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WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

A meeting of the WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL will be held in the COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA on TUESDAY 30 MAY and WEDNESDAY 31 MAY 2017, commencing at 9.00am, for the purposes of deliberating the 2017/18 Annual Plan.

Sarah Nichols
GOVERNANCE MANAGER

Recommendations in reports are not to be construed as Council policy until adopted by the Council

BUSINESS

1. APOLOGIES

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Conflicts of interest (if any) to be reported for minuting.

3. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

3.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Wednesday 3 May and Thursday 4 May 2017 to hear submissions to the Draft Annual Plan 2017/18

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Confirms as a true and correct record the minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Wednesday 3 May 2017 and Thursday 4 May 2017.

4. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

5. PRESENTATION

5.1 Jeff Millward, Manager Finance and Business Support

Mr Millward will provide an overview of the draft Annual Plan.
6. REPORTS

6.1 Draft Annual Plan 2017/18 Special Consultative Procedure – Maria Edgar (Corporate Planner) 44 - 46

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report no. LTC-03-12/ Draft Annual Plan 2017/18 Special Consultative Procedure.

(b) Receives all 83 submissions and the 256 submission points raised by submitters, as contained in the ‘Deliberations Pack’ previously distributed to Councillors.

(c) Considers all 256 submission points during the Draft Annual Plan 2017/18 deliberations.

6.2 Easter Sunday Trading – Lynley Beckingsale (Policy Analyst) 47 - 51

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No: 170516049264

(b) Maintains the status quo and does not develop an Easter Sunday Trading Policy at this time.

Or

(c) Instructs Council staff to develop an Easter Sunday Trading Policy on behalf of the Council and the community.

(d) Notes that the decision in (b) could be reconsidered on request from the community or as part of a sub-regional approach with Christchurch City Council and the Hurunui District Council.

(e) Suggests Council undertake further discussions with Members of Parliament advocating for a national decision regarding Easter Sunday trading.

6.3 Team Leader for Environmental Services Unit staff submission to the Draft Annual Plan 2017-18 – Malcolm Johnston (Environmental Services Manager) 52 - 54

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council

(a) Receives report No. 170511047604

(b) Approves the amended draft Annual Plan Provision for the Environmental Services Unit to increase the Annual Plan Budget by $105,000 to fund an additional full time team leader position.
6.4 **Staff Submission to the 2017-18 Draft Annual Plan Amend Non-Financial Performance Measure: Response to Dog Attack – Malcolm Johnston (Environmental Services Manager)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council

(a) **Receives** report No.170518050012

(b) **Approves** the amendment of the proposed response time for dog attacks from 24 hours to 1 hour as follows: “Complaints responded to within 1 hour for dog attack on a person and 48 for other incidences”

(c) **Notes** that many Councils throughout New Zealand have an expected response time for dog attacks of less than 24 hours

6.5 **Staff Submission to the Draft Annual Plan 2017-18 Project Development Unit Costs – Victoria Caseley, Plan Implementation Manager**

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council

(a) **Receives** report No. 170524052819

(b) **Approves** the amended draft Annual Plan Provision for the Plan Implementation Unit to increase the Annual Plan Budget by $60,000 to cover additional Project Development Unit costs.

(c) **Notes** the impact on rates is a 0.1% increase.

(d) **Notes** that there is a risk that if the current existing planning vacancy is not filled, or filled at an appropriate level of expertise, that the use of planning consultants may continue into the 2017/18 financial year giving a deficit in the costs budgeted for the use of consultants.

6.6 **International Portfolio – Jim Palmer (Chief Palmer)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 170519050730

(b) **Increases** the budget for International relations from the current draft budget of $10,200 to $25,500.

(c) **Notes** the additional $15,200 added to the General rate would translate into total rates increase of approximately 0.03% of an increase.
6.7 **Pegasus Road Connection to Gladstone Road Budget adjustment – Ken Stevenson (Roading Manager)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No 170518050120

(b) Approves shifting of the budget allocation of $350,000 for the Pegasus road connection to Gladstone Road project from 2017/18 to 2027/28 to align with the earliest expected construction date of the Woodend bypass.

(c) Notes that NZTA has not confirmed a construction date for the Woodend bypass but has indicated the earliest construction time is likely to be 2027.

(d) Notes that the permanent road connection between Pegasus and Gladstone Road has been aligned with the bypass on the basis that if the road connection is constructed before the bypass then it would generate traffic on Gladstone Road and have a negative impact on Gladstone Road residents.

(e) Circulates this report to the Woodend-Sefton Community Board

6.8 **Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery – Utilities and Roading Department**

**Staff Submission to the 2017-18 Draft Annual Plan – Gary Boot (Senior Engineering Advisor), Kalley Simpson (3 Waters Manager) and Ken Stevenson (Roading Manager)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 170519050782

(b) Notes that the total overall Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery budget has reduced by approximately $0.5M from $41,134,000 to $40,606,000.

(c) Notes that good progress has been made on some key infrastructure projects in Kaiapoi East and Kaiapoi West, which has enabled some projects to be brought forward.

(d) Amends the Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery Budgets for the 2017/18 years as follows:
### Three Waters – Utilities and Roading Department Staff Submission to the Draft 2017-18 Annual Plan – Kalley Simpson (3 Waters Manager)

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

**Water Environment Advisor - Position**

(a) **Approves** a new operational budget of $140,000 for a new position of Water Environment Advisor under the 3 Waters services management budget.

(b) **Notes** that this budget will be allocated to the drainage, wastewater and water supply operation accounts on a 40%, 30%, 30% split respectively.

(c) **Notes** that this new budget will increase the drainage, wastewater and water supply rates in the order of 1-2% depending on the individual scheme. This equates to 0.22% of total; rates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset</th>
<th>2017-18 Draft Annual Plan</th>
<th>2017-18 Revised Budget</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roading</td>
<td>$1,407,000</td>
<td>$4,205,000</td>
<td>+$2,798,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td>$562,000</td>
<td>$698,000</td>
<td>+$136,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>$507,000</td>
<td>$1,478,000</td>
<td>+$971,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer</td>
<td>$2,300,000</td>
<td>$4,478,000</td>
<td>+$2,178,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$4,776,000</td>
<td>$10,859,000</td>
<td>+$6,083,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(e) **Notes** that there are no material rating impacts from the proposed budget changes.

(f) **Resolves** to continue providing permanent roading, water, wastewater, drainage, and solid waste services within the areas formerly designated as Red Zones in Kaiapoi, Pines Beach, and Kairaki.

(g) **Notes** that the level of service to each property will be determined on a case by case basis, taking into account:

   a) The need for adequate and resilient services to the properties.
   b) The Council’s legislative obligations regarding servicing.
   c) The affordability of services to the property owners and the wider community.

(h) **Circulates** this report to the Kaiapoi Tuahiwi Community Board and the Regeneration Area Steering Group for their information.
6.10 Land Drainage – Utilities and Roading Department Staff Submission to the Draft 2017-18 Annual Plan

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

Flood response urban areas

(a) **Approves** an additional $100,000 of capital works budget, to the Flood Response Rural Areas account for the 2017/18 financial year.

(b) **Notes** that this will give a total budget of $150,000 for the project as a whole, taking into account the existing budget of $50,000 for the works in the 2016/17 financial year.

(c) **Notes** that the reason for the additional budget being required is due to flood projects costing more than was originally allowed for. The shortfall means that more budget is required to complete the Cones Road Culvert upgrade in the 2017/18 financial year.

Flood Response Kaiapoi

(d) **Approves** an additional $33,000 of operational expenditure, to the Kaiapoi Urban budget for the 2017/18 financial year.

(e) **Notes** that this will give a total budget for the project of $33,000 for the 2017/18 financial year.

(f) **Notes** that the reason for the additional funding is due the need, for extra temporary pumps to be installed in storm events (identified following recent flood events in Kaiapoi) - refer Management Team Report DRA / 170504044235

Rural Flood Response

(g) **Approves** an additional $100,000 of Capital Works Budget in the Flood Response Rural Areas account for the 2017/18 financial year.

(h) **Notes** that the reason for the additional funding being required is due to the need to upgrade five farm culverts on the drain that runs between Bradleys Road and Whites Road.

Kaiapoi Urban Drainage

(i) **Approves** an additional $15,000 of Capital Works Budget in the Kaiapoi Urban Drainage account for the 2017/18 financial year.

(j) **Notes** that the reason for the additional funding being required is due to an existing malfunctioning flap gate causing flooding.

(k) **Notes** that the reason for the additional funding being required is that there is not enough budget in the existing flap gate budget to upgrade the existing valve to a more reliable type.
Coastal Urban Drainage

(l) Approves the removal of an existing Capital Works Budget of $76,800 in the Coastal Urban Drainage account for the 2017/18 financial year.

(m) Notes that the budget is no longer required in the 2017/18 Financial Year.

(n) Notes that Council staff will be taking a report to Council in June to bring budget forward thereby eliminating the need to have the budget in 2017/18.

Coastal Urban Drainage

(o) Approves the removal of an existing Capital Works Budget of $186,800 in the Coastal Urban Drainage account for the 2017/18 financial year.

(p) Notes that the budget is no longer required in the 2017/18 Financial Year.

(q) Notes that Council staff will be taking a report to Council in June to bring budget forward thereby eliminating the need to have the budget in 2017/18.

Rangiora Urban Drainage

(r) Approves an additional $980,000 of Capital Works Budget in the Rangiora Urban Drainage account for the 2017/18 financial year.

(s) Notes that the reason for the additional funding being required is due the existing Stormwater infrastructure being undersized in a 1:50 year storm event.

(t) Notes a report was put to the Utilities and Roading Committee and they support its recommendations.

(u) Notes the proposed overall rate increase in Rangiora is 15.1%

6.11 Wastewater – Utilities and Roading Department Staff Submission to the Draft 2017-18 Annual Plan

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Approves a new capital works renewal budget of $45,000 for the Beach Road PS VSD Replacement under the Kaiapoi sewer account.

(b) Notes that this has an increase on the Eastern District wastewater rate of $0.22.
6.12 Water Supply – Utilities and Roading Department Staff Submission to the Draft 2017-18 Annual Plan – Colin Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager) and Kalley Simpson (3 Waters Manager)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

Woodend – Chinnerys Road Outlet Main Stage 2

(a) Approves a new capital works budget of $240,000 in 2017/18 for the Chinnerys Road Outlet Main Stage 2 project under the Woodend water supply account to be loan funded.

(b) Notes that this will give a total budget of $350,000 for the project as a whole, taking into account the existing budget of $110,000 for the first stage of the works in the 2016/17 financial year.

(c) Notes that this will increase the Woodend water supply rate by $9.90.

(d) Notes that the reason for the additional funding being required is due to the full extent of works for the project not being able to be completed within the budget in the 2016/17 financial year.

Oxford Rural No.2 – New Source

(e) Approves an additional $330,000 of funding to the New Source budget for the 2017/18 financial year under the Oxford Rural No.2 account to be loan funded.

(f) Notes that this will give a total budget for the project of $930,000 for the 2017/18 financial year.

(g) Notes that this will increase the Oxford Rural No.2 water supply rate by $12.90.

(h) Notes that the reason for the additional funding being identified is due to the concept design report being produced with a more refined cost estimate for the project.

Oxford Urban – Gammans Back-up Source

(i) Approves deferring the Gammans Back-up Source budget of $100,000 from the 2017/18 financial year to the 2018/19 financial year.

(j) Notes that this will allow consideration to be given to alternative options to add resiliency to the scheme before committing to this project.

(k) Notes that this will decrease the Oxford Urban water supply rate by $1.60.

(l) Notes that the reason for the deferral of the budget is due to alternative options being identified to add resilience to the scheme that warrant further consideration.

Kaiapoi – North East Kaiapoi Boost Main

(m) Approves an additional $330,000 of funding for the North East Kaiapoi Boost Main capital works budget under the Kaiapoi water supply account to be loan funded.
(n) Notes that this will increase the total budget for the project to $600,000 for the 2017/18 financial year.

(o) Notes that this will not change the Kaiapoi water supply rate.

(p) Notes that the reason for the additional funding being required is due to a more refined cost estimate being produced following pricing being received for current construction projects.

**Waikuku Beach - Capacity Upgrade**

(q) Approves an additional $130,000 of funding for the Capacity Upgrade capital works budget under the Waikuku Beach water supply account to be loan funded.

(r) Notes that this will increase the total budget for the project to $180,000 for the 2017/18 financial year.

(s) Notes that this will increase the Waikuku Beach water supply rate by $16.20.

(t) Notes that the reason for the additional funding being required is due to the scope of the capacity upgrade project being changed from a well pump installation to a new well, following an upgrade strategy report being completed.

**Ohoka – Pump Power**

(u) Approves a reduction in the Pump Power budget from $13,750 to $9,000 under the Ohoka account.

(v) Notes that this will decrease the Ohoka water rate by $61.10.

(w) Notes that the reason for the reduction in budget is that it was not previously identified that the pump power budget had been increased due to anticipated growth occurring on the scheme. As this growth has not yet eventuated the increase in pump power costs can be deferred until the growth occurs.

### 6.13 Funding Contribution for Kaiapoi High School Indoor Court – Craig Sargison (Manager Community and Recreation)

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No.170508045814

(b) Notes the concept plan for the proposed new gymnasium at Kaiapoi High School (TRIM: 170131008621)

(c) Approves a grant of $1 million to the Ministry of Education for the development of a full size indoor court at Kaiapoi High School, conditional upon the development of an agreement for community use which is satisfactory to the Council

(d) Approves staff working with Kaiapoi High School, applying to Rata Foundation for a grant of $300,000 to enable the development of a full size indoor Court at Kaiapoi High School which will be available for community use outside of school hours.
(e) **Notes** that staff will work with the Ministry of Education on the terms of an agreement, which will be subject to Council approval that provides for staged payments of the $1 million grant upon completion of key milestones.

(f) **Approves** staff developing an agreement, which will be subject to Council approval, with Kaiapoi High School on community use of the indoor court facility.

(g) **Circulates** this report to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board.

6.14 **Community and Recreation Department Staff Submission – Craig Sargison (Manager Community and Recreation)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No: 170505044822

(b) **Approves** a one off grant of $20,000 to Te Kohaka o Tuhaitara Trust to undertake the development of a business case for the future operation of the Trust.

(c) **Approves** an additional $6,800.00 to the Recreation Buildings Account for the operational expenses relating to Pegasus Community Centre.

(d) **Approves** an additional $20,000 for the remodelling of the Ashley Gorge Log Cabin making a total Council allocation of $85,000.

(e) **Approves** an additional $76,000 for the replacement of the crime camera system in Rangiora.

(f) **Approves** an additional $75,849.00 for the strengthening of the Oxford Cenotaph.

(g) **Approves** an additional $6,075.00 grant to the Oxford A&P Association which will make their total Grant amount $12,000 per Annum.

(h) **Approves** a grant of $50,000 to the Waikuku Surf Club to assist with earthquake strengthening of the clubrooms.

(i) **Approves** an additional $37,800 for the purchase of a portable sound system to be used at Community Board Meetings.

(j) **Circulates** this report to the Boards.

6.15 ** Carryovers from 2016-17 to 2017-18 – Paul Christensen (Finance Manager)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No 170516049095
(b) **Adopts** the carryovers as listed for inclusion in the 2017-18 Annual Plan.

7. **MATTER REFERRED FROM KAIAPOI-TUAHIWI COMMUNITY BOARD MEETING OF 15 MAY 2017**

7.1 **Proposed Modifications to Kaiapoi Community Centre – T Sturley (Community Team Leader) and C Sargison (Manager Community and Recreation)**

(report no. 170428041725 attached)

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 170428041725.

(b) **Approves** the proposed modifications to the ‘Community Centre’ space

(c) **Approves** the proposed modification to the Mill Room to accommodate the expansion of the Darnley Club space

(d) **Approves** additional budget of $165,000 for the alterations to the community space with $50,000 funded from the Earthquake Recovery Loan and $115,000 to be funded from the Recreation Community Buildings Account

(e) **Approves** additional budget of $30,000 for the alterations to the Mill/Cam Room to provide additional space for the Darnley Club to be funded from the Recreation Account.

(f) **Notes** that if funding is approved it is intended to commence the work in June 2017.

(g) **Notes** that the likely income from the building will be $16,000 per annum from the Community Space and $2,630 inc GST per annum from the Darnley Club

8. **MATTER REFERRED FROM DISTRICT PLANNING AND REGULATION COMMITTEE MEETING 18 APRIL 2017**

8.1 **District Plan E-Plan Software – Preferred Supplier and Budget – Trevor Ellis (Development Planning Manager) and Jolanda Simon (Information and Technology Services Manager)**

(report no. 170405033283 attached)

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Confirms** additional budget of $214,072 to progress implementation of the E-Plan software solution for District Plan and submissions management purposes and licensing costs

(b) **Notes** that additional budget will be sought as part of the 2018/2028 LTP budget to provide for licensing and to support District Plan Review Resource Management Act processes and that this has been previously signalled.
9. **MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED**

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting.

The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter and the specific grounds under section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution, are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Minutes/Report of:</th>
<th>General subject of each matter to be considered</th>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>Report of Chris Brown (Community Green Space Manager)</td>
<td>Contract 17-20 – Indoor Court Architectural Services Tender Report</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This resolution is made in reliance on section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, and the particular interest or interests protected by section 6 or section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Reason for protection of interests</th>
<th>Ref NZS 9202:2003 Appendix A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>Protection of privacy of natural persons To carry out commercial activities without prejudice</td>
<td>A2(a) A2(b)ii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. **CONSIDERATION OF SUBMISSIONS TO THE DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN 2017/18**

11. **QUESTIONS**

12. **URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS**
MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL HELD IN THE MEETING ROOM, RUATANIWHA KAIAPOI CIVIC CENTRE, KAIAPOI ON WEDNESDAY 3 MAY 2017 COMMENCING AT 1.00PM

PRESENT:

Mayor D Ayers (Chair), Deputy Mayor K Felstead, Councillors P Allen, N Atkinson (until 3.55pm), A Blackie, R Brine (from 1.04pm), W Doody, D Gordon (from 1.04pm), J Meyer and P Williams.

IN ATTENDANCE:

J Palmer (Chief Executive), Mrs K LaValley (Project Delivery Manager) (for part of hearing) and Ms E Stubbs (Minute Secretary).

1. APOLOGIES

Moved Councillor Allen seconded Councillor Meyer

Apologies were received and sustained from Councillor Stewart for absence and Councillor Brine for lateness.

CARRIED

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Nil.

3. APPROVAL TO ACCEPT LATE SUBMISSION

Moved Councillor Atkinson seconded Councillor Meyer

THAT the Council:

a) Agrees to receive the late submission from Environment Canterbury to the Waimakariri District Council’s Annual Plan 2017-2018.

CARRIED

Councillors D Gordon and R Brine arrived at 1.04pm during the Woodend Community Association submission.
4. **HEARING OF SUBMISSIONS TO THE DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN 2017/2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Rigby</td>
<td>Woodend Community Association</td>
<td>A Rigby spoke to the submission highlighting child safety and speed limits on local roads. She commented there was inconsistency around speed limits of roads into Woodend. She noted the locations of the schools and commented that with the current locations of reduced speed signs traffic was not given enough time to slow before the school zones. A Rigby appreciated work by Council in relation to speed limits for Woodend Beach road. A Rigby was concerned that the lack of pedestrian crossings in Woodend meant there was no safe way to cross SH1. She noted the bus stops on SH1 were located where people had to walk down a 100km/hr stretch of road. She acknowledged that in the future the bypass would change the situation, however believed that project was too far away and that safety concerns needed to be addressed now. Questions Councillor Blackie asked for the submitter’s opinion on closing the entrance/exit to Sandhills Road at SH1. J Archer replied that he preferred the Sandhills Road exit to the alternative and commented that the problem would ease if the speed limit was lowered. Councillor Brine asked if a school kea crossing was considered more important than a pedestrian crossing and if there would be a community backlash from reinstatement of a pedestrian crossing. J Archer commented that a kea crossing could be dangerous and he believed a pedestrian crossing would be preferred. A common question asked by the community was why they could not have a pedestrian crossing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shona Powell</td>
<td>Woodend-Sefton Community Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Powell spoke to the Board’s submission highlighting the following.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Water Supply**
The Board supported upgrades to the water supply but were concerned with cost. During consultation forecast rates were $334 however the proposed rate was now $417 which was an increase of $83. The board believed it would be beneficial to phase in rate increases.

**Court Indoor Facility**
The Board supported postponing the concept design phase until Regeneration costs were known and there was a better gauge of the budget for a facility. A more eastern location such as Ravenswood was desired.

**Waste Management**
The Board supported consultation noting the decline in satisfaction rate. Feedback from residents was that they supported changes. There were questions around how much greenwaste could be composted.

**Water**
The Board desired safe waterways for swimming including beaches, rivers and lakes. The health of Pegasus Lake was a concern, it was a recreational asset with a cost to maintain and it had the potential to attract events. They would like to see funding for research and investigation of the water quality issues.
The board would like to see the extension of the lifeguard season.

**Public Halls**
Requested assistance with repair of Sefton Hall as an important community facility.
Requested provision to address poor acoustics at Waikuku Beach Hall.

**Future growth**
Request planning for future growth and reserve land for future community services/facilities. Youth facilities planned for Pegasus had not proceeded, and the Board requests and audit and review of how best to meet community needs. The deterioration of Waikuku School grounds was noted.

**Questions**
Councillor Allen asked what S Powell defined as swimmable for Pegasus Lake. S Powell commented that while Pegasus Lake did not have issues with E Coli, toxic algae, weed and stagnation of the lake were issues.

Councillor Allen noted that the two campgrounds in the Board’s area were not
referred to and asked as major resources did the community board have a view with regard to their future and that of the internationally recognised Rakahuri Estuary. S Powell commented that the campgrounds and estuary were an important part of the district and they were supportive of Council work in that area.

Councillor Gordon asked what the amount of insurance shortfall was for the Sefton Public Hall and S Powell advised that the plans were currently with the engineer and they would have an idea of costings after that. There would be a definite shortfall.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peter Devlin and Lee Germon</th>
<th>Canterbury Country Cricket Association</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

P Devlin highlighted the upcoming season games at Mainpower Oval particularly the ICC Under 19 Cricket World Cup games and the request by Canterbury Cricket for Mainpower Oval to host the Sydney Thunder Big Bash team against the Canterbury Kings. To secure the Sydney Thunder game a capacity of 2000 was required while at the moment there was a capacity of 1500-1600. The association was requesting $12,500 to provide 500 temporary seats for the game. P Devlin advised that Mainpower Oval was recognised as the back-up first class cricket ground in Canterbury after Hagley Oval.

**Questions**

Councillor Brine asked looking forward whether there was value in purchasing temporary seating that could be shared between cricket, hockey and other facilities. P Devlin advised there would be 100% support for that.

Councillor Brine asked whether Canterbury Cricket supported cricket at Mainpower Oval. Lee Germon provided some background information, commenting that the resource consent for Hagley Oval cricket allowed for thirteen days of major fixtures (over 2000 attendees) for the following season. These days had already been allocated through internationals and if asked to host another match tickets would have to be restricted to 2000. Canterbury Cricket supported Mainpower Oval improvements and there was potential for Canterbury Cricket to be a partner in funding that development.
Councillor Doody asked how many ICC Under 19 International tournament were planned for Mainpower Oval and P Devlin replied four. In addition there would be training days and pre tournament warmup games. The Under 19 tournament could be catered for but the temporary seating was required to secure the Sydney Thunder game.

Councillor Doody asked if the changing shed and toilet facilities were adequate. P Devlin replied that they were manageable with the use of portable toilets.

Councillor Williams asked if there would be gate sales for the big matches. L Germon advised that it cost $70,000 to get the Sydney Thunder to Christchurch and gate sales would be around $20,000.

Councillor Gordon queried whether a more permanent seating solution had been investigated and P Devlin replied no. Councillor Brine advised of one quote.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doug Nicholl and Shirley Farrell</th>
<th>Oxford-Ohoka Community Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D Nicholl spoke to the Board’s submission highlighting the following.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truro Close</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The developer should have provided adequate drainage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Stream Walkway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would require ongoing maintenance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noted sharp increase in rates for Ohoka.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request German Road repairs and Ashworth’s Road sealing be brought forward.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request all schools have 40km/hr traffic controls for safety.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footpath</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request Bradleys Road footpath be urgently addressed as it had been discussed for several years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Skatepark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well utilised requires expansion and lighting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka Domain Playground</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledged positive progress.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions
Mayor Ayers referred to the complaints regarding German Road and asked if it was just in regards to one section. D Nicholl replied yes.

Mayor Ayers with regard to the 40km/hr flashing school lights asked if D Nicholl was aware that 30km/hr had been recommended by members of the community. D Nicholl replied that to his knowledge schools had reduced speed limits of 40km/hr.

Councillor Allen asked if the board had a view on Ohoka Domain market parking issues. D Nicholl advised that it had not been discussed and acknowledged there were conflicting community views on the market.

Councillor Doody asked if any money was received from the market and D Nicholl replied that funds went to the Ohoka Domain Advisory Group.

Councillor Doody, with reference to Oxford Area School pedestrian safety, asked if someone was assisting with students crossing the street and S Farrell replied that there would be a separate submission with regards to that.

Councillor Doody asked if a footpath on one side of Bay Road to the school was sufficient and S Farrell replied that the west side of Bay Road with grass verge and ditch required tidying up.

Councillor Gordon requested clarification on Truro Close drainage. D Nicholl replied that the only ‘drain’ in the area was a stockwater race and a separate drain should have been installed. There had been issues with flooding in 2014 and with the continued expansion of the subdivision, there were likely to be future issues if drainage was not addressed.

Councillor Gordon asked if $50,000 would cover relocation of the historic gatehouse and if there had been community support and fundraising for the project. D Nicholl replied a report had indicated that the gatehouse could be moved and that $50,000 should cover the relocation cost.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Group or Association</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peter Midgley and Peter</td>
<td>The Pines and Kairaki Beaches Association</td>
<td>P Robinson advised that there were similarities to the Association’s previous submissions. They wanted to highlight the issues at the Kairaki Carpark which was agreed to be a priority for improvement. It was heavily used and it would be ideal to tarseal the whole area. The increased congestion at the Williams Street/Beach Road intersection was also highlighted. Currently only one car was able to get through however if 0.5m was shaved off the footpath two cars would be able to fit. <strong>Questions</strong> Mayor Ayers asked if the issues with the Kairaki Carpark were related to drainage and P Robinson replied it was part of the issue. There were ongoing issues that appeared to be getting worse. Councillor Atkinson noted that since the changes at Beach Road Corner there had been fewer accidents and asked if the submitter’s had considered a white line in the middle to create two lanes, rather than modifications to the footpath. P Midgley commented it was an inexpensive solution to test. Councillor Atkinson asked why the offset crossing island on Beach Road was considered to be a hazard and P Midgley replied that it was not expected on a country road and was especially a hazard at night.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackie Watson and Chris</td>
<td>Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board</td>
<td>J Watson spoke to the Board’s submission highlighting the following. <strong>Town Entrances</strong> Commented that the northern entrance to Kaiapoi was beautiful and that they would like to see the same treatment at the southern entrance, particularly at 46 Main North Road. The Ohoka road and Smith Street entrances could be improved with signage and landscaping so people know they are arriving in Kaiapoi. <strong>Regeneration</strong> The Board were pleased to be part of the process and were pleased with progress. They were looking forward to the riverbanks and further retail developments. They were pleased council had listened to recommendations around green zone roading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Court Indoor Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The board opposed the proposed Coldstream Road location and suggested other places be considered as it was not wise to put all facilities in one spot. The economic benefit should be spread. It was noted the regeneration zone would allow adequate parking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reserve at Silverstream</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requested public toilets be provided as it was a long way from other facilities and was popular for walkers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic Plaques</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Referred to those at Amberley as an example. Would like to see more around town particularly due to loss of historic buildings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Protection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The board requested more investigation into the 1/500 year flood scenario and that effect of that in limiting growth and development in Kaiapoi.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Atkinson asked J Watson if she considered the Council should be looking at QR Code historic tours for the district. J Watson replied that she liked to see a physical display however it was the 'way of the future'.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Councillor Allen commented that he had sympathy for the point made around the common use of subdivision names and asked if the board had a solution. J Watson replied that better signage was required for Silverstream and there was a question whether suburbs should be named after developments. |

| Councillor Doody queried how many historic plaques were required. J Watson replied that the historical society were currently coming up with a list of sites. Sites could be worked on over a period of time. Councillor Williams asked if they were envisaging displays like that on the BNZ wall in Rangiora and J Watson replied it would be more like those in the Kaiapoi Domain. Mayor Ayers commented that the Landmark group had already completed a lot of that work and if they had been consulted. J Watson replied that it was not just looking at buildings but vistas. |
Janet Lefebvre spoke to the submission from the Rainbow ELC regarding the open stormwater drain in front of the centre. She advised that their building was leased. The drain had been a concern for a number of years and the ELC had requested in the past that it be closed and had been informed that it was not a council priority. J Lefebvre advised that in 16 years she had only seen maintenance being carried out twice on the drain.

