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WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

A meeting of the WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL will be held in the COUNCIL CHAMBER, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA on TUESDAY 3 APRIL 2018 at 1.00PM.

Sarah Nichols
GOVERNANCE MANAGER

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

BUSINESS

Page No

1. APOLOGIES

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

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

3. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

4. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

4.1. Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Tuesday 30 January, Wednesday 31 January and Thursday 1 February 2018

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Confirms as a true and correct record the circulated minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Tuesday 30 January, Wednesday 31 January and Thursday 1 February 2018.

4.2. Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Tuesday 6 March 2018

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(b) Confirms as a true and correct record the circulated minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Tuesday 6 March 2018.

4.3. Minutes of the public excluded portion of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on 6 March 2018

(refer to Blue agenda papers)
MATTERS ARISING

5. DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

6. ADJOURNED BUSINESS

6.1. Appointment to District Planning and Regulation Committee – Simon Markham (Manager Strategy and Engagement)

(a) Receives report No. 180223019257.

(b) Requests the Mayor to recommend to the Council an appointee representing Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga to the District Planning and Regulation Committee for the purposes of contributing to the Committee’s work in preparing a proposed Reviewed Waimakariri District Plan.

7. REGENERATION REPORTS

Nil

8. REPORTS

8.1. Submission on Environment Canterbury’s Long Term Plan 2018-28 – Mike O’Connell (Senior Policy Analyst)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180321030611.

(b) Approves the draft Council submission to Environment Canterbury’s 2018/28 Long-Term Plan (No. 180321030611).

(c) Delegates to the Mayor and Chief Executive responsibility for approving any alterations, additions or deletions that may be required before the submission is due to be lodged prior to the closing date of 3 April 2018.

(d) Circulates copies of this submission to the Community Boards.

8.2. Review of Liquor Ban Bylaw and Local Alcohol Policy – Lynley Beckingsale (Policy Analyst)

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180321030359

(b) Appoints Councillors _______________, _______________ and _______________ to the Hearing and Deliberations Panel for the review of the Local Alcohol Policy and to the Hearing and Deliberations Panel for the review of the Liquor Ban Bylaw
(c) **Appoints** one of these Councillors, Cr _____________ as Chair of the two panels.

### 8.3. Waimakariri District Development Strategy (DDS) ‘Our District, Our Future – Waimakariri 2048’ – Decisions Amended Strategy for Adoption – Trevor Ellis (Development Planning Manager) and Andrew Willis (Contract Planner)

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180322031167.

(b) **Adopts** the final Waimakariri District Development Strategy (DDS) ‘Our District, Our Future - Waimakariri 2048’, noting recommendation (c) below.

(c) **Nominates** the District Development portfolio holder (Councillor Atkinson) to confirm any minor edits of the District Development Strategy (final print ready version) as required in conjunction with staff prior to finalising.

(d) **Circulates** a copy of this report to the Community Boards for their information.

### 8.4. Request Authorisation to Bring Forward Funding for Reticulation Extension – Chris Parton (Wastewater Asset Manager) and Simon Markham (Manager Strategy and Engagement)

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180219017018.

(b) **Approves** the request to bring funding of $35,720 forward from the 2018/19 financial year in the draft Long Term Plan to the current financial year of 2017/18 for design and partial construction of the main extension in Tuahiwi Road.

(c) **Approves** a budget of $8,908 for the current financial year of 2017/18 to design a wastewater main extension in Topito Road.

(d) **Agrees** to enter into a private agreement with Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga to receive $33,000 (incl. GST) towards the cost of implementing a STEP sewer main in Topito Road from Tuahiwi Road to 61 Topito Road at a total cost of $86,109.

(e) **Notes** that additional works to develop a master plan for wastewater service in the Tuahiwi area will be conducted in parallel to these main extensions, with extensive public engagement with residents of the Tuahiwi community beginning later in 2018.
8.5. **Oxford Rural No. 1 New Source – Strategy for Completing Project – Colin Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180322031037.

(b) **Notes** that submissions on the consent application to take water from the new McPhedrons Road well have closed, and that it is considered likely that this will require the consent to go to a hearing with an earliest decision date by 6 June 2018.

(c) **Notes** that there is a risk that the consent will not be obtained or will be obtained with conditions that are not favourable to Council.

(d) **Notes** staff consider Council has a good case for obtaining a consent with conditions in favour of the Council based on the importance placed on high quality drinking water, the low quality and health risk associated with the existing source, the steps that Council has already taken to obtain a source in other locations, and the limited impact on other consent holders.

(e) **Approves** staff proceeding with the physical works to complete the upgrade prior to the decision on the resource consent to take water from the well.

(f) **Approves** the early adoption of the budgets for the project which are included in the draft 2018-28 Long Term Plan, and for these budgets to be available to spend within the 2017/18 financial year, noting the projected timing of expenditure within the contents of this report.

(g) **Approves** an additional Source Upgrade budget of $300,000 for the project to be split evenly between renewals and level of service (the renewals portion is to reflect that the upsized pipe is replacing an existing pipe).

(h) **Delegates** the authority to award the pipeline construction contract to Management Team at an estimated cost of $1,200,000 within a total project budget of $2,900,000.

(i) **Notes** that it is anticipated that the above steps will allow the new source to be online by 15 August 2018.

(j) **Notes** that it is not recommended to proceed with the temporary connection of the private well due to the cost of $125,000.

(k) **Circulates** this report to the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board for their information.
8.6. **20 February 2018 Storm Event – Kalley Simpson (3 Waters Manager) and Gerard Cleary (Manager Utilities and Roading)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180322031170[v03].

(b) **Approves** a new capital budget of $400,000 in 2017/18 under the Rangiora Urban drainage account for works on the North Brook and Railway Drain, to mitigate the flooding in Springbrook.

(c) **Notes** that this results in an increase of $3.82 per property of 2.3% increase in the Rangiora Urban drainage account from 2018/19.

(d) **Notes** that flood modelling of the further works is currently being undertaken to confirm that no additional further works are required to provide the required level of flood protection for the Springbrook development.

(e) **Approves** a new budget of $20,000 under the Rangiora Urban drainage account and $36,000 under the Roading capital work account for works at the Southbrook / South Belt intersection.

(f) **Notes** that the Roading budget of $36,000 includes $20,000 for drainage works and $16,000 for road-marking works.

(g) **Notes** that $20,000 of the drainage works and $16,000 of the road-marking works will be separately funded by NZTA, through existing approved budgets.

(h) **Notes** that works on the North Brook and Railway Drain, to mitigate the flooding in Springbrook, will be undertaken as emergency works and resource consent for these works will be applied for retrospectively.

(i) **Circulates** this report to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board for information.

8.7. **ANZAC Day Services 2018 – Sarah Nichols (Governance Manager)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No 180321030283.

(b) **Appoints** Mayor Ayers and Councillors ……………………………to attend the Kaiapoi RSA Dawn Parade at 6.30am Wednesday 25 April 2018 and lay a wreath.

(c) **Appoints** Mayor Ayers and Councillors ……………………………to attend the Kaiapoi Anzac Day parade at 10am Wednesday 25 April 2018 and lay a wreath.
Appoints Mayor Ayers and Councillors ........................................ to 
attend the Rangiora Anzac Day parade at 11.30am on Wednesday 25 
April 2018 and lay a wreath.

(e) Appoints Councillor ............... to attend the RSA service at the 
Rangiora High School at 9.30am on Wednesday 25 April 2018 and lay 
a wreath.

(f) Appoints Councillors ................................. to attend the Oxford 
Anzac Day parade on Wednesday 25 April 2018 at 9.30am and lay a 
wreath.

(g) Appoints Councillor ..................to attend the Cust and 
West Eyreton Anzac Day parade held at the Cust Community Centre 
on Wednesday 25 April 2018 at 10am and lay a wreath at Cust.

(h) Appoints Councillor ..................to attend the Cust and 
West Eyreton Anzac Day parade held at the Cust Community Centre 
on Wednesday 25 April 2018 at 10am and lay a wreath at West Eyreton.

(i) Appoints Councillor ..................to attend the Fernside 
Anzac Day parade on Wednesday 25 April 2018 at 10am and lay a 
wreath.

(j) Appoints Mayor Ayers and Councillors ............................to 
attend the Tuahiwi Anzac Day parade Wednesday 25 April 2018 at 
2pm on and lay a wreath.

(k) Appoints Mayor Ayers and Councillor ............................. to 
attend the 11am Ohoka Anzac Day service on Tuesday 24 April 2018 
at Ohoka Hall, Mill Road and lay a wreath.

(l) Appoints Councillor ..................... to attend the Sefton Anzac 
service on Tuesday 24 April 2018 at 6pm and lay a wreath.

(m) Appoints Councillor ..................... to attend the Woodend Anzac 
service on Tuesday 24 April 2018 at 6pm and lay a wreath.

(n) Notes the Community Boards will be represented and lay wreaths at 
Kaiapoi, Rangiora, Oxford, West Eyreton, Cust, Ohoka, Ashley War 
Memorial, Fernside, Tuahiwi, Rangiora High School, Woodend and 
Sefton Services.

(o) Circulates a copy of this report to the Community Boards.

8.8. **LGNZ Annual Conference Attendance – Sarah Nichols (Governance 
Manager)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180322031071.

(b) Approves Councillors ............, ............... attending the Local 
Government New Zealand Conference on 15-17 July 2018 in 
Christchurch, accompanying the Mayor and Chief Executive.
9. MATTERS REFERRED FROM COMMITTEES AND COMMUNITY BOARDS

9.1. Kaiapoi East Regeneration Area – outstanding roading repairs – Michelle Flanagan (Landscape Planner – District Regeneration), Ken Stevenson (Roading Manager), Duncan Roxborough (Implementation Project Manager – District Regeneration)

(refer to attached copy of report no. 180222019119[v02] to the Regeneration Steering Group meeting of 5 March 2018)

RECOMMENDATION
THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180222019119(v02).

(b) Approves staff progressing the concept design of permanent repairs Charles Street with a primary purpose of providing vehicle access to Jollie Street and adjacent reserve and land uses and on-street parking.

(c) Approves staff progressing with the concept design of permanent repairs to Jollie Street with a primary purpose of providing vehicle access reserve and rural land uses and on-street parking.

(d) Approves staff progressing with the concept design of permanent repairs to Cass Street (from Jones Street to the Kaiapoi East sport and recreation reserve) with a primary purpose of providing vehicle access to the sport and recreation reserve.

(e) Approves staff progressing with the concept design of permanent repairs to Cass Street (from Jollie Street to Hall Street) with a primary purpose of providing vehicle access to the boat ramp in Askeaton Park.

(f) Notes that the preliminary concept designs and refined cost estimates for Charles Street, Jollie Street, Cass Street (from Jones Street to the Kaiapoi East sport and recreation reserve), and Cass Street (from Jollie Street to Hall Street) will be presented at a staff briefing to the Regeneration Steering Group later this year for feedback.

(g) Notes that there is currently a budget of $1,810,000 allocated for the repairs to Charles Street, Jollie Street and Cass Street.

(h) Notes that the repair options for Jones Street will be presented in a separate workshop session; and subsequently a separate report will be presented.

9.2. Poyntzs Road Source Upgrade Project – Consultation – Colin Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager)

(refer to attached copy of report no. 180305022630 to the Utilities and Roading Committee meeting of 20 March 2018)

RECOMMENDATION
THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180305022630.
(b) **Notes** that staff have not been able to complete the required community consultation with the Poyntzs Road, West Eyreton and Summerhill water supply schemes regarding the proposed Poyntzs Road source upgrade prior to or to coincide with the draft 2018-28 Long Term Plan consultation.

(c) **Notes** that the budget allowance of $793,000 for the Poyntzs Road scheme source upgrade in the 2018/19 financial has been included for consultation as part of the draft 2018-28 Long Term Plan.

(d) **Resolves** that the physical works that this budget is intended for will not be implemented until Council has specifically approved this occurring, following consultation with the relevant advisory groups, community boards and communities.

(e) **Notes** that this strategy will give staff the required time to undertake the necessary consultation, without requiring that the project be delayed for an unnecessarily long period of time.

(f) **Notes** that the significant rating implication of the proposed expenditure does not eventuate until the 2019/20 financial year, by which time targeted consultation will have been completed.

(g) **Circulates** this report to the Oxford-Ohoka and Rangiora Ashley Community Boards for their information.

