production (selective) • income from carbon credits • avoided maintenance (long-term)	• establishment and maintenance costs • shading and lighting of neighbouring property and infrastructure • nuisance factors, e.g., leaf fall • safety hazards, e.g., tree fall • public space safety • opportunity cost of land disposal

Estimated value

An estimated value of carbon income is incorporated in our assessment.

Different forest types sequester carbon at different rates and timescales, and therefore have differing carbon income potential. For the purposes of this report, we have assumed that land will be established as permanent forest in either indigenous, exotic hardwoods, or in other exotic softwoods species (e.g. non-plantation forestry).

We apply the NZ ETS 'look up tables' to assign total and average carbon sequestration rates for each forest type at years 35 and 50 accordingly⁴; and apportion income under an assumed constant carbon price of \$60/NZU.⁵ This is illustrated on a hectare basis for each forest type in the table below.

Table 2. *Estimated carbon sequestration and income for three different permanent forest types.*

Forest Type	Total NZU/ha	Average NZU/ha/yr	Total Value \$/ha	Average Value \$/ha/yr
Indigenous	323 / 50 years	6.5	\$19,380	\$390
Exotic softwoods	641 / 50 years	12.8	\$38,460	\$768
Exotic hardwoods⁶	729 / 35 years	20.8	\$43,740	\$1,248

For our analysis of the VCM we have assumed carbon equivalence with the NZ ETS and applied the 'look up tables' to estimate carbon sequestration from those forests. This is because presently there is no VCM mechanism for which the Council is participating.

If in the future Invercargill City Council were to choose to develop climate change policies and emission reduction plans - such as to operate as carbon neutral - the value of offsets generated under a VCM would represent an avoided future emissions reduction cost to the Council.

⁴ If more than 100 hectares of post-1989 forest land is registered in the NZ ETS the participant's forests require field measurement and generation of participant-specific tables (PST) for modelled growth and unit entitlement, rather than use of the default NZ ETS look up tables. Actual sequestration may differ under a measurement approach.

⁵ For comparison, the spot market for NZU closed at \$59.25 on 19 June 2023.

⁶ Exotic hardwood look up tables only account for carbon sequestration to 35 years



In the absence of a voluntary emissions framework for the Council we have drawn equivalence with the NZ ETS compliance market for carbon pricing under a VCM, with the same \$60/unit value assumed for this analysis.

Assessment

We have assigned the key requirements for each land block in the main table below. In general terms, most land is suitable for carbon offsetting purposes, being presently unforested. For the purposes of our analysis, we have assumed that all land is eligible for carbon offsetting.

An estimate of potential value has been calculated by pro-rating forest sequestration from the NZ ETS look up tables for the area of each land unit, with a nominal carbon value of \$60/unit assigned. We have used the exotic hardwood forest type as representative of the highest income potential for differing permanent forest systems, with the exception of Flagstaff Road which is already in possible indigenous forest cover; giving an estimate of total income potential after 35 years, and an estimated average income over the period; as shown in the table below.

Table 3. *Assessment of land requirements and carbon income potential*

Name	Area	Land size suitability	Non-forest land	Carbon sequestration 35 yrs	Potential Income 35 yrs (exotic hardwood) ⁷	Potential Income/yr (exotic hardwood)
44 Harewood Road/Woodend Reserve	0.1012	VCM	Woody vegetation	74	\$ 4,426	\$ 126
231 Scott Street	0.6199	VCM	Bare land	452	\$ 27,114	\$ 774
794 Queens Drive	0.0372	VCM	Bare land	27	\$ 1,627	\$ 46
Awarua Bay Reserves	0.1472	VCM	Predominantly bare land	107	\$ 6,439	\$ 184
Conway Crescent Playground	0.3533	VCM	Bare land	258	\$ 15,453	\$ 441
JG Ward Reserve/38 Suir Street	0.39	VCM	Predominantly bare land	284	\$ 17,059	\$ 487
McMillan Street Reserve	2.0234	NZ ETS	Predominantly bare land	1,475	\$ 88,504	\$ 2,525
Mokomoko Road Reserve	0.4957	VCM	Predominantly bare land	361	\$ 21,682	\$ 619
Newfield Park	1.3	NZ ETS	Bare land	948	\$ 56,862	\$ 1,622
Rockdale Park	6.06	NZ ETS	Bare land	4,418	\$ 265,064	\$ 7,563

⁷ Flagstaff Road uses Indigenous Forest NZ ETS Look Up Tables from age 15-50 for the period of analysis.

'Carbon Offset Potential for Proposed Disposal Land', report prepared by John Turkington Limited 4 |

 JOHN TURKINGTON LIMITED						
Teviot Street Reserve	1.2141	NZ ETS	Predominantly bare land	885	\$ 53,105	\$ 1,515
Vernon Street Reserve	0.2558	VCM	Predominantly bare land	186	\$ 11,189	\$ 319
Waihopai Sports Association	0.3632		Bare land	265	\$ 15,886	\$ 453
Elizabeth Street Reserve	0.0986	VCM	Bare land	72	\$ 4,313	\$ 123
Donovan Park farm and restaurant	37	NZ ETS	Predominantly bare land	26,973	\$ 1,618,380	\$ 46,176
Part 67 Flagstaff Reserve, Bluff Hill	3.04	NZ ETS	Possible indigenous forest land ⁸	693	\$ 41,587	\$ 1,188
Surrey Park Ex School Site	1.007	NZ ETS	Predominantly bare land	734	\$ 44,046	\$ 1,257
Bluff Camping Ground	0.3987	VCM	Predominantly bare land	291	\$ 17,439	\$ 498

TOTAL	38,503	\$ 2,310,175	\$ 65,916
NZ ETS	36,126	\$ 2,167,548	\$ 61,847
VCM	2,377	\$ 142,627	\$ 4,069

Summary

As might be expected, larger land areas contribute the greatest potential for total carbon sequestration and income potential.