J Lefebvre advised that the submission had been triggered by an incident of a child falling into the drain which had contained water at the time. It had been difficult to get the child out due to the steep and overgrown sides of the drain. J Lefebvre acknowledged it had been the first incident with the drain in 16 years. The only access to the ELC was across the drain. The drain was also a hazard to those walking along the path. J Lefebvre requested that the drain be made safe.

J Lefebvre tabled a written petition and advised that there was also an online petition to Council. (Tabled petition in Trim doc 170327029554[v02])

Questions

J Lefebvre advised that the drain was about 1.5m deep and at the time of the incident contained about 30cm of water.

Mayor Ayers asked what had happened with the drain during the 2014 flood and J Lefebvre answered that it had overflowed and went up the ramp of the centre.

P Allen asked how many walked to the centre and J Lefebvre advised about a dozen families.

P Williams asked how close the drain was to the side of the road and J Lefebvre advised that at least one car had gone in the ditch.

J Meyer asked about the trees blocking the sight to the drain and J Lefebvre commented the trees were desirable as they provided a separation from the road.
Martin
Pinkham

M Pinkham advised that the submissions were personal submissions. Additional submission information was tabled at the hearing (Trim doc 170412035895[v02])

Kaiapoi Town Centre
Mr Pinkham noted the town centre plan was developed in 2011 in response to the earthquakes and suggested that with the approval of the Regeneration Plan town centre plan should be considered to have run its course.
Mr Pinkham noted the development adjacent to the Riverside Church was no longer proceeding, there was limited parking for Riverside Church and Trousselot Park.
Mr Pinkham believed the Hansens Mall development should be on the south side of the river.
Noted that in relation to the District Development strategy there was a shift away from small titles in business areas. Mr Pinkham suggested that the council consider public private partnership as a joint venture to bring in commercial expertise and capital.

Questions
Councillor Allen noted that post-quake there had been extensive discussion with the community around Kaiapoi Town Centre and there had been strong support for development both sides of the bridge and asked for M Pinkham’s comment on that. M Pinkham noted that the original plan had a strong north south focus however the red zone process had changed that and there was a focus on a vibrant east west access. Councillor Atkinson asked if M Pinkham had considered that with his proposal there would be no view of the Cure Boat Club and the easterly wind would be a factor. M Pinkham noted the steps in winter would be cold and shaded.

3 Waters Rating scheme
M Pinkham advised he was opposed to the creation of one rate for the 3 Waters Services across the district as it would effectively result in urban ratepayers subsidising rural ratepayers. Historically it had been inappropriate to allow rural development using a low cost model. Urban schemes had been set up using a sustainable model, rural had not.

Questions
Councillor Allen asked if M Pinkham was opposed to a working party and M Pinkham replied no. Councillor Allen commented that the argument was to spread the burden of the drainage costs across all the district as they
would all be affected by a flood. M Pinkham commented that in urban areas development contributions had been paid by developers however that had not happened in rural areas.

**Tsunami Warning Signage**
Mr Pinkham requested that Council implement the standard practice of simple signage to indicate extent of tsunami risk and indicating escape routes in the event of a tsunami especially considering the transient nature of beach settlements. Signage was relatively low cost and well understood.

**Questions**
Councillor Allen noted that tsunami hazard signs showed people running up hill and M Pinkham advised that there were also directional signs.

**Development Contributions**
M Pinkham noted that he had made a similar submission on the issue last year and had requested a peer review on development contributions. That had been carried out but had not covered the legality of the development contributions policy. M Pinkham highlighted the linkage road between Kaiapoi Town Centre and Silverstream commenting that he had been advised that it was not proposed to install services in the road so it was no benefit to future developers of adjacent land.

**Questions**
Councillor Atkinson noted that M Pinkham had not been supplied answers to questions and requested that these be given in the future. J Palmer noted the presence of Kelly LaValley to listen to the submission and who would be happy to sit down with M Pinkham in a workshop session to provide details of rationale and methodology used to support contributions to date.

J Meyer referred to services not being installed on the link road and Kelly LaValley advised that there had been confusion, the temporary road would not have services but the permanent road would. It was a challenging development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sue Ross, Rebecca Stevenson and Bailey Stevenson</th>
<th>Tuahiwi School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sue Ross explained that the submission was for funding toward a community skatepark. She commented that the skateboard craze was still very popular and that after school and on the weekends the the community park was well utilised by the tamariki as a safe, paved area to ride their bikes, scooters etc. There had been damage to school property from the activity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Ross noted that Woodend had the closest skate facilities however that was dangerous to get to.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Ross advised that they were in the process of seeking approval from Ngāi Tūāhuriri Runanga. She believed it was a good project opportunity for the children, Council, Ngai Tūāhuriri Runanga and the community to work together on.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Questions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Atkinson commented that he agreed it should be a joint effort. He noted that there were a lot of visitors to the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Allen acknowledged it was at an initial concept stage and asked if the submitters believed it should be a share community/council contribution. Rebecca Stevenson commented that $50,000 was a rough estimate of costs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amanda Hardy, Stephen Kelliher</th>
<th>Mandeville Sports Centre (MSC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Hardy advised that the new walking and bike track at the grounds was progressing. Some planting was still required and advice would be sought on the type of planting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Hardy advised that the main focus for the coming year was on development of the old ponyclub grounds triangle. This would provide more playing fields and training facilities. It would relieve pressure on the ‘light rugby field’, would allow hosting more than three cricket games at senior level and would allow other codes such as football to be added.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Hardy commented that the MSC had a lot of support from businesses who could help provide product and expertise.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
S Kelliher commented that it was a good opportunity to develop 5 hectares of premier sports ground for $20,000 which was only possible due to the support of the community. The development was a straightforward process.

S Kelliher noted that the MSC supported a third artificial turf in north canterbury to be situated at the MSC. He commented the 'light rugby field' at MSC already had existing infrastructure and was a logical location.

Questions
Councillor Brine asked if rugby was aware that Kendall Park astroturf was built for rugby.

Councillor Allen congratulated MSC for their excellent example of a Council/Community partnership and requested that with each submission to the Annual Plan they provide a summary of what had been achieved the previous year. A Hardy explained that last year a big project which had been ticked off was the second carpark.

Mayors Ayers commented that the extension to the bowling club was a good local project and thanked MSC for the work they were doing.

S Kelliher advised that a change since the previous year was the employment of a fully qualified groundsman. It assisted with volunteer health and safety issues.

Councillor Williams asked if vandalism was still a problem and A Hardy advised no.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Submission Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trevor Wright</td>
<td>Trevor Wright spoke to his submission commenting that Rangiora was approaching city size and that Council had a responsibility to provide community facilities. Towns smaller than Rangiora had botanic gardens and he would like to see one in Rangiora but was concerned suitable land was being built on. He wanted consideration of retaining a large area of land for a future botanic garden. Mayor Ayers asked if the submitter had considered the regeneration area of Kaiapoi. And asked if he was familiar with the Scott Rose Garden and Matawai Park. T Wright did not believe they had botanic garden status. He believed a botanic garden should be wider than natives. Councillor Blackie commented that the regeneration land was available now and T Wright believed it was better to start sooner than later. He noted there were opportunities with experimental crops and educational research through partnership with private enterprise. Councillor Williams asked if the submitter had a group willing to assist with the project and T Wright replied no, he wanted to put the idea to the Council and see how it would evolve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugald McLean</td>
<td>D McLean advised that the submission was in regards to the rating system noting property value based rates were a poor reflection of ability to pay for Council services. He suggested other systems could be looked at. D McLean was concerned that rates on the Oxford Rural No.1 rates had increased by over 30% in two years and while it was related to water issues it was a massive increase for anyone. He suggested a ‘cap and spread’ approach. D McLean referred to the targeted rates for the Thongcaster Road sealing cost and commented that it was hard to define who benefitted from the improvement. Once improvements had been made others would use the road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federated Farmers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Federated Farmers supported the upgrade of water supplies.

Councillor Felstead quiered whether the submitter preferred targeted rates or cap and spread and D McLean recognised that the comments were slightly contradictory but that there needed to be a limit on rate increases.

Councillor Doody with regard to Thongcaster Road improvements, asked if the submitter had considered that the users were new dairy conversions and D McLean recognised that changes in land use had put pressure on the road, however those users were already paying road user charges. It was not clear how to define the properties targeted. Mayor Ayers clarified that the boundary was those properties that had been charged financial contributions for sealing in the past.

The meeting was adjourned at 4.16pm to be reconvened on Thursday 4 May 2017 at 1.00pm in the Council Chambers, 215 High Street, Rangiora.
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MINUTES OF A RECONVENED MEETING OF THE WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL
HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, RANGIORA SERVICE CENTRE, 215 HIGH
STREET, RANGIORA ON THURSDAY 4 MAY 2017 COMMENCING AT 1.00PM

PRESENT:

Mayor D Ayers (Chair), Deputy Mayor K Felstead, Councillors P Allen, N Atkinson, A Blackie, R Brine (from 1.40pm), W Doody, D Gordon, J Meyer, S Stewart (until 4.15pm) and P Williams.

IN ATTENDANCE:

J Palmer (Chief Executive) and Mrs A Smith (Committee Advisor)

1. APOLOGIES

An apology for lateness was received and sustained from Councillor R Brine.

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Councillor Doody noted a conflict of interest relating to the submission from North Canterbury Neighbourhood Support, noting her role as Council representative in this organisation.

3. HEARING OF SUBMISSIONS TO THE DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN 2017/2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natasha Ackroyd</td>
<td>Big Brothers Big Sisters North Canterbury</td>
<td>Natasha Ackroyd and Rebecca Pugh (staff members) and Karen Shepherd and Frank Endacott (members of the Big Brothers Big Sisters Board) presented this submission on behalf of Big Brothers Big Sisters North Canterbury. A large contingent of supporters of the group were also present in the public gallery. The challenging times for fundraising were highlighted and it was pointed out that the group is very active in fundraising. Due to funding constraints the group has a cap on the number of matches of mentors and children in North Canterbury. Currently there are 55 active matches. The group is asking for $10,000 from the Council to help the group to continue the good work that it is doing at the moment. Natasha provided a background to the work of the group and the matching of the mentor with the children and the benefits to both. Groups are both community based and school based. The benefits to the children included improved self confidence and positive attitude towards school. Information tabled at the hearing included an evaluation programme report 2016, and a graph showing income sources (Trim doc. 170412035894[v2])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Pugh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Shepherd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Endacott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kaleb and Peter are a matched mentor and child who were part of the supporters present. They both spoke on the enjoyment of their friendship which has developed throughout the programme. Karen spoke on the $130,000 per annum needed to run the programme in North Canterbury. The Board has put in tremendous effort over the years for fundraising, with the most recent being the annual fundraising Breakfast held yesterday, which was a huge success. Cost reduction initiatives were noted in the handout: It is disheartening having to turn away both potential mentors and children as there is not enough funding for any further matches.

Questions: Cr Allen questioned is this cost likely to be a continuing cost, it was confirmed that this would be a fixed cost and required each year. Any options for reviewing costs would be considered.

Karl Howarth

Karl Howarth, and two others members of the Rangiora Winter Festival event organising team, spoke to the submission. The group is an incorporated society. The submission seeks $5,000 funding and/or infrastructure assistance from the Council for running the festival. Karl spoke on the plans to build on last years festival, with some exciting initiatives, including a black tie cocktail event and a farmers market on High Street. There is some major sponsors on board again this year, along with Singapore Airlines, who have donated two airfares as a prize. It is hoped to establish the festival as a long standing event that people from all over Canterbury and outside the region will want to come to. It was noted that finding sponsorship for the health and safety, traffic management, resource consent matters and other infrastructure required to run an event, is the most difficult aspect...
Rangiora Winter Festival (Contd)

There were between 7,000 to 8,000 people through the festival last year which was higher than the expected levels. There were a total of 92 local sponsors of the event last year and these also benefited from the increased patronage as a result of the Winter Festival, as did all businesses in the town, including the hospitality trade. The long term goal would be to create a broader festival, and call it the Waimakariri Winter Festival.

Questions
Councillor Gordon asked is there a breakdown on what the $5000 would go towards?. Approximate figures of $1500 for health and safety, $1000 for security guards were suggested and it was agreed that a more defined breakdown will be provided to the Council.

Karl advised that the Group had not applied for funding for marketing and promotion through ENC but ENC did not fund infrastructure costs. It was the intention to sell tickets to the black tie cocktail function, and hope to make money from this function.

Robert Johnston

Mr Johnston spoke to his submission, circulated some supplementary information (Trim doc 170330030962[v2])
1. Advised that the application for funding to the Rata Foundation was unsuccessful, so there is a further gap in funding for the heritage pavilion at Ashley Gorge Reserve.
2. Lees Valley Rd cattle stops have been cleaned since his submission, but suggested there needs maintenance work on the metal structures.
3. Bridge on Ashley Gorge Rd – still has concerns with the width of this bridge and potential for accidents, especially with the size of trucks. Mr Johnson provided details on the width of the bridge in comparison with another local bridge, showing it is 4ft 6in narrower. Would like it widened on one side by around 2 metres.
4. Would like better gorse control and regular inspection on the disused WDC Pit – off Lees Valley Road.
| Robert Johnston (continued) | 5. Ashley River – has spoken on several occasions on the past, though acknowledging that this is not this council's responsibility, but also linkages with the Zone Committee. Mr Johnston asked if the Council could keep the problems with the reach of river in focus with Ecan. Incorrect information has been told to the Zone Committee, and he believes that Ecan need to be spending money on protection of the source of the river, not just downstream near Rangora. Mr Johnston believes there needs to be rating districts formed for the different areas of the river.  
6. Additional information tabled on the day: roadside drains  
7. Regarding Easter Sunday trading: Mr Johnston supports trading in the afternoon. |
| Frances L Ryman | Ms Ryman spoke on her concerns with the traffic safety at the junction of Tuahiwi Road, Rangiora-Woodend Road and Boys Road. Mrs Ryman read her submission with copies tabled at the hearing (Trim doc. 170405033355[v2]). Mrs Ryman has lived on Tuahiwi Road for six years and in that time has witnessed the aftermath of several accidents at this intersection. Noted that there has been a dramatic increase in residential development since the 2010/2011 earthquakes and most residences have more than one car. Urges the Council to bring forward the time for considering realignment of the intersection. Submission also noted objections to the removal of trees in the district to accommodate new residential developments. Ms Ryman believes any residential development designs should be able to accommodate existing trees rather than trees having to be removed to accommodation developers residential designs. Ms Ryman supports having the train commuter service being reinstated between Rangiora and Christchurch and suggests that Council committee support to this also. She pointed out from first hand viewing, the daily volume of single occupancy vehicles that travel into Christchurch. In the interests of climate change, Ms Ryman suggests that Rangiora could be seen as a more progressive town by supporting this also. Question Ms Ryman supports a roundabout at the Tuahiwi Road intersection. |
Robin Brown

Mr Brown spoke to his submission which supports the Council developing a policy supporting shops opening for trading on Easter Sunday, following the passing of recent legislation. Mr Brown spoke on the anomalies in the previous Act which allows some towns to open on Easter Sunday, and others not (e.g. Queenstown were allowed, and Wanaka were not). This needed a change of thinking and it is not a good idea to have generally honest people breaking the law. This process now could have anomalies with some districts/towns open and others not. As a local supermarket owner, Mr Brown noted that there is a lot of perishable goods that goes to waste if a business has to close for a day. Already business have to close on Good Friday. There are already many people who have to work over Easter weekend and suggests that there is less people now who would observe Easter as a religious holiday. Mr Browns supermarket staff are not expected to work and if they say they cannot work a particular shift, they are not questioned if they decline. The sale of alcohol on Easter Sunday will still be prohibited. Mr Brown firmly believes that people should be given the choice of opening their business or not and urges the Council to form a policy for the whole district to allow business trading.

Question
Mayor Ayers asked why not have trading on Good Friday, rather than Easter Sunday – Mr Brown said anecdotal evidence suggests that people don’t expect the supermarket to be open on Good Friday, but they do on Easter Sunday.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Club/Environment</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Prain</td>
<td>Rangiora Cricket Club</td>
<td>Sarah Prain presented the submission on behalf of the Rangiora cricket Club, asking the Council to provide two cricket practice nets at Dudley Park, for the Club members. The park is very busy with cricket games during summer on Saturdays, and practices on Thursday nights. Rangiora High School also have teams now, they have nets at the school, but they play their games at Dudley on Saturday. Regarding the Mainpower oval outdoor nets, these are often used by Canterbury Country Cricket for their training and if Clubs do use these nets there is a cost involved. Questions Cr Allen asked re the quote, Ms Prain said this is for two nets, permanently installed. There had been some consideration given to having movable nets, but these could be open to vandalism, the nets being cut etc and it was felt that more permanent nets would be a better proposition. Mayor Ayers asked if she was aware of how other clubs finance having practice nets for their members. Ms Prain wasn’t aware of this. In an effort to encourage membership, Rangiora Club keeps its subscriptions low. If subs were increased this could be a source of funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Bayfield</td>
<td>Environment Canterbury</td>
<td>Council had previously agreed to consider the late submission from Environment Canterbury (Trim doc 170501042322). Mr Bayfield, Ecan Chief Executive presented the submission, noting apologies from Chairman (David Bedford) and Councillor Claire McKay. Congratulations were extended to the Council on the recent SOLGM Award for its community consultation project relating to the Earthquake Red Zone land. Ecan acknowledged the support provided by Waimakariri District Council to the Water Zone Committee, and noted the appreciation of the work of Chief Executive Jim Palmer, in the Mayoral Forum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Bayfield</td>
<td>Environment Canterbury (continued)</td>
<td>Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Council Stewart noted the representation on the Zone Committee from the Runanga, as due to illness, there has not been any representation for most of the year to date at Zone meetings or workshops from the Runanga. Mr Bayfield, said Ecan is aware of this situation, and noted the workload of Runanga representatives. Possibly replacement runanga representation for the Waimakariri Zone Committee could come from a different zone committee representative. This matter was being given consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The recent changes to bus routes going through Kaiapoi were highlighted. Councillor Atkinson noted that the Kaiapoi Community Board had submitted against the proposed routes, based on the public comments. The routes were changed regardless and suggests the new routes are not popular.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llewyllen Timpson</td>
<td>R13 Youth Development Trust</td>
<td>Mr Timpson presented this submission on behalf of the R13 Trust, which works with at risk young people in the community. The Trust is seeking $75,000 to further develop the current programmes, enabling the Trust to meet the current growing needs. This would support Administration of the Trust including remuneration for a part-time programme manager to oversee the day to day operations. The administrative budget is only 4.5% of the total budget. Volunteers are unpaid, and all the funding goes into the programmes that are delivered. Questions Mayor Ayers asked does the Ministry of Education help with funding in any way? The Ministry of Education provides interim response Funding (IRF) grants for short term interventions for referrals from schools. Councillor Allen: asked for clarification on the submission seeking $75,000 for the 2017/18 year. Mr Timpson said this funding is to build the capacity of the programme over a two year period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Cassin</td>
<td>Cust Community Network Incorporated</td>
<td>The submitter was not present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Gerard</td>
<td>Rangiora-Ashley Community Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The Board Chair Jim Gerard presented the submission on behalf of the Board. It was noted that none of the Council members of the Board were involved in the preparation of the submission. Concern raised were  
1. The entrance to the town from Lineside Road – needs landscaping and tidying up  
2. Current Victoria Park toilets need upgrading and enlarging to provide better facilities in the town.  
3. Cones Road/Carrs Rd, nothing further to add to the submission.  
4. The Board has concerns with the Uniform Annual General Charge and the impact of this on some residents  
5. Unanimous support of the Board for the Indoor Court Facility proposal at the Coldstream Road Rangiora site.  
6. Kerbside collection - the Board supports the status quo.  
7. District Wide rating for 3 waters – the Board feels that the cost should fall where the cost lies.  

Questions  
Councillor Allen, re the public toilets availability in Rangiora town centre – Mr Gerard noted it was a general issue of the provision of better facilities, there hadn’t been any discussion by the board if disability access was required.  

Mayor Ayers, re kerbside collection – Mr Gerard said if there was a choice available, this would mean a cost would be incurred.  

Re the entrance to the towns, Mr Gerard said the Board’s concerns were with the landscaping and general tidy up of the area, with addition of footpaths etc |

<p>| Kirstyn Barnett | This submitter did not attend. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sis Johnston</th>
<th>Ashley Gorge Reserve Advisory Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms Johnston presented the submission on behalf of the Ashley Gorge Reserve Advisory Group, along with Chairperson Jan Shelton, and Robert Johnston. Tabled a plan of a proposed Reynolds Heritage pavilion. Funding had been sourced from the Rata Foundation for this project, but unfortunately, this has not been successful which has resulted in a shortfall in the funding. Ms Johnston acknowledged the Council funding of $65,000 already approved for the project. The group has been very busy in enhancing other areas of the Reserve, and walking tracks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions

Councillor Allen - The $20,000 requested from the Council is the gap to bridge the shortfall of $65,000 already approved. The fitout costs would come from fundraising of the Advisory Group.

Mayor Ayers – enquired about any ongoing costs anticipated with the pavilion. Ms Johnston said that the information panels would not be expensive if needing to be replaced. There would be normal maintenance costs required for the building.

Councillor Doody – will the caretaker be responsible for the maintenance and tidy upkeep of the building, once it is established?. Ms Johnston said this would be a joint arrangement, with Advisory Group members possibly assisting with this. There could be a donation box also put in place.

Councillor Atkinson suggested it could be beneficial to approach any of the many clubs who use Ashley Gorge Reserve for gatherings for possible donations, which could go towards this facility.

Ms Johnston advised that an indication of the number of users of the Ashley Gorge Reserve – on Sunday 12 Feb there were 488 cars travelled in and out of the reserve.

The Group are passionate about this project and will continue with their fundraising in support of it.
John Lynn

Residents’ Association

Mr Lynn spoke representing the Ohoka Residents Association. There have been questions from residents on the rates in relation to the recent updated water supply and to the installation of reticulation sewerage system. The delay in the Jenkins and Bagrie residential subdivisions getting underway, which these updated schemes were to support, has meant increased rates to cover costs has fallen directly onto ratepayers. There is confusion amongst residents on this matter and Mr Lynn suggests this is a community engagement opportunity for the Council to provide clarification on this matter.

Ohoka Domain and Ohoka Pavilion – the pavilion has been waiting for earthquake repair/strengthening for quite some time. The Residents Association understand that the contract has been let for this, but no work has commenced yet.

Re the play equipment in the Ohoka Domain – this is well overdue for replacement and the need to provide better facilities for the young families in Ohoka. Noted there has been recent upgrades to the play equipment at Mandeville and a lot of money spent at Pearson Park in Oxford.

Cycleway/pathways – there is no pathway on Mill Road from Whites Road to Bradleys Road and this does not provide safe movement for children cycling or walking to Ohoka school. The area is also used by people exercising (walking/running) and is a serious safety issue. The Residents Association request the Council consider the cycleway/pathway extending on Mill Road from Whites Road to Bradleys Road.

Re Ohoka School, the Association believes every school should be eligible to have the “40kph” speed sign. Even though there is currently 70kph speed limit outside the school, too much speeding traffic uses Jacksons Road past Ohoka School particularly around drop off and pick up times. Mr Lynn added that traffic is not slowing down and there are also significant numbers of trucks that use Jacksons Road.

Questions

Mayor Ayers asked if parking when the Ohoka Market is operating on Friday mornings was considered an issue. It was noted that some residents are putting up
barriers and pegs. Mr Lynn said this is not something that has been discussed by the Residents Association.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tracey Doe</th>
<th>North Canterbury Neighbourhood Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Councillor Doody left the table during consideration of this submission. Tracey Doe (Coordinator) and Kat Hanna (Secretary) were present for this submission. This is an incorporated society. The submission proposes that Neighbourhood Support is included under the Council's Civil Defence team to formalising existing relationships. Ms Doe spoke on the system called North Canterbury GETS READY, which has a primary focus is to enable communities to be self-sufficient should another event occur. The arrangements that are currently in place in Selwyn between Neighbourhood Support and the Council Emergency Management Team were highlighted. This means that Neighbourhood Support are incorporated with Civil Defence and key messages from the Police and Fire service and any important Council notifications get circulated to the appropriate households.

Noted the system would have the ability to send text messages or have Facebook contact with information that would affect specific residents of certain areas. The system only sends out information under strict criteria.

Selwyn District Council have a growing group as part of the Council emergency management team and ability to contact 6,500 households if required.

Questions

Mayor Ayers asked what the costs involved would be. With a resource required of 30 hours per week for two, this would be $800 per week. Ms Doe advised that the group will also be submitting to Hurunui District Council. The group are working to engage with the Civil Defence teams in Waimakariri, Hurunui and Kaikoura.
### James Ensor

**Best Affordable Community Outcomes**

James Ensor presented his submission, supported by Andy, Kay Richard and Karen.

**Meeting Room**

Mr Ensor spoke to his submission proposing to have an additional meeting space at Mandeville Sports Ground, as it is currently difficult to get a meeting venue.

Mr Ensor suggested that the building originally proposed to be the Pegasus Community Centre could be used at Mandeville (the former Council Green Space team offices) and wishes to register an interest in this building for the Mandeville community. The Mandeville area has about 2000 residents in proximity. Community Board meetings could be held in this meeting space and it could also be used for sports club meetings, training/education seminars and Council consultation events. There are a large number of Clubs in the Mandeville area with no Clubrooms of their own. Mr Ensor noted that Oxford and surrounding area is served well with meeting space with the Oxford Town Hall and Jaycee Rooms, and all the other Wards in the District have suitable Council owned facilities for their Board meetings.

Having a meeting space in Mandeville would allow an even balance of Community Board meetings over a 12 months period throughout the Oxford/Ohoka Board area.

**Drainage Issues:** The group believes the rates charged for drainage for residents in Truro Close, Mandeville Sports Centre, Mandeville Road and Ohoka Meadows Drive are unrealistic and should not be charged. The group support the Oxford Ohoka Community Board with their concerns of the validity of requiring a contribution of rates. Residents perceive that they receive no benefit and are unaware of any Council Drains or connections in this area.

**Flooding from Mandeville Park**

The issue of flooding from the water race in Mandeville Park Drive bridge. Mr Ensor showed a slide presentation showing flooding of properties in Truro Close as a result of the flooding event of June 2014. It was suggested that there needs to be an over flow pipe installed at the end of the Bridge and there is also issues with the swales. Mr Ensor said these issues have been brought to the attention of Council staff in the past. The group are happy with the fixed rate of $42 across the district, but...
it is considered completely unrealistic for these residents to have to pay the Ohoka Drainage Rate of $130.64 each from 100 residences, totalling over $13,000.

There are also concerns with general flooding in Tram Road, Two Chain Road and No. 10 Road area, suggesting there is a mismatch in culvert sizes and the capacity required.

**Roading issues:**
Submission also requests sealing of Ashworths Road, to meet community expectations as this is what residents were told by the developer. Increased traffic use of this as a clear run to Rangiora, avoiding going through Ohoka, Flaxton Rd, and Southbrook. Suggests investigating having slip lanes on Jacksons and Whites Roads and also an improvement to the slip lane at Tram Road/motorway. The group would like to see some improvements at the Swannanoa Road/Johns Road intersection to enhance visibility and safety.

