

Attachment 8 – Feedback from Community Consultation Process

ECM Doc Set ID	Option	Feedback / comments Please advise which of the three options is your most favoured option and why:	Would you like to suggest an alternative option for managing gates and grids on public roads? If so please detail your suggestion/s below? Would you like to make any other comments or raise questions?
4278835	1a		
4279689	1a	Thanks to the Council for consultation on this issue and for providing an opportunity for landholders to document their preference.	
4280270	1a	<p>Option 1b and 2b are illogical because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The levy cost to landowners is greater than the current policy costs incurred by the landowner (ie. Permit fee, public liability insurance cover, maintenance costs/time) 2. The blanket levy charge to all landowners is unfair. Some grids are located on main arterial roads where traffic usage is much higher than on other roads off the main arterial road. For example, the grid that I am responsible for, there is only one other family that uses my grid to access their property entrance, which is only approximately 300 meters past the grid. Randles road is a no through road that Council only maintains up to my neighbours property entrance. 3. Also, the blanket levy charge is unfair because the condition of grids vary between landowners and could require zero or minimal maintenance compared to others that have not been maintained over the years. For example, my grid is new and has been well maintained, so costs to Council would be zero/minimal, therefore, it is unfair that I should pay the same levy as others who's grids have not been maintained and require replacement. <p>I chose 1a because GRC owns public roads for the community to use and grids are required within the public road network to provide a passage for vehicles and all rate payers utilize the road network.</p>	

Attachment 8 – Feedback from Community Consultation Process

		<p>Comment in relation to 1a or 1b. In my opinion Council should strategically focus on reducing the wider rating base costs and Council costs (ie. Annual Cost Estimates) if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each individual grid was assessed to determine maintenance requirements. For example: my grid is new and maintenance costs would be zero/minimal compared to other grids in the shire. Also, in my opinion based on personal experience, grids don't necessarily have a specified life if they are well maintained. • Council applied more than one standard for grids to be installed. What I am referring to is that main arterial roads that have to accommodate high traffic flow and varied vehicles sizes/tonnage (i.e. Motorbikes to semi-trailers, double decker cattle trucks etc.) Compared to other roads with low traffic usage. • Council took a strategic focus on reducing the number of grids through joint agreement with landowners, this could even be enhanced by providing fencing subsidy/support to landowners to reduce grid cost to Council, landowners and the wider rating base into the future. This would be a WIN-WIN outcome for all parties affected by this policy. 	
4280958	1a	<p>I have selected option 1a. My reasoning is based on the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is apparent that the root cause of the policy review is councils desire to protect itself against possible insurance claims. 2. Anna Scott advised that under option 1a, landholders would continue to be responsible for the installation costs of new grids. 3. Council has been providing grids for some landholders at no cost. 4. Currently, as a whole neither the landholder or council maintain the existing grids to an acceptable 	

Attachment 8 – Feedback from Community Consultation Process

		<p>standard. A few years ago Council passed a motion to seal grid approaches and upgrade approach signage. At the Miriam Vale meeting councilor Goodluck ?, advised that council has only sealed 10 grids in the last year. At that rate it will take 33 years to seal all grid approaches.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Although council has a policy that requires landholders to undertake maintenance on the grids, the greater majority of landholders do not have the knowledge, resources or skills to work on roads in a manner that will minimize risk associated with public liability. 6. Council has indicated what it expects it will cost to manage each grid but has not detailed or justified how it arrived at the costings. A specification for new grids has not been provided. A maintenance procedure and standard has not been provided. 7. Grids are a necessary part of running a rural business. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. They minimize the amount of boundary fencing that the landholder would have to erect. b. Moving stock is easier. c. Eliminates the need for permanent water points on both sides of a road. d. By grazing the road reserve a potential fire hazard is significantly reduced by the reduction of the fuel load. 8. Grids provide some benefits for the greater community <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. By grazing the road reserve a potential fire hazard is significantly reduced. Recent bushfires within the council region may have been minimized if the fuel load within road reserves had been reduced by grazing stock. b. Some grids also act as drainage structures. 	
--	--	---	--