9.3. **Enterprise North Canterbury Half Year Report to December 2017, Draft Statement of Intent for year beginning 1 July 2018; and Six month Promotions Report to December 2017 – Simon Markham (Manager Strategy and Engagement)**

(Refer to attached copy of report no. 180313026438 to the Audit and Risk Committee meeting of 27 March 2018)

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180313026438

(b) **Receives** the ENC’s Half Year Report to Dec. 2017, including profit and loss budget analysis

(c) **Supports** ENC's Draft Statement of Intent for the 2018/19 year

(d) **Receives** the Six-Month Promotions Report to December 2017
9.4. Te Kōhaka ē Tuhaitara Trust – Statement of Intent for the Year ending 30 June 2019 and Business Case – Jeff Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support)

(refer to attached copy of report no. 180313026469 to the Audit and Risk Committee meeting of 27 March 2018)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report N° 180313026469.

(b) Receives the Statement of Intent for Te Kōhaka ē Tuhaitara Trust for the year ending 30 June 2019.

(c) Notes that under the Local Government Act 2002, the Audit and Risk Committee may request Te Kōhaka ē Tuhaitara Trust to make changes to the Statement of Intent. Te Kōhaka ē Tuhaitara Trust would consider these changes requested and re-present the Statement of Intent prior to the 30 June.

(d) Receives the Business Case for Te Kōhaka ē Tuhaitara Trust and notes that the Council has made provision in the draft 2018-28 for an additional $120,000 per annum to the Trust to assist in its operations

9.5. Risk Management Framework – Jim Palmer (Chief Executive)

(refer to attached copy of report no. 180316028255 to the Audit and Risk Committee meeting of 27 March 2018)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Adopts the Risk Management Framework (Trim No. 180316028262)

(b) Notes that the Risk Management Framework will be formally reviewed annually, and that the Register of Key Risks will be presented to the Audit and Risk Committee on a six monthly basis.

10. HEALTH AND SAFETY


(a) Receives report No. 180326032221.

11. COMMITTEE/WORKING PARTY/JOINT COMMITTEE MINUTES FOR INFORMATION

Minutes of a meeting of the Regeneration Steering Group held on 5 March 2018

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the information in Items 11.1 be received.
12. COMMUNITY BOARD MINUTES FOR INFORMATION

12.1. Minutes of a meeting of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board held on 19 February 2018

RECOMMENDATION
THAT the information in Items 12.1 to 12.2 be received.

12.2. Minutes of a meeting of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board held on 8 March 2018

13. CORRESPONDENCE

14. MAYOR’S DIARY

14.1. Mayor’s Diary 24 February – 26 March 2018

RECOMMENDATION
THAT the Council:
(a) Receives report no. 180326032208.

15. COUNCIL PORTFOLIO UPDATES

15.1. Iwi Relationships
15.2. Canterbury Water Management Strategy
15.3. International Relationships
15.4. Regeneration (Kaiapoi)

16. QUESTIONS
(under Standing Orders)

17. URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS
(under Standing Orders)

18. 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>18.1</td>
<td>Minutes of the public excluded portion of Council meeting of 6 March 2018</td>
<td>Confirmation of minutes</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>Report of Gerard Cleary (Manager Utilities and Roading)</td>
<td>Ocean Outfall Update</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MATTER REFERRED FROM KAIAPOI-TUAHIWI COMMUNITY BOARD MEETING OF 19 MARCH 2018**

<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>18.3</td>
<td>Report of Simon Hart (Business and Centres Manager) and Rob Hawthorne (Property Manager)</td>
<td>FENZ Property Acquisition Proposal</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MATTER REFERRED FROM AUDIT AND RISK COMMITTEE MEETING OF 27 MARCH 2018**

<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>18.4</td>
<td>Report of Jeff Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support)</td>
<td>Te Kōhaka ō Tuhaitara Trustee Appointment</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>18.1 – 18.4</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>

**CLOSED MEETING**

See Public Excluded Agenda (blue papers)

**OPEN MEETING**

19. **NEXT MEETING**

The next scheduled meeting of the Council is on Tuesday 1 May 2018 commencing at 1pm.

COMMENCING AT 9AM EACH DAY.

PRESENT:

IN ATTENDANCE:
J Palmer (Chief Executive), J Millward (Manager, Finance and Business Support), G Cleary (Manager, Utilities and Roading), C Sargison (Manager, Community and Recreation), N Harrison (Manager, Regulation), S Markham (Manager, Strategy and Engagement), K Simpson (3 Waters Manager), K Stevenson (Roading Manager), J McBride (Development Manager), K Graham (Journey Planner and Road Safety Coordinator), C Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager), O Davies (Drainage Asset Manager), C Parton (Wastewater Asset Manager), G Bennett (Land Drainage Engineer), K LaValley (Project Delivery Manager), M O’Connell (Senior Policy Analyst), K Waghorn (Solid Waste Manager), S Collin (Infrastructure Strategy Manager), C Brown (Community Green Space Manager), R Hawthorne (Property Manager), T Ellis (Development Planning Manager), S Hart (Business and Centres Manager), D Roxborough (Implementation Project Manager – District Regeneration), P Ashbey (Libraries Manager), M Greenwood (Aquatic Facilities Manager), T Sturley (Community Team Manager), M Bacon (Team Leader Resource Consents), M Johnston (Environmental Services Manager), B Wiremu (Emergency Management Advisor), M Harris (Customer Services Manager), J Simon (Information and Technology Services Manager), A Smith (Committee Advisor), and S Nichols (Governance Manager).

C McMillan and G Byrnes of the Te Kohaka o Tuhatara Trust.

Day One
Meeting adjourned at 10.26am and resumed at 10.38am.
Meeting adjourned at 12.45pm and resumed at 1.22pm.
Meeting adjourned at 2.26pm for a workshop to discuss options raised in report 5.7 and resumed at 2.54pm.

Meeting adjourned at 3.12pm and resumed at 3.25pm.
Meeting adjourned at 5.07pm and resumed Wednesday 31 January at 9am.

Day Two
Meeting adjourned at 10.33am and resumed at 10.49am.
Meeting adjourned at 11.46am for a briefing and resumed at 12.15pm.
Meeting adjourned at 12.40pm and resumed at 1.14pm.
Meeting adjourned at 3.20pm and resumed at 3.35pm.
Meeting adjourned at 4.53pm and resumed Thursday 1 February at 9.03am.

Day Three
Meeting adjourned at 10.45am and resumed at 10.59am.
Meeting adjourned at 11.15am for a briefing and resumed at 12.01pm.
Meeting adjourned at 12.45pm and resumed at 1.20pm.
Meeting adjourned at 2.48pm and resumed at 3.04pm.

1. APOLOGIES

Moved: Mayor Ayers  Seconded: Councillor Atkinson
An apology was received and sustained from Councillor Stewart for absence from 12.45pm until 1.48pm (arrived during item 5.6) on Tuesday 30 January.
An apology was received and sustained from Councillor Meyer for early departure from noon on Wednesday 31 January.
An apology was received and sustained from Councillor Stewart for absence from 12.40pm until 1.52pm (arrived at commencement of item 6.3) on Wednesday 31 January.

An apology was received and sustained from Councillor Brine for absence from 10.05am until 1.31pm (departed during item 7.18 and returned during item 7.25) on Thursday 1 February.

An apology was received and sustained from Councillor Stewart for absence from 12.45pm until 1.52pm (during item 7.27) on Thursday 1 February.

Councillors Doody and Felstead arrived at 9.03am (during item 3.1) on Tuesday 30 January.

CARRIED

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Nil.

3. COUNCILLOR’S DECLARATION

The Waimakariri District Council adheres to the following legislation with regard to the swearing in of elected members.

3.1 Local Government Act 2002 - Schedule 7 – Clause 14: Declaration by Member

Mayor Ayers received and witnessed the Councillor declaration from Kirstyn Barnett.
Councillor Barnett, read an acknowledgement of receipt of various legislation applicable to elected members.

4. OVERVIEW AND FINANCIAL STRATEGY

4.1 Overview - Jim Palmer - Chief Executive.

J Palmer outlined the process, order of business and reflected on the complexities of the budget review process.

J Millward provided a financial overview via a PowerPoint presentation

5. REPORTS

5.1 Risk Assessment and Financing Strategy relating to Major Natural Disasters – J Palmer (Chief Executive)

J Palmer spoke to the report, commenting that three years ago the Council adopted a financial strategy, the first in the country to take into account the potential impact of major natural disasters. This report essentially updates that previous report and confirms the approach is reasonable for both effects and damage. Assessments show a major alpine fault or significant inter-plate earthquake would affect Council assets. Based on past experience, there are concerns for those areas with liquefaction risk such as the eastern seaboard.

J Palmer commented on community facilities such as the Kaiapoi Library and the Council’s overall spend of $100m on earthquake repair work, with most being covered by insurance and the government. If the alpine fault
ruptures, damage could be twice that which the district experienced in 2010. J Palmer spoke first of the financial assessment with insurance in place. He noted that even with such cover secondary costs are involved as not all assets are insured such as reserves and there are also further costs likely to be incurred in supporting the community such as temporary facilities. J Palmer then spoke of the estimated $30m headroom required to accommodate the consequences of those risks whereby insurance cover could be lost and where contingencies were needed. For example a major event in New Zealand. Staff estimate that such an event could cause $140m of potential damage and currently the Council has $80m set aside.

J Palmer spoke of a priority order approach with top priorities funded through headroom and lower level assets assessed on need and community desire. He commented on the strategic importance of the Rangiora Airfield in an emergency response and that it is the second largest airfield near Christchurch.

Councillor Blackie enquired why aquatic facilities were potentially prioritised ahead of other community facilities in particular the Oxford Service Centre. J Palmer advised that a level of service could still be achieved via other locations across the district for those services offered by the Oxford Service Centre, whereas aquatic facilities cannot migrate and operate in other locations. Relocation would mean a rebuild. There would be conversations and the potential to reassess and re prioritise at the time of any natural disaster as the true nature of the impact could be assessed.

Councillor Atkinson queried the potential priority of public toilets. J Palmer commented that returning public toilets to full use in accordance with current service levels takes time. However the Council can deal with these issues in other ways on a temporary basis (emergency) whilst the sewer is restored. J Palmer also advised members as regards long term reinstatement as opposed to emergency response.

Councillor Gordon enquired when the next review of the Council’s insurance arrangements would occur. Staff advised that this was scheduled for 2019.

Councillor Barnett queried the headroom concept. J Palmer explained how this operates in the financial context and serves to ensure that there is built in capacity to fund services and facilities in the event of a natural disaster or other significant event.

Councillor Barnett enquired what mechanism was there to stop a future Council from breaching the policy. J Palmer responded that one Council cannot bind a future Council. WDC has a stewardship for the District’s future and its financial future, balancing both current community needs and also making decisions for the ‘future’ community. There is a risk that funds that are built up and set aside for this ‘future proofing’ which could be utilised for a different purpose by a future Council or need to be used earlier than currently envisaged.

Councillor Doody queried the resilience and other arrangements for collector roads and bridges in relation to the potential for a number of communities to be isolated if these were compromised. J Palmer acknowledged bridges were at some risk. The major bridges, being the Motorway and Ashley/Cones Road are NZTA responsibility. The Williams Street Bridge in Kaiapoi which held up well in the 2010 earthquake could be an issue and for the Waikarariri Gorge (Selwyn) and the old highway bridge (Christchurch) the Council would work with
neighbouring Councils. If all bridges failed together then there would need to be government intervention.

Moved: Councillor Barnett Seconded: Councillor Doody

THAT the Council
(a) **Receives** report No 180112002169
(b) **Adopts** the Risk Assessment and Financing Strategy relating to Major Natural Disasters (Trim No: 180112002171).
(c) **Notes** that there is a 30% probability of an Alpine Fault rupture occurring within the next 50 years, and it is assessed as being the most damaging event for Council’s assets.
(d) **Notes** that it is estimated to cost $210 million for the Council to recover from Alpine Fault rupture, which is nearly double the Council’s recovery cost from 2010-11 Canterbury Earthquake series.
(e) **Notes** that, net of Government, NZTA financial assistance and insurance proceeds, the Council’s share of the recovery costs resulting from a major natural disaster could be in the order of $32 million, and if insurance was not available, for whatever reason, that amount could increase up to $104 million.
(f) **Notes** that any shortfall in Council’s share of the funding requirement can only be funded through maintaining adequate borrowing ‘head-room’.
(g) **Provides** in the 2018-28 Long Term Plan borrowing ‘head-room’ of $32 million, in the event of insurance being in place, and $84 million of borrowing ‘head-room’ in the unlikely situation of insurance not being available.
(h) **Notes** the Strategy’s priority listing for the restoration of Council’s services and assets.
(i) **Circulates** this report to all Community Boards.

**CARRIED**

Councillor Barnett stated the information was covered well and she took confidence in the report. Councillor Barnett remarked it was a chicken and egg situation being responsible for preparing for an emergency and looking after our community. Priorities will change as and when an event occurs, but the proposed provisions where thorough in her view.

Councillor Doody concurred with Councillor Barnett’s comments and reflected on Kaikoura and how it was vital to get water and infrastructure services available as soon as possible.