Questions
Mayor Ayers asked re the Mandeville Sports Centre suitability for holding meetings. Mr Ensor noted that there is often many users in the sports centre at one time and it is not suitable for holding meetings when this is the case. (i.e. people ordering meals, using the changing rooms after sports practices, and other meetings taking place).
Katrina Bourgeois was present, accompanied by Shirley Farrell. Ms Bourgeois submission requests that the speed limit in the main street of Oxford be reduced from 50kph to 40kph. Ms Bourgeois has experienced first hand that people are travelling too fast and not always seeing pedestrians on any of the three pedestrian crossings. Her own children were nearly hit by a vehicle at the Bay Road pedestrian crossing. She has set up a face book page seeking community views on this matter, and has had mixed response. Ms Bourgeois has suggested on this page as a safety measure that school children wear high viz clothing. Ms Bourgeois has also spoken to staff at Oxford Area School, and it has been suggested that the High School students could possibly assist the younger children crossing the streets. Ms Bourgeois has undertaken a petition that has 285 signatures requesting that the speed limit be reduced to 40kph. Oxford is a busy town and lots of traffic also passing down the main street. Sometimes visibility is not good around the pedestrian crossings, with the signs blocked by shrubs and large trucks parked. It was noted that there are three pedestrian crossings, and six streets off Main Street, within an 800 metre section of road, and Ms Bourgeois believes the 50kph speed limit is too fast.

Questions
Councillor Allen suggested that this concern could be taken to the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board.

Are the vehicles travelling at the 50kph speed limit or are they travelling faster? The local Police Officer has this information from his observations, but Ms Bourgeois does not have this information.
| Councillor Felstead – would the temporary speed signs be of benefit? Ms Bourgeois thought these definitely would be of benefit. Councillor Felstead noted that these signs have been in Oxford previously. The signs also have the capacity to keep records of traffic and the average speed when these signs were here then was just 43kph.

Councillor Meyer asked if sunstrike has come up as an issue with impairing visibility of drivers approaching the crossing? This has come up in conversation but is not considered to be a major issue. |

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 4.56pm.
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1. **SUMMARY**

1.1. The purpose of this report is to provide the Council with an overview of the results of the Special Consultative Procedure (SCP) undertaken for the 2017/18 Draft Annual Plan following the Council adopted the *Draft Annual Plan 2017/18* and *Consultation Document* at its meeting on Tuesday 7 March 2017 for public consultation.

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report no. LTC-03-12/ *Draft Annual Plan 2017/18 Special Consultative Procedure*.

(b) Receives all 83 submissions and the 256 submission points raised by submitters, as contained in the ‘Deliberations Pack’ previously distributed to Councillors.

(c) Considers all 256 submission points during the Draft Annual Plan 2017/18 deliberations.

3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

3.1. **Preparation and Adoption**

Council considered proposed changes to budgets and work programmes for the third year of the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan during the Council’s Annual Budget meetings held on Wednesday 15 and Thursday 16 February 2017. As a result, the *Draft Annual Plan 2017/18* was prepared and adopted by Council as the Statement of Proposal and the *2017/18 Draft Annual Plan Consultation Document* was prepared and adopted by Council as the basis for consultation at its meeting on Tuesday 7 March 2017.

There were no material or significant changes to that shown in the LTP proposed in the Draft Annual Plan 2017/18. There was however, a question included in the *Consultation Document* about Easter Sunday Trading – ‘Do you support shops opening for trading on Easter Sunday?’
Public consultation opened on Friday 10 March and closed on Tuesday 11 April 2017 under section 83 Special Consultative Procedure of the Local Government Act 2002.

3.2. Consultation

A copy of the 2017/18 Draft Annual Plan Consultation Document was posted to previous submitters to the Draft Annual Plan 2016/17 and other interested parties. Copies of the Draft Annual Plan 2017/18 and Consultation Document were made available for public inspection at all the Council service centres and libraries.


A submission form was included in the Consultation Document and available for downloading from the Annual Plan webpage. Submissions could also be made via email and directly online.

Public notices advertising the consultation period were placed in the Kaiapoi Advocate and the Northern Outlook, with social media updates, advertisements in local newsletters and articles in local newspapers providing further information during the consultation period.

Engagement with the community on the Draft Annual Plan 2017/18 and more specifically Easter Sunday trading, involved a series of online videos to generate interest and seek both informal and formal feedback. There was also a Council presence at the Oxford A & P Show where the Easter Bunny sought informal feedback on Easter Sunday trading.

Eighty-three submissions were received, raising 256 individual submission points. Submission topics included:
- Capital Projects
- Community Facilities
- Development Contributions Policy Review
- Developing our Long Term Plan 2018-2028
- District Plan
- Easter Sunday Trading
- Emergency Management
- Rates
- Requests for Funding
- Speed Limits.

3.3 Hearings

All submitters where given the opportunity to present their submission in person. Council heard 26 submitters, 12 presented in Kaiapoi with the remaining 14 presenting in Rangiora.

3.4 The Management Team/CE has reviewed this report and supports the recommendations.

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. Community views were sought during the Draft Annual Plan 2017/18 submission period and the hearings process.
5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1 Financial Implications

There may be financial implications as an outcome of Council deliberations.

6. CONTEXT

6.1. Policy

This matter is not a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

6.2. Legislation

Local Government Act 2002, section 82 Principles of Consultation, section 83 Special Consultative Procedure and section 95(2) Annual Plan – Subject to subsection (2A), a local authority must consult in a manner that gives effect to the requirements of section 82 before adopting an annual plan.

6.3. Community Outcomes

Undertaking a Special Consultative Procedure (SCP) for the Draft Annual Plan 2017/18 contributes to the following outcomes:

- Local, regional and national organisations make information about their plans and activities readily available
- Local, regional and national organisations make every effort to accommodate the views of people who contribute to consultations.

Maria Edgar
CORPORATE PLANNER
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1. The purpose of this report is to advise Council of the options available regarding Easter Sunday trading.

1.2. Central Government, through the 2016 Amendment of the *Shop Trading Hours Act 1990* has given Local Government the opportunity to develop a policy to allow Easter Sunday trading in their districts. A policy may allow trading throughout the District or be restricted to certain areas of the District. It cannot restrict the hours or type of business that may trade. Local policies cannot control or override shop trading provisions in other legislation, such as the *Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012*.

1.3. If a policy is not developed the status quo remains, with Easter Sunday trading allowed within the provisions of the current law. The current law allows a number of types of businesses to be open, most with restrictions but some, like pharmacies, may open without conditions.

1.4. Of the three neighbouring Territorial Authorities, only Selwyn District Council has made a decision regarding Easter Sunday trading which is to maintain the status quo. Neither Christchurch City Council nor Hurunui District Council have considered this question with their communities at this stage.

1.5. Through the Annual Plan process Council took the opportunity to ask the Waimakariri community what they thought about whether or not the Council should develop an Easter Sunday trading policy. In total 579 people expressed their views on Easter Sunday trading in the District. Of these, 274 want the Council to develop a policy to allow Easter Sunday trading and 305 supported the status quo.
2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No: 170516049264

(b) **Maintains** the status quo and does not develop an Easter Sunday Trading Policy at this time.

Or

(c) **Instructs** Council staff to develop an Easter Sunday Trading Policy on behalf of the Council and the community.

(d) **Notes** that the decision in (b) could be reconsidered on request from the community or as part of a sub-regional approach with Christchurch City Council and the Hurunui District Council.

(e) **Suggests** Council undertake further discussions with Members of Parliament advocating for a national decision regarding Easter Sunday trading.

3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

3.1. Central Government, through the *Shop Trading Hours Amendment Act 2016* enabled Territorial Authorities to develop a policy to allow trading in their district on Easter Sunday. The policy may apply to the whole, or selected parts, of a district but may not place any restrictions on hours or type of premises that may trade. Any such policy must be developed using the special consultative procedure as outlined in the *Local Government Act 2002*.

3.2. If a policy is developed, the Council has no further role in implementing, monitoring or enforcing the policy. The policy must be reviewed every five years, again using the special consultative procedure. A policy can not require businesses to open, or require people to shop, on Easter Sunday unless it is their wish to do so.

3.3. If the status quo is maintained and a policy not developed the current law applies. The following shops may open on Easter Sunday whether or not a policy is in effect:

3.3.1. **Dairy**

The only goods sold are:
- Food
- Drink
- Household items
- Personal items

3.3.2. **Service Station**

The only goods sold are:
- Food
- Drink
- Household items
- Personal items
- Petrol, oil, car parts and accessories
The goods sold are items people can’t put off buying until the next day, such as baby formula or pet food, and the quantity of goods for sale is no more than needed to meet the needs of people in the area or travelling through. (Applies to 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 above).

3.3.3. Take away bar, restaurant, café

Only selling prepared or cooked food ready to be eaten immediately in the form in which it is sold.

*Note that shop trading provisions allowing a bar, café or restaurant to open on restricted trading days to sell goods such as food, have no effect on the conditions for the sale and supply of alcohol on these days (including Easter Sunday). The Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012 continues to apply and premises selling and supplying alcohol (such as bars, some cafes and restaurants) must comply with it. This means they are not permitted to sell alcohol on restricted trading days unless this is with a meal.*

3.3.4. Duty Free store

Only selling duty free items

3.3.5. A shop providing services, rather than selling goods, such as a video rental store or a hairdresser

Only providing a service such as renting videos or cutting hair. No goods are sold such as videos or hair products.

3.3.6. Real estate agency

No conditions, real estate does not fit within the definition of goods as defined by the Act.

3.3.7. Pharmacies

No conditions

3.3.8. Garden centres

The sole or principle business is the supply of plants or garden supplies or both.

3.3.9. A shop at any public transport terminal or station

Only selling books, magazines and newspapers, or duty free items/souvenirs, or food that has been cooked/prepared and is ready to be eaten.

3.3.10. A shop in a premises where an exhibition or show is taking place. This includes markets, craft shows and stalls at these exhibitions and shows.

The shop/stall must be within the premises (this means the building/location but doesn’t include e.g. a street which has been closed for the event) of an actual exhibition or show.

The exhibition or show must be devoted entirely or primarily to agriculture, art, industry, and science or any of these. This is quite a strict requirement, and to be considered ‘devoted’ to a show or exhibition a shop must be selling goods that are connected in some way with the show. For example, arts and crafts at an art and craft show, or farming supplies at an agriculture show rather than general goods.

3.3.11. A shop primarily selling only souvenirs

The criteria for whether or not an item is considered a souvenir is that it is connected to a New Zealand place or New Zealand culture.

3.4. Council took the opportunity through the Annual Plan 2017/18 to ask the community whether they would like shops to have the option of trading on Easter Sunday.

The Annual Plan 2017/18 consultation attracted 31 submissions regarding Easter Sunday trading. Of these 15 were in support of the development of a policy to allow Easter Sunday trading in the Waimakariri District and 16 supported the status quo.
3.5. A further 206 comments were received via social media (predominantly the Council’s Facebook page) and 242 preferences through a ‘tick box’ survey available at the Oxford Market and Rangiora A & P Show. Of these, 259 supported the development of a policy and 289 preferred status quo.

3.6. In total 579 people expressed their views on Easter Sunday trading in the District. Of these, 274 want the Council to develop a policy to allow Easter Sunday trading and 305 supported the status quo.

3.7. There has not been a great deal of enthusiasm from South Island Territorial Authorities to develop Easter Sunday trading policies for Easter 2017. The exception are tourist destination authorities such as Queenstown Lakes and Westland. Other authorities such as Ashburton, Selwyn, Tasman and Nelson found that on consultation with their community’s views were polarised and the decision to maintain status quo was made.

The following table shows the status of the decisions around this issue:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TA</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashburton</td>
<td>No policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gore</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson/Tasman</td>
<td>No policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timaru</td>
<td>Planning to consult in October 2017 for Easter 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westland</td>
<td>Policy developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selwyn</td>
<td>No policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurunui</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch City</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queenstown Lakes</td>
<td>Policy developed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.8. The Management Team/CE has reviewed this report and supports the recommendations.

4. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

4.1. Community views were sought through the Annual Plan consultation. A number of video interviews were posted on the Council Facebook page and website to encourage people to participate and express their views. The videos included interviews with local business owners, a Christian Minister and members of the public to ensure a broad view of the issue was presented.

5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

5.1. Preparation of a policy will be covered under current budgets with staff time being the major financial commitment to this project. The policy has a statutory review timetable of every five years. On each occasion a full special consultative procedure will need to be undertaken, the cost of this process is approximately $10,000 for each process.

6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. **Policy**

This is not a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance Policy.

6.2. **Legislation**

*Local Government Act 2002*
6.3. Community Outcomes

Businesses in the District are diverse, adaptable and growing

- There are growing numbers of businesses and employment opportunities in our District
- There are sufficient and appropriate places where businesses are able to set up in our District

There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision making by local, regional and national organisations that affects our District

- Local, regional and national organisations make information about their plans and activities readily available.
- Local, regional and national organisations make every effort to take account of the views of people who participate in community engagement.
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT

FILE NO and TRIM NO: LTC-03-12/170511047604

REPORT TO: The Council

DATE OF MEETING: 30 May 2017

FROM: Malcolm Johnston. Environmental Services Manager

SUBJECT: TEAM LEADER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES UNIT

STAFF SUBMISSION TO THE DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN 2017-18

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to seek funding for a team leader within the Environmental Services Unit (ESU). It is proposed the role be responsible for overseeing both Environmental Health Officers, the General Inspector and Parking Officer within the ESU. The team leader would also be in charge of overseeing the day to day management of the Food/Health contract Council has with Food and Health Standards Ltd (FHS). This proposal is based on the staffing levels within ESU and the current role of the Environmental Services Manager who is responsible for 10 direct reports, Food and Health contract management along with Council’s after-hours contract management. He is also responsible as the Secretary of the District Licensing Committee (DLC) in preparing and coordinating all alcohol applications and hearings for the DLC. The appointment of a team leader would assist the Environmental Services Manager in ensuring supervision of staff, ensuring Council meets demand for service, whilst supporting the Council in delivering our customer promise of being professional, approachable and solutions focussed.

1.2. Funding is sought to employ a full-time position team leader with a salary range of $90,000 to $95,000. This proposal increases the proposed Environmental Services Unit annual budget by $105,000.

1.3. The additional $105,000 equates to 1.5% of the general rate which would mean an increase of 0.2% on total rates.

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 170511047604

(b) Approves the amended draft Annual Plan Provision for the Environmental Services Unit to increase the Annual Plan Budget by $105,000 to fund an additional full time team leader position.

(c) Notes the impact on rates is a 0.17% increase.
3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

Reason it was not included in the Draft Annual Plan

3.1. The Environmental Services Unit has been implementing the new Food Act 2014 for the last 12 months. This is still an incomplete change in the industry and is recognised by the Act’s 5 year transition period from the old 1974 food regulations. To help address this and associated with a retirement of one of the health inspectors, service delivery is now by a mix of contract with Food and Health Standards and in-house staff. The contract has been in place for 6 months. This period has confirmed that the appointment of a team leader would help better co-ordinate day to day staff and contract work and provide more ability to work with individual staff to ensure the Council’s customer service objectives are embedded. An alternative would be to leave the discussion to the Long Term Plan. In staffs’ view it’s preferable to act sooner to enable changes sought in customer service to be implemented more quickly.

3.2. The Environmental Services Unit delivers a wide range of services to the Waimakariri District. These include all health services, food, alcohol, noise, animal control, hazardous substances, litter and general nuisances. To undertake this the ESU has three Animal Control Officers and an Animal Shelter Attendant; two Environmental Health Officers covering Food Licensing, Alcohol Licensing and Health matters; and two general Inspectors of which 0.5 FTE is parking control with the balance following up to dust, smell, litter, noise and other matters. With 10 direct reports, the Environmental Services Manager is also responsible for the after-hours contract management, the Food and Health Services contract, and is Secretary to the District Licensing Committee.

3.3. We are seeking the appointment of a team leader in the ESU. Expected gains and outcomes from a team leader include a more focused ability to address customer service, ensuring staff commit to our customer promise, providing close supervision of part of the regulatory team, ensuring consistency of work, create more efficiencies within the ESU and ensure the ESU continues to meet a high level of demand. It is proposed that the team leader will also be the Chief Licensing Inspector’s

3.4. **Current Structure**

Environmental Services Manager
- 1.5 FTE Administration staff
- 3.5 FTE Animal Control Staff
- 3 FTE Environmental Health Staff (2 currently plus external service provider)
- 2 FTE General Inspector (includes 0.5 parking)

3.5. **Proposed Structure**

Environmental Services Manager
- 1.5 FTE Administration staff
- Team Leader
- 3.5 FTE Animal Control Staff
- 3 FTE Environmental Health Staff (2 currently plus external service provider)
- 2 FTE General Inspector (includes 0.5 parking)
3.6. Two options exist. The status quo creates some risk for Council that the level of customer service provided by ESU, along with its ability to meet demand, is not delivering as well as it could. The Environmental Services Manager with 10 direct reports, contract management and portfolios is not currently able to provide the close one on one supervision required to more readily raise performance and customer service. The preferred option in our view is the appointment of a team leader within the ESU who will provide Council with the gains and outcomes as outlined above.

3.7. The Management Team and Chief Executive have reviewed this report and support the recommendations.

4. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

4.1. Community views have not been sought. The position however, provides direct supervision of a highly visible function of Council.

5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

5.1. Funding for this role will come from both the general rate and alcohol licensing. Some of the team leader’s role and work will be recoverable through licence fees. It is proposed to appoint the Team Leader as the Chief Liquor Licensing Inspector for the district. This will see the team leader working closely with our current Liquor Licensing Inspectors monitoring licenced premises, assisting with licence applications and assisting with District Licensing Committee hearings.

5.2. Note that the additional $105,000, if it was fully funded from the general rate, would mean an increase on that rate of 0.17%

6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. **Policy**

   This is not a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance Policy.

6.2. **Legislation**

   Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012
   Food Act 2014
   Litter Act 1979
   Resource Management Act 1991

6.3. **Community Outcomes**

   Outcomes that the community told us are priorities
   
   - There is a safe environment for all
1. SUMMARY

1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek approval to amend the non-financial performance measure as it relates to a response time for Animal Control staff and after-hours Animal Control contract staff.

1.2 Approval is sought to change the performance measurement response time for dog attacks on people. The current expected response time for Animal Control is 24 hours. A more immediate response time of 1 hour is sought.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No.170518050012

(b) Approves the amendment of the proposed response time for dog attacks from 24 hours to 1 hour as follows: “Complaints responded to within 1 hour for dog attack on a person and 48 for other incidences”

(c) Notes that many Councils throughout New Zealand have an expected response time for dog attacks of less than 24 hours

3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1 The Animal Control Unit is responsible for attending jobs and complaints relating to animals, wandering stock, found dogs, barking dogs and aggressive dogs. The public expect timely response to complaints, especially serious complaints involving dog attacks on people.

3.2 Non-financial performance measurements for Animal Control currently have a range of response times which staff and after-hours contractors are expected to meet. For attacks by dogs on people that response time is 24 hours as described by the current performance measure:

"Complaints responded to within 24 hours for serious attacks and 48 hours for other incidences."
3.3 It is recommended that a more immediate response of 1 hour be set and the performance measure redrafted as:

"Complaints responded to within 1 hour for dog attack on person and 48 for other incidences."

This new response time is more in keeping with other Councils and community expectations.

3.4 Note that the current performance measure is under Environmental Services. This amended measure should more appropriately be under Animal Control.

3.5 Management team and the Chief Executive have reviewed this report and support the recommendation.

4. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

4.1 Community Views have not been sought on this matter. However this proposed new measure better reflects community expectations.

5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISK**

5.1 There is no direct financial implication for the Council in adopting this revised measure. Current response time by staff or the after hours contractor for a dog attack on a person is already within this proposed timeline as it is treated as the top priority.

6. **CONTEXT**

6.1 Policy

This is not a matter of significance in terms of the Council's Significance and Engagement Policy.

6.2 Legislation


6.3 Community Outcomes

This report relates to the following community outcomes:

- There is a safe environment for all.
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT

FILE NO and TRIM NO: GOV-01-11 / 170524052819

REPORT TO: The Council

DATE OF MEETING: 30 May 2017

FROM: Victoria Caseley, Plan Implementation Manager

SUBJECT: Staff Submission to the Draft Annual Plan 2017-18 Project Development Unit Costs

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to seek additional budget to cover costs associated with engineering advice being provided by the Project Development Unit and for the Council to note a risk associated with consultants costs if the Plan Implementation Unit fails to secure planning staff to fill an existing current vacancy at an appropriate level of expertise.

1.2. This proposal increases the proposed Plan Implementation Unit annual budget by $60,000.

1.3. This additional $60,000 equates to an increase of 0.1% on total rates.

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 170524052819

(b) Approves the amended draft Annual Plan Provision for the Plan Implementation Unit to increase the Annual Plan Budget by $60,000 to cover additional Project Development Unit costs.

(c) Notes the impact on rates is a 0.1% increase.

(d) Notes that there is a risk that if the current existing planning vacancy is not filled, or filled at an appropriate level of expertise, that the use of planning consultants may continue into the 2017/18 financial year giving a deficit in the costs budgeted for the use of consultants.

3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. Engineering advice is provided to the Plan Implementation Unit by the Project Delivery Unit. This advice is mainly provided by the Subdivisions Engineering Team and the Project Delivery Unit Manager. Whilst a large proportion of this advice is on-charged, either through 'at cost' resource consent applications or via the 'additional lot fee', some of the costs are not able to be on-charged, such as some developer liaison and project management costs. These costs, in the past, have
not been included in the Plan Implementation Unit budget and were added in recently at a nominal figure of $50,000. During the course of the current financial year, this figure has been able to be assessed more accurately and it is considered that the 2017/18 budget should be amended to better reflect the likely cost. It is considered that the figure of $50,000 should be raised to $110,000, giving a budget increase in this area of $60,000.

3.2. Both the Plan Implementation Manager and the Project Delivery Unit Manager have reviewed the Council’s fees and charges associated with the processing of resource consents. As the overall fee structure is very similar to similar sized Councils, as well as our neighbouring Local Authorities, there has been no changes proposed to the majority of the application fees for resource consents. However, some changes have been proposed to the structure of the charges, which will provide for a greater ability to recovery costs where processing fees have been exceeded by more than 130%. Whilst this may provide some additional income it will not cover the costs associated with the Council working closely with developers, their consultants and other applicants. Both Unit Managers are reviewing whether these costs are being charged to the appropriate budget.

3.3. The Council should also be aware that there is a current existing vacancy in the Plan Implementation Unit for a senior planner and the Council has to date been unable to find a suitable planner to fill this position. In order to ensure the same level of service and meet statutory timeframes for processing resource consents the Plan Implementation Unit have been employing the services of planning. There is a risk that if this vacancy cannot be filled, or filled at an appropriate level of expertise, that the use of planning consultants to cover this vacancy may continue into the 2017/18 financial year, potentially leading to a deficit in the budgeted consultants costs.

3.4. The Management Team has reviewed this report and supports the recommendations.

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. Community views have not been sought.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. This additional funding will need to come from the general rate.

6. CONTEXT

6.1. Policy

This is not a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance Policy.

6.2. Legislation

Resource Management Act 1991

6.3. Community Outcomes

Outcomes that the community told us are priorities:

- The distinctive character of our towns, villages and rural areas is maintained.
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1. The purpose of this report is for the Council to consider increasing the budget for its costs associated with its international relationships – Zonnebeke twinning relationship and the Enshi sister city relationship.

1.2. The current draft budget for 2017/18 is $10,200 and is unlikely to be sufficient to meet the 2017/18 expected commitments.

1.3. A budget of nearer $25,500 is more likely to be required, as outlined in the report.

1.4. The reason this was not included in the draft budget is that since the draft budget meetings the nature of obligations has become clearer with both relationships needing further support than that currently budgeted for.

 Attachments

2. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

THAT the Council:

a. Receives report No. 170519050730

b. Increases the budget for International relations from the current draft budget of $10,200 to $25,500.

c. Notes the additional $15,200 added to the General rate would translate into total rates increase of approximately 0.03% of an increase.

3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

3.1. The Council has two international relationships – Zonnebeke and Enshi.

3.2. In the 2017/18 year the expected commitments are likely to be:

Zonnebeke

- Hosting Belgium guests in September 2017 (art exhibition), and associated reception event prior to the departure of the RSA contingent of about 50 and the Council delegation to Belgium for the 100 year commemoration. Estimated at $3,000
• Incidental costs while in Belgium for the Council delegation – transport, gifts and incidentals – estimated at $2,000 (Note: airfares have been funded from the 2016/17 budget)

• The Council supports the Waimakariri Passchendaele Trust. The Trust intends sending a member of the Trust to the 100th year commemoration. It is anticipated that the Council will need to fund this, as the Trust has no other funds. Given the significance of the event, it is understandable why the Trust wants to represented, in addition to the Mayor. Costs for this may be in the order of $3,000 for airfares and other transport costs.

Enshi
• Return visit to Enshi in early-mid 2018. The Council visited Enshi in 2016 and the cost was in the order of $10,500. This covered airfares, accommodation and gifts. Enshi paid for transport and all meals. A similar provision would be needed again.

• We have received two visits from Enshi in the past year. While nothing is planned, it is reasonable to anticipate another visit may occur in the next year. Depending on the nature of the delegation and length of stay it can cost in the order of $7,000 to host a delegation to cover meals, transport and other incidental costs.

The above amounts total $25,500.

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS
4.1. Not directly sought.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS
5.1. As outline within the report

6. CONTEXT
6.1. Policy
This is a decision to be made by the Council.

6.2. Legislation
N/A

Jim Palmer
Chief Executive
1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to seek Council approval to adjust the budget for the Pegasus road connection to Gladstone Road project.

1.2. Included in the LTP for this project is $50,000 in the current year (16/17) and $350,000 in 2017/18.

1.3. On 8 May 2017 the Woodend Sefton Community Board approved the installation of an emergency access gate to connect Pegasus Main Street to Gladstone Road. The board also supported delaying further investigations into a permanent road connection between Pegasus and Woodend until a construction time for the Woodend Bypass is confirmed.

1.4. It is therefore recommended that the $350,000 currently budgeted in 2017/18 be moved to 2027/28. NZTA advise that the earliest date for the construction of the Woodend bypass is 2027.

1.5. The construction of the emergency gate will be funded from the $50,000 in the current year.

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

a) Receives report No 170518050120

b) Approves shifting of the budget allocation of $350,000 for the Pegasus road connection to Gladstone Road project from 2017/18 to 2027/28 to align with the earliest expected construction date of the Woodend bypass.

c) Notes that NZTA has not confirmed a construction date for the Woodend bypass but has indicated the earliest construction time is likely to be 2027.

d) Notes that the permanent road connection between Pegasus and Gladstone Road has been aligned with the bypass on the basis that if the road connection is constructed before the bypass then it would generate traffic on Gladstone Road and have a negative impact on Gladstone Road residents.

e) Circulates this report to the Woodend-Sefton Community Board
3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

3.1. The Woodend Sefton Community Board supports delaying further investigation into a permanent road connection between Pegasus and Woodend until a construction time for the Woodend Bypass is confirmed.

3.2. On the basis of that decision the current budget needs to be adjusted and funding for the permanent road connection needs to align to the Woodend bypass timing. NATA advise that the earliest date for the construction of the Woodend bypass is 2027.

3.3. If NZTA subsequently decide to carry out the project earlier then the Council budget can be adjusted through Annual Plan or LTP processes.

3.4. The Management Team has reviewed this report and supports the recommendations.

4. **THE COMMUNITY VIEWS**

4.1. The Woodend Sefton Community Board took into account community views when deciding to support delaying a permanent road connection between Pegasus and Gladstone Road.

5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISK**

5.1. The financial implications and risk are covered in the Sections 1 and 3 above.

6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. **Policy**

   6.1.1. This is not a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance Policy.

6.2. **Links to Community Outcomes**

   6.2.1. There is a safe environment for all:

       • Crime, Injury and road accidents are minimised

   6.2.2. Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable, affordable and sustainable

       • The standard of our District’s roads is keeping pace with increasing traffic numbers

Ken Stevenson
Roading Manager
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1. The purpose of this report is twofold:

1) To request changes to the 2017-18 Draft Annual Plan regarding the Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery budgets.