Land areas greater than 1 hectare in size, which would be suited for participation in the NES ETS, comprise approximately 94% of total potential income. These lands provide the greatest opportunities for scale and operational efficiencies to establish permanent carbon forests, and would be suited to the compliance market in the NZ ETS; or with further development, forest offsets could be designed to support a VCM for the Council to achieve a voluntary emissions reduction target.

The combined value of land areas less than 1 hectare is largely inconsequential to this analysis.

⁸ Assumed present indigenous forest cover, age 15 for this analysis; equal to 228 NZU (to the nearest whole number). Further verification of forest eligibility and age is required to confirm this analysis.

'Carbon Offset Potential for Proposed Disposal Land', report prepared by John Turkington Limited 5 |



Policy Updates

At the time of writing this report, Government has issued two consultations relating to forestry settings under the NZ ETS. These proposals (if implemented) could affect permanent forest participation in the NZ ETS and the demand for forestry offsets generally.

Feedback is being sought on appropriate species for inclusion in the permanent forest category of the NZ ETS; how to achieve transitional forests⁹; and management obligations for permanent forests.

Proposals to amend the NZS ETS relate to changes in market settings for forestry units, in order to achieve desired gross and net emissions to deliver most efficiently on New Zealand's climate change targets.

Further details of these proposed changes can be provided.

⁹ Transitional forestry is the process whereby exotic tree species are used as a nursery crop for emergent native forest.

'Carbon Offset Potential for Proposed Disposal Land', report prepared by John Turkington Limited 6 |



PARKS AND RESERVES DISPOSAL POLICY

Effective from 24 February 2015

Purpose

This Policy seeks to define the factors Council will take into consideration when deciding to dispose of property. Taking into account the long term contribution that the property will make to the operation of the Council and the achievement of its wider objectives in comparison to the benefits of disposing of the property.

Definitions

Property in this Policy is defined as the following:

Park and Reserve Land means land acquired or used principally for community, recreational, environmental, cultural, or spiritual purposes. Any land taken, purchased, or otherwise in any manner acquired, whether before or after the commencement of the Reserves Act 1977, by a local authority, unless the land is acquired subject to a trust or a condition that it shall be held by the local authority as a reserve.

Sale or Disposal

Council will consider the following when disposing of surplus land or property:

- Is it in the best interest of the Community and Council to dispose of any uneconomic land or property either by sale or development.
- If the Council owned property is subject to a perpetually renewable lease, the freehold title may be offered to the lessee, for freeholding purposes.
- If a property is subject to a lease containing a right of purchase, the freehold title may be offered for freeholding purposes or in accordance with the purchase procedure set out in the lease.
- If a Council owned property is of a size or shape unsuitable for any independent use in accordance with the operative District Plan, it may be offered to an adjoining owner at, or above, a registered valuation.
- In any of the above cases the Chief Executive can be delegated by the Infrastructure and Services Committee to negotiate on behalf of the Invercargill City Council to determine the final sale price (This could include sales at lower than the valuation price.)

In general, competitive open market methods of sale will be considered and determined on merit. These may include public tender, public auction or private treaty.

Council may consider a sale or disposal other than through the open market based on individual case merits. Council will use an independent valuation as a pricing guide for the disposal of surplus land or property. The following are some examples of circumstances where this may be considered appropriate. The following list is not exhaustive and other circumstances may be considered.

- Land that because of its small size or irregular dimensions or shape would not be readily support a self-contained development.
- Land that has no legal access.
- Preferred future use for the land as identified by Council.
- Land of nominal value.
- Land for inclusion with an adjacent holding.
- Land that will complement a proposed adjacent site, the sale of which is consistent with the objectives of Council.
- Land where the cost of ownership is greater than the rate of return if sold.

Attached is a process diagram for how Property will be disposed of by the Invercargill City Council, this will serve as a check and balance system for reporting.

This Policy does not include investment property-disposal of investment property is covered by its own policy.

Revision History:	NA
Effective Date:	24 February 2015
Review Period:	This policy will be reviewed every three (3) years unless earlier review is required due to legislative change, or is warranted by another reason requested by Council.
New Review Date:	February 2018
Associated Documents / References:	Any Council sale must take into account the following section of the Local Government Act: Section 138 Restriction on disposal of parks Section 140 Restrictions on disposal of endowment property Section 141 Conditions applying to sale or exchange of endowment property Public Works Act 1981 Section 40-42 Reserves Act 1977
Supersedes:	N/A
Reference Number:	A1176247
Policy Owner:	Parks Manager/Director of Works and Services

Property Disposal Process Diagram