Mayor Ayers commented that there were two parts to an emergency: the initial response phase and the recovery phase, noting much of this plan is for the recovery phase.

**5.2 Draft Revenue and Financing Policy to be used in the Draft LTP 2018-28 and Draft Funding Impact Statement – J Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support) and M Harris (Customer Service Manager)**
J Millward spoke briefly to the report, reflecting on the past resolution of the Council. He clarified the fixed charge, noted that community outcomes had been added as had the new Barkers Road (Loburn) rate, and various word changes had been made.

Moved: Councillor Felstead  Seconded: Councillor Williams

THAT the Council

(a) Receives report No 180110001745

(b) Approves the Draft Revenue & Financing Policy as the basis for preparing the Draft 2018/28 Long Term Plan, and

(c) Approves the Draft Funding Impact Statement as the basis for preparing the Draft 2018/28 Long Term Plan, and

(d) Notes that the Uniform Annual General Charge (UAGC) is recommended to be $120 in the Draft 2018/28 Long Term Plan and Impact Funding Statement, the same as in 2017/18, for the 2018/19 financial year.

CARRIED

Councillor Felstead reflected that the information that had been received through the Audit and Risk Committee and documentation had been through a robust Audit process. The outcome and actions made practical sense.

Councillor Williams was supportive of the processes and the motion.

Councillor Atkinson queried the Chair on the procedure of proforma motions. Mayor Ayers clarified the process that all resolutions, particularly in relation to the budget commentary were adopted proforma, and can then be reviewed and amended at any point during the meeting before being formally adopted at the end of the meeting. Members indicated acceptance of the process.

Moved: Mayor Ayers  Seconded: Councillor Atkinson

THAT the Council

(a) Adopt resolutions as proforma during the meeting, enabling amendment at any stage until being formally adopted at the conclusion of the meeting.

CARRIED

5.3 Amendment to Treasury Policy – J Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support)

J Millward spoke to the report, commenting on an option to take loans over a longer period than the current ten year period which utilises opportunity for good interest rates.

Moved: Councillor Gordon  Seconded: Councillor Blackie

THAT the Council
(a) Receives report No. 180118003861.

(b) Approves the Treasury Policy (Trim 180118003863).

CARRIED

5.4 2018 – 2048 Infrastructure Strategy – V Spittle (Senior Policy Analyst)

J Palmer spoke to the report and the importance of the document. He outlined the importance of prudent management and good stewardship. Legislation requires a 30 year strategy, however staff have opted to take a longer view, from 100 years to 150 years, to outline planning for infrastructure and funding. The report summarises all asset management plans for the Council. J Palmer spoke of five themes worth noting.

- Population growth to 90,000 from 59,000 (Infrastructure Strategy is required to understand this growth and associated development areas which is also closely linked to the District Development Strategy)
- Recognising new standards such as drinking water standards, stormwater particularly urban and changing expectations with groundwater being better managed. Water is the biggest issue.
- How WDC manages its response to natural hazards and building resilience for infrastructure and renewal work for the most crucial and vulnerable.
- Making sure WDC understands when assets need renewal and how they will be funded.
- Learning the lessons of the earthquakes five years ago, the delays from the earthquake, and signalling now how to develop sustainability practices and taking the lead in the community.

The strategy is a working draft, and it will be finalised as part of the LTP adoption process.

Councillor Barnett asked why the Woodend Bypass and path from Woodend to Kaiapoi was omitted. J Palmer advised that although this had been signalled from the last government clarification is now needed on where it sits with the current government’s plans and NZTA. It was possible that a clearer indication may be available at the time of LTP adoption. The Government’s formal priority setting is unlikely to occur until June so it is not helpful to WDC timeframes. J Palmer commented on the issues for this Council and acknowledged the local impact with most new Woodend infrastructure likely to be significant for the community. Connecting footpaths was a conversation yet to occur. G Cleary spoke of proposed state highway work first then conversations regarding connectivity for footpath and cycle lanes. He commented on projects which were dependent on when NZTA advise or signal that its work is starting.

Mayor Ayers spoke in his role as the Council’s representative on the Regional Transport Committee, commenting on the regional plan, and its dependence on the Government Policy Statement. In the meantime current new motorways (south etc) already have walk/cycleways incorporated into the design work and one could assume any new motorway would do the same. The previous government signalled work to start in three years, but with the new government matters are on hold.

Councillor Doody asked if WDC was putting enough emphasis on rural economic growth, providing example of vehicles servicing farms getting larger whereas bridges and road edges cannot take the weight. J Palmer spoke of national change and roading prioritisation and what is required to be ‘fit for purpose’. It was acknowledged that many roads were stretched and not necessarily designed for the capacity they were now experiencing.
J Palmer explained that this is part of NZTA priorities and WDC continue to work with NZTA on future planning. There are also challenges for the Council service levels for lower usage roads. G Cleary advised that these points are covered in the Asset Management Plan.

Councillor Atkinson commented on the current population, and queried roading priorities. J Palmer commented on a number of aspects: how do we change the traffic flow? ie the western bypass and also the east/north of Rangiora is partially dependent on state highway (NZTA) development. He commented on the eastern bypass for Rangiora where alignment has been secured and a review to be undertaken when works progress. J Palmer commented on the work with NZTA and other partners and acknowledged that these were locally important issues.

Councillor Stewart enquired if the initiatives within the Canterbury Water Management Strategy (CWMS) were significant and whether there should be a ‘placeholder’ for funds, commenting on the risks to budgeting for such a significant project. J Palmer advised that those matters for which the Council was responsible, such as stormwater, are currently included. However, at this stage the full extent of the Council’s responsibilities under the CWMS and associated plans are not yet defined or known. If they are significant it will be reflected in an updated strategy and then either an amendment to the LTP occurs or it is included at the next scheduled LTP. Currently our known responsibilities have been included. Councillor Stewart acknowledged the date of finalisation was at a similar time as the Water Zone Committee would complete their work. J Palmer advised if the Committee had any information they can come before the Council during the May deliberations.

Moved: Councillor Doody  Seconded: Councillor Atkinson

THAT the Council
(a) Receives report: Trim Number 180119004562.
(b) Receives the attached Draft 2018-2048 Infrastructure Strategy: Trim number 171129129930.
(c) Notes that the 2018-2048 Infrastructure Strategy will be adopted as part of the process to finalise the Long Term Plan in June 2018.

CARRIED

Councillor Stewart remarked that she had found the report an interesting read, commenting on the general rate rises and demands that will come to implement improvements for the derogation of our waterways. Councillor Stewart referenced sustainability and future decision making, and bringing together policy and practices. Councillor Stewart expressed concern at the lack of placeholder funding believing it was a risk to the LTP and reflected on community concern for the state of our rivers.

Councillor Barnett acknowledged Councillor Stewart’s comments, acknowledging that it was not yet clear what was local and central government responsibilities. Councillor Barnett commented on the responsibility toward an ageing population and the need to focus more on roading, transport and housing going forward.

Councillor Atkinson stated the matter could be revisited when necessary and acknowledged the inherent risks, commenting on roading as a major budget item, and the relationship with electric cars. Councillor Atkinson...
stated the potential need to review matters more frequently but that we
cannot control what we do not know.

5.5 Multi Use Sports Facility – C Sargison (Manager Community and
Recreation)

C Sargison and C Brown presented the report. C Sargison briefly
recapped the 2013 feasibility study, discussions, functional design brief,
stakeholder groups and concept plan development. He spoke of the need
for a facility in the sports strategy and the provision for Greater
Christchurch ie not being in conflict with the City. C Sargison confirmed
such matters had been discussed at CE Forum level. He commented on
the importance of the facility to be multi use to cater for many sports and
group use.

C Sargison remarked on the usage of facilities for an ageing population
and an example of the Woodend Community Centre facility currently being
used to near capacity. He drew Councillors’ attention to the site plan which
allows for Astroturf tennis courts, and future developments if and when
required. C Sargison noted the operating model and potential concept of
the facility being operated by the North Canterbury Sport and Recreation
Trust through a formal agreement. The draft LTP did not currently include
figures for their management contribution of approximately $200,000 for
running the facility. C Sargison advised the capital cost of the facility would
be spread over three financial years, with the design team yet to be
engaged following a proposed tender early in 2019 followed by an
approximate 18month build period.

Councillor Atkinson queried the Selwyn District Council building being twice
the size for half the price of the Rangiora facility, and another North Island
facility example of similar size which cost much less. C Sargison
commented on various costings for various developments. This proposed
facility is more than four courts, with space for a fitness gym plus offices.
He cautioned any comparisons as costings were done by Aecom who have
undertaken all WDC cost estimates and which have come in on budget.
The Ashburton facility has a similar cost base. Durability was also
considered with inclusion of ventilation, high grade cladding and a 50 year
life span. C Sargison was cautious about a reduced facility and impacts as
a feasibly study had already been done thoroughly including square metre
rates being peer reviewed.

Councillor Stewart asked for an explanation of the Vulnerable Children’s
Act, referencing ‘without use during school hours’. C Sargison explained
who can be involved when schools are utilising their facilities during the
day, whilst it was common for community use to occur after school.

Councillor Stewart sought clarification on the Trust wanting to deliver
programmes for children. C Sargison commented on adults (retired) use of
facilities primarily during the day, elderly persons being more active than
20 years ago and the range of use at Woodend and Pegasus confirming
demographic information.

Councillor Stewart sought clarity on development contributions and extra
capital works. Staff advised that this would mean that Council was actually
paying such contributions to itself. In a supplementary question Councillor
Stewart enquired what this would add to budgets. J Palmer explained the
costs of developing and connecting to sewer schemes, equality and
contributions from all to the water and eastern sewer. C Sargison
commented on the same process for other facilities and that this has been
included as part of the development costs. Overall the project is approximately $27m and includes all infrastructure costs.

Councillor Stewart enquired as to why the Council is offering the Trust exclusive use and not going to expressions of interest for management of the facility, seeking assurance that ratepayers would have the best management of the facility. C Sargison acknowledged the points raised and discussions with the Council, noting that the Council is already a partner with the Trust. The difference is that the Trust operates on a not for profit basis and returns funds back into the sports through key school sports programmes which contributes to an increase in junior sports participation. With previous Trust agreements the Trust has paid for facility maintenance. J Palmer commented on the Trust’s gym which is profitable and then invested into other factors, acknowledging that it is competing against commercial operators. A Heads of Agreement would come back to the Council in May 2018 for consideration.

Councillor Barnett sought clarification on exclusions to the proposal such as the outdoor plaza and whether it has an impact on the facility being less multi-use. C Sargison remarked that the proposal would look similar to the Ruataniwha metal structure and ground treatment would be the same, along with its independence from the building. Solar panels could be attached and staff could investigate further which may be eligible for a grant. C Sargison advised that the canopy is $1.25m and has not been included in the budgets, however the area beneath would be usable as it would be hard space.

Councillor Barnett expressed concern for shade/shelter. C Sargison advised of another area with some shelter for those waiting for lifts or other transport. He commented on possible exclusions from grant funding.

Councilor Barnett queried the fitness gym and competing with other commercial gyms. J Palmer remarked that the Council was transparent that it is a commercial operation and WDC were not giving benefit to one party over another. In a supplementary question Councillor Barnett asked if an analysis of gym usage (capacity) had occurred. Staff advised the Trust were working through their model, as their current East Belt facility was coming to end of life, whilst their Southbrook operation is smaller and caters to a different market. J Palmer acknowledged some Trust members present at the Council meeting.

Following a question from Councillor Barnett, J Palmer confirmed that this is a draft provision.

Councillor Williams enquired if income will be generated from this building and if that will be kept within the building or go into the Trust account to be re-dispersed around the community. C Sargison advised those points can be looked at in the Heads of Agreement. The broad intent is that the Trust would be operators and any income would go back to the Trust. The Trust Deed stipulates its funds go back to the community. Staff acknowledged North Canterbury Sport and Recreation Trust is wider than Waimakariri going through to Hurunui and the Council does not stipulate what and how it funds projects.

Councillor Brine enquired if it was proposed that schools could hire the facility. Staff confirmed they could for such events as sports day.

Moved: Councillor Gordon Seconded: Councillor Atkinson

THAT the Council
(a) Receives report No. 180118003759.

(b) Approves the provision of $27.85 million in the Draft LTP for the construction of a multi-use sports facility at Coldstream Road, scheduled for completion around September 2020.

(c) Notes that there will be a community engagement process during the consultation period for the Draft LTP specifically on the Multi Use Sports Facility, including the proposed site layout at Coldstream Road.

(d) Approves Staff working with the North Canterbury Sports and Recreation Trust on the development of a Heads of Agreement for the management and operation of the facility.

(e) Notes that the Draft Heads of Agreement will be available for Council’s consideration prior to the finalisation of the 2018 LTP.