2) To confirm the Council’s position regarding provision of services to occupied residential properties within the Regeneration Area.

1.2. Since adoption of the Residential Red Zone Recovery Plan in December 2016, considerable progress has been made on a number of key infrastructure projects associated with Regeneration Areas (previously known as Residential Red Zones).

1.3. A total of 44 of the original 50 projects have been completed. Significantly, the water and wastewater components of two major projects (Kaiapoi East and Kaiapoi South) are currently under construction and the design of roading improvements is well progressed.

1.4. The current estimate for the capital component of the recovery works is $40,606,000, which is a reduction of approximately $0.5M from the previous budget of $41,134,000.

1.5. The apportionment of budget between the various infrastructure groups has changed and the programme has been brought forward to reflect recent progress.

1.6. The following table summarises the draft and proposed budgets for the 2017/18 year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset</th>
<th>2017-18 Draft Annual Plan</th>
<th>2017-18 Revised Budget</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roading</td>
<td>1,407,000</td>
<td>$4,205,000</td>
<td>+$2,798,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td>$562,000</td>
<td>$698,000</td>
<td>+$136,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>$507,000</td>
<td>$1,478,000</td>
<td>+$971,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer</td>
<td>$2,300,000</td>
<td>$4,478,000</td>
<td>+$2,178,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$4,776,000</td>
<td>$10,859,000</td>
<td>+$6,083,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.7. There is a further $5.6M to be spent in the 2018/19 year on roading and stormwater projects, primarily in the Kaiapoi East area.

1.8. It should be noted that these budgets only relate to the Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery works and do not include aspects of the Regeneration Area programme outside this scope of works.

1.9. The rating implications of the changes are minimal as 60% of the works are funded by the Crown and the overall budget has not changed materially.

1.10. The budgets include two previously unbudgeted items:

- 1) Allowance for removing of asbestos contaminated ground in Kaiapoi South ($0.35M)
- 2) Allowance for servicing residential properties with in Regeneration Area ($0.65M)

1.11. These costs have been more than offset by savings gained through competitive tendering on recent large water and wastewater projects.

1.12. Servicing Properties in the Regeneration Area

1.13. While Council has provided “temporary” services to a number of properties within the Red Zone, a formal resolution has not been made regarding the provision of permanent services to these properties. Rather, the Council has resolved annually to continue providing temporary services to these properties.

1.14. With the adoption of the Residential Red Zone Recovery Plan, it is timely for Council to make a formal resolution regarding provision of permanent services to properties in the Red Zones and Regeneration areas.

1.15. The proposed approach to servicing properties in the Regeneration Area is as follows:

- Council services will continue to be provided to all serviced properties within the Red Zones and Regeneration areas.

- The existing Level of Service will be maintained where possible, except where it would compromise the resilience or affordability of the service to do so.

- Where on-site wastewater pump stations are required, these will be:
  - Supplied and installed by the Council.
  - Ongoing ownership and operation will be the responsibility of the property owner.

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 170519050782

(b) **Notes** that the total overall Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery budget has reduced by approximately $0.5M from $41,134,000 to $40,606,000.

(c) **Notes** that good progress has been made on some key infrastructure projects in Kaiapoi East and Kaiapoi West, which has enabled some projects to be brought forward.

(d) **Amends** the Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery Budgets for the 2017/18 years as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset</th>
<th>2017-18 Draft Annual Plan</th>
<th>2017-18 Revised Budget</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roading</td>
<td>1,407,000</td>
<td>$4,205,000</td>
<td>+$2,798,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td>$562,000</td>
<td>$698,000</td>
<td>+$136,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>$507,000</td>
<td>$1,478,000</td>
<td>+$971,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer</td>
<td>$2,300,000</td>
<td>$4,478,000</td>
<td>+$2,178,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$4,776,000</td>
<td>$10,859,000</td>
<td>+$6,083,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(e) **Notes** that there are no material rating impacts from the proposed budget changes.

(f) **Resolves** to continue providing permanent roading, water, wastewater, drainage, and solid waste services within the areas formerly designated as Red Zones in Kaiapoi, Pines Beach, and Kairaki.

(g) **Notes** that the level of service to each property will be determined on a case by case basis, taking into account:

   a) The need for adequate and resilient services to the properties.
   b) The Council’s legislative obligations regarding servicing.
   c) The affordability of services to the property owners and the wider community.

(h) **Circulates** this report to the Kaiapoi Tuahiwi Community Board and the Regeneration Area Steering Group for their information.

3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

3.1. **Programme Estimates & Budgets**

3.2. Overall the programme budget has reduced by approximately $0.5M. Additional costs associated with servicing properties within the Regeneration Area and removing asbestos in Kaiapoi South have been offset by savings on other projects.

3.3. A detailed discussion of the estimates and proposed budgets is included in the financial section.

3.4. **Servicing Residential Properties in the Regeneration Area**

3.5. While Council has provided “temporary” services to a number of properties within the Red Zone, a formal resolution has not been made regarding the provision of permanent services to these properties. Rather, Council has resolved annually to continue providing temporary services to these properties.

3.6. With the adoption of the Residential Red Zone Recovery Plan, it is timely for Council to make a formal resolution regarding provision of permanent services to properties in the Red Zones and Regeneration areas.

3.7. Services of a permanent standard have already been provided to properties in Pines Beach and Kairaki and Kaiapoi West. Three of these properties (3 Black Street and 2 & 3 Chichester Place) have been provided with on-site wastewater pump stations.

3.8. It should be noted that while all services provided to existing properties in the red zones to date have been “temporary”, they have been installed to a permanent standard.
3.9. The Council jointly with the Christchurch City Council commissioned a legal opinion from Simpson Grierson regarding the legal obligations to continue servicing properties that remain in the red zones or regeneration areas.

3.10. The full 53 page legal opinion is available on request (Trim Ref 141117125067), but essentially, it concludes that, if the Council were of a mind to, “there are very high levels of difficulty in disestablishing network services to properties in the red zone where those properties are currently serviced.”

3.11. While the Council could not discontinue services to existing properties, there appears to be no legal impediment to modifying the level of service provided to those properties.

3.12. For most part, it is not difficult to continue providing services to the remaining properties within the Regeneration areas, although there are a few properties, particularly in Kaiapoi East, where a modified level of service is warranted.

3.13. The proposed approach to servicing properties in the Regeneration Area is as follows:

- Council services will continue to be provided to all serviced properties within the Red Zones and Regeneration areas.
- The existing Level of Service will be maintained where possible, except where it would compromise the resilience or affordability of the service to do so.
- Where on-site wastewater pump stations are required, these will be:
  - Supplied and installed by the Council.
  - Ongoing ownership and operation will be the responsibility of the property owner.

3.14. The following tables summarise the proposed servicing approach for the remaining properties in the Regeneration areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Road Access</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Wastewater</th>
<th>Stormwater</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Ilex Place</td>
<td>New driveway off new road</td>
<td>Water connection off new main in new road. Fire protection maintained.</td>
<td>Gravity connection to existing main on northern boundary.</td>
<td>New connection to SW in new road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Feldwick Drive</td>
<td>Existing driveway off repurposed Feldwick drive (turning head at end)</td>
<td>Water connection off new main in repurposed Feldwick Drive. Fire protection maintained.</td>
<td>On-site wastewater pump station pumping to public main at boundary.</td>
<td>SW to repurposed Feldwick Drive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65A Cass St</td>
<td>Existing driveway off repurposed Cass St or Jollie Street (TBC).</td>
<td>Water connection off new main in Cass St. Fire protection maintained.</td>
<td>On-site wastewater pump station pumping to public main at boundary</td>
<td>SW to Kaiapoi East SMA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Jones St</td>
<td>Existing driveway off Jones St.</td>
<td>Water connection off new main in Cass St. Fire protection maintained.</td>
<td>On-site wastewater pump station pumping to public main at boundary. May be replaced with gravity connection in future.</td>
<td>SW to Jones St.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Proposed servicing of properties within Kaiapoi East Regeneration Area
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Road Access</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Wastewater</th>
<th>Stormwater</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14A Bowler St</td>
<td>Existing driveway to Bowler St.</td>
<td>Existing water connection to Bowler St.</td>
<td>Existing private lateral across regeneration area to Courtenay Dr.</td>
<td>Existing SW to Bowler St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Courtenay Drive</td>
<td>Existing driveway to Courtenay Dr.</td>
<td>Existing water connection to Courtenay Dr.</td>
<td>Existing private lateral to Courtenay Dr.</td>
<td>Existing SW to Courtenay Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Courtenay Drive</td>
<td>Existing driveway to Courtenay Dr.</td>
<td>Existing water connection to Courtenay Dr.</td>
<td>On-site wastewater pump station pumping to public main at boundary</td>
<td>Existing SW to Courtenay Dr.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Proposed servicing of properties within Kaiapoi South Regeneration Area

3.15. A decision regarding the final layout of the roading in the Cass Street, Jollie Street, Charles Street, Jones Street block is yet to be confirmed. Therefore the access to some properties in Kaiapoi East cannot be finalised at this time. However, that decision does not materially impact on the budgets for servicing these properties.

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. The infrastructure recovery programme was presented to the community following its release in May 2012. Drawings showing the programme are published on the Council website. These drawings are updated approximately every two months, the latest being April 2017.

4.2. Extensive community engagement was undertaken by Council through the development of the Draft Residential Red Zone Recovery Plan.

4.3. Staff have been discussing servicing with landowners within the regeneration area.

4.4. As the majority of the remaining projects are either within or adjacent to the Kaiapoi East and South Regeneration areas, key members of the Earthquake Infrastructure Steering Group have been incorporated into the Regeneration Project Control Group to ensure a seamless delivery of all projects relating to the Regeneration Areas.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. Project Costs and Estimates

5.2. The draft Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery Budget of $41,134,000 was adopted for consultation by Council in February 2017.

5.3. Due to some savings on recent large water and wastewater projects, the overall estimate for the capital component of the infrastructure recovery works has reduced by approximately $0.5M to $40,606,000.

5.4. The apportionment of budget between the various infrastructure groups has changed and the programme has been brought forward to reflect recent progress.

5.5. The following table summarises the draft and proposed budgets for the entire capital programme:
### Table 3: Total Programme Capital Works Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset</th>
<th>Draft Annual Plan</th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roading</td>
<td>$11,883,000</td>
<td>12,053,000</td>
<td>+$170,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td>$5,215,000</td>
<td>$5,769,000</td>
<td>+$554,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>$5,286,000</td>
<td>$4,621,000</td>
<td>-$665,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer</td>
<td>$18,750,000</td>
<td>$18,163,000</td>
<td>-$587,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$41,134,000</td>
<td>$41,106,000</td>
<td>-$528,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.6. In short, the roading and drainage estimates have increased, but this has been offset by reductions in the estimates for water and sewer.

5.7. The following table summarises the draft and proposed budgets for the 2017/18 year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset</th>
<th>2017-18 Draft Annual Plan</th>
<th>2017-18 Revised Budget</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roading</td>
<td>1,407,000</td>
<td>$4,205,000</td>
<td>+$2,798,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td>$562,000</td>
<td>$698,000</td>
<td>+$136,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>$507,000</td>
<td>$1,478,000</td>
<td>+$971,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer</td>
<td>$2,300,000</td>
<td>$4,478,000</td>
<td>+$2,178,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$4,776,000</td>
<td>$10,859,000</td>
<td>+$6,083,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Capital Works Budget for 2017/18

5.1. There is a further $5.6M to be spend in the 2018/19 year on roading and stormwater projects, primarily in the Kaiapoi East area.

5.2. In summary, the total programme budget has reduced by approximately $0.5M, but the quantum of work programmed to be compete in the 2017/18 year has increased from $4.8M to $10.9M.

### Project Risks

5.3. The Steering Group regularly reviews the Risk Register, with the last full review being undertaken in July 2016. There are no remaining risks on the Risk Register that are categorised as “major”.

5.4. Other risks still exist, such as availability of contractors and market fluctuations but these are more in line with business as usual and the risk register provides a plan to mitigate them.

5.5. A significant new risk that presented itself recently is Asbestos in the Courtenay area. Recently, our contractor (ARC Projects) encountered asbestos buried in Wyber Place, Courtenay Drive, and Charters Street while setting up to replace the gravity sewer mains as part of the Kaiapoi South earthquake recovery works.

5.6. Testing has confirmed that the material is Chrysotile and Amosite Asbestos. These forms of asbestos are classed as a high-risk, with the recommended treatment being removal and disposal.
5.7. The asbestos is incorporated within building rubble under the road carriageway in some locations. Further investigations have concluded that the rubble was demolition material used to create a subbase for the road as part of the Courtenay subdivision in the 1990’s.

5.8. WorkSafe have been notified and ARC are working with an authorised subcontractor to safely remove and dispose of the asbestos where it has been encountered.

5.9. The infrastructure works have or are being redesigned to minimise the effect of the asbestos on the works.

5.10. A preliminary estimate to address the asbestos risk in the area is between $250,000 and $350,000. The budget to cover this cost has been incorporated within the revised budgets so the financial effects of this risk have largely been mitigated.

6. CONTEXT

6.1. Policy
The Council is authorised to consider matters relating to programming and budgeting of earthquake recovery works.

6.2. Legislation
The Greater Christchurch Regeneration Act, Land Transport Management Act, Local Government Act are all relevant in this matter.

6.3. Community Outcomes
This report relates to the following community outcomes:

- There is a safe environment for all.
- Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable, affordable and sustainable.
- There is sufficient clean water to meet the needs of communities and ecosystems.
- Core utility services are provided in a timely, sustainable, and affordable manner.

Gary Boot
Senior Engineering Advisor
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT

FILE NO and TRIM NO: DRA-02-04 / 170512047760

REPORT TO: Council

DATE OF MEETING: 30-31 May 2017

FROM: Kalley Simpson, 3 Waters Manager
       Gerard Cleary, Manager – Utilities & Roading

SUBJECT: 3 Waters – Utilities & Roading Department Staff Submission to the Draft 2017-18 Annual Plan

SIGNED BY: 3 Waters – Utilities & Roading Department Staff

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to provide a request for changes to the 3 Waters services management budgets in the Draft 2017-18 Annual Plan, from the 3 Waters Unit of the Utilities and Roading Department.

1.2. The following items are addressed:

   3 Waters:
   • Water Environment Advisor - Position

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

Water Environment Advisor - Position

(a) Approves a new operational budget of $140,000 for a new position of Water Environment Advisor under the 3 Waters services management budget.

(b) Notes that this budget will be allocated to the drainage, wastewater and water supply operation accounts on a 40%, 30%, 30% split respectively.

(c) Notes that this new budget will increase the drainage, wastewater and water supply rates in the order of 1-2% depending on the individual scheme. This equates to 0.22% of total; rates.

3. Water Environment Advisor - Position

3.1. REASON IT WAS NOT INCLUDED IN THE DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN

3.1.1. There has been an increasing focus on the water environment at a local, regional and national level and water quantity and quality issues have been identified as a key area of concern to the current Council. The 3 Waters team has previously operated predominantly in the area of utility based water services, but it is clear
there is a need to now operate in the wider water environment. The draft Annual Plan has no provisions for operational budget for the 3 Waters team to operate in this area.

3.2. RISK OF NOT ADOPTING THE RECOMMENDATION

3.2.1. If the operational budget were not approved then ability of existing staff to operate in the water environment area, while still ensuring the water utility services are provided, would be limited. Currently the existing 3 Waters staff are stretched and are finding it difficult to input to the increasing areas in the water environment that the Council is involved with.

3.3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.3.1. The need for additional staff in the water environment area has previously been raised and discussed with Council. Currently Council staff across the 3 Waters, Policy, Green Space, Planning and Project Delivery Unit teams provide input to this area. The new role could potentially fit within any of these teams, but is seen to best fit within the 3 Waters as it will, in the future, involve the coordination of physical works and there is the need to coordinate with the management of existing water utilities.

3.3.2. The following outlines the main areas this role will input to:

- **Water Zone Committee** – technical support and coordinator/facilitator for any work being undertaken by WDC.
- **Land and Water Regional Plan & NPS for Freshwater Management** – understand implications to WDC and advocate for WDC on any plan changes or interpretations. Participate on the Canterbury Regional Stormwater Forum.
- **Waterway Management** – coordinate with Environment Canterbury water quality monitoring and improvements, waterway enhancement, encroachment of farmland into rivers. Manage Council work related to waterway management, potentially including the following:
  - Kaiapoi River Rehabilitation
  - Cam River Restoration Fund
- **Esplanade Reserve Management** – work with the Green Space team on the management of Council owned riparian land.
- **Groundwater Management** – coordination with Environment Canterbury to:
  - Advise on trends in groundwater quality in relation to our water supplies and lowland streams
  - Advice on groundwater quantity in terms of private wells that are drying up.
- **Erosion and Sediment Control** – monitoring and enforcement. LWRP indicates that WDC has to take this over by 2025.
- **Consent Management** - Implement and management of a consent database, oversee consent monitoring and input to the urban network discharge consenting
- **Public Education** – develop and implement, working with the Communications team, material in the format of pamphlets, web pages and videos that cover:
  - Roles and responsibilities for drains and waterways.
  - Best practice for drain maintenance.
- **Water Strategy** – development of water strategy for integration of water utilities with the water environment from a sustainability perspective.
3.3.3. There is also the scope for this role to cover specific issues that we are currently dealing with including:

- Pegasus Lake water quality issues
- Drain spraying with glyphosate – environmental effects
- Ocean outfall – sea foam effects
- Avian botulism

3.3.4. The position will need to have close internal links with the Policy, Planning, Green Space and Customer Services teams as well as external links with Environment Canterbury, the Water Zone Committee and Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga.

3.4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

3.4.1. Community views have not been sought on this proposal.

3.5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

3.5.1. It is proposed that a new budget of $140,000 the new position of Water Environment Advisor is included under the 3 Waters services management budget. The $140,000 budget includes for salary and associated plant and equipment for the new position.

3.5.2. Additionally, it is proposed that this budget is allocated to the Drainage, Wastewater and Water Supply operation accounts on a 40%, 30%, 30% split respectively. This split will mean that 90% of the district by population will be rated to fund this role to some degree, however not all properties in the district are rated for drainage, wastewater or water supply. The split also recognises that this role will benefit the existing water utilities, with drainage likely to benefit more compared to the other two waters.

3.5.3. The new budget will increase the drainage, wastewater and water supply rates in the order of 1-2% depending on the individual scheme. For example, the Eastern Districts sewer rate will increase by approximately $5 (or approximately 1%) from $452 to $457 and the Ohoka Rural average drainage rate will increase by $2 (or approximately 0.9%) from $228 to $230. This equates to 0.22% of total rates.

3.5.4. It should be noted that currently there is no allocation in the budget for physical works associated with improving the water environment, with the exception of the business as usual works associated with the water utilities. This is seen an issue that will need to be addressed as part of the Long Term Plan as Council’s role in this area is better defined.

3.6. CONTEXT

3.6.1. Policy
The Council is responsible for considering submissions on the draft Annual Plan and making budget provisions.

3.6.2. Legislation
- Local Government Act 2002
- Resource Management Act 1991

3.6.3. Community Outcomes
This report relates to the following community outcomes:

- There is sufficient clean water to meet the needs of communities and ecosystems
- The land is healthy.
1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to provide a request for changes to the 2017-18 Draft Annual Plan regarding the drainage budgets.

1.2. The following table shows the items that are addressed and the effect that these changes are projected to have on rates and development contributions.

1.3. Each of the submissions is stand-alone, and should be considered on its merits. The justification for each separate issue is given for each submission, in order for them to be debated separately.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme/budget</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Recommended Budget Change</th>
<th>Rate Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flood Response Rural Areas</td>
<td>Cones Road culvert</td>
<td>Increase by $100,000</td>
<td>0.1% increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Urban Drainage</td>
<td>Emergency Temporary Pumps</td>
<td>Increase by $33,000</td>
<td>0.2% increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood response Ohoka</td>
<td>New farm culverts on drain below Bradley's Road</td>
<td>Increase by $100,000</td>
<td>0.1% increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Urban Drainage</td>
<td>Replacement non return valve (Wastop) at Adderley Terrace</td>
<td>Increase by $15,000</td>
<td>$0.1 increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Urban Drainage</td>
<td>East Woodend Detention Pond</td>
<td>Remove budget - $76,800</td>
<td>Only affects development contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Urban Drainage</td>
<td>East Woodend Internal Reticulation</td>
<td>Remove budget - $186,800</td>
<td>Only affects development contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Urban Drainage</td>
<td>Townsend Road/West Belt Stormwater Pipe Extension</td>
<td>New Budget - $980,000</td>
<td>4% increase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

Flood response urban areas

(a) Approves an additional $100,000 of capital works budget, to the Flood Response Rural Areas account for the 2017/18 financial year.

(b) Notes that this will give a total budget of $150,000 for the project as a whole, taking into account the existing budget of $50,000 for the works in the 2016/17 financial year.

(c) Notes that the reason for the additional budget being required is due to flood projects costing more than was originally allowed for. The shortfall means that more budget is required to complete the Cones Road Culvert upgrade in the 2017/18 financial year.

Flood Response Kaiapoi

(d) Approves an additional $33,000 of operational expenditure, to the Kaiapoi Urban budget for the 2017/18 financial year.

(e) Notes that this will give a total budget for the project of $33,000 for the 2017/18 financial year.

(f) Notes that the reason for the additional funding is due the need, for extra temporary pumps to be installed in storm events (identified following recent flood events in Kaiapoi) - refer Management Team Report DRA / 170504044235

Rural Flood Response

(g) Approves an additional $100,000 of Capital Works Budget in the Flood Response Rural Areas account for the 2017/18 financial year.

(h) Notes that the reason for the additional funding being required is due to the need to upgrade five farm culverts on the drain that runs between Bradleys Road and Whites Road.

Kaiapoi Urban Drainage

(i) Approves an additional $15,000 of Capital Works Budget in the Kaiapoi Urban Drainage account for the 2017/18 financial year.

(j) Notes that the reason for the additional funding being required is due to an existing malfunctioning flap gate causing flooding.

(k) Notes that the reason for the additional funding being required is that there is not enough budget in the existing flap gate budget to upgrade the existing valve to a more reliable type.
Coastal Urban Drainage

(i) Approves the removal of an existing Capital Works Budget of $76,800 in the Coastal Urban Drainage account for the 2017/18 financial year.

(m) Notes that the budget is no longer required in the 2017/18 Financial Year.

(n) Notes that Council staff will be taking a report to Council in June to bring budget forward thereby eliminating the need to have the budget in 2017/18.

Coastal Urban Drainage

(o) Approves the removal of an existing Capital Works Budget of $186,800 in the Coastal Urban Drainage account for the 2017/18 financial year.

(p) Notes that the budget is no longer required in the 2017/18 Financial Year.

(q) Notes that Council staff will be taking a report to Council in June to bring budget forward thereby eliminating the need to have the budget in 2017/18.

Rangiora Urban Drainage

(r) Approves an additional $980,000 of Capital Works Budget in the Rangiora Urban Drainage account for the 2017/18 financial year.

(s) Notes that the reason for the additional funding being required is due the existing Stormwater infrastructure being undersized in a 1:50 year storm event.

(t) Notes a report was put to the Utilities and Roading Committee and they support its recommendations.

(u) Notes the proposed overall rate increase in Rangiora is 15.1%

3. FLOOD RESPONSE RURAL AREAS – CONES ROAD CULVERT

3.1. REASON IT WAS NOT INCLUDED IN THE DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN

3.1.1. This project was initially intended to be completed in the 2016/17 financial year within existing budgets totalling $50,000. The Project Delivery Unit is carrying out detailed design however, this was delayed by the requirement to tie in with upgrades to the Fawcetts / Cones Road intersection and cycling strategy.

3.1.2. A budget shortfall of $100,000 was identified, due to previous flood related projects going over budget.

3.1.3. The reason for the additional budget being required is due to flood projects costing more than was originally allowed for. Additional requirements were identified during construction, which caused the final project costs to rise.

3.2. RISK OF NOT ADOPTING THE RECOMMENDATION

3.2.1. This project is required to mitigate flooding in the Cones Road / Fawcetts Road area. If this project cannot be completed, there would be risks of further flooding.

3.3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS
3.3.1. This project was identified following the June 2014 floods.

3.3.2. With a total budget of $110,000 available this financial year, it is recommended that an extra $100,000 be allocated to allow the project to be constructed in the 2017/18 financial year.

3.4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

3.4.1. The views of the community have not been sought on this matter.

3.5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

3.5.1. This increase in budget will increase the general rate by less than 0.1%.

3.6. CONTEXT

3.6.1. Policy

The Council is responsible for considering submissions on the draft Annual Plan and making budget provisions.

3.6.2. Legislation

The Local Government Act 2002 is relevant in this matter.

3.6.3. Community Outcomes

This report relates to the following community outcomes:

- Core utility services are provided in a timely, sustainable, and affordable manner.

4. KAIAPOI URBAN DRAINAGE – EMERGENCY FLOOD RESPONSE KAIAPOI

4.1. REASON IT WAS NOT INCLUDED IN THE DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN

4.1.1. The reason for the budget not being included in the draft annual plan is that the flood event subsequent to the draft annual plan highlighted the need for extra emergency pumping.

4.2. RISK OF NOT ADOPTING THE RECOMMENDATION

4.2.1. Without extra emergency pumping there is an increased risk that parts of Kaiapoi will be flooded in a significant storm.

4.3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.3.1. The need for emergency pumping was identified following the June 2014 floods however, no specific budget was established at that time.

4.3.2. A storm event in April 2017 highlighted the need for additional emergency temporary pumping in Kaiapoi.

4.3.3. Additional emergency flood response is estimated to cost $11,000 per storm event, to be paid for from the Kaiapoi drainage maintenance budget.

4.3.4. An additional $33,000 (based on three flood events per year) is requested for FY17/18 and the Long Term Plan for future years until the proposed drainage upgrades are complete.

4.4. COMMUNITY VIEWS
4.4.1. The views of the community have not been sought on this matter.

4.5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

4.5.1. This increase in budget will increase the Kaiapoi Urban rate Drainage by approximately 0.2%

4.6. CONTEXT

4.6.1. Policy
The Council is responsible for considering submissions on the draft Annual Plan and making budget provisions.

4.6.2. Legislation
The Local Government Act 2002 is relevant in this matter.

4.6.3. Community Outcomes
This report relates to the following community outcomes:
- Core utility services are provided in a timely, sustainable, and affordable manner.

5. FLOOD RESPONSE OHOKA – NEW FARM CULVERTS BETWEEN BRADLEYS ROAD AND WHITES ROAD

5.1. REASON IT WAS NOT INCLUDED IN THE DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN

5.1.1. Negotiations with a landowner had not been concluded in time for the Draft Annual Plan.

5.2. RISK OF NOT ADOPTING THE RECOMMENDATION

5.2.1. This project is required to avoid localised flooding because of previous flood works carried out in the upstream catchment. There is a risk that the landowner may take legal action against the council if the culverts are not upsized.

5.3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

5.3.1. This project was identified following discussions with a landowner who owns the farm between Bradleys Road and Whites Road.

5.3.2. There is an increased risk of flooding on his farm because of flood works carried out upstream on Bradleys Road, after the 2014 flood.

5.3.3. The work involves upsizing of 5 private farm culverts.

5.3.4. The project is estimated to cost $100,000

5.4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.4.1. The views of the community have not been sought on this matter.

5.5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.5.1. This increase in budget will increase the general rate by approximately 0.1%.
5.6. CONTEXT

5.6.1. Policy
The Council is responsible for considering submissions on the draft Annual Plan and making budget provisions.

5.6.2. Legislation
The Local Government Act 2002 is relevant in this matter.

5.6.3. Community Outcomes
This report relates to the following community outcomes:
- Core utility services are provided in a timely, sustainable, and affordable manner.

6. KAIAPOI URBAN DRAINAGE – REPLACEMENT NO-RETURN VALVE (WASTOP) AT ADDERLEY TERRACE

6.1. REASON IT WAS NOT INCLUDED IN THE DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN

6.1.1. This project was not identified in time for the draft Annual Plan.

6.2. RISK OF NOT ADOPTING THE RECOMMENDATION

6.2.1. There is an increased risk that flooding will occur, blocking access to the pedestrian rail underpass on Adderley Terrace.