Attachment 8 – Feedback from Community Consultation Process

		<p>c. Grids are a part of rural industry. If council was to take ownership of the grids then it would be supporting the rural industry in a small way.</p> <p>9. Currently from information provided by council 0.84% of ratepayers own grids. Given that it is councils desire to elevate the standard of grid maintenance and minimize its potential risk it is reasonable that the cost is shared across the entire rate base of almost thirty four thousand ratepayers. This principal is similar to council's provision and maintenance of parks which are primarily used by the traveling public/tourist and support small business.</p>	
4280969	1a	<p>Rules need to be amended for driveways or end of the road. Landholders are not the only user's of the road so needs to be added to all rate payers.</p> <p>Costs can be saved by leaving railway line grids in service. No need to rate them if they have had years of traffic!!!</p>	
4281757	1a	<p>Option 1a – as it solves all the issues of public liability, dual ownership and maintenance. My rate dollar gets spent on things like parks I don't use so it should be the same for all rate payers.</p>	
4281759	1a	<p>Option 1a – it's the fairest way. Rates are rates and should be spent on the whole community.</p>	
4281837	1a	<p>We have chosen option 1a as we feel there is a lot of traffic that use Clarke's Rd with council and trucks and also with the Clarky's 4WD Park which puts a lot of wear & tear on our grids and would be only fair for everyone to help pay for these grids. Thanks heaps.</p>	
4284494	1a	<p>I was very disappointed when Gladstone council commenced their gates & grids policy p-2015/27 in 2015, which forced me to take ownership of the cattle grid on cattle station road, Rosedale, even though it was on the road reserve and not on my private property. This cattle grid existed when I bought my property in 1997, & in the 22 years</p>	

Attachment 8 – Feedback from Community Consultation Process

		<p>since then I have maintained it & there has not been any accident or problems on that grid.</p> <p>Gladstone council p-2015/27 grids policy in 2015 meant i was solely responsible for maintenance & insurance on that grid (which is not on my land) & was liable for \$57p.a., (for what???)</p> <p>I AM VERY PLEASD THAT GLADSTONE COUNCIL HAS SEEN FIT TO CONDUCT A REVIEW OF THE UNPOPULAR P-2015/27 GRIDS POLICY & HAVE PROVIDED FIVE OPTIONS FOR US TO CHOOSE, & I APPLAUD GLADSTONE COUNCIL FOR THIS REVIEW.</p> <p>I AM IN FAVOUR OF OPTION 1A AS IT WILL KEEP THE GRID IN GOOD CONDITION FOR ME, MY NEIGHBOURS, CONTACTORS, DELIVERY PERSONS, LIVESTOCK CARRIERS ETC. WHO USE THE GRID WITHOUT ME HAVING TO SOLELY FUND THE MAINTENANCE, INSURANCE ETC.</p> <p>AS FOR THE COST OF MAINTENANCE, RENEWALS & INSURANCE TO BE MET BY THE WIDER RATING BASE, I THINK THAT IS TOTALLY FAIR. FROM WHERE I LIVE AT ROSEDALE, ONLY 7KM FROM THE GLADSTONE SHIRE SOUTHERN BORDER, I HAVE NOTHING TO DO WITH GLADSTONE, 50MINS TO BUNDABERG OVER TWO HOURS TO GLADSTONE, SO BUNDABERG IS WHERE I SHOP & BE ENTERTAINED. SO FOR MY ANNUAL RATES TO GLADSTONE COUNCIL, ALL I GET FOR THAT IS 4.9KM OF CATTLE STATION ROAD GRADED ONCE OR TWICE PER YEAR, I DON'T HAVE GARBAGE COLLECTION & I DON'T USE ANY GLADSTONE COUNCIL AMENITIES SUCH AS SWIMMING POOLS, PARKS, LIBRIES, ENTERTAINMENT CENTRE ETC. SO FEEL THAT FOR GLADSTONE COUNCIL TO TAKE OWNERSHIP OF MY GRID COVERING MAINTENANCE, INSURANCE & POSSIBLE REPLACEMENT TO BE PAID BY THE WIDER RATING BASE WOULD COMPENSATE ME FOR ALL THE OTHER COUNCIL AMENITIES MY</p>	
--	--	--	--