(f) Circulates this report to the Boards.

CARRIED
Against Councillors Blackie and Stewart

Councillor Gordon was supportive of the recommendation and acknowledged the work of the North Canterbury Sports Trust over the years on this project. The Trust were an important partner and involved all the way and matters can be worked through in open conversations over the next couple of months. Councillor Gordon spoke positively of the Trust’s investment and contribution. Councillor Gordon believed that whilst price was important, functionality, and quality should not be compromised. Councillor Gordon expressed a view to see the indoor facility and earthquake rates included in the budget and work to date was quite an achievement.

Councillor Atkinson reserved his speaking right.

Councillor Barnett noted this motion provided the community the opportunity to see the budget and comment. Indoor space was shown to be deficient 10 years ago but we had an earthquake. Strengths of such a community facility is a place for people to meet and the district lacks facilities for having major events for more than 300 people. This allows for the flexibility of differing events. She commented on school growth and limited indoor space for school sports and acknowledged the benefits of an indoor area for elderly sports participation. Councillor Barnett remarked that this proposal is not for a commercial operation but for a community facility and encouraged members to think of the advantages for a partnership with a group like the Trust. Councillor Barnett stated it was the view of the community that is important so encouraged that provision be included into the budget for consultation.

Councillor Blackie commented on not knowing what other fiscal commitments are on ratepayers. The success of fiscal matters is dependent on economy and growth and worldly change. We have to think about the ratepayers, aging population, and low income people in our community he stated. Councillor Blackie acknowledged the Council finances had been handled well to date, and this project is fiscally sound to do now, but was cautious with the pressures of earthquake and proposed three bins and queried whether it would act as a disincentive for people to take up the recycling option as compared with using the sports facility.

Councillor Williams believed the facility was a good concept but was cautious if the community cannot afford it. He commented on Council borrowing over the past five years. Councillor Williams suggested the
matter be considered at the end of the meeting so that Councillors could understand the rest of the budget provisions yet to be discussed. Councillor Williams stated he would abstain from voting until he was confident the community and Council could afford the facility.

Councillor Atkinson commented on affordability and the ageing population with fixed incomes. He commented on rates cost impact relevance and being different to different people depending on their circumstances. Councillor Atkinson remarked on the gym and Town Hall process and believed the Council should not be in competition with other commercial operators, however he felt comfortable with that and also that the facility is multi-use. Councillor Atkinson’s concern was that consultation to gather the range of community views was needed and remarked on the importance of having a conversation with the community.

Councillor Stewart stated she would not vote on the matter, but recognised the consultation process. Councillor Stewart believed the facility was not a priority but a nice to have, with people informing her that they want to see river quality matters addressed first. Councillor Stewart commented that she would be interested in deferring the facility for consideration in a future LTP but not this time and endorsed Councillor Blackie’s comments on debt levels. Councillor Stewart commented on the impacts in the budget for the three bin proposal and implications to the community on affordability. Councillor Stewart stated she had an issue with Council subsidy against commercial operators.

Mayor Ayers commented on the need to consult and providing the opportunity for feedback in relation to both the facility and rate rise impacts. He felt it was important not to second guess the community. Mayor Ayers commented on his personal options for waste and what is one person’s nice to have is another person’s essential. He remarked on the world economy changing, and adjustments we make because we cannot see into the future. Mayor Ayers stated the Council was nowhere near debt level maximums. He also commented on water quality being with us for the rest of our lives and it being a continual matter for the community to work on. There will always be pressures on our environment which is a continual cost. If not now, when for a facility like this. We need to ask the community he stated.

Councillor Meyer agreed with the Mayoral comments, and believed it was an exciting time and opportunity to take the proposal out to the community. He hoped for many responses from the people we represent. Personally Councillor Meyer believed the matter should have been discussed at the end of the meeting, rather than the beginning as a bigger picture of the budget, however he did not believe it would have changed the outcome today to consult. Councillor Meyer acknowledged that the Council has many issues, a reasonable budget, however people in the community are financially hurting and now was decision time.

Councillor Doody stated she was proud to be part of the steering group and commented on the important work undertaken to get to this point which included visiting the Lincoln facility observing community use. This facility will be used day and night she stated. The facility area is perfect as it is in the centre of a great sports hub and Councillor Doody was pleased to consult on the proposal.

Councillor Felstead spoke of the importance of consulting and the proposed motion was now asking to gather feedback. Good work had occurred to get to the current position of being able to consult. Councillor
Felstead believed there is never a right time to do expensive projects but it will never be cheaper he stated.

Councillor Brine reflected on past conversations on replacing community facilities such as Dudley Pool and the importance of community consultation.

Councillor Gordon, in his right of reply, reflected on the good debate and acknowledged all were concerned about people on fixed/lower income and their ability to receive rates rebates. Councillor Gordon commented on water quality being a matter for Ecan and the Water Zone Committee. Future accountability/affordability is a debate for another day but we need to go to consultation Councillor Gordon stated. He believed this was the right time to consult and hoped for a strong response from many before the Council considers the next stage.

5.6 Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry – Stage 2 Report – C Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager)

C Roxburgh spoke to the report, highlighting key aspects and noting the Government have not yet legislated change to mandatory drinking water requirements.

Councillor Gordon queried if the Council should wait for a government response. Staff advised it was an option to consider but it was a risk. It was acknowledged that it was unusual for staff to suggest change until legislated, however indications were that change from government would come and the time between any change and implementation requirements may be short. It was staff view, based on industry feedback that it was best to include options now for consideration, and budgets could be removed at a later stage if no legislative requirements came into being. The advice staff have received is government feedback could be received as soon as February/March 2018 during the LTP process. Councillor Gordon suggested a small change to recommendation (d).

Mayor Ayers enquired if Kaiapoi water was chlorinated during the earthquake and whether there was current provision to do so. Staff advised that as of today Woodend and Cust have the equipment to enable chlorination of the water supply. Other sites could become operational for perhaps a month or two, but the Council was not currently in a position to enable long term (ie years) of chlorination with the current plant.

In a supplementary question Mayor Ayers asked if staff would consider that the Council was resilient in terms of water supplies currently. Staff confirmed they were able to respond quickly in an emergency event with short-term measures.

Councillor Barnett enquired why additional funding on UV filtration is required. Staff explained treatment for bacteria and protozoa such as giardia, which is ineffective with chlorination as it needs UV. Staff commented on water standards, testing requirements and secure wells.

Councillor Barnett referred to para 6.5 commenting on Cust costs associated with proposed changes and the impact on smaller schemes. J Palmer suggested it was more appropriate to discuss with the next agenda item.

Councillor Blackie enquired if there was risk of contamination from bacteria based around the well head or in the vertical piping. K Simpson commented on three events; contamination following earthquake
contamination from source water itself (Mandeville) which now includes UV treatment; Woodend which had two experiences in 2012 and 2013 attributed to a reservoir which is part of the reticulation system; and the current situation at Oxford No.1 where the source is yet to be determined, although it is possible it is within the reticulation system. G Cleary commented on the Havelock North situation and J Palmer reflected on time during the earthquakes and periods of chlorination.

Councillor Stewart reflected on Christchurch City’s current publicised issues, enquiring if Waimakariri has similar well head situations that could be cause for concern. K Simpson commented on 28 primarily bores, of which 18 are above ground. Ten of those well heads have been inspected and matters identified, but only require minor works. It was noted that the Christchurch City wells that were inspected were coming up for standard five year inspection which is what led to their current situation. All WDC wells have current approval from independent drinking water inspectors. It was acknowledged that some wells were due for re-inspection in August 2018 and will need to be at higher standard to ensure compliance so minor works is being undertaken now and funded from current operational budgets.

In a supplementary question Councillor Stewart enquired about surface water aquifers and if there are any public supplies where contamination from surface activities occurs. G Cleary confirmed that Oxford No.1 was drawn from a shallow intake of Waimakariri River with a proposal to draw from a deeper well soon. Also Garrymere has a shallow intake, but again there is a proposal to undertake an upgrade. Fernside is not secure but is about to be connected to the Mandeville scheme. Waikuku Beach, although not a secure well, has never had contamination however a UV system is due to be commissioned to that system to provide another layer of security to the water. The Rangiora scheme prior to the main upgrade was taken from Ashley River.

Councillor Felstead referred to the Oxford No.1 and No.2 new wells and the delay of 12 months. C Roxburgh advised one well is on now but has low flow and the other well has the consent currently being processed by ECan. The second well is in an area that is over consented, staff are working with ECan who are aware of the current situation. Staff are currently working on a design of a 5km pipeline and anticipate the tender in February. The situation was outlined, including risk factors.

Moved: Councillor Gordon Seconded: Councillor Blackie

THAT the Council

(a) Receives report No. 180118003751.

(b) Notes that key recommendations from the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry Stage 2 Report include the abolition of the secure classification system of the current standards meaning that all water will need to be treated, the need for a residual disinfectant (chlorine) within the reticulation system, and for compliance with the standards to be mandatory.

(c) Notes that staff have allowed for the implementation of UV treatment on all schemes that currently rely on secure classification of their sources for compliance with the current Drinking Water Standards, based on the recommendations from the Stage 2 Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry.

(d) Approves the inclusion of a budget provision for UV treatment across the district’s water supply schemes at an estimated
additional capital cost of $3.0M, which has been allowed for within the Council’s Draft 2018-28 Long Term Plan over the years 2018/19 through to 2022/23. A decision on implementation to be resolved by a future council meeting.

(e) Approves the approach of allowing for the cost of chlorination on all the currently unchlorinated schemes while not committing to implementation of this without Council being legislatively required to do so or without consultation with the public at the direction of Council.

(f) Notes the reasoning set out in Section 6.2 of this report for making financial provision for mandatory chlorination which is not consistent with current Council practice.

(g) Notes that due to the timing of the Havelock North Inquiry Stage 2 Report, the cost estimates that fed into the Draft Long Term Plan budget were carried out without detailed site specific analysis.

CARRIED

Councillor Gordon commented that it was good that staff brought the information to Council for consideration regarding anticipated Government change, but a decision should remain with Council as to when the budget is set. He would watch with interest what ensues from the government.

5.7 Funding Options for Water Supply Rates – C Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager)

C Roxburgh spoke briefly to the report outlining the reasoning behind the proposal.

Councillor Doody sought clarification on charging of two units and if a property owner wanted more units whether it would be at the full rate. C Roxburgh explained that it was not that simple as some properties were on a restricted service and staff propose to have one cap for two units and one cap for 19 units, alternatively the property is up for the cost of a tank and electrics which could be in realm of $5,000 to $10,000.

In a supplementary question Councillor Doody asked if staff could consider a cap so the system is not abused. C Roxburgh advised an option may be to meter the water but further consideration on options would be required and brought back to the Council.

Councillor Felstead asked how would staff (or elected members), explain the proposal to people on the Oxford No.1 scheme who are subsidising the Garrymere scheme user. Staff acknowledged Garrymere and Poyntz Road schemes do not have many users so metering could be considered to reduce abuse. Staff could bring a report back to the Utilities and Roading Committee for consideration, prior to the LTP adoption in June.

Mayor Ayers sought clarification of the Garrymere rate. Staff explained growth limitations and implications for having a capped rate.

Councillor Barnett referred to the budget pg 48, and queried the Summerhill rate for two units, included in the budget, but not mentioned in this report. Staff acknowledged it may be an omission and another look would occur as potentially there were three areas with challenges regarding funding. It was explained that costs fall where they lay or alternatively Council could apply a capped system to limit the effect on smaller schemes.
Councillor Stewart queried the split on two units and 19 units and how many properties are affected. Staff were unable to recall final figures for the Ohoka, Garrymere and Poyntz schemes, however would furnish the information.

Mayor Ayers adjourned the meeting for a workshop to discuss options at 2.26pm, which concluded at 2.54pm.

Moved: Councillor Gordon Seconded: Councillor Blackie

THAT the Council

(a) Receives report No. 180119004275.

(b) Notes that the current figures in the 2018-28 Draft Long Term Plan include rating increase in the order of $1,100 to $2,000 per standard connection (2 unit and 19 unit connections respectively) on both the Garrymere and Poyntz Road water supply schemes.

(c) Notes that the Utilities and Roading Committee recommended that Council consider funding options for the scheme upgrade as part of the Draft Long Term Plan that could include partial funding from other water supply schemes, or the general rate.

(d) Approves funding of the Garrymere and Poyntz Road scheme upgrades from within each scheme respectively, as per the current practice.

(e) Notes that the 3 Waters rating structure is due to be reviewed in 2022.

CARRIED

Councillor Gordon, reflected on the past working party reasoning.

Councillor Blackie commented on the working party and consideration of the affected users.