6.2.2. Children crossing the railway line when the pedestrian underpass is flooded poses a high Health and Safety risk, for which Council may be held liable.

6.3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

6.3.1. This project was identified recently when the pedestrian railway underpass on Adderley Terrace, was flooded at high tide on a number of occasions.

6.3.2. A flap gate controls the Drain leading from Adderley Terrace to the Kaiapoi River, and is prone to sticks jamming it open.

6.3.3. It is recommended that the existing flap gate be replaced with a ‘Wastop’ valve, which is less prone to jamming and blockages.

6.3.4. There is $10,000 in the existing drainage budget for maintenance of flap valves.

6.3.5. The total project is estimated to cost $25,000.

6.4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

6.4.1. The views of the community have not been sought on this matter.

6.5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.5.1. This increase in budget will increase the Kaiapoi Urban Drainage rate by $0.01.

6.6. CONTEXT

6.6.1. Policy
The Council is responsible for considering submissions on the draft Annual Plan and making budget provisions.

6.6.2. Legislation
The Local Government Act 2002 is relevant in this matter.

6.6.3. Community Outcomes
This report relates to the following community outcomes:
- Core utility services are provided in a timely, sustainable, and affordable manner.

7. COSTAL RURAL URBAN DRAINAGE – EAST WOODEND RETENTION POND

7.1. REASON IT WAS NOT INCLUDED IN THE DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN
7.1.1. This project was undertaken by the developer in lieu of paying development contributions therefore the budget is no longer required in the 17/18 financial year.

7.2. RISK OF NOT ADOPTING THE RECOMMENDATION
7.2.1. Development contributions will be higher than required.

7.3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS
7.3.1. The budget items for the East Woodend Detention Pond and Internal reticulation included in the 2017/18 Annual Plan budget were brought forward from 2024/25 to coincide with timing for growth.
7.3.2. Development in the area, specifically, the Two Roads subdivision, has occurred faster than anticipated and therefore the budget is required in 2016/17.
7.3.3. Council staff will be taking a report to Council in June to bring budget forward thereby eliminating the need to have the budget in 2017/18.

7.4. COMMUNITY VIEWS
7.4.1. The views of the community have not been sought on this matter.

7.5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS
7.5.1. Removal of the budget does not affect the 17/18 rates as this budget relates to development contributions.

7.6. CONTEXT
7.6.1. Policy
The Council is responsible for considering submissions on the draft Annual Plan and making budget provisions.
7.6.2. Legislation
The Local Government Act 2002 is relevant in this matter.
7.6.3. Community Outcomes
This report relates to the following community outcomes:
8. **COSTAL RURAL URBAN DRAINAGE – EAST WOODEND INTERNAL RETICULATION**

8.1. **REASON IT WAS NOT INCLUDED IN THE DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN**

8.1.1. This project was undertaken by the developer in lieu of paying development contributions therefore the budget is not required any longer in the 17/18 financial year.

8.2. **RISK OF NOT ADOPTING THE RECOMMENDATION**

8.2.1. Development contributions will be higher than required.

8.3. ** ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

8.3.1. The budget item for Internal reticulation included in the 2017/18 Annual Plan budget was brought forward from 2024/25 to coincide with timing for growth.

8.3.2. Development in the area, specifically, the Two Roads subdivision, has occurred faster than anticipated and therefore the budget is required in 2016/17.

8.3.3. Council staff will be taking a report to Council in June to bring budget forward thereby eliminating the need to have the budget in 2017/18.

8.4. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

8.4.1. The views of the community have not been sought on this matter.

8.5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

8.5.1. Removal of the budget does not affect the 17/18 rates as this budget relates to development contributions.

8.6. **CONTEXT**

8.6.1. Policy

The Council is responsible for considering submissions on the draft Annual Plan and making budget provisions.

8.6.2. Legislation

The Local Government Act 2002 is relevant in this matter.

8.6.3. Community Outcomes

This report relates to the following community outcomes:

- Core utility services are provided in a timely, sustainable, and affordable manner.

9. **RANGIORA URBAN DRAINAGE – TOWNSEND ROAD / WEST BELT STORMWATER PIPE EXTENSION**

9.1. **REASON IT WAS NOT INCLUDED IN THE DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN**

9.1.1. This project was identified in a previous report to council (Trim No 161109115427) however, a budget for the work has not been established.
9.2. RISK OF NOT ADOPTING THE RECOMMENDATION
   9.2.1. There is an increased risk that flooding will occur in Rangiora.

9.3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS
   9.3.1. The preferred option involves a 900mm stormwater diversion down Townsend Road extension, which diverts rural and treated stormwater away from the Pentecost Road drain.
   9.3.2. In large rainfall events, such as the June 2014 flooding event, the Pentecost Road drain was flooded, allowing overland flow to enter the central portion of Rangiora. The proposed works will provide the capacity required for a 50-year event plus additional engineered secondary flow capacity along the new road corridor to convey flow to the South Brook.
   9.3.3. A report was put to the Utilities and Roading Committee and they support its recommendations.

9.4. COMMUNITY VIEWS
   9.4.1. The views of the community have not been sought on this matter.

9.5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS
   9.5.1. This increase in budget will increase the Rangiora Urban Drainage rate by 4.0%.
   9.5.2. The total projected Rangiora rate increase is 15.1%.

9.6. CONTEXT
   9.6.1. Policy
       The Council is responsible for considering submissions on the draft Annual Plan and making budget provisions.
   9.6.2. Legislation
       The Local Government Act 2002 is relevant in this matter.
   9.6.3. Community Outcomes
       This report relates to the following community outcomes:
       - Core utility services are provided in a timely, sustainable, and affordable manner.
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT

FILE NO and TRIM NO: SEW-02-12 / 170512047720

REPORT TO: Council

DATE OF MEETING: 30-31 May 2017

FROM: Kalley Simpson, 3 Waters Manager

SUBJECT: Wastewater – Utilities & Roading Department Staff Submission to the Draft 2017-18 Annual Plan

SIGNED BY: (for Reports to Council or Committees)

Department Manager

Chief Executive

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to provide a request for changes to the wastewater budgets in the Draft 2017-18 Annual Plan, from the 3 Waters Unit of the Utilities and Roading Department.

1.2. The following item is addressed:

Wastewater:
- Beach Road Pump Station – VSD Replacement

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

Beach Road Pump Station – VSD Replacement

(a) Approves a new capital works renewal budget of $45,000 for the Beach Road PS VSD Replacement under the Kaiapoi sewer account.

(b) Notes that this has an increase on the Eastern District wastewater rate of $0.22.

3. Beach Road Pump Station – VSD Replacement

3.1. REASON IT WAS NOT INCLUDED IN THE DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN

3.1.1. The Variable Speed Drive (VSD) on one of the pumps in the Beach Road Pump Station overheated and tripped out during the April 2017 rainfall event. At the time of setting the budgets for the draft Annual Plan in November 2016 the VSD was not known to have any issues. A replacement VSD was not allowed for in the LTP either.

3.1.2. The Council’s electrical maintenance contractor, Nairn Electrical, has recommended that the VSD on this pump be replaced to avoid it tripping out in the future.
3.1.3. The cost of the replacement VSD has been estimated to be $35,000 based on advice from Nairn Electrical. A further $10,000 has been added to this figure for engineering fees and project contingency.

3.2. RISK OF NOT ADOPTING THE RECOMMENDATION
3.2.1. If the capital works budget were not approved then there is risk out future outage of this pump station as there would be no standby pumps.

3.3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS
3.3.1. The Beach Road Pump Station located in Kaiapoi, comprises of a duty and a standby pump, which are rotated on a duty/standby cycle.
3.3.2. During the April 2017 rainfall event, Pump 1 tripped out due to the VSD overheating. Pump 2 was changed to the duty pump and the station operated as designed for the remainder of the Easter weekend.
3.3.3. Pump 1 has since been brought back into normal operation, however there is a risk the pump will trip out in the future during periods of rainfall when the pumps run for extended periods of time. It is expected that the overheating problem will only occur more frequently as the condition of the VSD deteriorates with time.
3.3.4. Based on previously experience with VSDs, it is considered likely that the VSD will fail within the next 12 months given that it is experiencing issues with overheating. It is therefore recommended that this VSD be replaced.
3.3.5. Nairn Electrical have also identified some changes to the control logic at the pump station, which will improve the operation of the pumps during rainfall events. This will ensure the pumps will run at full speed before the high level alarm is reached.

3.4. COMMUNITY VIEWS
3.4.1. Community views have not been sought on this project specifically, however this project has been part of the draft Annual Plan consultation.

3.5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS
3.5.1. The $45,000 includes $35,000 for the new VSD plus $10,000 for engineering fees and project contingency.
3.5.2. The proposed new budget of $45,000 would have an impact of increasing the Eastern District wastewater rate by approximately $0.22.

3.6. CONTEXT
3.6.1. Policy
The Council is responsible for considering submissions on the draft Annual Plan and making budget provisions.
3.6.2. Legislation
There is no specific legislation relating to this matter.
3.6.3. Community Outcomes
This report relates to the following community outcomes:
- Core utility services are provided in a timely, sustainable, and affordable manner.
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT

FILE NO: WAT-03 / 170505044899

REPORT TO: Council

DATE OF MEETING: 30-31 May 2017

FROM: Colin Roxburgh, Water Asset Manager
Kalley Simpson, 3 Waters Manager

SUBJECT: Water Supply - Utilities & Roading Department Staff Submission to the 2017-18 Draft Annual Plan

SIGNATURES

SIGNED BY: (for Reports to Council or Committees)

Department Manager
Chief Executive

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to provide a request for changes to the 2017-18 Draft Annual Plan regarding the water supply budgets.

1.2. Each of the submissions is stand-alone, and should be considered on its merits. The justification for each separate issue is given for each submission, in order for them to be debated separately.

1.3. The following table shows the items that are addressed and the effect that these changes are projected to have on rates and development contributions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Recommended Budget Change</th>
<th>Rate Change</th>
<th>Development Contribution Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Woodend</td>
<td>Chinnerys Rd Outlet Main Stage 2</td>
<td>New Budget of $240,000</td>
<td>$9.90</td>
<td>$408.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Rural</td>
<td>No.2 New Source</td>
<td>Increase by $330,000</td>
<td>$12.90</td>
<td>$336.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Urban</td>
<td>Gammans Back-up Source</td>
<td>Defer $100,000 until 2018/19</td>
<td>-$1.60</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>North East Kaiapoi Boost Main</td>
<td>Increase by $330,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$361.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikuku Beach</td>
<td>Capacity Upgrade</td>
<td>Increase by $130,000</td>
<td>$16.20</td>
<td>$297.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka</td>
<td>Pump Power</td>
<td>Decrease by $4,750</td>
<td>-$61.10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

Woodend – Chinnerys Road Outlet Main Stage 2
(a) **Approves** a new capital works budget of $240,000 in 2017/18 for the Chinnerys Road Outlet Main Stage 2 project under the Woodend water supply account to be loan funded.

(b) **Notes** that this will give a total budget of $350,000 for the project as a whole, taking into account the existing budget of $110,000 for the first stage of the works in the 2016/17 financial year.

(c) **Notes** that that this will increase the Woodend water supply rate by $9.90.

(d) **Notes** that the reason for the additional funding being required is due to the full extent of works for the project not being able to be completed within the budget in the 2016/17 financial year.

**Oxford Rural No.2 – New Source**

(e) **Approves** an additional $330,000 of funding to the New Source budget for the 2017/18 financial year under the Oxford Rural No.2 account to be loan funded.

(f) **Notes** that this will give a total budget for the project of $930,000 for the 2017/18 financial year.

(g) **Notes** that this will increase the Oxford Rural No.2 water supply rate by $12.90.

(h) **Notes** that the reason for the additional funding being identified is due to the concept design report being produced with a more refined cost estimate for the project.

**Oxford Urban – Gammans Back-up Source**

(i) **Approves** deferring the Gammans Back-up Source budget of $100,000 from the 2017/18 financial year to the 2018/19 financial year.

(j) **Notes** that this will allow consideration to be given to alternative options to add resiliency to the scheme before committing to this project.

(k) **Notes** that this will decrease the Oxford Urban water supply rate by $1.60.

(l) **Notes** that the reason for the deferral of the budget is due to alternative options being identified to add resilience to the scheme that warrant further consideration.

**Kaiapoi – North East Kaiapoi Boost Main**

(m) **Approves** an additional $330,000 of funding for the North East Kaiapoi Boost Main capital works budget under the Kaiapoi water supply account to be loan funded.

(n) **Notes** that this will increase the total budget for the project to $600,000 for the 2017/18 financial year.

(o) **Notes** that this will not change the Kaiapoi water supply rate.

(p) **Notes** that the reason for the additional funding being required is due to a more refined cost estimate being produced following pricing being received for current construction projects.

**Waikuku Beach - Capacity Upgrade**

(q) **Approves** an additional $130,000 of funding for the Capacity Upgrade capital works budget under the Waikuku Beach water supply account to be loan funded.

(r) **Notes** that this will increase the total budget for the project to $180,000 for the 2017/18 financial year.
(s) **Notes** that this will increase the Waikuku Beach water supply rate by $16.20.

(t) **Notes** that the reason for the additional funding being required is due to the scope of the capacity upgrade project being changed from a well pump installation to a new well, following an upgrade strategy report being completed.

**Ohoka – Pump Power**

(u) **Approves** a reduction in the Pump Power budget from $13,750 to $9,000 under the Ohoka account.

(v) **Notes** that this will decrease the Ohoka water rate by $61.10.

(w) **Notes** that the reason for the reduction in budget is that it was not previously identified that the pump power budget had been increased due to anticipated growth occurring on the scheme. As this growth has not yet eventuated the increase in pump power costs can be deferred until the growth occurs.

3. **WOODEND – CHINNERYS ROAD OUTLET MAIN STAGE 2**

3.1. **REASON IT WAS NOT INCLUDED IN THE DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN**

3.1.1. This project was initially intended to be completed in the 2016/17 financial year within existing budgets totalling $110,000. Detailed design has been carried out by Aecom in March 2017 who have identified a significant budget shortfall, with the estimate for the project being $350,000.

3.1.2. Due to this deficit it is intended that this year's budget of $110,000 be utilised to commence the construction work in June 2017, with the additional ‘stage 2’ budget to be used to complete the project early in the 2017/18 financial year.

3.1.3. The reason for the budget shortfall is predominantly due to the standard rates being used for larger diameter pipes with a lot of fittings and temporary works required that does not represent the actual construction costs.

3.1.4. The budget was set at an indicative level based on standard per metre construction rates for the given pipe size. It has been identified that while these standard rates are reasonably accurate for straight sections of pipework they do not adequately account for situations where numerous fittings and temporary works are required.

3.1.5. The temporary works are required as the main is an outlet from the primary water headworks for Woodend, and therefore specific allowances have been required to be added for this project to ensure that there are no significant disruptions to the supply of water to Woodend. This has resulted in a bypass pipe being required to be allowed for, which has added cost to the project.

3.2. **RISK OF NOT ADOPTING THE RECOMMENDATION**

3.2.1. This project is required to facilitate growth in Woodend, and in particular is required to provide water to the Ravenswood development as well as other developments to the east of Woodend. If this project was not able to be completed, there would be risks of low pressure and loss of supply at the extremities of the scheme during periods of high demand.

3.3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

3.3.1. This project was identified in the 2015 Woodend Water Activity Management Plan to install a new 375mm diameter trunk main from the Chinnerys Road headworks to Rangiora Woodend Road.
3.3.2. The need for the project is to maintain 300kPa minimum residual pressure in east Woodend, and to provide for future growth towards the west and southeast of the town.

3.3.3. The Network Planning Team of the Project Delivery Unit have reviewed the initial need for the project and confirmed that this will be required prior to the connection of the Ravenswood Stage 1 residential properties. This stage of works has been consented and it is expected that these properties may begin to connect within approximately 12 months.

3.3.4. Aecom have been engaged to carry out the detailed design for this work, and Council staff have given the design a high degree of scrutiny to ensure that the design is logical and costs associated with the project are not excessive.

3.3.5. It has been identified that they key reason for the budget shortfall is due to the initial budget allowance being insufficient, rather than a conservative design and/or engineering estimate.

3.3.6. This project has also highlighted the need for additional scrutiny to be given to budgets where larger diameter pipes are required (greater than 150mm internal diameter). As these pipes are not installed as often as the smaller diameter pipes, there is not as much recent cost information for these projects. It has also been identified that the cost for parts and fittings can increase substantially as pipe size increases, which needs to be taken into account at the budget setting stage.

3.3.7. The Water Unit have provided a preliminary cost estimate to carry out the works based on the design prepared by Aecom. Their construction estimate is $350,000.

3.3.8. With a total budget of $110,000 available this financial year, it is recommended that a remaining $240,000 be allocated for the 2017/18 financial year to allow the project to be construction over the two financial years.

3.3.9. The intention is for construction to commence in June 2017 (the end of the 2016/17 financial year) and continue into July and August (the start of the 2017/18 financial year). Continuous construction throughout this period will mean that site establishment will only have to be paid once.

3.4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

3.4.1. The views of the community have not been sought on this matter.

3.5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

3.5.1. This increase in budget will increase the Woodend water development contribution by $406, and will increase the Woodend water rate by $9.90 per connection per year.

3.5.2. It is noted that the Woodend community was consulted regarding the project to join with the Pegasus water supply. It was noted as part of this consultation that a result of this would be a rate reduction for Woodend residents relative to if the schemes were not joined.

3.5.3. Prior to the requested additional budget, the reduction in Woodend rates relative to the projected rate if the schemes were not joined, was projected to be $21 per connection. The recommended additional budget will mean that the rate reduction to Woodend residents will be $9.90 less than previously indicated in the original 2017/18 Draft Annual Plan.

3.6. CONTEXT
3.6.1. Policy
The Council is responsible for considering submissions on the draft Annual Plan and making budget provisions.

3.6.2. Legislation
The Local Government Act 2002 and the Health (Drinking Water) Amendment Act 2007 are relevant in this matter.

3.6.3. Community Outcomes
This report relates to the following community outcomes:
- Core utility services are provided in a timely, sustainable, and affordable manner.

4. OXFORD RURAL NO.2 – NEW SOURCE

4.1. REASON IT WAS NOT INCLUDED IN THE DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN

4.1.1. This budget is for the construction of three booster pump stations with chlorination equipment. This is the final stage in the project to join the Oxford Rural No.2 scheme to the Oxford Urban scheme, in order for the Oxford Rural No.2 scheme to achieve compliance with the Drinking Water Standards for New Zealand.

4.1.2. An original budget allowance for the construction of the new booster pump stations and associated chlorination equipment was set at $630,000. This was based on a high level estimate produced in the concept design report for the project in 2012.

4.1.3. Beca have since been engaged to carry out the detailed design for the construction of the booster pump stations. As the first stage of this work a concept design report has been produced in March 2017. This included a review of the cost estimate for the work. As a result of this review, the revised recommended budget figure is now $960,000. This is $330,000 greater than the current allowance of $630,000.

4.1.4. It is noted that the revised recommended budget of $960,000 includes a 25% project contingency allowance which is deemed appropriate for the current stage of the project.

4.1.5. The key reasons for the budget shortfall are as follows:
- Increases in construction costs since the original options report was produced in 2012 that were not reflected by an increase to the budget.
- Costs associated with obtaining ‘affected party’ consents from landowners that are neighbouring the sites for the new pump stations, or where easements are required.
- Minor modifications to the design requirements that were not identified until the detailed design stage.

4.2. RISK OF NOT ADOPTING THE RECOMMENDATION

4.2.1. As is noted in the original options report in 2012 the current source for the Oxford Rural No.2 scheme at Coopers Creek does not comply with the DWSNZ, and it presents an unacceptable level of risk. Council has a legal obligation to comply with the DWSNZ.

4.2.2. Therefore if this project were not completed, Council would not meet its legislative requirements in terms of complying with the DWSNZ, and there would be the continued risk of sickness in the community associated with the current drinking water source.
4.3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.3.1. This budget is for the construction of three booster pump stations. This is the final stage in the project to join the Oxford Rural No.2 scheme to the Oxford Urban scheme, in order for the Oxford Rural No.2 scheme to achieve compliance with the Drinking Water Standards for New Zealand.

4.3.2. The need for this project was identified in 2012, following a report produced by CPG Ltd (Trim reference 121012071002) to identify options for the Oxford Rural No.2 water supply scheme to achieve compliance with the DWSNZ.

4.3.3. It was identified that the optimum way to achieve compliance for the Oxford Rural No.2 scheme is to join it with the Oxford Urban water supply scheme, and source its water from Domain Road (refer to report 140507046729 for background to decision to join schemes). In order to join the schemes three booster pump stations are required, along with chlorination equipment. This will allow water from the Bay Road and Gammans Creek reservoirs (which are fed from Domain Road) to be chlorinated and pumped into the Oxford Rural No.2 reticulation.

4.3.4. Beca have been engaged to carry out the detailed design and tendering for this project. The first key output for this work was a concept design report which included an updated cost estimate for the three pump stations. This cost estimate was greater than the initial cost estimate prepared in 2012, which has meant that the recommended budget has been revised.

4.4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.4.1. The Oxford Urban and Oxford Rural No.2 scheme members were consulted on the joining of the schemes in February and March 2014. Refer to report 140507046729 for the consultation feedback.

4.5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

4.5.1. This increase in budget will result in an increase to the Oxford Rural No.2 water rate of $12.90 per unit of water per year, and will increase the development contribution by $336.00 per new unit of water.

4.6. CONTEXT

4.6.1. Policy

The Council is responsible for considering submissions on the draft Annual Plan and making budget provisions.

4.6.2. Legislation

The Local Government Act 2002 and the Health (Drinking Water) Amendment Act 2007 are relevant in this matter.

4.6.3. Community Outcomes

This report relates to the following community outcomes:

- Core utility services are provided in a timely, sustainable, and affordable manner.

5. OXFORD URBAN – GAMMANS BACK-UP WELL

5.1. REASON IT WAS NOT INCLUDED IN THE DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN
5.1.1. This budget of $100,000 was originally intended to construct the well head, well pump installation and electrical upgrades to connect up the new Gammans Creek well as a back-up well to the Oxford Urban water supply scheme.

5.1.2. It is noted that this well does not meet compliance with the Drinking Water Standards for New Zealand (DWSNZ), however is considered to be a higher quality source than the existing back-up for the Oxford Urban scheme which is the shallow Gammans Creek intake. It is also noted that the existing intake is at risk of washout when Gammans Creek is in flood.

5.1.3. The previous decision to connect up the new Gammans Creek well as a back-up supply was based on the assumption that this could be achieved within existing budgets. It was later identified that additional budget would be required for the 2017/18 financial year to achieve this, which led to the decision to connect up this well being reviewed.

5.1.4. Given the limitations of the new Gammans Creek well as a back-up, staff have given consideration to alternative ways to add resilience to the Oxford Urban scheme. One such alternative is a second pipe to be installed under the Eyre River, as this section of the existing supply pipe from the Domain Road source to Oxford township is considered to be the most critical section of pipe on the scheme.

5.1.5. It is recommended that in order to carry out a thorough assessment of the resiliency of the Oxford Urban scheme that more time is required to carry out an investigation. In order to allow time for this investigation it is recommended that this project be deferred by one year.

5.2. RISK OF NOT ADOPTING THE RECOMMENDATION

5.2.1. If the recommendation to defer the budget until an investigation into alternative options can be carried out is not adopted, there would be a risk the expenditure on the Gammans Creek Back-up source may not be the best value solution in terms of adding resiliency to the scheme.

5.3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

5.3.1. A well was drilled next to the existing Gammans Creek intake (which is currently the back-up source for the Oxford Urban scheme). The intention was to find a secure water source on the north side of the Eyre River to act as a back-up to the Domain Road source.

5.3.2. The well did not achieve the desired outcome in terms of providing the required capacity to act as a sufficient back-up to the Domain Road well, or in terms of striking a secure groundwater source to achieve compliance with the Drinking Water Standards for New Zealand.

5.3.3. It was however identified that there would be some value in installing a well pump, constructing a well head, and carrying out the necessary electrical and pipework upgrades to connect up the well to provide an emergency back-up to the Oxford Urban scheme for the event in which supply from the Domain Road site is lost. For this reason a budget of $100,000 was recommended as part of the 2017/18 Draft Annual Plan to carry out this work.

5.3.4. Staff have however since given some consideration to whether connecting this well is the best value option for adding resiliency to the Oxford Urban scheme.

5.3.5. It has been identified that the key piece of infrastructure that is likely to cause the new Gammans Creek well to be required to be used would be a break in the delivery main between the Domain Road source and Oxford town. In most cases a break in this main could be repaired within a short timeframe (less than 8
hours), so the need for the additional back-up is considered to be relatively minor.

5.3.6. The exception to this is if there were to be a break in the section of delivery main that is installed beneath the Eyre River, particularly if this main broke during a flood in the Eyre River which would mean that there would be a large amount of time until the main could be repaired, and the current back-up source at Gammans Creek would not be able to meet the full demand for the scheme.

5.3.7. An alternative option to connecting up the new Gammans Creek well to increase the resilience of the Oxford Urban water scheme would be to construct a duplicate main beneath the Eyre River.

5.3.8. In order to give this alternative option the necessary analysis it is recommended that staff undertake an options assessment in the 2017/18 financial year, and construct the preferred option in 2018/19. Therefore it is recommended that the budget of $100,000 to connect the Gammans Creek back-up well be deferred until the 2018/19 financial year, by which time the options assessment will have been completed.

5.4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.4.1. The Oxford Urban and Oxford Rural No.2 scheme members were consulted on the joining of the schemes in February and March 2014. Refer to report 140507046729 for the consultation feedback. This primary focus of this consultation was regarding the primary source for the schemes however, with less focus on the back-up sources for the schemes.

5.5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.5.1. The deferral of the budget will defer the increase in the Oxford Urban water rate associated with the expenditure of $100,000 by one year. The impact of the deferral of this expenditure will be a $1.60 reduction in the Oxford Urban water rate.

5.6. CONTEXT

5.6.1. Policy

The Council is responsible for considering submissions on the draft Annual Plan and making budget provisions.

5.6.2. Legislation

The Local Government Act 2002 and the Health (Drinking Water) Amendment Act 2007 are relevant in this matter.

5.6.3. Community Outcomes

This report relates to the following community outcomes:

- Core utility services are provided in a timely, sustainable, and affordable manner.

6. KAIAPOI – NORTH EAST KAIAPOI BOOST MAIN

6.1. REASON IT WAS NOT INCLUDED IN THE DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN

6.1.1. The original budget for this project was set based on standard per metre rates at the time that the budget was derived. The original project budget was $300,000, with $30,000 for the design in 2016/17 and $270,000 for construction in 2017/18
6.1.2. This project is similar to the Chinnery Road outlet main project, in that the both involve a 375mm internal diameter pipe being required on a large on-demand water supply scheme in an urban area.

6.1.3. Given the shortfall that was identified on the Chinnery Road outlet main project, the Project Delivery Unit were engaged to carry out a detailed cost estimate for the North East Kaiapoi Boost Main project.

6.1.4. This analysis indicated the need for a total project budget of $630,000. With $30,000 available in the 2016/17 financial year for the design, the recommended budget for the 2017/18 financial year is $600,000.

6.1.5. As with the Chinnerys Road Outlet Main project, the key reasons for the shortfall are due to the following factors:

- The previous strategy of setting budgets based on indicative per metre rates is not always accurate for larger diameter mains. A more detailed analysis is required in these cases to provide accurate budget allowances.

- The cost for parts and fittings associated with larger diameter water mains can increase considerably as pipe size increases. This was not sufficiently accounted for at the budget setting stage previously.

6.2. RISK OF NOT ADOPTING THE RECOMMENDATION

6.2.1. This project is required to facilitate growth and maintain minimum pressures in northeast Kaiapoi, in particular due to growth within the Beach Grove and Sovereign Lakes areas. If this project was not able to be completed, there would be risks of low pressure and loss of supply at the extremities of the scheme during periods of high demand.