Attachment 8 – Feedback from Community Consultation Process

		<p>ANNUAL RATES TO GLADSTONE REGIONAL COUNCIL CONTRIBUTE TO BUT WHICH I AM UNABLE TO USE. I AM SURE THE GREATER MAJORITY OF RURAL LANDOWNERS WHO HAVE GATES AND CATTLE GRIDS COVERED UNDER P-2015/27 WOULD BE IN SIMILAR CIRCUMSTANCES, BECAUSE OF THEIR DISTANCE TO GLADSTONE & THE HUGE AMOUNT OF TIME REQUIRED TO RUN A RURAL PROPERTY MEANING NO TIME TO VISIT GLADSTONE TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THE PUBLIC AMENITIES PROVIDED BY GLADSTONE regional council and FUNDED BY OUR RATES. I DO CONGRATULATE GLADSTONE REGIONAL COUNCIL ON CONDUCTING A REVIEW OF P-2015/27 GATES & GRIDS POLICY WHICH I FEEL HAS BEEN VERY UNFAIR 7 UNPOPULAR. I THANK YOU FOR ORGANIZING THE THREE MEETINGS TO ADVISE US OF THE FIVE OPTIONS & I WAS VERY IMPRESSED AT THE professionalism of the presenters and the amount of information given. I certainly hope that option 1a will be the preferred & selected option when councilors make their decision in june 2019.</p>	
4284501	1a	Landholders pay to install grids and maintain this grids & fix up any broken rails & council looks after maintenance up to the grid & insurance as grids are on the council road.	
4286189	1a	<p>My favoured option for a grid policy is 1a. I do not believe that this is too much extra per rate payer, as council has embarked on other more expensive projects without public consultation, and rate payers pick up much of these costs.</p> <p>Also grids are not for the sole benefit of the landowners. In the past, gates served just the same purpose of preventing stock movement along the roads. Grids were installed for the benefit and convenience of the public travelers, more than for the benefit of the landowners.</p> <p>I would consider option 2a as a possible alternative.</p>	
4286552	1a	No landowner should have to fence out another person's stock, along the road reserve.	

Attachment 8 – Feedback from Community Consultation Process

4286554	1a		
4286573	1a	Grids will all be under the control of council & all grids would meet the same standard shire wide. Council would have to chase up land owners for to maintain grids & ensure they have public liability cover.	
4286577	1a	I choose option 1a because I believe that dual ownership between Council and the property owner will only cause complications. For example if a car lost control 50 meters either side of the grid and then hit the grid, This then creates issues as to who is legally responsible for any damage incurred.	
4286579	1a	We are only a small concern and do not have the equipment to maintain the roads either side of the grid and I don't believe that we should be responsible for the upkeep. The argument relating to the expense to other rate payers even if they don't use the road can be met with the fact that as a rate payer myself, I don't use rate payer funded facilities in Gladstone but contribute anyway.	
4286582	1a	The reasons for option 1A for us are no more digging grid out by hand after Council Grader has filled in bars on grid while grading road. And having to reweld railway line bars on grid after grader has bent or broken with blade. We replaced 1 grid on Ferguson Road about 6 years ago to the then Council standard, but this since changed in 2015. We can't afford to replace all our grids to this new standard. The volume of traffic we now get of a weekend down Fergon Road of people from town accessing the Calliope river & enjoying the outdoors it is only fair that the contribute to this infrastructure as well. Just some benefits to council. Standardising of Grids, Saving in Admin of checking with landowners for public liability insurance, choosing when to replace or upgrade to double with grid without time consuming consultation process & putting a huge financial burnden on the Landowner.	

Attachment 8 – Feedback from Community Consultation Process

4289294	1a		<p>LANDOWNERS TO PAY FOR THE NEW GRIDS & MAINTENANCE OF THE GRIDS IF BROKEN BY THEM NOT IF COUNCIL BREAKS THEM. ALL NEW GRIDS TO BE 14FT BY 10FT NOT 14FT BY 7FT AS THE SMALLER GRIDS DO NOT STOP CATTLE FROM JUMPING OVER THEM.</p>
4290136	1a	<p>In regard to the policy review for Gates and Grids and the options given to us at this point we feel that option 1a would be in our best interest. This would be the simplest and fairest way to deal with the problem as grids are beneficial to all rate payers using them. A lot of these grids were first built to replace gates for the convenience of the passing travelers and not only as property boundaries. We feel that costs for other services in urban areas are paid for in this way so it makes since that grids could be covered also with the wider rating base.</p> <p>In the latter part of us owning one of our grids there has been a quarry set up nearby. The quarry is now used regularly with heavy vehicles passing over this grid which is causing extra heavy stress. We feel that consideration of road conditions should be given when this type of enterprise happens and should not cause extra expense to the land owner. A good example of why option 1a is the best choice for Council to use.</p> <p>Looking at the two grids that are on our properties for example a thought I wish to share with Council is that we feel grids could be classed into two categories. Category 1 high risk being an entry used by members of the public as well as the land owner. Category 2 low risk being only one resident building using the entry which is usually no through roads. Should Council decide to put the financial onus on the land owner for all grids I feel that consideration could be given in the handling of category 2 grids. I do realise these grids are still on Council land but fail to understand why council need to be concerned with responsibility should there be plenty of warning signs before this point. Signs as follows</p>	