5.8 Oxford Wastewater Treatment Plant Treatment Upgrade – request for additional budget – C Parton (Wastewater Asset Manager) and M Andrews (Civil Engineer PDU)

C Parton spoke to the report advising the plant is overdue for replacement and provided background of a tender process and outlined issues associated with the project.

Councillor Stewart sought clarity between the original budget and the proposal for additional funding being sought. Staff acknowledged a typo in recommendation (d) and this was amended accordingly.

Councillor Stewart enquired how much this particular plant has cost to date. Staff advised they would report back in the future through the Utilities & Roading Committee.

Moved: Councillor Barnett Seconded: Councillor Doody

THAT the Council

(a) Receives report No. 180109001310
(b) **Approves** additional budget of $282,500 in the Draft Long Term Plan for the 2018/19 financial year to enable the full scope of required aeration upgrades at Oxford WWTP to be completed as one construction package.

(c) **Notes** that the additional budget will have a rating increase of $27 per property per year over the next 15 years.

(d) **Notes** that staff will carry over the remaining budget of approximately $350,000 from the 2017/18 financial year to the 2018/2019 financial year, to provide a total budget of $647,500 for this work.

(e) **Notes** that this budget provision is included in the Draft Long Term Plan.

**CARRIED**

Councillor Barnett acknowledged the value of improving the plant and stated it is important to ask such questions as townships grow.

Councillor Doody spoke of the need to improve the plant and get it working as it's supposed to, as she felt it was an expensive scheme for ratepayers.

Councillor Stewart enquired on the cost of a connection against what has been spent on the plant. J Palmer acknowledged the question, and the suggestion in 2007 to run the pipe down to Rangiora. He spoke of it being a substantial project to run the pipe 35km due to the various pressures and undulations along such a long pipeline.

5.9 **Herbicide, Glyphosate use for Waimakariri District Council Weed Control Operations – G Bennett (Land Drainage Engineer) and G Cleary (Manager Utilities and Roading)**

G Bennett spoke to a presentation showing before and after photos of various areas across the district utilising various treatment methods.

G Cleary spoke of the efforts of staff and contractors to ensure glyphosate is used sparingly where deemed the most appropriate treatment. Other treatments are used for differing situations.

Councillor Atkinson acknowledged steps taken but thought education was lacking to landowners asking if budget considerations for education could be factored in future budgets and queried what other options were available for consideration. K Simpson explained there was some budget for education in the urban drainage but it was used for education related to stormwater management. Potentially either an increase in budgets or re-allocation of some current funds (ie approx. $20,000) could be directed towards glyphosate education. Councillor Atkinson stated he would welcome a future report.

In a supplementary question Councillor Atkinson referred to the method of cut and gel for willows, and not spraying in the waterways itself (not the banks). K Simpson advised this is option 2 in the report, and referred to different aspects of the report.

Councillor Meyer referred to earlier comments on educating landowners and their reactions. Staff commented on building relationships with landowners.

Councillor Stewart queried damaging a public asset (drains) and powers to address issues with the landowner. Staff commented that most
occurrences are with landowners are positive when engaged on the spray application use and working towards a balanced result.

Councillor Stewart queried wider education, the new role and reflecting on Ecan aspects. K Simpson confirmed the role would have a close relationship with Ecan, however it would not be doubling up work, with rather more collaboration on education practices.

Councillor Stewart enquired if there was a budget to advance education. Staff related matters back to the Stormwater Bylaw (ie excessive use of herbicide of Council managed waterways), which does not include Ecan managed waterways. The role would assist with the co-ordination of work undertaken. What was not budgeted is work of the Regional Council. 

Councillor Stewart asked if there is anything this Council needs to do to make this happen for sustainability in our drainage management. Staff commented about the Flaxton Road corridor and adjustment to drains.

Moved: Councillor Atkinson    Seconded: Councillor Stewart

THAT the Council

(a) Receives report No. 180111001840.
(b) Notes that based on information to date, it is unlikely that the use of glyphosate by the Council would pose a risk to public health and the environment.
(c) Notes that the use of herbicide in Council operations is carried out strictly in accordance with the manufacturer’s instructions.
(d) Notes that herbicides, including glyphosate, for Council operations are only used where deemed necessary by Council staff and contractors, and other weed control options are used where they are deemed more appropriate.
(e) Notes that the budgets in the LTP have been based on continuing to use herbicides, including glyphosate, for weed control where deemed necessary by Council staff and contractors.
(f) Circulates this report to the Community Boards, Drainage Advisory Groups and the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee for their information.
(g) Adds Option Two.

Note: Following item 5.9 the Council will then consider Item 6.2 from ‘Matters Referred’ being Adoption of Utilities and Roading Activity Management Plans 2018.

Councillor Atkinson commented on community feedback on the glyphosate matters and outlined reasoning for ceasing any spraying directly over waterways. He commented on photos presented and ongoing education with adjacent landowners. Councillor Atkinson acknowledged additional cost of cleaning up waterways, and taking steps towards improve the situation. Public pressure is increasing on clean waterways. This is an affordable long term step in the right direction he remarked. Councillor Atkinson stated education needs to be led by leaders such as councillors who were elected by the community.

Councillor Stewart endorsed her colleague’s comments and believes WDC could lead in sustainable waterways and improved health of those waterways through such projects as the Cam River Project. Councillor Stewart praised staff in their sensible use of spray and community
feedback and was supportive of publicity on key projects. Councillor Stewart thanked staff for their efforts.

Mayor Ayers sought clarification where funding for Councillor Atkinson’s suggestion be sourced. J Palmer advised district wide funding is a uniform charge or per property. General discussion on where the additional funding would be allocated occurred.

Councillor Blackie remarked he was supportive of the general recommendation but reluctant with the addition of Option 2 however would support it being consulted on. Councillor Blackie acknowledged glyphosate as a tool, being one option for weed control but that needed to be combined with educational aspects. He reflected on Christchurch conversations, steam machines and the struggle for weed control.

Amendment
Moved: Councillor Brine Seconded: Councillor Doody

That the Council remove recommendation (g) being option two.

Councillor Brine acknowledged the comprehensive report and informative presentation. He commented on glyphosate as being one of a number of tools available to staff, and having the confidence in staff common sense to use chemicals only when and where appropriate. Councillor Brine was also conscious of the additional cost involved, however was comfortable as the matter would be for public consultation with the draft LTP. Over time more technologies will become available, and will be discussed, however currently Councillor Brine believed glyphosate was an essential tool to be available for staff to use at discretion.

Councillor Doody supported the amendment due to having confidence in the staff who had already demonstrated careful and limited use of glyphosate.

Councillor Barnett stated she was of a mind to support the amendment having seen no conclusive evidence that glyphosate poses any significant health risk to our population and believed in staff having a choice to use the most appropriate means where available. Councillor Barnett acknowledged glyphosate as a tool, at this point in time, and noted there are two types of glyphosate. Councillor Barnett stated an extra cost for a lower level of service did not sit well with her, reflecting on anecdotal feedback from Christchurch residents.

Councillor Gordon stated he would vote for the amendment, acknowledging staff information at this time with its limited use and the fact the matter could be reviewed at another time. Councillor Gordon stated he appreciated the impact on rates of the increased spend.

Councillor Atkinson commented on the volume of research and conclusive proof, which has not been conclusive either way at this stage in his view. Councillor Atkinson queried when we stop spray use, and take the steps as examples of how to control weeds have been seen with positive results. Councillor Atkinson reflected on the cost of an indoor stadium which contributes to good health verse clean water and healthy waterways with a reduction in chemicals, accompanied by education.

Councillor Felstead stated he was not supportive of the amendment, and reiterated what option 2 means, which does not stop using glyphosate, but stops use directly over waterways.

Councillor Brine asked staff if Tram Road drain is considered a waterway. Staff confirmed it was a waterway, being a contributory of Silverstream and
has permanent flowing water. Councillor Brine then asked about the allocation of costs for traffic management when undertaking drainage clearing. Staff advised it is a day cost for traffic management.

Councillor Meyer commented on staff doing a great job in a difficult environment. He believed it was better not to be spraying over water and reflected on stream life 30-40 years ago and changes observed. Councillor Meyer was supportive of the amendment.

Councillor Brine called for a Division for the amendment
For: Councillors Blackie, Barnett, Brine, Doody, Gordon and Mayor Ayers
Against: Councillor Felstead, Atkinson, Meyer, Stewart and Williams

6:5

THAT the Council

(a) Receives report No. 180111001840.
(b) Notes that based on information to date, it is unlikely that the use of glyphosate by the Council would pose a risk to public health and the environment.
(c) Notes that the use of herbicide in Council operations is carried out strictly in accordance with the manufacturer’s instructions.
(d) Notes that herbicides, including glyphosate, for Council operations are only used where deemed necessary by Council staff and contractors, and other weed control options are used where they are deemed more appropriate.
(e) Notes that the budgets in the LTP have been based on continuing to use herbicides, including glyphosate, for weed control where deemed necessary by Council staff and contractors.
(f) Circulates this report to the Community Boards, Drainage Advisory Groups and the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee for their information.

CARRIED
Against Councillors Atkinson, Stewart and Williams

Councillor Atkinson believed this was a sad day, as the Council had an opportunity to make a difference today, but we did not take that opportunity. Chemicals are not good things and minimising their use is beneficial to the community he stated.

5.10 2018/19 Development Contributions Schedules – K LaValley (Project Delivery Manager)

K LaValley spoke to the report advising generally rates had decreased due to the way calculations and forecasts were undertaken. Adjustment has also been undertaken in the reserves development schedules.

Councillor Felstead queried Oxford matters being unrelated to growth and impact on Development Contributions (DC’s). Staff confirmed and clarified the situation. The table in the report was referred to and the effect of DC’s for viability for development. J Palmer commented on working with developers, for aspects such as storm catchment areas were we manage and charge through DC’s which manages the risk, particularly for Rangiora developments.
Moved: Councillor Gordon    Seconded: Councillor Felstead

THAT the Council

(a) **Receives** report No. 180111002046.

(b) **Approves** the Draft 2018/19 Development Contributions Schedule for consultation with the 2018-28 Long Term Plan.

(c) **Notes** that the methodology for the neighbourhood reserves land purchase has been reviewed and updated.

(d) **Notes** that staff will be assessing the options for development contributions when existing properties connect to reticulation. A report will be brought to Council with a recommendation based on this assessment.

(e) **Notes** that proposed updates to the Development Contribution Policy are presented in a separate report (TRIM 180111001799).

CARRIED

### 5.11 Draft Development Contributions Policy 2018/19 – M O’Connell (Senior Policy Analyst)

M O’Connell commented on amendments to the policy which primarily relates to timing of payments. Another change due to Resource Management Act changes, related to financial contributions was explained. Resident population figures had been reviewed and that has changed downwards from previous calculations with schedules and maps amended accordingly. There will be a full review next year and reported back to the Council.

J Palmer commented on pg 416, para 4.6.3 and clarification on the situation of administration in relation to a 224 Certificate “or” option. K LaValley briefly outlined options and impacts, acknowledging that further work needs to occur as part of the 2019 full review.

Moved: Councillor Felstead    Seconded: Councillor Brine

THAT the Council

(a) **Receives** report No 180111001799

(b) **Approves** the Draft Development Contribution Policy 2018/19 for consultation as a Special Consultative Procedure as part of the 2018-2028 Long-Term Plan.

(c) **Notes** that this update has been undertaken through the Development Contribution Internal Review Group.

(d) **Authorises** staff to make minor amendments to the Policy.

CARRIED

### 5.12 Fees and Charges for Community Facilities and Airfield Ground Rental – C Sargison (Manager Community and Recreation)

C Sargison provided an overview of the report, commenting on comparisons with other districts and facility hire. He commented on
upgraded buildings following the earthquakes, particularly toilets and kitchens. Cleaning is now undertaken generally by the Council contractors rather than groups and the level of service including technical support has increased. C Sargison commented on different category groupings of facilities at varying locations across the district.

Staff advised the biggest change relates to recommendation (c), commenting on the volume of fee waiver requests that occur and the issues caused. C Sargison commented on potential agreements with groups and communication on changes to each regular user group.

C Sargison commented on airfield operations, improved safety procedures and charging systems. The Council leased out the land however the buildings are privately owned. A water pump and toilet at the airfield are the only owned Council buildings at the airfield.

Councillor Williams referred to the airfield and businesses operating out of the airfield, in relation to low rental rates. He inquired if it was possible to increase the Council income to break even and be more competitive. C Sargison advised it was possible, but queried if the users would agree. Staff referred to pg 274 of the airfield budget and commented on an approximate $200,000 per year deficient. C Sargison commented on the terms of land leases and the 30 year terms that commenced in the mid 1990's, noting there is a rent review period. If the Council desired to have a differential rate for commercial users then staff would have to undertake research, review current leases, investigate commercial and hobby rates and report back. It was noted that an increase in landing fees would help increase overall funding. C Sargison commented on hangar size and how some hangar owners subleased to other plane users and how commercial use may be interpreted.