6.3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

6.3.1. This project was identified in the 2015 Kaiapoi Water Activity Management Plan to install a new 375mm diameter trunk main from the Darnley Square pump station along Smith Street to Williams Street (project reference AMP0031).

6.3.2. The need for the project is to maintain 300kPa minimum residual pressure in north east Kaiapoi, in particular due to growth in the Beach Grove and Sovereign Lakes areas.

6.3.3. A budget was set for the project based on standard per metre rates for 375mm diameter pipe, with $30,000 allocated for design in 2016/17 and $270,000 for construction in 2017/18.

6.3.4. The Project Delivery Unit have been engaged to carry out the design for this project. As the first stage of this work it was requested that they carry out a detailed cost estimate for the works, based on a concept design.

6.3.5. This cost estimate indicated the need for a total project budget of $630,000. With $30,000 allowed for in 2016/17, the required budget for 2017/18 is required to be increased from $270,000 to $600,000 to give the required total project budget of $630,000.

6.3.6. A key source of data in estimating the expected construction costs for this project was Contract 16/47 Parnham Lane Sewer Rising Main. This also involves the installation of a 375mm internal diameter pressure main in Kaiapoi. While this is a sewer main it is similar in nature to the water main project, and gives a high level of confidence in the budget estimate provided.
6.3.7. As with the Chinnerys Road Outlet Main project, this reinforced the need for additional detail and scrutiny at the budget setting stage for larger diameter water main projects.

6.4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

6.4.1. Community views have not been sought on this matter.

6.5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.5.1. This increase in budget will increase the Kaiapoi water development contribution by $361 per new connection.

6.6. CONTEXT

6.6.1. Policy
The Council is responsible for considering submissions on the draft Annual Plan and making budget provisions.

6.6.2. Legislation
The Local Government Act 2002 and the Health (Drinking Water) Amendment Act 2007 are relevant in this matter.

6.6.3. Community Outcomes
This report relates to the following community outcomes:

- Core utility services are provided in a timely, sustainable, and affordable manner.

7. WAIKUKU BEACH – CAPACITY UPGRADE

7.1. REASON IT WAS NOT INCLUDED IN THE DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN

7.1.1. Opus International Consultants have only recently completed an options investigation report regarding the recommended methodology to complete the capacity upgrade works on the Waikuku Beach water supply scheme.

7.1.2. It was initially thought that the capacity upgrade at the Kings Avenue water headworks would be able to be achieved through the installation of a well pump in the well (which is currently artesian).

7.1.3. The Opus report however identified that this option would not be possible due to the well casing being too small to fit in a well pump with the required capacity for the scheme.

7.1.4. The recommended option was that a second shallow artesian well be drilled close to the existing headworks building. The recommended budget estimate for this work is $180,000 which is greater than the original budget of $50,000 for the 2017/18 financial year.

7.2. RISK OF NOT ADOPTING THE RECOMMENDATION

7.2.1. If the budget is not allocated the recommended capacity upgrade would not be able to be completed. The intention of the capacity upgrade at Kings Avenue is to allow for the entire scheme’s water to be treated at the Kings Avenue water headworks to achieve compliance with the DWSNZ. If the capacity upgrade is not able to be completed, the Campground Well (which is not treated and does not comply with the DWSNZ) would be required to be used in summer, meaning that the scheme as a whole would not comply with the DWSNZ.
7.3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

7.3.1. A capacity upgrade is required at the Kings Avenue water headworks primarily to allow all water for the scheme to be treated at this site (once the UV upgrade project is completed) without relying on the Campgroud Well in times of high demand.

7.3.2. It has been identified that the optimum way to achieve the capacity upgrade at Kings Avenue is to drill a second shallow well close to the existing headworks building.

7.3.3. Opus are currently undertaking the detailed design for the treatment upgrade at Kings Avenue, with budget in place to construct the UV treatment system in the 2017/18 financial year. The capacity upgrade is required to be constructed alongside the treatment upgrade as they are both part of the wider project to achieve full compliance with the DWSNZ for the scheme.

7.3.4. Given that the methodology for achieving the capacity upgrade has changed, the budget has been required to be reviewed.

7.4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

7.4.1. Community views have not been sought on this matter at this stage. It is intended that the community will be informed of the upcoming works before the construction stage.

7.5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

7.5.1. The increase of the capacity upgrade budget by $100,000 will increase the Waikuku Beach water rate by $16.20 per connection per year, and will increase the Waikuku Beach water development contribution by $297.00 per new connection.

7.6. CONTEXT

7.6.1. Policy

The Council is responsible for considering submissions on the draft Annual Plan and making budget provisions.

7.6.2. Legislation

The Local Government Act 2002 and the Health (Drinking Water) Amendment Act 2007 are relevant in this matter.

7.6.3. Community Outcomes

This report relates to the following community outcomes:

- Core utility services are provided in a timely, sustainable, and affordable manner.

8. OHOKA – PUMP POWER

8.1. REASON IT WAS NOT INCLUDED IN THE DRAFT ANNUAL PLAN

8.1.1. The pump power for Ohoka was previously forecast to increase due to projected growth occurring on the scheme. As this growth has not yet occurred, additional pump power is not required to be included in the budget at this stage. This has only recently been identified.

8.2. RISK OF NOT ADOPTING THE RECOMMENDATION
8.2.1. If the recommendation is not adopted Ohoka ratepayers’ rates would be higher than necessary to recover costs associated with the pumping power for the scheme.

8.3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

8.3.1. Significant growth is forecast for the Ohoka water supply scheme. Originally this growth was forecast to occur in the 2017/18 financial year, and for this reason the pump power for Ohoka was increased to account for the expected increase in demand.

8.3.2. As this growth has not yet eventuated, the additional pumping power budget is not required at this stage. It is therefore recommended that the pump power budget be reduced from $13,750 to $9,000.

8.4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

8.4.1. Community views have not been sought on this matter.

8.5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

8.5.1. The reduction in the pump power budget from $13,750 to $9,000 would reduce the Ohoka Water rate for a 19 unit connection by $61.06 from $1,504.90 to $1443.84. It is noted that the Ohoka rates are already projected to increase significantly. This reduction in the Pump Power budget will mitigate this increase to some extent.

8.6. CONTEXT

8.6.1. Policy

The Council is responsible for considering submissions on the draft Annual Plan and making budget provisions.

8.6.2. Legislation

The Local Government Act 2002 and the Health (Drinking Water) Amendment Act 2007 are relevant in this matter.

8.6.3. Community Outcomes

This report relates to the following community outcomes:

- Core utility services are provided in a timely, sustainable, and affordable manner.
**ATTACHMENT I – OXFORD RURAL NO.2 NEW SOURCE BUDGET ESTIMATE**

*refer to report 170331031420 for basis of the construction estimate*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>2017/18 Spent to Date</th>
<th>2017/18 Balance</th>
<th>2017/18 Commitments 16/17</th>
<th>PJ</th>
<th>PJ Description</th>
<th>PJ Balance</th>
<th>PJ Commitments 16/17</th>
<th>PJ Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated costs</td>
<td>$80,000.00</td>
<td>$69,000.00</td>
<td>$9,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Monitoring</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation for easement</td>
<td>$170,000.00</td>
<td>$160,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Direct Cost Estimate</td>
<td>$767,500.00</td>
<td>$690,500.00</td>
<td>$77,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Deficit</td>
<td>$329,375.00</td>
<td>$171,875.00</td>
<td>$157,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Recommended Budget</td>
<td>$959,375.00</td>
<td>$862,375.00</td>
<td>$97,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>UNIT</td>
<td>RATE</td>
<td>AMOUNT</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 EROSION SEDIMENT CONTROL</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 SETTING OUT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 GRID LAYING SERVICES</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 PRESSURE PIPE SUPPLY AND INSTALLATION</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 CONSTRUCTION CONTINUITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 TOTAL CONSTRUCTION ESTIMATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 PROFESSIONAL FEES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8 FUNDING CONTINUITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ATTACHMENT II – NORTH EAST KAIAPOI BOOST MAIN BUDGET ESTIMATE**

Prepared by: [Signature]
Date: [Date]

[Table with detailed budget estimates for each project]
**ATTACHMENT III – WAIKUKU BEACH CAPACITY UPGRADE BUDGET ESTIMATE**

*concept taken from Opus options report 170418037131. Cost estimate refined.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waikuku Beach Capacity Upgrade Cost Estimate</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Tender price, Contract 17/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drill and Develop New Bore</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td></td>
<td>50000 50000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing and Consenting</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td></td>
<td>25000 25000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install pipework to connect into headworks</td>
<td>m</td>
<td></td>
<td>200 20000 typical WU costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valves / Fittings</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td></td>
<td>20000 20000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Contingency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Construction Estimate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>126500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Contingency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Recommended Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>181150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT

FILE NO and TRIM NO: GOV-01-11 / 170508045814

REPORT TO: Council

DATE OF MEETING: 30 May 2017

FROM: Craig Sargison Manager Community and Recreation

SUBJECT: FUNDING CONTRIBUTION FOR KAIAPOI HIGH SCHOOL INDOOR COURT

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is for the Council to consider supporting Kaiapoi High School in developing a full size indoor court which would be available for community use outside of school hours.

1.2. As part of the redevelopment of Kaiapoi High School, the Ministry of Education is proposing to build a new multipurpose gymnasium which could be extended to provide a full size indoor basketball court.

1.3. There is the potential to build a full size court now if the School can source approximately $1.3 million

1.4. This report proposes making a grant of $1,000,000 towards the cost of the full sized court and working with Kaiapoi High School on a joint application to Rata Foundation for $300,000.

Attachments:

i. Concept floor plan and exterior of gymnasium facility.(TRIM: 170131008621)

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No.170508045814

(b) Notes the concept plan for the proposed new gymnasium at Kaiapoi High School (TRIM: 170131008621)

(c) Approves a grant of $1 million to the Ministry of Education for the development of a full size indoor court at Kaiapoi High School, conditional upon on the development of an agreement for community use which is satisfactory to the Council

(d) Approves staff working with Kaiapoi High School, applying to Rata Foundation for a grant of $300,000 to enable the development of a full size indoor Court at Kaiapoi High School which will be available for community use outside of school hours.
Notes that staff will work with the Ministry of Education on the terms of an agreement, which will be subject to Council approval that provides for staged payments of the $1 million grant upon completion of key milestones.

Approves staff developing an agreement, which will be subject to Council approval, with Kaiapoi High School on community use of the indoor court facility.

Circulates this report to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board.

3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. As part of the redevelopment of Kaiapoi High School, the Ministry of Education is proposing to build a new multipurpose gymnasium which could be extended to provide a full size indoor basketball court which would also allow for indoor netball.

3.2. The Ministry of Education is expecting the cost of the building will be $2.6 million and have agreed that if there is a grant of $1.3 million from the community a full size court will be built.

3.3. This report proposes making a grant of $1,000,000 towards the cost of the full sized court and working with Kaiapoi High School on a joint application to Rata Foundation for $300,000.

3.4. The facility would complement other full size indoor courts at Ohoka, Rangiora New Life and Mitre 10 Mega, and Woodend. All of these facilities are well used by the Community for a variety of sports with basketball having the most criticality around size, particularly in relation to a run off zone.

3.5. The concept plan for the proposed facility at Kaiapoi High School identifies that it will be able to function independently of the school in relation to toilets. There are no changing rooms proposed but this should not be an impediment to community use as experience at other facilities is that players turn up dressed in their sports clothes and usually are just removing track tops/pants.

3.6. It is intended that the facility will provide single storey viewing area on bleacher style seating. If a full size court/gym was to be constructed this single storey extension would be the full length of the building to provide either additional seating, storage or changing rooms.

3.7. Staff will need to work with the School and the Ministry of Education to develop a full concept plan including the specifications for services such as heating and ventilation.

3.8. It is intended to negotiate an agreement with the Ministry of Education on key project milestones upon which an agreed percentage of the grant will be transferred to the Ministry. This agreement will come to Council for approval.

3.9. Similarly there is a need to develop an agreement with Kaiapoi High School for community access and use of the facility. That agreement will also be referred to the Council for approval.

3.10. The Management Team/CE has reviewed this report and supports the recommendations.
4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. Community views have not been sought on this proposal. But indoor court facilities are in demand across the District and it is most probable that the facility would be frequently used by the community.

4.2. Letters of support are attached from Kaiapoi Netball Club; Kaiapoi Basketball; Waimak United Football Club and North Canterbury Basketball

4.3. Staff and a representative from the High School have met with the Rata Foundation on a potential funding application.

4.4. The Ministry of Education, Delivery Manager, Melissa Jarvis, has confirmed that with a grant of $1.3M from the community the Ministry of Education will deliver a full size indoor court facility on the Kaiapoi High School site. The Ministry would retain ownership of the building, with the contribution from the community providing an agreement for community use.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. The total cost estimate of the proposed facility is around $2.6million.

5.2. The proposal is that the Ministry of Education will commit to pay for half of the amount. That leaves a shortfall of around $1.3 million.

5.3. The fit out of the premises will be undertaken by the Ministry of Education and the High School

5.4. The agreement from the Ministry of a capped grant of $1.3million from the Community alleviates the uncertainty of a potential percentage contribution of the total cost would have.

6. CONTEXT

6.1. Policy
This matter is not a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance Policy

6.2. Legislation
- Local Government Act.

6.3. Community Outcomes
- Public spaces and facilities will be accessible and of a high standard.
- People will involve themselves in a range of recreation activities.
To Whom This May Concern,

The Kaiapoi Netball club would like to express their full support of Kaiapoi High Schools application for a new gymnasium.

As one of North Canterbury’s largest netball clubs, we would benefit from an indoor facility at our local training location that could be utilised by our club.

Netball is a winter sport with many of our training sessions cancelled during the season due to not being able to access an indoor facility. The current demand on the gym by other local sports clubs means we are unable to utilise the current facility.

We believe that a new facility would have a positive impact on the entire community offering many solutions to many situations.

We hope you look favourably on Kaiapoi High Schools request.

If you require any further information from the Kaiapoi Netball Club, please do not hesitate to contact us on the above address.

Kind Regards
Sam Harris

Kaiapoi Netball Club
President
Tuesday May 9th, 2107

To whom it may concern,

Please accept this letter in support of the proposal to build a new gymnasium facility onsite at Kaiapoi High School.

The Kaiapoi Rugby Club is one of the oldest sporting organisations in the country having been founded in 1883 and has an active membership of over 300 players across 12 grades. The club is fortunate to boast some of the best outdoor facilities in the region but, like many other sports clubs in Kaiapoi, struggles with the lack of functional indoor space available. This is particularly evident with many of our junior teams who simply end up cancelling training nights if the weather conditions are adverse as access to indoor facilities is extremely limited.

Outside of a pure rugby environment many of our players are part of other sporting codes where the lack of local facilities necessitates extra travel for players, parents and coaches alike.

The Kaiapoi Rugby Club would wholeheartedly support the proposal for the additional gymnasium facilities to be built at Kaiapoi High School and believes that it is an important step in supporting the needs of a growing local community.

Finally, on a personal note, I am a parent to two primary school aged boys who are keen on every sport possible so I am only too familiar with the pressures currently placed on the existing available infrastructure, and as a former Kaiapoi High School student I feel the expansion and modernisation of the facilities there are long overdue and in immediate need given the current growth in the local population.

If there are any further queries please do not hesitate to contact me.

Kind regards,

Jamie McKay
Club Captain
Kaiapoi Rugby Football Club
Ph: 021 987948
Sarah Saunders  
c/- Kalapoi High School  
101 Ohoka Road  
Kalapoi 7630

4 May 2017

To Whom It May Concern,

I write in support of Kalapoi High School's intention to build a second gymnasium on-site at their school.

North Canterbury Basketball Association was established, formally, in 1981. From humble beginnings as a volunteer association managing a league with 12 school teams, this BBNZ-affiliated Association has burgeoned to 3 staff managing a full annual calendar, with over 1200 members, of which there would be over 3000 registrations over the course of a year in the various events and programmes.

Basketball has no season as such – there are both Summer and Winter programmes, and with the sport being one of the fastest growing in the country, this continues to be reflected in our enrolments which demonstrate an ever increasing number of participants of all ages.

As a local sports group, we rely heavily on the availability of school gymnasiums, as there is a severe lack of community facilities to host our programmes.

To highlight the number of participants involved, I would like to provide you with a few examples:

- Term 1 and 3 and 4 – Friday Night Basketball League  
  26 primary schools involved (including Hurunui based teams); over 1100 primary aged children (years 5 – 8) play EVERY FRIDAY NIGHT. NCBA rely heavily on school gyms (11 venues; 13 courts – EVERY FRIDAY NIGHT.

- Hoops and Stars skills programme  
  Terms 1 – 4; over 200 participants enrolled EVERY Wednesday night

- Rep/ High Performance  
  Terms 1 and 4 – mornings and evenings TWO DAYS per week  
  School gyms used (dependent upon availability)
South Island Primary Tournament
NCBA’s own tournament. Teams from all over the South Island are invited to attend. We have to cap it at 40 teams at the moment, due to lack of court space. Visiting teams bring money into the region through purchase of food, groceries and accommodation.
3 days, over the April School holidays.
3 gyms utilized/ 5 courts – capped capped due to lack of availability.

Having additional court space available will not only enable more sports to grow their participation rates in the region, but encourage schools and local sports and cultural clubs to work together for the benefit of the wider community.

North Canterbury Basketball are experiencing significant growth, not just as a result of the increased popularity of the sport, but the increased population of the region known for its love of sports. A decrease is unlikely in future, due to the continued population increase in the district.

A new gymnasium built on the Kaiapoi High School site would enable a reasonably quick solution to what is a growing issue amongst the local community, being an extreme lack of court space.

North Canterbury Basketball therefore fully support the development of an additional court at Kaiapoi High School, in the lead up to the region building a purpose-built community facility, as part of their long-term plan.

I invite any of the Counsellors considering this decision, and any decision with respect to the development of further indoor court space, to visit one of our programmes. I would be happy to host you. My contact number is 027 222 0943.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Caroline Whittaker
Operations Manager
12th April 2017

Kaiapoi High School
101 Ohoka Road
Kaiapoi

To Whom It May Concern

RE: ADDITIONAL SPORTS GYM – KAIAPOI HIGH SCHOOL

My name is Ian Fong and I am the Chairman of the Waimak United Football Club Inc (Waimak). The Waimak Football Club provides football opportunities to North Canterbury residents.

The club and its former entities have been running for 50 years and we have a club membership of over 1000 using various facilities around North Canterbury. We are very proud of our achievements and the hard work of a lot of people connected with the club has also led to this on-field success.

As a club we would be very supportive of any additional indoor facilities, especially if we have a wet winter as it does put pressure on grounds that have to double as both training and playing fields. Our club also has a great number of players that play Futsal a indoor 5 a side version of football. Currently our players have to travel in to Christchurch to play due to the lack of suitable venues in North Canterbury.

Please do not hesitate to contact me directly with you have any further queries.

Yours faithfully

[Signature]

Ian Fong
Chairperson
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1. The purpose of this report is to seek Council approval for adjustments to the Community and Recreation Budget.

1.2. The report is seeking adjustments to the Greenspace budgets

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No: 170505044822

(b) **Approves** a one off grant of $20,000 to Te Kohaka o Tuhaitara Trust to undertake the development of a business case for the future operation of the Trust.

(c) **Approves** an additional $6,800.00 to the Recreation Buildings Account for the operational expenses relating to Pegasus Community Centre.

(d) **Approves** an additional $20,000 for the remodelling of the Ashley Gorge Log Cabin making a total Council allocation of $85,000.

(e) **Approves** an additional $76,000 for the replacement of the crime camera system in Rangiora.

(f) **Approves** an additional $75,849.00 for the strengthening of the Oxford Cenotaph.

(g) **Approves** an additional $6,075.00 grant to the Oxford A&P Association which will make their total Grant amount $12,000 per Annum.

(h) **Approves** a grant of $50,000 to the Waikuku Surf Club to assist with earthquake strengthening of the clubrooms.

(i) **Approves** an additional $37,800 for the purchase of a portable sound system to be used at Community Board Meetings.

(j) **Circulates** this report to the Boards.
3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. Te Kohaka o Tuhaitara Trust

3.1.1 With the additional areas of land that the Trust is going to be responsible for under the Recovery Plan, there is a need for the Trust to review its current organisational structure and business plan to ensure that it has a sustainable model.

3.1.2 Staff have had discussions with the Trust and the Trustees have agreed a grant of $20,000 would enable them to undertake business plan. The following is an extract from the Trust’s minutes:

Moved A Jolliffe  Seconded N Tirikatene-Nash

THAT Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust

(a) request the Waimakariri District Council to provide a one-off grant of $20,000 to fund a review of the current organisational structure and future needs within a business plan

CARRIED

3.1.3 Staff support this initiative and recommend that Council approve an additional one off grant of $20,000 for 2017/18.

3.2. Community Buildings Budget - Pegasus

3.2.1. In May 2017, the Council entered into a lease with Todd Properties for the use of building space for establishing the Pegasus Community Centre. This was done following Council approval in April 2017. As part of the Council approval, a sum of $5,700 was allocated for outgoings or operational funding over and above the lease fee amount.

3.2.2. Due to the timing of entering into the lease, it was not possible to include operational funding or the funding for the lease fee into the 2017/18 Draft Annual Plan budget.

3.2.3. As a result of negotiations regarding the terms of the lease and also the operating agreement with the Pegasus Residents Association staff are now more informed about what the true cost for the operation of the building will be. The initial estimate of $5,700 did not anticipate the amount of cleaning that will be required or the fact that Council will be responsible for the cost of power. This report proposes that Council approve an additional $6,800 over and above the $5700 already approved. This will make a total of $12,500 operating expenditure for the Pegasus Community Centre and will cover power, cleaning and building maintenance.

3.3. Ashley Gorge Log Cabin Restoration

3.3.1. The Draft 2017/18 Annual Plan currently has identified $65,000 for the development of a log cabin for interpretive and picnic use at Ashley Gorge. The total cost for the project is expected to be $100,000. This price estimate was completed by a registers Quantity Surveyor and is believed to be accurate. To fund the total amount staff had asked Council to carry over $29,000 of unspent Ashley Gorge capital funding and also provide additional new capital funding of $36,000. The Ashley Gorge Reserve Advisory Group
have fundraised $15,000. To make up the $20,000 difference Council staff had prepared an application to the Rata Foundation. Unfortunately the application was not successful. Staff did not find out about the unsuccessful application until after the Draft 2017/18 Annual Plan was already prepared.

3.3.2. The Council now has three main options.

3.3.3. Option 1 – Allocate an additional $20,000 capital funding towards the development of the log cabin. This means that the Council contribution towards the project would sit at $85,000. The project would be able to be completed.

3.3.4. Option 2 – Remove the $65,000 Council contribution which is currently in the Draft 2017/18 Annual Plan. This would mean that the project would not be able to proceed.

3.3.5. Option 3 – Leave the $65,000 Council contribution in the budget. The Ashley Gorge Reserve Advisory Group would then have to fundraise an additional $20,000 before the project could commence.

3.4. Rangiora Crime Cameras

3.4.1. In April 2017 Council approved funding for a new camera system for Kaiapoi and noted that a separate report would be made on Rangiora Cameras.

3.4.2. The Rangiora System was installed in 2006 and has had a series of stop gap repairs to continue functioning until the Town Centre rebuild was substantially completed.

3.4.3. Staff have now received a proposal from Visual Networks that allows to:

- Replace all existing PTZ cameras (5) in Rangiora
- Add an additional 2x new locations (Joes Garage & East Belt)
- Add an additional 2x cameras (fixed) to cover Flaxton Road. There is approval from CCC to use the Fusion Fibre Network as a backhaul. Upgrade Police Milestone Recording & Viewing Hardware

3.4.4. The new system will utilise recently installed cameras in Conway Lane etc.

3.4.5. The total cost of this work, including installation, is $76,600.

3.5. Oxford Cenotaph

3.5.1. After a routine inspection of the Oxford Cenotaph, it was bought to Council’s attention that the top granite plinth was not secured to the rest of the structure. Staff immediately asked for a structural engineer and stonemason to undertake a more detailed analysis and provide some recommendations about what could be done to strengthen the structure.

3.5.2. The first recommendation was to remove the plinth as soon as possible to eliminate the risk to the public. This was done using a crane by the stonemason with no damage to the granite plinth during the removal process.

3.5.3. Both the Structural Engineer at Opus and the Stonemason then prepared a design and costing for how the plinth could be reattached. An extract from the Opus Structural Engineer is included below which identifies how the final design was determined.

The primary objective of the structural assessment is life safety. As the cenotaph is located within a public area, we have assessed the structure against an IL2 seismic
event and 50 years design life (which is equivalent to designing the memorial to withstand an earthquake with a return period of 1 in 500yrs – note this is as specified in the New Zealand Loadings Code to meet the requirements of the New Zealand Building Code). As part of the initial analysis we determined that connecting the top obelisk to the granite block below does not have sufficient stability to withstand the design level earthquake without toppling. We considered the cenotaph as a whole and considered the rocking of the granite plinths at each level. In all scenarios, the structure’s inertia was not sufficient to counter the design level earthquake. As a result, to strengthen the cenotaph to 100% NBS it will be necessary to connect the pieces of granite together and connect them to a concrete foundation, note that this is what was done at the Cust cenotaph following the Darfield 2010 earthquake.

Our experience of the concrete quality at the time of the cenotaph’s construction was backed up by Peter Dunn, we both believe that the existing concrete foundation which forms the steps will be bony and poor quality at best, and may include broken bricks and rubble. Unfortunately this would not be adequate to resist the earthquake forces generated and toppling would occur. For the purposes of your budget we have assumed that the concrete is poor and new concrete foundation will be required. If our assumption is found to be incorrect and the existing foundation can be used, the time and cost to strengthen the cenotaph will be reduced.

We considered three options to strengthen the cenotaph to 100% NBS, these are described below:

A. **Design the cenotaph as a ductile structure** – this would entail installing a central unbonded steel rod anchored at ends only. This option could result in permanent deformation (lean) to the central steel core after a design level earthquake and as the steel rod would be epoxy fixed to the top obelisk the only way to rectify this lean would be to destroy the top obelisk. This was not considered acceptable.

B. **Installation of ground anchors.** This design would induce higher demand on the foundation than Option C described below. In our opinion, this option is likely to be more expensive and time consuming because the foundation below the cenotaph footprint would still need to be strengthened/replaced and geotechnical involvement design of the ground anchors would be required. Consequently this option was not pursued further.

C. **New concrete foundation and install steel bars through each granite piece.**
   Option C1 –Deconstruct the granite pieces down to the concrete steps. Keep the steps but remove a portion in the centre of the existing concrete foundation steps to construct a new foundation to connect the new steel rods to. Construct new concrete foundation with steel reinforcement, drill holes in the granite and reconstruct the cenotaph connected by the steel rods.
   Option C2 – this option was provided based on Peter Dunn’s input that it might be more cost effective to replace entire concrete steps rather than the partial replacement suggested in Option C1.

3.5.4. The Stonemason has prepared the cost estimate based on Option C2 which comes to a total of $75,849.00

3.5.5. Recommendations from the Opus Structural Engineer and the Stonemason are that option C2 is the best option. The cost difference between Option C2 and C1 is $600. The concrete foundation steps have been fixed many times to repair broken concrete. The original inspection undertaken by Council staff was to the concrete steps after receiving complaints about the need for maintenance. Therefore, staff are recommending that Council fund the full $75,849.00.
3.6. Waikuku Surf Club Grant

3.6.1. Staff alerted Council some time ago to the fact that the Surf Club was looking for assistance to complete the earthquake strengthening of their building.

3.6.2. Staff have met with the Surf Club to clarify what is being sought and also some greater understanding of the scope of works.

3.6.3. The total works include an engineer’s estimate of $250,000 for work yet to be completed and work to the value of $120,000 that the Club has already undertaken which has been totally funded by the Club. Some of the $120,000 included betterment such as upgrading the kitchen etc but the scope of the remaining $250,000 is focused on earthquake strengthening and bringing the building up to code for fire egress as is required through the building consent process.

3.6.4. The Club has not yet formally approached other funders, such as Rata foundation, as they wanted to get an understanding of how much the Council is willing to fund.