Attachment 8 – Feedback from Community Consultation Process

		“private property past this point, end of Council maintained road, no through road, unmaintained road, drive to conditions or proceed at own risk” as an example of what could be used. These grids could then be owned by the land owner and no different to others on private property.	
4290138	1a	Option 1a, added clause no grid can be removed without the land owners consent via writing	
4290227	1a		Why do the council maintain public roads where they have to access through a gate on the road but now when proposing a new gate over the public road, the council inform they will not maintain the road past the gate even if the gate isn't locked.
4290220	1a		
4290225	1a		
4290251	1a		
4290257	1a	Safety is a big concern for landowners working on grids. The last grid policy has cost us a lot of stress, time and money!	Dramatically Increase Traffic on the Tableland Road has been a huge concern for our family.
4290270	1a	Repairing and maintaining grids is a real safety issue especially with the very high increase of traffic on Tableland Road.	The increase of public liability insurance from our \$5 million to \$20 million has cost us \$750 annually extra. A combination of all the above has been very emotionally upsetting.
4290772	1a	Cost spread amongst community (public & business)	NO HAD GATES AND HAD ISSUES WITH NEIGHBOUR DESTROYING THEM.
4291285 & 4300713	1a	Dear ms scott, Despite what the bom forecasts, our area is in a drought phase and funds are limited to repair, construct and maintain roads, gates and grids which pass through the property at xxxxxx. Our inability to service the road and grids has been further exacerbated by five years of alleged maladministration by the public trustee of queensland from july 2013 to december 2017 during which the xxxxxx's cattle business was “brought to it knees” with wasteful extreme expenditure and all her savings wasted. She is all but “broke”. On the 11 february we adised council of our concerns at damage done to the grid on tableland/neil creek road by heavy earth moving equipment and excessive traffic	

Attachment 8 – Feedback from Community Consultation Process

		using the unsealed road passing through her property, due to development work further west. We also sent electronic photos at a later date to council. With reference to council assuming further responsibility for neil creek road and grids and gates, we support this suggestion provided that this <u>does not burden</u> the landowner too heavily with fees and charges other than the existing annual grid fee levied on landowners. In xxxxxx's case, the road could be totally closed and traffic diverted elsewhere as this part of the property has a cattle attrition (loss) rate that is much higher than other locations of the property due it's isolation and public access.	
4291617	1a	High cost of registration High cost of council grids Change in council specifications Interested in keeping costs down & to a minimum.	
4291873	1a		
4291907	1a	The council should be responsible for the upkeep & insurance of the grid.	As long as the grids are kept stockproof I can't see any problems
4291912	1a	The council is responsible for the road reserve and the road surface	Notification of any works or problems with the grid
4292088	1a	All ratepayers subsidize amenities for the town population, so rural ratepayers should receive the same support.	
4298999	1a	With council-driven changes to grid compliance requirements looking like being more frequent in the future, and OHS for installation and maintenance likely to become more demanding, Council would be better placed to do it all themselves as part of overall road maintenance.	At the Calliope meeting, it was stated that grids "are for the benefit of landholders", as if roads users don't benefit at least equally. Surely grids were installed originally as a convenience for travellers/motorists, so that they did not have to stop to open and close gates. I have concerns that the calculations for annual per grid costs in the B options appear to be unnecessarily high. Should 1a be unacceptable to council, 2a would be my next preference. The Bs and Option 3 are highly unpalatable.
4298999	1a	It is the insurance that is the key downfall. We need our grids and maintenance is not an issue but the insurance was so much trouble to get.	Owners keep ownership but the insurance amount is reduced or council source a cheaper alternative for the insurance premiums.