Councillor Williams queried increased landing fees as having no effect on commercial non-flyers. C Sargison reflected on the various types of users of the airfield. No land was currently available for new hangars however land recently purchased on the other side of the road may be able to become a commercial area and operate at commercial rates in the future. Staff understood approximately six hangars are still to be built in the near future.

Mayor Ayers referred to the Priors Road development and it not being included in the budget. C Sargison advised there was currently no significant user that had approached the Council so it was not in the budget for future plans. It could be added to a later LTP if the situation changed.

*The meeting adjourned for an airfield related briefing at 11.46pm and recommenced at 12.15pm.*

*J Meyer departed the meeting at noon for the remainder of the afternoon.*

Councillor Gordon referred to current facility charges and sought clarification on some facilities fee not changing from current rates, referring to a group with limited use of other rooms. C Sargison commented that Advisory groups do not pay anything for meeting rooms as the groups are part of the Council. Such examples were Pearson Park Advisory Group and Friends of the Rangiora Town Hall.

Councillor Barnett commented on Woodend Community Centre and weekend rates particularly in relation to the impact of an annual flower show. C Sargison commented that increased demand at that facility now experiences heavy use on weekends. Under the recommendations, if the
flower show organisers wanted a different rate they would be required to apply to the Community & Recreation Committee.

Councillor Barnett enquired if charges could be staged over two years referring to a 50% increase for some facilities. Staff advised that is a decision of the Council. The rates suggested are reflective of rates that should perhaps have changed earlier.

Moved: Councillor Doody Seconded: Councillor Atkinson

THAT the Council

(a) Receives report No. 180117003266

(b) Approves the fees and charges for community facilities as attached in Appendix 1 (P6) for inclusion in the Fees and Charges Section of the Draft LTP.

(c) Approves the community facilities fees and charges applying to all users.

(d) Approves the airfield land rent charge of $4.00 per square metre for inclusion in the Fees and Charges section of the Draft LTP.

(e) Staff to contact all airfield facility users and indicate that a review of airfield charges will occur over the next 12 months and discussions with users will be held as part of the review.

CARRIED

Against Councillor Barnett

Councillor Doody thanked staff for the reasonable and responsible approach to fees and charges. It was also commented that an airfield review is appropriate given the nature and increased use of the facility.

Councillor Atkinson remarked that it is appropriate to review the airfield situation and have a future discussion on future charges. Councillor Atkinson accepted that community groups have difficulties in funding facility hire, but the Council requires some form of income from the venues to cover maintenance and ongoing servicing. Councillor Atkinson believed there was realism around the proposed rates.

Councillor Gordon reflected on past Community and Recreation Committee discussions and the expectation of receiving feedback from community groups on the proposed changes to facility charges, including process for seeking a different rate. Councillor Gordon understood the proposal for staff to no longer have the discretion to amend rates but a process to have a firm framework and option for individual groups to approach the Community & Recreation Committee, via a formal staff report for consideration of the Committee. Councillor Gordon was supportive of a review of airfield charges.

Amendment

Moved: Councillor Barnett

Revokes recommendation (c) and replaces with ‘that for community facilities support a gradual introduction of fees for Community Facilities with 50% in the first year (being 2019/20) and 50% in 2020/21.

Lost for lack of seconder

Councillor Barnett stated she appreciated the work undertaken and understood the proposed rates for community facilities, commenting on
community fundraising that contributed to the Woodend community facility. Councillor Barnett commented on her experience being a treasurer of a community group and the increase of hire rates being too much, too soon for some groups to organise their budgets going forward. Councillor Barnett suggested the proposed increased facility hire rates would impact on events such as the Woodend spring flower show and groups would likely need to negotiate with the Council for future use. Councillor Barnett stated she would vote against the recommendation believing it was too harsh and too soon and would seriously compromise groups and events. Councillor Barnett remarked that she hoped proposals of change would be well communicated to groups so they can provide feedback through the process.

Councillor Gordon sought clarification on charges being per day rather than as Councillor Barnett was interpreting per hour. C Sargison clarified hourly rates and not charging overnight rates. Staff advised the table of charges would be modified to be clear on day or hour rates and recirculated to the Council before the meeting ended.

Councillor Doody was happy with the proposal and noted the change for the Woodend Community Centre amendment from a day rate rather than an hourly rate.

The meeting adjourned at 12.40pm and recommenced at 1.14pm.

5.13 Draft Community Green Space Activity Management Plan 2017 – C Brown (Community Green Space Manager)

C Brown outlined the report and previous considerations taken on board from the Community & Recreation Committee. The Activity Management Plans (AMP’s) have been sent for a peer review. It was possible that capital projects may change through the LTP process and affect the AMP’s and these would be adjusted accordingly through the process.

Moved: Councillor Atkinson    Seconded: Councillor Blackie

THAT the Council

(a) Receives report No. 171107120943.

(b) Notes that a preliminary version of the Draft Community Green Space Activity Management Plan was presented to the Community and Recreation Committee in November 2017.

(c) Notes that the Draft Community Green Space Activity Management Plan has been sent to an external consultant for peer review.

(d) Adopts the Draft Community Green Space Activity Management Plan (TRIM 171110122373).

(e) Approves the Community Green Space Manager to make minor amendments if required as a result of the peer review.

(f) Notes that the final Activity Management Plan will be adopted by Council in conjunction with the adoption of the Final LTP.

CARRIED

Councillor Atkinson stated that it was a well prepared report, and he appreciated the references to other documents.

Councillor Blackie was complimentary to a comprehensive report.
5.14 **Waimakariri Public Art Advisory Trust – C Sargison (Manager Community and Recreation)**

C Sargison reflected on past discussions and proposed consultation with the public. He highlighted reasoning for not having an annual grant and commented on the Creative Communities Fund relationship. The trust deed would be amended to be appropriate to the need as directed by the Council and would be presented back to the Council at the time of the LTP adoption.

J Palmer outlined aspects for consideration of whether the trust becomes a Council Controlled Organisation (CCO) including the risks involved, auditor implications or other aspects by representatives and control level and deed implications. The implications of different options available to the Council were outlined.

Councillor Blackie enquired of implications for $25,000 seed funding. J Palmer commented that there would be no impact in relation to that funding however matters for consideration do revolve around the level of control ie directors, representation or council appointments etc.

Councillor Gordon reflected on past involvement with the working party and past work undertaken to get deed to the current draft.

Councillor Doody outlined the thinking of the working party and the direction they took.

J Palmer advised the draft deed is outlined as a CCO. He outlined the implications and processes required to move forward with a statement of proposal.

Councillor Doody sought clarification on other groups such as the Community Art Trust etc. Staff confirmed such groups that the Council support were not CCO’s.

Mayor Ayers queried audited accounts. J Palmer advised auditing and accountability requirements of a CCO.

Councillor Gordon sought advice on the best way forward. J Palmer reiterated the options for the Council to consider.

Councillor Williams enquired if the Council does not control the trust, if there were any issues with fraud etc. J Palmer outlined the responsibility that lay with the Trust and that some public liability insurance cover would be required.

**Moved:** Councillor Gordon  **Seconded:** Councillor Doody

**THAT** the Council

(a) **Receives** report No. 180118003966

(b)  **Receives** the Art in Public Places Policy and Waimakariri Public Arts Trust Deed.

(c)  **Approves** the inclusion in the Draft LTP of the Proposal to establish a Waimakariri Public Art Advisory Trust.

(d)  **Notes** that the expectation is that the Trust will externally source funds for art installations
(e) **Approves** funding of $5,000 in the Recreation Account for the Servicing of the Art Trust. – Note that this is included in the Draft LTP Recreation Budget.

**CARRIED**

Councillor Gordon remarked it was appropriate this matter is considered as work had been done on the deed and policy that accompanies it. He believed public money is not needed right now and that the matter would be looked at in the future. However, this resolution would enable the trust to seek funding from other sources. Councillor Gordon reiterated the purpose of the proposal was to have some experts on public art and deal with a number of enquires.

Councillor Doody reiterated thoughts of the working party and believed the resolution would enable achievement of suitable placement of arts in the community, with appropriate processes and accountability being followed.

5.15 **Cones Road Proposed Walkway Link to Boundary Road - C Brown (Community Green Space Manager) and M Kwant (Community Projects Officer)**

C Brown spoke briefly on the report, providing history including Community Board recommendations.

Councillor Blackie queried the safety factors and the costing of road works required. C Brown advised speed reduction and widening of the road was required.

Councillor Barnett sought clarification on where the budget was coming from. Staff confirmed no funding had been signalled from the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board, roading works would be funded from the roading budgets, recreation staff would provide advice to the community on requirements however the majority of the track proposal was intended to be a community funded and supported project.

Councillor Williams queried why roading costs were not included in the report. Staff explained the outstanding roading report which would be provided before the LTP was finalised.

Moved: Councillor Gordon    Seconded: Councillor Barnett

**THAT** the Council

(a) **Receives** report No.180104000506

(b) **Notes** that the Rangiora / Ashley Community Board supported the construction of a walkway between Cones Road and Boundary Road at its March 2017 meeting subject to a number of safety initiatives being implemented including the reduction of the speed limit to the unsealed portion of Cones Road.

(c) **Approves** funding of $11,800 being included in the draft Long Term Plan for the construction of a track from Cones Road to Boundary Road.

(d) **Notes** that a budget of $11,800 for the track construction has already been included in the draft budget sheets in the 2018/19 financial year.

(e) **Notes** that the Roading report Trim # 170822090365 regarding the reduction of the speed limit on Cones Road and other safety...
related changes to Cones Road is still lying on the table and will be considered when the Long Term Plan is finalised.

CARRIED
Against Councillors Atkinson and Williams

Councillor Gordon outlined what was being sought at this time as a budget provision. Safety matters such as roading were still to be considered. Councillor Gordon commented on the Community Board discussions, and the final outcome is still subject to budget deliberations. Councillor Gordon commented on other work being done at Cones Road corner which is a separate issue.

Councillor Barnett reflected on the first presentation from Mr Harris at a previous Woodend-Ashley Community Board some time ago, and was pleased to include the project in the draft LTP so the community can comment. Councillor Barnett commented on the importance of supporting volunteer initiatives, on water quality and native flora and fauna.

Councillor Williams stated he would oppose the motion, reflecting on neighbours’ feedback and safety concerns. Councillor Williams was concerned about safety and the possibility of a serious accident/death along that particular road, remarking on environmental factors.

Mayor Ayers supported the motion on the basis of the project being included in the budget for public comment and acknowledged there were further discussions on roading matters yet to occur.

Councillor Blackie was supportive of the concept of a track and volunteers driving the project but expressed reservations about safety aspects which would be considered another day.

Councillor Doody was supportive of the motion and consultation opportunity but acknowledged more work needed to be done.

Councillor Atkinson stated he would not support the motion as he held concern for safety related matters which needed to be addressed.

In his right of reply Councillor Gordon stated road safety matters would be dealt with later, but he was supportive of the project being included in the LTP and would reserve further thoughts until he had reviewed the public comment and feedback.

5.16 Te Kohaka o Tuhaitara Trust Management Plan – J Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support)

C McMillan and G Byrnes presented information on behalf of the Te Kohaka o Tuhaitara Trust. C McMillan advised that current information is an executive summary.

C McMillan reflected on the recent positive meeting with the Pegasus Residents Association where the Trust outlined proposed plans for the Western Ridge reserve area with a 200 year vision. G Byrnes commented on the need for a clear strategy and additional help, along with continuing ecology education with schools and research work with Universities. Additional resource was required to manage educational aspects and the physical operations. The Trust were seeking continued support from the Council and would also be discussing matters with Ngai Tahu.
G Byrnes commented on the risk of being a victim of success particularly in relation to the importance of ongoing work with local schools. To date the Trust had developed a successful mix to achieve the Trust mission but further work and resourcing was required. The community is starting to recognise the importance of the work and is supportive, even to a participation level.

The Trust is seeking two positions; one being a visitor liaison person and another relating to the physical aspect of track and contract work. G Byrnes advised it was typical for Local Government involvement with aspects of coastal protection work which had already begun at the Park. G Byrnes commented on the dune protection programme progress with assistance of the University.

Councillor Atkinson sought an update of the University involvement. G Byrnes commented on the University of Hawaii and transferrable aspects related to species that migrate to the sea. Research is ongoing with the Ministry of Primary Industries contributing with equipment that will be retained by the Trust at the end of the research project. He also commented on the 30 bio-nodes research and sharing the information with other research groups.