3.6.5. Having a commitment from Council will also greatly assist with application to Rata Foundation.

3.6.6. Staff have alerted Rata to the needs of the Club and Rata Foundation is expecting an application from the Surf Club.

3.6.7. Staff recommend that the Council contribute $50,000 to the upgrade and recommend to the Club that the Club applies to the Rata Foundation for the balance.

3.6.8. This will not preclude the Club from coming back to the Council once all funding opportunities have been explored.

3.7. Oxford A & P Lease

3.7.1. For a number of years the Oxford A&P Association has been talking to staff about the possibility of increasing their annual grant while also renegotiating the cost of the lease. The main reason for wanting an increase is the ongoing difficulty in covering operational costs including field and building maintenance as well as insurance.

3.7.2. Council currently leases a single field from the A&P Association which is used by the Oxford Football Club. The grant is given to the club to assist with operational costs associated with providing the land for community use recognising the fact that Council would otherwise have to consider providing the land if the A&P Association didn’t. Currently Oxford A&P receives an annual Grant of $4,900 and a lease fee of just over $1,000. A total annual figure of $5,925.

3.7.3. Staff have undertaken some comparisons and based on the number of grounds and other services such as toilets and changing rooms which are provided by the Oxford A&P Association believe there should be an increase to the overall amount which is received by the Association.

3.7.4. Based on other grants which the Council provides other community recreation ground providers and the services provided at the Oxford Showgrounds staff have estimated a per field figure of $4,000. The Oxford A&P Association currently provide three fields for community use. Staff are therefore recommending that the appropriate annual combined amount provided to the Oxford A&P Association is $12,000. This is an increase of $6,075.00
3.7.5. For ease of administration it would be more efficient to do away with the lease and instead look to provide the full $12,000 as a grant on the bases that two fields remain available for rugby and one for soccer and that the changing rooms and toilets remain open for rugby.

3.8. Sound System

3.8.1. There have been suggestions made by various Community Board Members and some Councillors about the potential for a sound system for Board meetings.

3.8.2. Currently all Boards, with the exception of Rangiora, meet in venues without sound systems.

3.8.3. It can be problematic for members of the community attending a Board meeting to hear what is being said around the table at meetings. Staff have also had feedback from users of the Rangiora Town Hall Function Room about the desirability of a sound system for board room type meetings. The Function Room and Woodend Community Centre do have sound systems but these are for single speakers and are designed to be used as a public address system.

3.8.4. Staff have investigated options and there is a portable wireless sound system “Stennheiser ADN System” that seems to be suitable for use at all of the Council owned venues that host Community Board Meetings as well as the Rangiora Town Hall Function Room.

3.8.5. The system is fully portable and being wireless is easily set up. It also has a recording option on a USB stick.

3.8.6. The price is $37,792.47 which includes a:
   - A Chairman’s unit
   - 9 delegates units
   - 10 Gooseneck microphones
   - A road case for transporting
   - A charging unit for 10 units.

3.8.7. The system has the functionality to set limits for delegates talk times between 1 and 60 minutes, and a warning light that gives delegates a pre-set warning that their speaking time is nearly up. This can be set from 10 seconds to 120 seconds.

3.8.8. Each unit has a built in speaker and it can also connect to any existing speakers in a building. This would be useful at Ruataniwha, Woodend Community Centre, Oxford Town Hall and Rangiora Town Hall Function Room.

3.9. The Management Team/CE has reviewed this report and supports the recommendations.

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. The increases that are being sought have all come from customer feedback or from previous discussions with Council.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. The financial information relating to each submission is detailed in Section 3 above.
6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. **Policy**

This matter is not a matter of significance in terms of the Council's Significance Policy.

6.2. **Legislation**

Reserves Act; Building Act

6.3. **Community Outcomes**

The provision of parks and reserves contributes to the following community outcomes:

- Public spaces and facilities are plentiful accessible and high quality

Craig Sargison
MANAGER, COMMUNITY AND RECREATION
1. SUMMARY

The following list of projects and capital works have either not commenced or will not be completed this financial year. Approval is required to include these projects into the 2017-18 Annual Plan. The cost of completing the projects listed will be met either by credit balances carried forward, reserve fund transfers or by loan funding.

It is intended that the budget carryovers be approved as part of the 2017-18 Annual Plan process, but the actual carryover will be made after the 30 June 2017 accounts have been completed and the actual expenditure situation for each project is known.

Attachments:

i. Schedule of Proposed Carryovers from 2016-17 to 2017-18.

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 170516049095

(b) Adopts the carryovers as listed for inclusion in the 2017-18 Annual Plan.

3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. This report identifies the projects included in the 2016-17 budget which will not be completed by 30 June 2017.

Remarks have been provided for each project explaining the reason why the carryover has been requested.

3.2. Rates may be affected in outer years to a minor extent, due to the expenditure relating to loan repayments. The cost of completing the projects listed will be met either by credit balances carried forward, reserve fund transfers or by loan funding.

3.3. A project is normally capitalised when it is fully completed. Therefore in most cases the full budget needs to be carried over. Projects that will be partially capitalised as at 30 June 2017 will only have unspent portion carried over. If a project is overspent but still continues into the next financial year, only the Council approved budget will be carried over. Capital projects that have already been included/re-budgeted in the 2017-18 Annual Plan will not be included on the carry over list and a separate report requesting additional expenditure approval will be provided.
3.4. Operational expenditure will only be carried over if there is sufficient operational expenditure surplus in the account. If there is not, a separate report is required to be approved by Council. The carry over requirements for operational budgets this year are $120,000 in total that is made up of $40,000 from Information Services for ArcGIS-TechOne integration and modelling tools and $80,000 from Development Planning for the Urban Development Strategy.

3.5. Council’s projected spend on capital (excluding projects carried over from last year) as at 30 June 2017 is expected to be over $39.0m.

3.6. Carryovers requests (capital projects) for the current year are summarised below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Budget for Projects to carryover ($million)</th>
<th>Anticipated expenditure to 30 June 2017 ($million)</th>
<th>Unspent portion ($million)</th>
<th>Amount to be carried over ($million)</th>
<th>Number of Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthquake Recovery</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>29.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>16.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>25.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>99</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.7. The 101 projects to be carried over include the following:

- Multi-year projects: 37
- Developer led projects: 5
- Current year projects: 57

3.8. Significant carryovers in each activity are summarised below, that makes up 33% of the $29.1 million budgets for carryover:

**Capital budget**

3.8.1. Water

Oxford No 1 - Additional Source - Budget $1.3m Anticipated Expenditure $1.1m

It is projected that a new well will be being drilled for the source upgrade in May and June 2017, with testing of the well continuing into July 2017. This will then be followed by design of the next stage of the project involving building a well head, electrical work and the installation of 5km of pipe. The 2017-18 financial year has a budget of $500k for this future work. $300,000 spent on first well to be expensed. $673,000 spent on complete second well to be capitalized this financial year.
Oxford No 2 - Ashley Gorge Trunk Main - *Budget* $0.3m *Anticipated Expenditure* $0.1
Design is being carried out at present. The work is projected to be awarded to the Water Unit in June and works starting towards the end of June 2017 and continuing into the 2017-18 financial year.

### 3.8.2. Sewer

Woodend - New Aeration Pond 1C recommission Pond 2B - *Budget* $2.7m *Anticipated Expenditure* $1.5m
This is a multi-year project due for completion in October 2017. Construction is underway and is progressing to programme with approximately 30% of the physical works complete.

Rangiora Waste Water Treatment Plant Aeration Basin - *Budget* $1.0m *Anticipated Expenditure* $0.4m
This is a multi-year project due for completion in April 2018. Detailed design and consenting is complete. Tender is to be awarded in April 2017.

### 3.8.3. Drainage

Kaiapoi - Parnhams Drain PS Upgrade & Access - *Budget* $0.3m *Anticipated Expenditure* $0.05m
Consultants (Becca) are investigating alternative construction methods for the new retaining wall. Project will not be completed this financial year.

### 3.8.4. Road

Urban Cycleway Programme - Rangiora to Kaiapoi - *Budget* $1.0m *Anticipated Expenditure* $0.2m
This is a multi-year project due for completion in June 2018. Design and tender underway. Scheme design approved by Council.

Rangiora - West Belt Extension to Townsend Rd - *Budget* $0.8m *Anticipated Expenditure* $0.7m
This is a multi-year project due for completion in June 2018. Delays in the design work has meant construction could not commence before the winter. Has a budget of $3m for the 2017-18 financial year.

### 3.8.5. Recreation

Play Safety Surface/Equipment - *Budget* $0.6m *Anticipated Expenditure* $0.3m
Project is for on-going capital replacements. Assessments undertaken in December 2016 have determined that three playgrounds require new safety surfacing. This will come to a total cost of approximately $70,000. In addition, funding will be required to replace furniture and lighting on the stop bank adjacent to the Ruataniwha Centre. This work is currently underway. $145,000 of complete works to be capitalized this financial year.

Gladstone Park - *Budget* $0.6m *Anticipated Expenditure* $0.2m
This is a multi-year project due for completion in June 2019. The project is fully underway with ground works being completed and the path and car park in the final design stage ready for tender.
3.8.6. EQ General

Rangiora Town Centre Revitalisation - Budget $1.1m Anticipated Expenditure $0.6m
The upgrade on High St has been completed with remained budget reserved for Good St upgrade.

The attached schedules were prepared in combination with the managers of the departments concerned. The Management Team has reviewed this report and supports the recommendations.

4. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The Annual Plan for 2017-18 will be adjusted to include the approved carryovers. The effect of the carry-over of capital expenditure means that loan funding may not be required for funding. The effect on rates will depend on the carryovers approved and how much of the expenditure is funded from sources other than loans, for example Development Contributions, Grants and Subsidies, Reserve Funding and other funds.

Risks arise with the delay or non-completion of projects with the two main consequences being:

- Necessary work not being completed could result in not achieving the level of service.
- Escalation of prices due to the current economic environment.

4.1. For each project the Council may approve that the project is carried over to the 2017-18 Annual Plan.

OR

4.2. The Council may amend the work.

OR

4.3. The Council may decide not to proceed with the particular project.

5. CONTEXT

5.1 These issues may be considered significant in terms of the Council’s Significance Policy as the cost of some projects, or in total, exceed $1m, however the original approval was done in conjunction to a special consultative procedure and is requested for approval due to the timing of the projects. The expected completion dates (if known) are provided on the schedule attached.

5.2 Links to Community Outcomes

The Annual Plan process contributes to the following community outcomes:

“There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision-making by public organisations that affects our District

- Public organisations make information about their plans and activities readily available.
- Public organisations make every effort to accommodate the views of people who contribute to consultations.”

5.3 The Local Government Act 2002 requires that the Annual Plan for 2017-18 must be completed and adopted by 30 June 2017. The Draft Annual Plan must be subject to consultation using the Special Consultative Procedure outlined in the Local Government Act 2002.
### Carry-over schedule 2017/18

Capital work requested to be carried over from 2016/2017 to 2017/2018 (capital projects that had been re-budgeted in 2017/2018 will not be listed on this carry over report)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Full year revised budget</th>
<th>Actual Expenditure to date as at 31 March 17</th>
<th>Anticipated Expenditure to 30 June 2017</th>
<th>Projected Completion Date (mth/yr)</th>
<th>Unspent</th>
<th>Amount to be carried over</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Budgets (None Earthquake)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WATER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>Developer led project, programme is yet to be confirmed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/O - Southbrook Ring Main - Stage 1</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>Oct-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Budget was insufficient so additional budget is being sought for 17/18 financial year. Works will be started in Jun-17 with construction continuing into the 17/18 financial year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chennery Rd Main Upgrade</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>Dec-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Budget was insufficient so additional budget is being sought for 17/18 financial year. Works will be started in Jun-17 with construction continuing into the 17/18 financial year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOODEND</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Woodend Rd main upgrade</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PEEGASUS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convert Filters to Biological Treatment</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>31,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>Jun-18</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>This is a multi-year project due for completion in Jun-18. Preliminary design for the converted filters is underway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MARUKU BEACH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Capacity Upgrade</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>Jun-18</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>This year's budget is being used for professional services for options assessment and design of a capacity upgrade. Additional budget has been requested for 17/18 financial year to carry out the physical works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FERNSIDE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection to Mandeville</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>Aug-17</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>This is a multi-year project due for completion in Aug-17. The contract has been awarded to the Water Unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MANDEVILLE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 10 Rd - South Link Main</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Developer led project, programme is yet to be confirmed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KAIAPOI</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENE Kaiapoi Supply Main</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Developer led project, programme is yet to be confirmed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East Kaiapoi Boost Main</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dec-17</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Design work is being carried out at present by Project Delivery Unit. The design will be completed by the end of the 16/17 financial year, with the tendering occurring early in the 17/18 financial year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OXFORD NO 1 RURAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional source</td>
<td>1,250,000</td>
<td>973,000</td>
<td>1,123,000</td>
<td>May-19</td>
<td>127,000</td>
<td>277,000</td>
<td>It is projected that a new well will be being drilled for the source upgrade in May and Jun-17, with testing of the well continuing into Jul-17. This will then be followed by design of the next stage of the project involving building a well head, electrical work and the installation of 9m of pipe. The 17/18 financial year has a budget of $500k for this future work. $300k spent on first well to be expensed. $673k spent on complete second well to be capitalized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish Road ring Main Stage 3</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>Aug-17</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parish is being carried out at present. The work is projected to be awarded to the Water Unit in June and works starting towards the end of Jun-17 and continuing into Jul and Aug-17.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Carry-over schedule 2017/18

Capital work requested to be carried over from 2016/2017 to 2017/2018 (capital projects that had been re-budgeted in 2017/2018 will not be listed on this carry over report)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Full year revised budget</th>
<th>Actual Expenditure to date as at 31 March 17</th>
<th>Anticipated Expenditure to 30 June 2017</th>
<th>Projected Completion Date (mth/yr)</th>
<th>Unspent</th>
<th>Amount to be carried over</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEW ZEALAND</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Source 125,000                  -                               50,000                               Jan-18 75,000    125,000                  this project is underway with Beca currently designing the new pump stations for the new Water Unit in June and works starting towards the end of Jun-17 and continuing into the 17/18 financial year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Gorge Trunk Main 255,000                   8,000                           75,000                                Oct-17 180,000 255,000                  Design is being carried out at present. The work is projected to be awarded to the Water Unit in June and works starting towards the end of Jun-17 and continuing into the 17/18 financial year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipeline Renewals 40,000                   -                               25,000                               Jul-17 15,000 40,000                  Renewal of the Springbank 1 well head in order to achieve compliance with the Drinking Water Standards. The physical works will start in June and be completed in Jul-17.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CARRAMORE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Source 50,000                   28,000                           32,000                               Jun-19 18,000 50,000                  Staff are currently investigating options to upgrade the Carramore water supply source. A report will be brought to the community board with options towards the end of the 16/17 financial year, which will be followed by community consultation in Jul-17.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEWER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Rangiora Capacity Upgrade Design 92,000                  -                               70,000                               Oct-17 22,000 72,000                  this is a multi-year project due for completion in Oct-17.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Rga Railway Rd to Waste Water Treatment Plant Inlet Works - Goolwa 301,000                  -                               82,000                               Oct-17 219,000 301,000                  this is a multi-year project due for completion in Oct-17.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Waste Water Treatment Plant Inlet Works - Growth 2,150,000                2,093,000                    2,550,000                Oct-17 2,150,000 2,150,000                  this is a multi-year project due for completion in Oct-17. Has a budget of $2.5m for the 17/18 financial year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Waste Water Treatment Plant Inlet Works - Level of Service 1,000,000                1,005,000                    1,200,000                Oct-17 1,100,000 1,100,000                  this is a multi-year project due for completion in Oct-17. Has a budget of $550k for the 17/18 financial year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Rga - Railway Rd to Waste Water Treatment Plant Construction - Growth 132,000                  58,000                   100,000                               Oct-17 32,000 132,000                  this is a multi-year project due for completion in Oct-17. Has a budget of $1.4m for the 17/18 financial year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Rga Railway Road to Waste Water Treatment Plant Construction - Level of Service 595,000                453,000                    520,000                Oct-17 75,000 595,000                  this is a multi-year project due for completion in Oct-17. Has a budget of $1.3m for 17/18 financial year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Rangiora capacity Upgrade Replacement 35,000                  21,000                   20,000                               Oct-17 18,000 38,000                  this is a multi-year project due for completion in Oct-17.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Waste Water Treatment Plant Aeration Basin 1,000,000                1,000,000                    600,000                Apr-18 600,000 1,000,000                  this is a multi-year project due for completion in Apr-18.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOODEND</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Aeration Pond 1c recommission Pond 05 2,700,000                947,000                   1,500,000                Oct-17 1,200,000 2,700,000                  this is a multi-year project due for completion in Oct-17.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KAPOPO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parnham Ln Rising Main 1,493,000                715,000                   1,493,000                Oct-17 1,493,000 1,493,000                  this is a multi-year project due for completion in Oct-17. Has a budget of $1.5m for the 17/18 financial year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second inlet screen at Waste Water Treatment Plant 250,000                  12,000                   30,000                               Dec-17 250,000 250,000                  this is a multi-year project due for completion in Dec-17.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OFFSHORE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrate aerators 100,000                  10,000                   30,000                               Dec-17 70,000 100,000                  this is a multi-year project due for completion in Dec-17. Council staff have not been able to gain approval to carry out this work from the land owner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipeline replacement 46,000                  2,000                   3,000                               Dec-17 43,000 46,000                  this is a multi-year project due for completion in Dec-17.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade aerators 360,000                  31,000                   70,000                               Dec-17 290,000 360,000                  this is a multi-year project due for completion in Dec-17.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEWER SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Carry-over schedule 2017/18

Capital work requested to be carried over from 2016/2017 to 2017/2018 (capital projects that had been re-budgeted in 2017/2018 will not be listed on this carry over report)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Full year revised budget</th>
<th>Actual Expenditure to date as at 31 March 17</th>
<th>Anticipated Expenditure to 30 June 2017</th>
<th>Projected Completion Date (mth/yr)</th>
<th>Unspent Amount to be carried over</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DRAINAGE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Channel Piping</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Oct-18</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Rangiora Retention</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Dec-17</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Brook Enhancement Work</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>Sep-17</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>29,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlebrook Upgrade</td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td>181,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>Dec-17</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Rangiora - Enverton Drive Ballarat Road</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>49,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Brook - Janelle to White</td>
<td>84,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Dec-17</td>
<td>74,000</td>
<td>84,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KAAPOI URBAN**

- Parnhams Drain PS Upgrade & Access: 300,000 | 45,000 | 50,000 | Dec-18 | 250,000 | 300,000 | Consultants (Becca) are investigating alternative construction methods for the new retaining wall. Project unlikely to be completed this financial year. |

**FLOOD RESPONSE**

- Flood Response Rural Areas: 50,000 | 98,000 | 98,000 | Oct-18 | - | 50,000 | Project unable to be completed until Paicote Road intersection (roading) is completed. |
- Flood Response Central Rural: 247,000 | 144,561 | 144,561 | Dec-17 | 102,439 | 247,000 | This project involves upgrading Moys Creek between Johns Road and O’Roarke’s Road. Negotiations to obtain land owner approvals has delayed the project however a construction contract has been let (construction to start in November 2017). |

**Drainage Subtotal** | 1,161,000 | 484,561 | 532,561 | 1,674,439 | 940,000 |          |

**ROADING**

**DRAINAGE RENEWALS - KERB & CHANNEL**

- Drainage Renewals - K & C: 563,000 | 45,184 | 70,000 | Aug-17 | 593,000 | 563,000 | Design work completed late in the year and contract late due to resources tied up on other major projects. Other completed work will be capitalised. Balance only to be carried forward. |

**DRAINAGE RENEWALS - CULVERTS**

- Drainage Renewals - Culverts: 212,241 | 187,585 | 220,000 | Dec-17 | 53,240 | 53,240 | Oilmouth Road culvert work is funded from both the drainage and roading budgets. A delayed occurred due to budget issues in the drainage budget, which have now been resolved. Other completed work will be capitalised. Balance only to be carried forward. |

**MINOR IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS**

- School Safety Projects: 65,000 | 12,130 | 12,130 | Jul-17 | 52,870 | 52,870 | 60km/h variable speed limit at Kaiapoi High School approved. Installation will be in Jul-17 to coincide with the school holidays. Other completed work will be capitalised. Balance only to be carried forward. |
- Minor Works: 265,000 | 93,866 | 155,000 | Nov-17 | 110,000 | 110,000 | Uniwersa Rd bridge renewal work started but has been delayed due to services relocation and subsequently consent conditions relating to working a waterway after the end March. Other completed work will be capitalised. Balance only to be carried forward. |
- Roadside Hazard Removal: 150,000 | - | 110,000 | Dec-17 | 40,000 | 40,000 | A project at Cones Road/Paical Dr has been identified to be done in conjunction with drainage improvement work. The drainage improvement work has not progressed at this stage. Other completed work to be capitalised. |

**FOOTPATH RECONSTRUCTION**

- Footpath Reconstruction: 710,166 | 398,835 | 500,000 | Aug-17 | 210,166 | 210,166 | The footpath realigning that is part of the kerb and channel renewal projects as detailed above will not be completed until Aug 2017. Other completed work will be capitalised. Balance only to be carried forward. |

**OTHER WORKS**

- Burnett Street Oxford Improvements: 150,000 | 44,323 | 125,000 | Sep-17 | 30,000 | 30,000 | Most of the work is complete except for the work outside the service centre and this cannot be completed until the new building is completed. The work will be coordinated with the new building construction. The completed work can be capitalised so only the balance needs to be carried forward. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Full year revised budget</th>
<th>Actual Expenditure to date as at 31 March 17</th>
<th>Anticipated Expenditure to 30 June 2017</th>
<th>Projected Completion Date (mth/yr)</th>
<th>Unspent</th>
<th>Amount to be carried over</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBDIVISION PROJECTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone Rd – Walking/Cycling Connection</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Jun-18</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>Planning and investigation work has not commenced due to resources being tied up on other major projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach Grove</td>
<td>230,000</td>
<td>20,767</td>
<td>20,767</td>
<td>Dec-17</td>
<td>209,233</td>
<td>209,233</td>
<td>This funding is for the new walkway/cycleway along the road reserve adjacent to Beach Grove and the work is to be constructed by the developer. Developers programme has yet to be confirmed. Other completed work will be capitalised. Balance only to be carried forward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ODP DEVELOPMENT CONTRIBUTION FUNDED PROJECTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Belt Extension to Townsend Rd</td>
<td>751,500</td>
<td>671,505</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>Jun-18</td>
<td>751,500</td>
<td>34,395</td>
<td>Delays in the design work has meant construction could not commence before the winter. Has a budget of $3m for 17/18 financial year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbrook ODP</td>
<td>332,395</td>
<td>1,978</td>
<td>1,978</td>
<td>Jun-18</td>
<td>332,395</td>
<td>332,395</td>
<td>Has funding set up to upgrade Flaxton Road. The planning and design of the Flaxton Road upgrade has not commenced yet due to resources being tied up on other major projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverstream Collector Rd (Adderley-Island)</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>29,698</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>Jun-18</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>This is a multi-year project due for completion in Jun-18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DISTRICT TRANSPORT STRATEGY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Passenger Transport Infrastructure</td>
<td>148,707</td>
<td>83,158</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>Aug-17</td>
<td>48,707</td>
<td>48,707</td>
<td>New bus stop improvements and new shelters are still being identified and implemented. Not all will be complete by Jun-17. Other completed work will be capitalised. Balance only to be carried forward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Cycleway Programme - Rangora to Woodend</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>42,311</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>Jun-18</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>This is a multi-year project due for completion in Jun-18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Cycleway Programme - Rangora to Kaiapoi</td>
<td>1,055,000</td>
<td>210,000</td>
<td>210,000</td>
<td>Jun-18</td>
<td>845,000</td>
<td>1,055,000</td>
<td>This is a multi-year project due for completion in Jun-18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbelt extension to Townsrd Rd</td>
<td>283,013</td>
<td>202,041</td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td>Jun-18</td>
<td>63,013</td>
<td>283,013</td>
<td>Delays in the design work has meant construction could not commence before the winter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Rga Improvement - Lehmans to River Rd</td>
<td>205,600</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Jun-18</td>
<td>205,600</td>
<td>205,600</td>
<td>This is for purchase of property for the proposed new road to connect River Road to Lehmans road. Negotiations with the landowner have commenced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roading Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>5,532,621</td>
<td>2,020,582</td>
<td>2,524,875</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,007,746</td>
<td>4,224,724</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Full year revised budget</td>
<td>Actual Expenditure as at 31 March 17</td>
<td>Anticipated Expenditure to 30 June 2017</td>
<td>Projected Completion (mth/yr)</td>
<td>Unspent</td>
<td>Amount to be carried over</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Safety (surface/equipment)</td>
<td>615,000</td>
<td>172,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>315,000</td>
<td>470,000</td>
<td>Ongoing capital replacements, $145k to be capitalized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall Court Renovations</td>
<td>292,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>292,000</td>
<td>292,000</td>
<td>Part of the budget will need to be carried over to accumulate funds in order to cover future tennis court works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Henne氏 Reserve Landscape</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>This budget is being used to replace the planting around the outside of the Library Service Centre. The work is likely to occur in Aug 17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Street Trees Gardens</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>This budget is being used to replace the planting around the outside of the Library Service Centre. This work is likely to occur in Aug 17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora-Ashley General Landscape Development</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>Projects are determined by the board. These projects are approved at various times of year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hagan Estate</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>16,800</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>Oct-17</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>Some additional planting and the installation of some hammocks is still to be completed. The planting is to be done this autumn and next spring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeshore Land</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>Jun-19</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>The bridge has now been removed and staff are working on further options which may mean that additional funding is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karapiti - Tahunanui General Landscape Development</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>101,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>The Karapiti Community Board have been carrying over money of the last few years in order to have a significant amount that can be spent on a project into the regeneration area. What this is to be and when is still not confirmed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington-Silton General Landscape Development</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>Projects are determined by the board. These projects are approved at various times of year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addington Sports Turf - Landscape Works</td>
<td>94,000</td>
<td>39,000</td>
<td>39,000</td>
<td>Jun-18</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>99,000</td>
<td>While the Addington Sports Club have identified a number of projects. Some projects are to be further investigated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford-Akoka tongariro Landscape Development</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>Projects are determined by the board. These projects are approved at various times of year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverstream Reserve</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>Staff are still trying to negotiate access through the Silverstream Hatchery. Until this is completed it is difficult to know how the funding will be utilised and a time frame for completion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Grove</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>Jun-18</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>Staff have asked through the Annual Plan process that this money be allocated towards the log cabin construction. This is being considered as part of the Annual Plan process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Tennis Centre car park</td>
<td>315,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Not yet determined</td>
<td>315,000</td>
<td>315,000</td>
<td>Staff are in discussions with Tennis Clubs now but the scope of any new development is not yet determined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karapiti Park</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>The Pearson Park Advisory group make decisions regarding the spending of this budget. The idea is that it accumulates each year to allow the group to build up funds to undertake larger projects. $45k to be capitalized for completion stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Camera Installation Trousselot Park</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Aug-17</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>Completion of project is determined by the Christian Fellowship Church building finishing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposalised Reserve Enhancement</td>
<td>415,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>407,000</td>
<td>413,000</td>
<td>The tender for the toilet project has been evaluated and should be approved by Management Team shortly. The park development has a 2 week development timeframe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone Park</td>
<td>623,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>Jun-19</td>
<td>423,000</td>
<td>623,000</td>
<td>This is a multi-year project due for completion in Jun 19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church St House Carpark</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>Oct-17</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>The building has been removed and the tender documents completed. The new car park construction will commence in Sep-17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves - Recreation Subtotal</td>
<td>2,974,000</td>
<td>616,000</td>
<td>790,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,194,000</td>
<td>2,744,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC CONVENIENCES - RECREATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Renovs</td>
<td>466,000</td>
<td>237,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>66,000</td>
<td>416,000</td>
<td>This budget is for the ongoing renewal of the districts toilets. The remodelled budget refers to the Kendal Park Changing rooms which are not currently complete. $55k to be capitalized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverstream Reserve</td>
<td>73,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Not yet determined</td>
<td>73,000</td>
<td>73,000</td>
<td>Project has been put on hold. The Silverstream Advisory group would like to be able to negotiate a connection between the east and west end of the reserve before installing a toilet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngaru Beach Toilet</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>Sep-17</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>The new toilet will be installed in winter to reduce any inconvenience to beach users. The contract has been signed and design work is underway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Convenience - Recreation Subtotal</td>
<td>739,000</td>
<td>243,000</td>
<td>425,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>319,000</td>
<td>889,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY BUILDINGS - RECREATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court facilities</td>
<td>78,000</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>Dec-17</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>78,000</td>
<td>This budget is being used for the architectural services to develop a master plan and building layout concept for the indoor court facility and Cobstonstream Road Rangiora.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Buildings - Recreation Subtotal</td>
<td>78,000</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>78,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWIMMING POOLS - RECREATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudley Pool Renewals</td>
<td>138,000</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>71,500</td>
<td>This budget is for the ongoing renewal of the Dudley Pool. $89k to be capitalized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Pool Renewals</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>This budget is for the ongoing renewal of the Oxford Pool.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Pools - Recreation Subtotal</td>
<td>139,000</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>84,000</td>
<td>72,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Carry-over schedule 2017/18