Attachment 8 – Feedback from Community Consultation Process

4298999	1a	Our understanding is that current levied rates support infrastructure and services to the whole community and accordingly as rural people we already contribute to support services that we don't use or have access to, so anything to do with roads generally should fall under the wider community rates base.	
4298999	1a	Cost to wider rating base is minimal - as estimated by GRC at consultation meeting Grid areas (not fenced) reduce GRC weed control and slashing cost to wider rating base Public roads are used by all	Thank you for consultation process. It took along time to get to this point but the end result has been well executed. Staff at public forums were approachable, interested and helpful.
4298999	1a	1 - The current location of road is not on the gazetted line allocated for the road which is a boundary line between properties. If the road was in the correct location there would be no need to have any grids for paddock division as the road could be fenced and not impact greatly on cattle operations. 2 - Grader drivers consistently drop a blade full of dirt into the grid whilst doing road maintenance making the grid ineffectual for cattle separation. Cleaning grids out is a time consuming and just plain hard work when dirt needs to be removed to stop cattle straying. 3 - The need to increase my public liability nearly doubled the cost of it. Why should I wear this cost when the road is incorrectly located causing disruptions to my cattle grazing operation.	
4304094	1a		
4304100	1a		
4290142	2a	Rural ratepayers pay a lot of rates for no return. Example those who own land adjoining mainroads & none maintained Council roads so it is appropriate for Council to accept option 2a and for grid costs to come out of general rates	
4291880	2a	I want to maintain ownership of the grid and feel the public liability should rest with the council as it is on council land. It should also be and always has been the councils responsibility to ensure the approach to the grid is kept at an acceptable standard.	
4291916	2a	As the grid is located in the road reserve it makes sense for council to maintain and insure.	

Attachment 8 – Feedback from Community Consultation Process

		We pay for items such as the airport sculpture & the water park through general rates.	
4292629	2a	The grid benefits the land owner but they help reduce fuel for fire thus benefiting the general rate payer	
4292631	2a	The most workable option Far more sensible as far as insurance is concerned Trying to cover infrastructure on land that doesn't belong	
4298999	2a	Grids are widely used by the general public and the fact is that the property owners are bearing the major cost. Because all are benefiting the cost of maintaining the grids should be borne by the wider ratepayers at what would be a negligible amount spread over all taxpayers. The work done by property owners to roads after fires, floods and winds saves councils an enormous amount of money. Grids should be treated as any other council asset. They are just part of council roads.	
4287322	2a	Subject to comments attached in Annexure A	
4287606	2a	Subject to comments attached in Annexure A Dear Gladstone Regional Council, Following your meetings last month I would like to reinforce our view. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Firstly the land is rated rural where the income generated comes from cattle or cropping. The money made from these businesses then pays the rates. We get very few services in return for these rates. • Secondly we often clean up the roads after storms/floods etc. Saving the council a great deal of time and money not having to send out crews and machinery to do the clean up. • Thirdly we maintain all fencing shared with council, while fences shared with other landholders are only a 50% responsibility/cost. • Fourthly there is no way urban residents would accept and pay a fee for an unfair policy like this. It 	

Attachment 8 – Feedback from Community Consultation Process

		<p>is taking advantage of a group too small in numbers to oppose unfair legislation.</p> <p>For the above reasons we should not have to pay a fee or be responsible for the liability of the grids. The grids are there for the road user's convenience and not ours, the cows don't care what structure blocks their escape. I have no problem with council coming down hard on landowners who are not doing their bit to keep the grids safe, but leave the ones doing the right thing alone. Please consider the fairness of this policy and review the alternative we have prepared. The least council can do is take on the liability.</p>	
4288145	2a	Subject to comments attached in Annexure A	
4288150	2a	Subject to comments attached in Annexure A	
4288220	2a	Subject to comments attached in Annexure A	
4290149	2a	Subject to comments attached in Annexure A	
4289344	2a	Subject to comments attached in Annexure A	
4304092	2b	<p>I'm in favour of paying a rate extra, within reason, for Council to maintain grids on property accesses.</p> <p>Let it be noted that grids are in imperative structure for controlling livestock from straying off the owners property.</p>	
4278733	3		
4289180	3	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Council to keep annual grid fees same 2. Dual ownership of landowners to share costs 3. Council to maintain grid approaches to grids and signage at council costs 	
4290073	3		
4290144	3	<p>Current policy is working</p> <p>Would like to see dual ownership of grids between landowners shared. Keep yearly costs same</p>	
4291577	3	Good as it is	
4299998	3	Cheapest for landowners	<p>REDUCE PUBLIC LIABILITY TO \$10 million</p> <p>PUT SPEED SIGNS ON RURAL ROADS eg. <60 <70 <80</p>
4292633	3		
4294765	3	I feel the landowner must retain ownership of their grid. My second preference is 2a.	