Councillor Gordon sought clarification on the breakdown of the requested $150,000. C McMillan confirmed it was basically for the resourcing of two people. The Trust were currently in the process of producing a comprehensive business plan. It was also clarified that the Council currently grant $30,000 to the Trust, so it is actually an additional $120,000 being sought, and collectively totalling $150,000.

Councillor Gordon enquired as to what other funding was being sourced. C McMillan advised currently the Trust were discussing matters with Ngai Tahu and various options were being investigated. The Ministry of Education will be also targeted as the school programmes are ERO approved.

Mayor Ayers enquired if the Hawaiian researcher is also looking at cultural sharing. G Byrnes confirmed this was the case.

Mayor Ayers commented that contestable funding is not always available every year, enquiring if the Trust envisaged funding being maintained over a number of years. C McMillan confirmed the Trust would appreciate if the funding was set for a number of years. She spoke of being dependent on grants which were often short term (yearly) and it would be beneficial to source longer term funding (3-4 years) to provide longer staffing contracts and assist with staff attraction and retention. The Trust were exploring options which could include a research centre which could potentially generate further funds.

G Byrnes commented generally on the group Trees that Count, the Western Ridge proposal, regeneration land options and strengthening partnership increasing vibrancy to the area.

Councillor Blackie commented on Iwi and Council being equal partners and clarification if the Trust was seeking to match funding. C McMillan confirmed that whilst funding was being sought, it was not necessarily for the same things but complementary which would have overall benefit to the community.
THAT the Council

(a) Receives report No 180119004236;

(b) Receives the Summary Business case for Te Kōhaka ō Tūhaitara Trust;

(c) Approves an annual Grant of $150,000 plus GST to Te Kōhaka ō Tūhaitara Trust that would contribute towards the additional operations cost of the conservation areas; subject to receiving a full business plan and breakdown of budget.

(d) Notes that budget provision is to be funded from the Governance Grants account and that this amount has tentatively been included within the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan. Excluding contributions in kind, the total amount provided within the 2018-28 LTP for grants and leases is $243,391 p.a.;

(e) Notes Te Kōhaka ō Tūhaitara Trust are also receiving land as a result of the Regeneration Plan and is be funded from a number of other external sources.

(f) Notes that Te Kōhaka ō Tūhaitara Trust is to incorporate into the Reserve Management Plan and the Statement of Intent additional objectives and measures in relation to the recently acquired ECMA & WCMA.

CARRIED

Councillor Atkinson spoke of development of the area since his involvement, the success of the Trust and the importance of continuing to move forward.

Councillor Blackie endorsed his colleague’s comments and was very supportive of the educational and ecological benefits and achievements to date.

Councillor Gordon was complimentary of progress and development of the Park, commenting that the support of the Council had been earned through progress and results achieved to date and he personally admired the work done.

Councillor Barnett stated she was delighted to hear about the links in the community, with schools, residents and Runanga. Councillor Barnett believed the work could not be measured in dollars and had received positive feedback from the community. She was confident the Western Ridge area would be looked after well by the Trust.

Councillor Stewart endorsed comments of such an exciting and successful project. Councillor Stewart stated she was fully supportive of granting $150,000 for the next ten years. She remarked on the work of the Trust fits with her personal vision of the park being a contributor to a national visitor attraction of the Waimakariri trails between two important rivers. Councillor Stewart encouraged members to support the project and visit again.

In his right of reply Councillor Atkinson commented on sea level rises and the work that is being undertaken at the Park, and how the whole community will benefit. He commented on the positive relationships and
the projects occurring in an affordable way that is accepted by the public. Councillor Atkinson believed the whole park area is a jewel in the crown of the district.

Mayor Ayers thanked the speakers for their ongoing work, commenting positively on the ecological benefits.

5.17 Rangiora Service Centre Refurbishment Project – R Hawthorne (Property Manager)

R Hawthorne spoke to the report providing an overview of issues within the Rangiora building primarily relating to frequent maintenance and ongoing staff accommodation space. Future reports would be provided as the various staging occurs of differing aspects of the project to clarify the spend at a particular time. He spoke of alternative options considered and associated risks and benefits considered.

Staff noted a preference for the councillor’s room to be referred to as a meeting room.

Councillor Barnett sought to understand the essential requirements and commented on the Farmers office space. J Palmer commented on the increased use of the staff area over the next two to three years and the team working environment. The proposal was significant for current purposes and would be anticipated appropriate for the next ten years. The demands and challenges on the Rangiora campus were outlined including outdated air conditioning systems, limited installation in some areas, cramped working areas, limitations of building infrastructure access. The proposal was aimed at improving efficiency of space, air flow systems and health and safety aspects.

Councillor Williams indicated support for some modifications, however queried the supporting figures, particularly against rental rates for other buildings in Rangiora and Southbrook. Mayor Ayers sought clarification and asked if alternative lease solutions were a possibility. J Millward clarified the proposal was about renovating what WDC currently has.

Councillor Stewart enquired if aspects of the project would be tendered. Staff confirmed a tender process would occur, then the Council would be updated accordingly once prices were received.

Moved: Councillor Atkinson Seconded: Councillor Gordon

THAT the Council

(a) Receives report CPR-05-04 / 180119004578
(b) Approves The Rangiora Service Centre Refurbishment Project at 215 High Street and budget $ 3,985,000;
(c) Notes that;
   • The expenditure timing in the LTP as 2018/19 ($2,300,000), 2019/20 ($1,685,000)
   • The option attends to identified hazards and risks – both health and safety as well as business continuity and performance
   • Provides future proofing for staff growth over the next 10 years and aligns with Ta Matou Mauri and the Council’s organisational culture.
• Several lease and refurbishment options have been reviewed and evaluated and this is considered the preferred and most viable option.
• Adds value to the existing asset and improves the working environment for existing staff, as well as allowing for a more adaptable re-use of the building either for sale or for integration with a building extension, if needed.

CARRIED

Councillor Atkinson commended staff for accepting the current restrictive accommodation and an employer’s responsibility. Councillor Atkinson remarked on having respect for staff and the need to look after the people who look after the community.

Councillor Gordon endorsed comments, and the duty to provide a safe and healthy place to work, noting the substandard air-conditioning. Councillor Gordon emphasised the need to plan for the future. He reflected on Christchurch City rental rates and effects after the earthquakes and the subsequent changes in the rental market. He acknowledged Councillor Williams view however believed that whilst the build cost may be lower once the fit out is added it averages information in the staff report.

Mayor Ayers agreed with many of the previous comments particularly the various levels of accommodation around the Rangiora campus and was supportive of improving air systems etc.

Councillor Barnett explained her earlier questions, public perceptions and acknowledged the back office conditions. Councillor Barnett believed it was important to inform the public about the conditions, the need for the investment and commitment to being a good employer with appropriate health and safety standards.

Councillor Stewart endorsed the recommendations, and challenged Councillor Williams to submit a tender if he could build for substantially less than what was reported. Councillor Stewart would await the tender information and plans. Councillor Stewart commented on being conscious of the public purse, and balancing the responsibility to the staff for appropriate accommodation as it was unacceptable for staff to continue in the current conditions.

Councillor Blackie was supportive of the motion, commenting on various options and balancing funding.

Councillor Williams was supportive of the motion acknowledging the ‘rabbit warren’ however believed that long term the Rangiora building is not going to be suitable therefore cautioned the need to be smart about proposed improvements.

In his right of reply Councillor Atkinson acknowledged Councillor Williams’ right to question expenditure and looked forward to the next phase.

The meeting adjourned at 12.45pm and recommenced at 1.20pm.
5.18 **Waimakariri District Plan Review – District Plan Review Budget – T Ellis (Development Planning Manager)**

T Ellis provided an overview of the two stage process required to implement a new District Plan. The Plan is evidence based throughout the process, hence the need for contracting experts in at various points through the process. T Ellis provided an update on where neighbouring councils are at with their Review and implementation, which Waimakariri can take learnings from and commented that information sharing on best practice is occurring.

Councillor Williams queried the Rangiora Town Centre (RTC) Strategy budget of $100,000, asking why just one town. S Markham explained the RTC Strategy which feature traffic and transport prominently. He then explained a similar process was underway in for Kaiapoi and that Oxford matters had been recently updated with the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board. S Markham also commented on commercial facilities such as Ravenswood would come up for discussion at a later phase. The budget funding being sought was proposed for investigative technical aspects for the RTC Strategy.

Councillor Doody queried staffing requirements and whether student interns was applicable. T Ellis confirmed that interns had already been sourced and utilised for aspects of the strategy project.

Moved: Councillor Atkinson  
Seconded: Councillor Blackie

**THAT** the Council

(a) **Receives** report No. 171215136380.

(b) **Approves** loan funding of $4.131 Million to complete the statutory process of the District Plan Review over the five-year period to 2022/23 as set out in paragraph 3.6 below.

(c) **Notes** the estimated total cost of the District Plan Review is $8million.

(d) **Notes** a loan funding repayment period of 15 years (to 2032/33).

**CARRIED**

Councillor Atkinson commented on past conversations regarding costs and process and the work involved to date. He remarked on the legislative process required and that Waimakariri is undertaking a significant project for less cost than Selwyn Council are undertaking their District Plan review.

5.19 **Additional Business and Centres Unit Resource – S Hart (Business and Centres Manager) and S Markham (Manager Engagement and Strategy)**

S Hart highlighted key aspects of the report noting key aspects of good relationship management, leadership, co-ordination and development of resources for the community. Each type of actively has grown across a range of projects with many core project plans being close to completion and ready for implementation soon, which requires greater resourcing. Tables in the report were referenced.

Councillor Williams sought clarification on the role, and whether it was a double up of resource that ENC provide. S Markham responded that ENC is about business attraction which is complimentary to council resources;
provided an example of Cones Street, proposed development and the
different council units that would be involved from planning, consenting,
roading etc. The current role of S Hart provides a single link with council
departments for varying consents required.

Councillor Stewart sought further clarification of S Hart responsibilities.
S Markham further explained the concept of the new business
experiencing the different council units in an integrated way. It was
acknowledged some smaller businesses take more time to work through
the process due in part to their own resourcing. The day to day work
S Hart undertakes was explained with examples provided of that ongoing
relationship from initial conversations, through to implementation. There
were currently a number of developments occurring, with others still
working through options. The aim was to be more proactive rather than
reactive, making the Council more business friendly. The role S Hart
undertakes is seen as the project manager for RTC and KTC.

Councillor Barnett asked if there was a case for bringing ENC in-house
resource. S Markham advised it was part of a wider issue of the Council
being at arm’s length of the economic basis. In a supplementary question
Councillor Barnett enquired if it would be possible to bring some aspects
in-house. S Markham spoke of a phase in the earthquake recovery, the
role of ENC being business attraction and the different expertise required
for navigating through council processes. Staff commented on being
organised internally to deal with new business in an integrated way.

Councillor Barnett sought evidence of what the current role had achieved in
the last two to three years to assist justifying the proposal. S Markham
referred to the business case and information in the report.

Councillor Barnett spoke of economic development and administration
support from other Council areas. S Markham reiterated time spent with
developers, and the strategy planning being part of S Hart role with the
implementation of two Town Strategies. S Markham commented on other
department resourcing.

Councillor Barnett enquired if on-line information would assist. S Hart
advised that initially a physical presence is required, followed by a second
stage of online information and thirdly physical presence again with
education and liaison. S Hart commented on the complexities of providing
guidance and advice on regulatory application processes. On-line
information would not reduce the overall input required.

J Palmer acknowledged the need to improve the level of service to the
customer, particularly regulatory related. He reflected on the creation of
the role and the differences and improvements that have occurred as a
result of S Hart’s role. Some pressure points had been identified, including
with the ownership of Town Centre Strategy and the proposal before
Council was another step to improving that level of service.

Moved: Councillor Gordon Seconded: Councillor Doody

THAT the Council

(a) Receives Report No. 180109001129

(b) Notes the information contained in the attached Resourcing
Business Case.
(c) **Notes** the potential resourcing options illustrated in the Options and Issues section below.

(d) **Approves** an annual inclusion of $100,000 into the Business and Centres Unit budget for a permanent full time Business and Centres Advisor (Resourcing Option 3C as per section 3.3 below).

(e) **Circulates** a copy of this report to Community Boards for their information.

**CARRIED**

*Against Councillors Barnett, Stewart and Williams*

Councillor Gordon believed the CE had summed up the value of the role. He acknowledged people need assistance to navigate through the various council processes. Councillor Gordon remarked that he wanted the Council to have a good reputation, and customer experiences reflects on all of us. Councillor Gordon reflected on his experiences as the Business, Promotion and Town Centre portfolio holder.

Councillor Doody spoke of the importance of building good relationships with potential business from the first impression.

Councillor Williams was complimentary of the current role. Councillor Williams remarked on developers generally having their own resources, and should pay for the service rather than ratepayers generally. He believed more use of ENC resourcing should occur, or alternatively move some of the ENC budget towards this proposal and Councillor Williams believed there was some doubling of resource.