Capital work requested to be carried over from 2016/2017 to 2017/2018 (capital projects that had been re-budgeted in 2017/2018 will not be listed on this carry over report)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Full year revised budget</th>
<th>Actual Expenditure to date as at 31 March 17</th>
<th>Anticipated Expenditure to 30 June 2017</th>
<th>Projected Completion Date (mth/yr)</th>
<th>Unspent</th>
<th>Amount to be carried over</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOLID WASTE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Transfer Access Roads Replacement</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Sep-17</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Late due to getting resourcing consent taking longer than expected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbrook Recycling Compactor Shelter</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>Aug-17</td>
<td>152,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>Has taken longer than expected to get consultant in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gareys Pitts Road and Franching</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Sep-17</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Late due to getting resourcing consent taking longer than expected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste Subtotal</td>
<td>260,000</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>222,000</td>
<td>260,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ELDERLY HOUSING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathroom renovations Pensioner Housing</td>
<td>92,170</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>Jun-18</td>
<td>91,989</td>
<td>92,000</td>
<td>Project to continue in next financial year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital - Asset Management Plan</td>
<td>251,170</td>
<td>22,933</td>
<td>61,361</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>92,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Has taken longer than expected to get consultant in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly Housing Subtotal</td>
<td>153,170</td>
<td>23,124</td>
<td>61,361</td>
<td>222,000</td>
<td>260,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CIVIL DEFENCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement/upgrade of tablets &amp; PCs</td>
<td>15,350</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Jun-18</td>
<td>15,350</td>
<td>15,350</td>
<td>Equipment to be purchased in next financial year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace Civil Defence centre signage</td>
<td>10,230</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Jun-18</td>
<td>10,230</td>
<td>10,230</td>
<td>Equipment to be purchased in next financial year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Defence Subtotal</td>
<td>25,580</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25,580</td>
<td>25,580</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wi-Fi Town Centres</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>12,293</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>Jun-18</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>To continue into next financial year. $17k to be capitalized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development Subtotal</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>12,293</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>222,000</td>
<td>260,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMPUTER SERVICES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional PDA</td>
<td>163,480</td>
<td>46,380</td>
<td>88,480</td>
<td>Jun-18</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>To carry over $75k for Mobility Strategy labels not bought.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wi-Fi</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>1,740</td>
<td>1,740</td>
<td>Jun-18</td>
<td>38,260</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>To carry over $40k set aside for Facilities Bookings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Jun-18</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>To carry over $24k for PPA PIPP implementation stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overdrive Replacement</td>
<td>29,950</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Need $15k to be carried over to next financial year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP Autoworker</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>35,786</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>Jun-18</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>Will continue into next financial year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Services Subtotal</td>
<td>332,980</td>
<td>83,906</td>
<td>160,720</td>
<td>172,260</td>
<td>214,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VEHICLE RENEWAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicle purchase</td>
<td>509,000</td>
<td>39,411</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>Jun-18</td>
<td>559,000</td>
<td>559,000</td>
<td>Vehicles will be purchased per replacement programme in 17/18. $50k to be capitalized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicile Renewal Subtotal</td>
<td>509,000</td>
<td>39,411</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>559,000</td>
<td>559,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SERVICE CENTRES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alteration to Oxford Sc</td>
<td>1,832,000</td>
<td>824,656</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>432,000</td>
<td>1,832,000</td>
<td>Project will be completed next year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alteration to Oxford Sc - Furniture &amp; Fittings</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>Will be sorted after alteration is completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Centres Subtotal</td>
<td>1,952,000</td>
<td>824,656</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>552,000</td>
<td>1,752,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Capital Budgets (None Earthquake)</strong></td>
<td>26,353,351</td>
<td>11,109,533</td>
<td>15,048,517</td>
<td>11,300,834</td>
<td>23,297,804</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Carry-over schedule 2017/18

Capital work requested to be carried over from 2016/2017 to 2017/2018 (capital projects that had been re-budgeted in 2017/2018 will not be listed on this carry over report)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Full year revised budget</th>
<th>Actual Expenditure to date as at 31 March 17</th>
<th>Anticipated Expenditure to 30 June 2017</th>
<th>Projected Completion Date (mth/yr)</th>
<th>Unspent</th>
<th>Amount to be carried over</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earthquake Recovery Budgets (excluding 3 Waters and Roading)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ GENERAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Town Centre Renewal</td>
<td>2,046,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>2,046,000</td>
<td>2,046,000</td>
<td>Project scope still to be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Town Centre Revitalisation</td>
<td>1,100,000</td>
<td>419,044</td>
<td>569,000</td>
<td>3/3-17</td>
<td>531,000</td>
<td>531,000</td>
<td>The upgrade on High St has been completed with remained budget reserved for Good St upgrade. $569k to be capitalized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ General Subtotal</td>
<td>3,146,000</td>
<td>419,044</td>
<td>569,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,577,000</td>
<td>2,577,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Earthquake Recovery Budgets</td>
<td>3,146,000</td>
<td>419,044</td>
<td>569,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,577,000</td>
<td>2,577,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL CAPITAL TO CARRY OVER</td>
<td>29,499,351</td>
<td>11,528,577</td>
<td>16,217,517</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,877,834</td>
<td>25,874,804</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SUBJECT: PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO KAIAPOI COMMUNITY CENTRE

SIGNED BY: (for Reports to Council or Committees)

1. SUMMARY

1.1 The purpose of this report is to present a proposal to modify the Sewell St Building to support better community and social service provision for Kaiapoi residents and is a follow up to the report considered by the Board at its March Meeting (TRIM:170307022086). 

1.2 This report has the cost details of the proposed alterations and is seeking a recommendation from the Board to the Council for additional funding for alterations to the Community Centre to both fund additional space for the Darnley Club and to reconfigure existing spaces to make them more suitable for current community needs.

1.3 If Council approves the funding there will be a subsequent report to the Board seeking a licence to occupy for Kaiapoi Community Services.

Attachments:
   i. Proposed floor plan community space draft sketch (Trim:170307022079)
   ii. Endorsements from Satisfy Food Rescue, Plunket, and Barnardos (Trim :705040436978)
   iii. General stakeholder feedback. (Trim: 170504043989)
   iv. Proposed alteration to Darnley and Mill Cam Room spaces(Trim: 170504044278)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Community Board recommends to Council:

(a) Receives report No. 170428041725.
(b) Approves the proposed modifications to the ‘Community Centre’ space
(c) Approves the proposed modification to the Mill Room to accommodate the expansion of the Darnley Club space
(d) Approves additional budget of $165,000 for the alterations to the community space with $50,000 funded from the Earthquake Recovery Loan and $115,000 to be funded from the Recreation Community Buildings Account
(e) Approves additional budget of $30,000 for the alterations to the Mill/Cam Room to provide additional space for the Darnley Club to be funded from the Recreation Account.
(f) Notes that if funding is approved it is intended to commence the work in June 2017.

(g) Notes that the likely income from the building will be $16,000 per annum from the Community Space and $2,630 inc GST per annum from the Darnley Club

3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. Proposed Modifications to ‘Community Centre Space

3.1.1. Background

a) Following the 2010/2011 earthquakes, the Community Centre space in the Sewell Street building was modified to provide accommodation for a range of agencies providing post-earthquake support services to the residents of Kaiapoi. The Red Zone futures team and the Social Recovery Team, out of which the You Me We Us Kaiapoi Community-led Development initiative was conceived, have also used this space.

b) With the disbanding of the Earthquake Support Service and the completion of the Red Zone Futures consultation, this space is now largely un-used; except two consulting engineers, the You Me We Us facilitator and three part-time Barnardos staff. Consulting engineers will relocate to Rangiora in June.

c) Other areas of the Sewell St building are occupied by Darnley Club, which provides day-care and associated support for older people; and by Plunket, which operates a clinic, mother’s groups and parent education.

d) A range of community support groups utilise the meeting room space at the Sewell St Building. These include Mothers Supporting Mothers and Child Youth and Family (Group Family Conferences)

e) Wellbeing North Canterbury’s, Kaiapoi Community Support provides operating space for a wide range of community services out of its Williams St premises. These include:

   - RCPHO Brief Intervention Counselling Service
   - Community Law
   - Nurse Maude
   - Meals on Wheels
   - Kaiapoi Food Bank
   - Budget Advice Service
   - Triton Hearing
   - Foot care service for older people
   - Satisfy Food Rescue
   - Volunteer Driver Service, and a range of other important community supports

In recent times, challenges with sustainable funding to service high commercial rent costs, a lack of off-street parking for clients and a shortage of space have prompted the need for Kaiapoi Community Support to seek an alternative location, so that it can better serve the needs of the community.

f) Lack of space currently limits provision of Social Support Services in Kaiapoi. This has seen initiatives like the Restorative Justice and the Aviva Men’s Advocacy service forced to operate in Rangiora only, despite having many Kaiapoi-based clients.
3.1.2. Proposal for Shared Services to Support the Kaiapoi Community

We propose a reconfiguration of the existing ‘Community Centre’ space, as detailed on the attached draft sketch. This would house the services currently located at Kaiapoi Community Support, alongside existing, complementary community providers currently located in the building. It would also create operating and meeting space for providers from key Christchurch and Rangiora-based agencies.

3.1.3. Benefits to the Community

A range of providers were consulted regarding to this proposal. These included Nurse Maude, counsellors from various agencies, Community Law, CAF North, Satisfy Food Rescue, Restorative Justice, You Me We Us Kaiapoi, School Attendance Service, Volunteer Drivers Service and Community Pantry volunteers.

To summarise their views, the proposed shared service model will achieve:

- Full and efficient utilisation of this facility.
- Increased ‘Kaiapoi-based’ social and community support provision.
- Better ‘safety’ for workers who are currently forced to operate in relative isolation.
- More affordable accommodation for local social and community support providers, ensuring sustainable service provision for residents.
- Easily accessible social and community support services for our more vulnerable residents, with ample parking and closer proximity to the town centre.
- Greater anonymity for clients; given the broad range of services and activities operating out of the Sewell Street facility.
- A broad range of shared services all under one roof, allowing for better cross referral for clients with varied and often complex needs.
- Greater opportunity for collaboration between services, resulting in more effective and efficient support for the wellbeing of local residents.
- Increased low-cost meeting space.
- Provision of a free reception service for waiting clients, or those needing social support information.

The attached written endorsements from Plunket, Satisfy Food Rescue, and Barnardos reflect these views.

3.2. Proposed Modification to Mill Room Space

3.2.1. Background

a) The Darnley Club has successfully operated as a day care facility for older people since 1991. In recent years the service has experienced increased demand for its services, coinciding with a 45% increase in clients with mobility frames.

b) The existing space is not large enough to accommodate these pressures and recreational opportunities are severely restricted due to a lack of space.

c) Since being combined into one large community space, what was “The Mill and Cam room” is currently under-utilised. Many of the users would be better provided for with a smaller, more intimate space for activities like craft and peer support.

d) Currently the Christadelphian Church operates out of the Mill Room. However, an agreeable alternative has now been secured.
3.2.2. Proposal for Extension of Darley Club Space

We propose that the Mill Room be returned to two separate spaces. The east end of the room could then be incorporated into the Darnley Club space, leaving a good, medium sized community meeting space to accommodate the needs of the existing and prospective users.

3.2.3. Benefits to the Community

This reconfiguration would benefit the community through the provision of:

- Increased provision of quality day-care support for our ageing population.
- Provision of a low cost/no cost, more intimate and appealing meeting space for smaller community groups.
- More effective and efficient use of Council owned community space.

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. In considering the implications of the proposed modifications to the Sewell Street Facility, we have consulted with existing and prospective Sewell Street building tenants.

4.2. The attached letters of support are from Groups who would utilise the reconfigured community space.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. Council had originally allocated a budget, from the Earthquake Recovery Loan, of $50,000 to "return" the configuration of the space occupied by the Service Centre/Earthquake Recovery operation for community use.

5.2. Once the use of the space was extended to accommodate the Red Zone Recovery Plan team the amount was dropped from the budget.

5.3. Plans for alterations for the community space have been developed and a cost estimate obtained of $165,000.

5.4. The following table, from AECOM, summarises the key costs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building works</td>
<td>129,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction contingency (10%)</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building consent</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional fees (12%)</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$165,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.5. It is proposed that $50,000 is funded from the Earthquake Recovery Loan as that was the original estimate to return the centre as it was pre earthquake, with the balance of $115,000 funded from the Recreation Community Buildings account.

5.6. Engineers have investigated 3 options for extending the Darnley Club into the current Mill/Cam Room. Each option was within $2,000 and the preferred structural option is costed at $30,000.

5.7. The scope of work includes a “new” wall to divide the current Mill/Cam Room and opening as much as possible of the wall between the existing Darnley Club and the Mill Room.

5.8. The following table, from AECOM, summarises the key costs for the Darnley Club extension:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building works</td>
<td>22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction contingency (10%)</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building consent</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional fees</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$30,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.9. It is proposed that the $30,000 be funded from the Recreation Community Buildings Fund.

5.10. Note that the expected income from the community section of the building is approximately $16,000 per annum and from the Darnley Club $2,630 incl GST per annum.

6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. **Policy**

This matter is not a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance Policy.

6.2. **Legislation**

Local Government Act

6.3. **Community Outcomes**

This project aligns with the following Community Outcomes:

- Public spaces are plentiful, accessible and high quality.
- The health and social needs of our community are met.
SEWELL ST BUILDING
Proposed Update for Shared Community Services

- Inward Goods
- Sewell St Carpark (existing)
- Barnardos
- KCS Manager
- Shared Reception
- Food Bank
- Community Support Providers
- Community Support Providers
- Community Support Providers
- Community Support Providers
- Community Info
- Shared meeting and Service Provider space
- You, Me, We, Us
- Shared Meeting Space
- Hot Desk and Storage
- Kitchen
- Oatley Entrance (existing)
- Oatley Club Extension
- Mill Room - reduced size to accommodate smaller groups
- New window above holiday reel
- Existing Deck
- Plunket (existing)
10 April 2017

Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board
C/- Kaiapoi Service Centre
Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre
176 Williams Street
Kaiapoi

Dear Madams and Sirs

Use of Sewell St Council building

I am writing in support of the proposal by Council to use the WDC building on Sewell Street as a shared community agency space.

Satisfy Food Rescue has been located at the Kaiapoi Community Support (KCS) buildings since our inception as an organisation in May 2014. In the past year we have rescued, sorted and distributed over 1,650kgs of food a month from the KCS premises at 116 Williams Street.

We highly value being located in the same premises at KCS as it allows us to closely collaborate with the KCS team and to quickly and easily distribute food to the Kaiapoi Community Pantry, which is currently our largest recipient organisation. We are therefore excited about the proposal to move with KCS to the WDC Sewell Street building since this will provide us with a dedicated space for our operations while allowing continued collaboration with KCS.

This new location will also have the benefit of allowing us to work alongside and explore potential collaborative efforts with the other shared space uses, i.e. YouMeWeUs and Barnardos.

We view this proposed move as mutually beneficial to all the community agencies that will be using the space.

If you require further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Phillipa Hunt
Chairperson
Satisfy Food Rescue
To Whom it may concern,

Plunket in North Canterbury wishes to absolutely support a model of "Community House" for the Kaispoi Sewell St building.
Plunket have been tenants of this building for many years and having a hub style of service providers to support families in the area with young children would be invaluable.
Working collaboratively services and agencies can provide beneficial support and guidance for families therefore improving health outcomes which is what we strive to do.
On their parent journey accessibility to services is very important to all families, some who may have no transport and do not know where to find the support.
The hub would improve community linkage for families, provide options and enhance their parenting experience. A holistic approach to caring for families in our community is vital to safe parenting.
Parents are more likely to accept help and support if services are in close proximity, easily accessible.
"It takes a village to raise a child" is a true statement and Plunket strongly endorses the need for this collaborative approach within the Waimakariri District Council Community Team.

Yours sincerely,
Cindy Smith
Plunket Clinical Leader
North Canterbury
3 May 2017

To Whom it May Concern.

Barnardos is delighted to have the opportunity to endorse the current proposal to house a number of social service agencies within the Sewell St building in Kaiapoi.

Barnardos is one of the largest providers of children’s services in New Zealand. Our work focuses on children aged 0-18. We deliver high quality social work, community development and early childhood education services throughout New Zealand. Our 0800 What’s Up helpline provides professional counselling directly to children and young people throughout Aotearoa.

Locally, our Child and Family Services provide in-home parenting education and support, safety planning for children and families experiencing family violence, and programmes for children who have witnessed family violence.

Our Child and Family Services, rural social workers are already based in Kaiapoi at the Sewell St site. Being based within the North Canterbury area is preferable when offering rural families support services.

The opportunity to share with like-minded service providers is both exciting and mutually beneficial. Some of the many advantages in shared space situations that we see are better collaboration between agencies, better understanding of each others work, the building of strong inter-agency working relationships, and a place that becomes known in the community for clients to be able to access support.

All of these things aid efficiency, reduce duplication of services, and provide a hub of community support.

Karen Kelly
Barnardos
Child and Family Services
Kaiapoi
Sewell Street
Room user feedback / Support for concept

Overall
- Complete pool of volunteers to provide reception assistance to the building
- Increased capacity for social services to be based in Kaiapoi – instead of having to commute through to Rangiora
- Increased security for the building
- Services are able to be situated in Kaiapoi – especially those who are not situated there now e.g. Aviva Mens Reachout

KCS/Community Pantry
- Kaiapoi Community Pantry – better collaborative space for clients & increased anonymity – utilisation of the back door for distributing food parcels
- Central hub for information to the community
- Shared service model for many social services that are not based in Kaiapoi or North Canterbury area
- Anonymous
- Ease for cross referral – especially those who utilise the Community Pantry
- H&S – shared service will enhance H&S for those social services who are situated in the community on their own

Volunteer Drivers
- Ease of parking for pickups from Kaiapoi Community Support

Nurse Maude Supplies
- Nurse Maude clients who come to pick up their products from KCS use this time to get out of the house, pop in to a warm inviting space for a chat and a cuppa – this alleviates social isolation

Clinical Team
- Nice green area around the place, feel good factor for workers- especially useful for clients with small children
- Access front and back….eg more hidden for picking food parcels up from rear entrance way in the car park so not as obvious why someone is there, also ease of loading in to a car.
- More storage space not having to clutter corridors and meeting room.
- More professionals around to support each other and to support volunteers.
- Better networking opportunities.
- Better community links.
- Ease of access and parking.
- More widely known to more of the community as it gets established. Easier to direct people to.
- More space for holding meetings.
- More equipped to deal with staff/client/community needs as bigger more workable spaces...e.g. meeting rooms access

**Restorative Justice North Canterbury**
- I find that my clients really appreciate that we hold our meetings locally. Enhances engagement through accessibility, and knowing the venue already...people feel empowered and reassured by that. Reduces uncertainty. Local services for local people.
- Recent NCPD is a good example, cross multiple referrals, easy access to building(local knowledge)
- Safety for our RJNC facilitators with evening pre-conferences and RJC
- I personally have accessed food parcels for 3 participants at different times (2 offenders & 1 victim)

**School Attendance Service**
- Really supportive for staff from many social services to all be there in one place where they can support each other more easily.

**Satisfy Food Rescue**
- Central location in Kaiapoi and proximity to Lineside Road means that it is convenient for both Kaiapoi and Rangiora recipient agencies to pick food up and more convenient for Satisfy volunteers to collect from Rangiora and Kaiapoi food donors
- Allows for a dedicated space for Satisfy operations which we currently do not have
- Being located next to the Kaiapoi Community Pantry allows for food to be quickly and easily transferred (KCP is currently SFR’s largest recipient agency)
- The set up with an exterior door for Satisfy allows for ease of accessibility for donated food and subsequent distribution of food
- Closely located to KCS will ensure continued close collaboration
- Good accessibility to hot-desks and meeting rooms which is essential for Satisfy administration and operations
- Adequate outdoor space for SFR chiller
- Provides potential for collaboration with other Agencies sharing space. Specifically, YouMeWeUs and Barnardos
- Encourages continued collaboration with WDC
- Increased space will allow Satisfy to grow and impact local community organisations for the better.

**CAF North**
- Integrated system for building and maintaining relationships across different agencies
- Improved communication across agencies
- Reducing stigma
- Improving knowledge and education of agencies – best fit for consumers
- Consultation with other agencies to benefit the client
Community Law Canterbury

- Shared service model is excellent for all clientele making cross referral easy. This is the way that most satellite services work these days especially Community Law
- Excellent parking for clients
NOTE:

This option likely to result in more movement & therefore non-structural damage near grid 6 in the event of earthquake shaking.
Option 2

- Remove existing GIB lining both sides
- Install 15 mm F8 ply both sides
- Allow new 140x140 stud both ends of wall

PART REMOVE EXISTING WALL & MAKE GOOD

NEW RC FOOTING 2.5 x 1.5 x 800 deep
OPTION 3

U P G R A D E E X I S T I N G T I M B E R
S H E A R W A L L

NEW P O R T A L F R A M E
FROM 2 N X 2 0 0 P F C (B A C K T O B A C K)

E X I S T I N G P L Y MAY REQUIRE REPLACEMENT

W A L L E L E V A T I O N

S E C T X - X

NEW PLY

PORTAL FRAME
COLUMN B U I L D I N T O
S H E A R W A L L

PORTAL FRAME RAFTER
FIXED TO EXISTING 2 0 0 P F C
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT

FILE NO and TRIM NO: DDS-06-05-06-09 / 170405033283

REPORT TO: District Planning and Regulation Committee

DATE OF MEETING: 18 April 2017

FROM: Trevor Ellis, Development Planning Manager
       Jolanda Simon, Information and Technology Services Manager

SUBJECT: District Plan E-Plan Software – Preferred Supplier and Budget

SIGNED BY: [signature] [signature]

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is twofold:
   a. To note confirmation of a recommended E-Plan supplier following a Request for Proposal (RFP) process; and
   b. To recommend to Council that it approves additional budget for inclusion in the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan for E-Plan implementation and licensing.

1.2. This report reconciles the preferred E-Plan solution against existing budgets. There is existing budget within both the Information Technology Services and the Development Planning Unit budgets. However, full implementation and licensing costs, including contingency, are unbudgeted specifically beyond this financial year. Additional budget will be required for the 2018-2019 year onwards.

1.3. The E-Plan project is an important project for the District Plan and by extension other submission processes, and the product will help achieve broader customer service objectives.

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the District Planning and Regulation Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 170405033283.

(b) Notes the selection of Isovist as the preferred supplier of the District Plan Review Software Solution, subject to final contract negotiation.

(c) Notes the total budget requirement over 5 years is $347,642 of which $99,570 is available from the Information and Technology Services budget and $34,000 from the Development Planning Unit budget.

(d) Notes that most of the additional cost ($214,072) over 5 years is attributed to external consultant support and contingency, should it be required.
(e) **Recommends** to Council to confirm additional budget of $214,072 to progress implementation of the E-Plan software solution for District Plan and submissions management purposes and licensing costs.

(f) **Notes** that additional budget will be sought as part of the 2018/2028 LTP budget to provide for licensing and to support District Plan Review Resource Management Act processes and that this has been previously signalled.

3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

3.1. A Request for Proposal (RFP) process was undertaken to identify a preferred supplier for Waimakariri District Council’s (WDC) District Plan Review Software Solution (E-Plan). As a result of the subsequent evaluation process, Isovist Ltd have been selected to provide the software. Overall, Isovist provide an E-Plan package that has an end customer focus and from a staff point of view strikes the right balance in regard to its Resource Management Act and Local Government Act planning functions and IT/GIS integration. Isovist currently supply Environment Canterbury, Hurunui and Selwyn Districts with a similar product.

3.2. The following tables provide a summary of costs and existing budget:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E-Plan</th>
<th>Year 1 (2017/18)</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Grand total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor implementation costs</td>
<td>$27,100</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$27,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Consultant cost (PM) for ePlan implementation</td>
<td>$49,320</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$49,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDC Risk Reserve (10%)</td>
<td>$10,042</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$10,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support - DP Review process</td>
<td>$19,800</td>
<td>$15,840</td>
<td>$62,620</td>
<td>$28,960</td>
<td>$13,960</td>
<td>$141,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Yearly Costs</td>
<td>$130,262</td>
<td>$39,840</td>
<td>$86,620</td>
<td>$52,960</td>
<td>$37,960</td>
<td>$347,642</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Grand total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Licensing (in IT Budget)</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$37,150</td>
<td>$7,290</td>
<td>$7,470</td>
<td>$7,660</td>
<td>$99,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ePlan implementation costs (DPU budget)</td>
<td>$34,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget - shortfall</td>
<td>$56,262</td>
<td>$2,690</td>
<td>$79,330</td>
<td>$45,490</td>
<td>$30,300</td>
<td>$214,072</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3. Total costs for year 1 are estimated at $130,262, with an approved budget of $74,000 for licensing and implementation. The extra cost can be attributed to contingencies, being external project management and potential additional costs related to ongoing assistance from the vendor. On-going costs over the following years relate to licensing, plus anticipated time from external support and Isovist (especially in regard to District Plan notification, submissions and hearing management). Most of these additional costs are dependent on the software selection and negotiation with the vendor.

3.4. The Development Planning Unit E-Plan budget for 2016/2017 is $34,000 relating to operative plan migration. The Information Technology Services budget for 2016/17 sits at $40,000 for licensing; this assumed an on-premise solution for the operative plan. Timing is such that most of this budget will be recommended to be carried forward to 2017/18. $30,000 was budgeted for 17/18 for setting up the District Plan Review
component, and $7150 was budgeted for yearly licensing costs (to be carried forward to 2018/19).

3.5. The selected software solution is SaaS (Software as a Service (cloud option)), meaning a cheaper license for the first year ($24,000), but subsequent years it will also be $24,000 each year not the approximately $7,000 per year budgeted for. Being an SaaS client will mean the latest version of the software is always available (there are no in house costs for hosting) and it also paves the way towards shared services with other Councils given the extent of use of the product with adjacent councils.

3.6. The Plan implementation and later Resource Management Act (RMA) costs are unbudgeted specifically beyond this financial year, but can be sourced from the District Plan Review funding. The need for potential additional budget for the RMA process through the Long Term Plan process has also been previously signalled to Council.

3.7. The E-Plan project is part of the Business Improvement Strategy for 2016/17 to 2020/21.

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. No community views have been sought. This project provides an important tool in regard to engagement with the community and stakeholders, linking to organisational objectives and objectives relating to the District Plan Review and other regulatory processes.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. Financial implications are set out above. In addition, report 160505040697 notes that the costs of the hearings stage of the District Plan review are to be determined through the 2018/2028 Long Term Plan and a portion of the contingency, if required, will fall within this budget assessment.

6. CONTEXT

6.1. Policy

This is not a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance Policy.

6.2. Legislation

Resource Management Act 1991
Local Government Act 2002

6.3. Community Outcomes

Local, regional and national organisations make information about their plans and activities readily available.

Local, regional and national organisations make every effort to take account of the views of people who participate in community engagement.