Attachment 8 – Feedback from Community Consultation Process

4297168	3		I WISH COUNCIL ALL THE BEST WITH THIS PROBLEM
4298999	3		
4298999	3		
4274741	4 - Refer Landholder Recommended Grid Policy Position attached		
4286587	4 - Refer Landholder Recommended Grid Policy Position attached	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost per grid for 1B & 2B per annum exorbitant and would be <u>strongly opposed</u>. • Dual ownership should be allowed – boundary fences are shared so should grids • Railways & Highways <u>DO</u> derive benefits from Grids – no cattle on roads. They should be responsible – preferably fully – for these grids. • Public liability by landholders adhoc and not supported. 	
4286589	4 - Refer Landholder Recommended Grid Policy Position attached	<p><u>Option 4-</u> Policy suggestions as presented by landowners at the mt larcom meeting. Almost the same as option 2 but landowner maintains grids. <u>10</u> recommendations to policy changes.</p>	
4286592	4 - Refer Landholder Recommended Grid Policy Position attached	Opition (4) as a policy	
4286594	4 - Refer Landholder Recommended Grid Policy Position attached	Option supplied by landowners at Mt Larcom.	

Attachment 8 – Feedback from Community Consultation Process

4286596	4 - Refer Landholder Recommended Grid Policy Position attached	As per policy provided by landowners at Mount Larcom consultation.	
4286575	None	Landholders should have a permit to occupy. Landholders should be responsible either side of the grid. I believe its illegal.	
4298999	None	I don't think we should be charged at all on the position and current address of our grid as detailed below. If the grid is the only access to your home why are we being charged grid fees it. The grid is off mceniery Road. We have always maintained our grid. The council never grads the road to our home.	

Response to the Gladstone Regional Council's Gates and Grids Policy Review

Preferred Council option:

- 2A, subject to comments below.

Summary:

- Any attempt to adopt or force the fencing of Council roads would create several issues including:
 - o Increased fire risk from fuel load,
 - o Lack of management of pasture and weeds on road easement,
 - o The need for compensation for the removal of the right of grazing on road easements.
- The move of insurance risk under public liability to landholders is not supported and is better for consistency to be held by Council.
- There should be provision for shared responsibility and grids adjoining Government infrastructure such as Main Roads or Railway should be the responsibility of the Government entity.

Comments on Council options:

- **Option 1A** – *Council takes ownership of any existing and any future grids with the cost of maintenance and renewals met by the wider rating base.*
This option should never have been put forward, as Council will never approve it.
- **Option 1B** – *Council takes ownership of any existing and any future grids with the cost of maintenance and renewals met by Special Levy to Land owners.*
This option is clearly and financially unacceptable to land owners.
GRC's proposed annual fees exorbitantly outweigh what any land owners currently spend on their annual average grid maintenance.
- **Option 2A** – *Council takes ownership of the structures from an insurance and maintenance perspective, with the Land owners continuing to be responsible for the initial installation of a new grid and the replacement of the structure at the end of its life. Additional costs covered through general rates.*
This option shows a positive solution and a way forward.
Land owners already pay full costs for new installs and full costs for replacement when grid is past its used by date (end of life).
GRC already maintain the roads entering and leaving grids and replace signs if vandalized or damaged by motorists, so no additional maintenance costs beyond the current status should be seen by rate payers/wider rating base.
(“Additional costs” covered through general rates.) this should read (“Additional costs” met by the wider rating base.)
This option is a clear way forward to allow GRC to insure the structures and accept liability in the event of an accident and still allows landowners to graze their livestock as per current procedures.

Attachment 8 – Feedback from Community Consultation Process

- **Option 2B** – *Council takes ownership of the structures from an insurance and maintenance perspective, with the Land owners continuing to be responsible for the initial installation of a new grid and the replacement of the structure at the end of its life. Additional costs covered through a special Levy.*
This option is clearly and financially unacceptable to land owners.
GRC's proposed annual fees exorbitantly outweigh what any land owners currently spend on their annual average grid maintenance.
- **Option 3** – *Maintain the current policy position, with minor amendment to address dual ownership.*
This option also shows a positive solution and a way forward if GRC can insure under the current status.

Notes:

For landowners that need the sense of ownership for sentimental reasons or other reasons "so others cannot remove and take away" - Land owners will effectively always own the structure as they will have the bill of sale and installation records
Land owners will need to ensure that they hold a copy of GRC grid installation approval – This is the GRC approval to graze roadside. If a copy is not held GRC will need to issue an approval certificate for each approved/accepted grid – This is the GRC approval to graze roadside.