Councillor Barnett was generally supportive of the current role and work undertaken to date. However Councillor Barnett believed the responsibility should lie across all staff for developing the culture and customer experience. Councillor Barnett stated she was yet to be convinced that there was a need for a second person as proposed and concerned with the budget impact suggesting the administrative aspect be resourced internally.

Councillor Atkinson stated he was still deciding the merits of the proposal, and reflected when he advocated for the role in 2011 which came to fruition in 2015 and how things evolve. Councillor Atkinson commented on competition for business from other authorities, population growth and the need to attract business, economic benefits including people working in the district. Councillor Atkinson stated he did not believe the proposed role was the function of ENC, however he accepted there was some cross over with other budgets and departments. Councillor Atkinson complimented the work undertaken by S Hart.

Councillor Stewart held some concerns that had already been raised, however acknowledged the benefits of the current role. Councillor Stewart stated she was supportive of more resource if the proposal combined with the Business Support Manager from ENC being brought in-house. Councillor Stewart believed this would enable administrative assistance to be better supported across the organisation. Councillor Stewart remarked she would like to see complete review of both functions and that the ratepayers need transparency and accountability.
Councillor Brine responded to Councillor Stewart’s comments. Councillor Brine was supportive of the proposal if further investment is made. He believed the district benefits from this role and ENC and had seen the evidence.

Mayor Ayers commented on being a growing district as are the businesses, and he would be interested in the next census data of who works or lives outside the district. Mayor Ayers reflected on the importance of momentum of what had been started with many new business being small to medium in size and the Council recognising the need to provide assistance to work through regulatory process. Mayor Ayers reiterated the function of ENC and the differences being proposed relating to council/consenting/building processes and the importance of someone in-house coordinating between different departments. Mayor Ayers commented on personal experiences with potential business operators and encouraged councillors to support the proposal.

Councillor Felstead stated he had heard no negative aspects with the current role, however the question is does the role need support and he believed it was outlined in the report and with staff presentation.

Councillor Blackie remarked the question for him came down to value for money, such as spreading the role among existing staff or having one dedicated person.

6. MATTERS REFERRED FROM COUNCIL AND COMMITTEES

Item 6.1 is referred from the Council meeting of 5 December 2017 being report reference 171123127385.


K Waghorn spoke to the report and tabled an amended recommendation (k) to enable the proposal to be included into the LTP.

Moved: Councillor Brine Seconded: Councillor Doody

THAT the Council

(a) Receives report No. 171123127385.

(b) Approves the following inclusions and amendments in the 2017 Waste Management & Minimisation Plan.

1. Insert Option C as the preferred kerbside collection service in Section 5.4 comprising service choices of: rates-funded recycling bin, collected fortnightly; user-pays WDC rubbish bag OR rates-funded rubbish bin, collected fortnightly; AND/OR rates-funded mixed organics bin, collected weekly.

2. Insert the below targets in Section 2.2

   a. Reduce annual per capita waste to landfill from 294kg per capita in 2015/16 to 236kg per capita by 2029
b. Increase the annual per capita quantity of materials diverted from 170kg per capita in 2015/16 to **228kg per capita** by 2029

(c) **Notes** that the final draft version of the 2017 Waste Management & Minimisation Plan will be brought to the Council for approval after the 2018-2028 LTP has been approved.

(d) **Notes** that the Long Term Plan solid waste budgets, Solid Waste Activity Management Plan and solid waste section in the Infrastructure Strategy will be prepared using the kerbside collection methodology as approved in 2(b(i)).

(e) **Includes** a proposal in the Draft LTP to change the rating policy so that motels and other similar businesses only pay for one recycling targeted rate per property. Additional bins, if requested, would be provided and rated at the standard charges.

(f) **Requests** staff to bring further advice to the Council following the LTP consultation regarding the option of the Council or the Contractor owning the bins.

(g) **Requests** staff to bring the proposed engagement method and material for asking property owners which service option they choose to Council for approval prior to release.

(h) **Requests** that staff provide information on proposed fees and charges for properties to change their future service option following their initial choice.

(i) **Requests** staff, prior to the introduction of the new services, to enquire of each eligible household which services they wish to use. If no choice is made the default position will be that the property continues to receive a fortnightly recycling service and has access to the Council’s user pays fortnightly bag collection service.

(j) **Increases** the level of education to the public on the reduction of waste including diversion to green waste.

(k) ** Approves** inclusion of Option C comprising the following service choices as the preferred kerbside collection service for public consultation in the LTP 2018-28 and its associated Consultation Document:

1. Rates-funded recycling bin, collected fortnightly.
2. User-payers WDC rubbish bag OR rates-funded rubbish bin, collected fortnightly
3. AND/OR rates-funded mixed organics bins, collected weekly.

CARRIED

Councillor Brine remarked that this proposal had been through an extensive public process and this was another opportunity for the community to provide feedback.

Mayor Ayers reflected the matter had already been through a special consultative procedure and this was the second stage that is required.
Item 6.2 is referred from the Utilities & Roading Committee meeting of 12 December 2017 being report reference 171122126970.

6.2 **Utilities and Roading Activity Management Plans 2018 – G Cleary (Manager Utilities and Roading) and S Collin (Infrastructure Strategy Manager)**

S Collin spoke to the report, briefly outlining amendments. It was advised the final document would come back at the finalisation stage of the LTP, which will incorporate any amendments.

Moved: Councillor Atkinson  Seconded: Councillor Meyer

**THAT the Council**

(a) **Adopts** the following 2018 Activity Management Plans for Roading, Water, Wastewater, Drainage, Stockwater, and Solid Waste:

i. **Introduction, IFR-02-01**, TRIM 170724076981

ii. **Roading AMP, IFR-02-02.04**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(b) Scheme / Document Reference</th>
<th>TRIM Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 1 Executive Summary Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018</td>
<td>170321027383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 2 Introduction Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018</td>
<td>170321027382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3 Levels Of Service Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018</td>
<td>170321027378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4 Future Demand Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018</td>
<td>170321027379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5 Risk Management Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018</td>
<td>170321027377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 6 Life Cycle Management Plan Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018</td>
<td>170321027282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 7 Financial Summary Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018</td>
<td>170321027375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 8 Asset Management Practices Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018</td>
<td>170321027374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 9 Plan Improvement And Monitoring Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018</td>
<td>170321027381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 10 Appendices Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018</td>
<td>170321027373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix A Glossary of Terms Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018</td>
<td>170321027372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix B 2018 Draft Strategic Business Case</td>
<td>171025115475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix C Level Of Services Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018</td>
<td>170321027288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix D 2018 Roading Valuation Report Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018</td>
<td>171201130750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix E Capital Works Forward Works Programme Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018</td>
<td>170321027277</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

i. **Water Supply AMP, IFR-02-03**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme / Document Reference</th>
<th>TRIM Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Supply AMP Overview Document 2018</td>
<td>170822090191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme / Document Reference</td>
<td>TRIM Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi (including Pines/Kairaki) AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus/Woodend Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Urban Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Rural No. 2 Water Supply AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Rural No. 1 Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikuku Beach Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cust Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville/Fernside Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summerhill Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poyntz Road Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Eyreton Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrymere Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117714</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Wastewater AMP, IFR-02-04

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme / Document Reference</th>
<th>TRIM Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater AMP Overview Document 2018</td>
<td>161116117659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern District's Wastewater Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Wastewater Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Wastewater Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend Wastewater Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus Wastewater Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikuku Beach Wastewater Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville Wastewater Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pines/Kairaki Wastewater Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuahiwi Wastewater Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend Beach Wastewater Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Wastewater Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loburn Lea Wastewater Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernside Wastewater Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117682</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Drainage AMP, IFR-02-05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme / Document Reference</th>
<th>TRIM Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drainage AMP Overview Document 2018</td>
<td>161116117610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal urban Drainage Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus Urban Drainage Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Rural Drainage Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka Rural Drainage Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loburn Lea Rural Drainage Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Urban Drainage Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Rural Drainage Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarkville Rural Drainage Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Urban Drainage Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cust Rural Drainage Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Urban Drainage Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Rural Drainage Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117602</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
iv. **Stockwater AMP, IFR-02-06**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme / Document Reference</th>
<th>TRIM Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stock Water Race AMP 2018</td>
<td>16115117090</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

v. **Solid Waste AMP, IFR-02-07**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme / Document Reference</th>
<th>TRIM Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste AMP November 2018</td>
<td>171129129620</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Notes that the levels of service provided for are reflected in the draft budgets for the Long Term Plan (LTP)

**CARRIED**

*Items 6.3 to 6.5 are referred from the Community and Recreation Committee meeting of 21 November 2017 with copies of the three reports provided.*

6.3 **Community Green Space Strategic Planning – C Brown (Community Green Space Manager)**

C Brown commented on the different aspects of the report and highlighting key areas of each strategy and the reasoning behind the recommendations. Staff commented on the level of service and prudent budget.

Mayor Ayers referred to toilets in Rangiora, particularly in the town centre asking if staff had considered increased publicity and signs on where public toilets, such as the New World public toilets are located. Staff referred to pg 694 reflecting on a proposal of promotion. C Sargison commented on the demand placed on the library toilets which was primarily to cater for library users and that people would use Victoria Park toilets if they were of a better quality.

Councillor Williams queried tree maintenance against budget levels. Staff advised there was no increase to the budget, but the number of trees staff were responsible for overseeing had increased in the district. Maintenance was undertaken with less frequency for the same funding. Staff advised the greenspace maintenance contract would tendered later this year. It was noted that Council trees are maintained on a height basis, and because of development in the future there will be a need to increase the budget due to the increasing number of larger trees. Currently the Council oversee approximately 19,000 trees.

Councillor Barnett queried the sports strategy consultation as it appeared no consultation had occurred with schools or play centres. C Sargison explained where the expertise is based, and liaison with many different groups. Mayor Ayers commented on the interaction with Community Boards and localised consultation. C Sargison commented on discussions with Community Boards of each strategy.

In a supplementary question Councillor Barnett enquired about signage in rural areas. Staff confirmed it was occurring in rural areas as well as urban areas.
Councillor Gordon enquired if the Youth Council had been consulted on aspects of the report. Staff confirmed that the group had been consulted.

Moved: Councillor Blackie  Seconded: Councillor Gordon

THAT the Council

(a) Receives report No. 171103119339

(b) Receives the Sports Facilities Strategy (Trim: 171114123628)

(c) Receives the Public Toilet Strategy (Trim: 171114123588)

(d) Receives the Play Space Strategy (Trim: 171114123637)

(e) Approves a new level of service for the maintenance of street reserve and cemetery trees which provides a programmed maintenance visit for all trees based on the below table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Example Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Streets</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>Williams St Kaiapoi, Main St Oxford, Good St, Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Reserves</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>Arlington Reserve, Corcoran Reserve, Pearson Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Roads</td>
<td>7 yearly</td>
<td>Keetley Place, Libby drive, Mill Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Reserves</td>
<td>7 yearly</td>
<td>View Hill Domain, Whites Road Reserve, West Oxford Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Profile Reserves</td>
<td>annually</td>
<td>Victoria Park, Kaiapoi Domain, Rangiora Service Centre, Trousselot Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young tree Maintenance</td>
<td>annually</td>
<td>WDC planted trees under 8 years old</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(f) Notes that approving the levels of service for tree maintenance will have no impact on current budget allocation.

(g) Notes that no additional land is required to be purchased over the LTP period.

(h) Notes that the artificial provision of $1.7million in 2018/19 is no longer required.

(i) Approves the provision of $1.7million over the ten year period for upgrading and development of existing sports facilities.

(j) Notes that there is a separate report on the provision of indoor court facilities.

(k) Approves an additional total of $500,000 of capital expenditure over ten year period to provide for a new toilet at Mandeville Sports Ground (Equestrian), Milton Memorial Reserve and West Oxford Reserve. Note that the previous LTP had a funding provision of $114,000 in 20/21.
(l) **Notes** that staff will investigate funding opportunities from the Tourism Infrastructure fund for West Oxford Reserve and Saltwater Creek.

(m) **Approves** an additional total of $90,000 capital replacement funding over the ten year period for replacement of existing toilets which will make a total funding $1,150,000 over the period of the LTP.

(n) **Approves** the inclusion of an additional $415,000 of capital expenditure over the ten year period for development of playgrounds at Hurunui Reserve, Milton Memorial Reserve, Kippenberger/Elm Green and a skate park for the Woodend/Pegasus Area.

(o) **Notes** that $190,000 is included for playground replacement which is consistent with previous years funding.

**CARRIED**

Councillor Blackie complimented staff on the report.

Councillor Barnett stated the information in the report was a good step forward, although she believed the youth voice was missing.

Mayor Ayers commented on visiting various parks with grandchildren and their enjoyment.

6.4 **Community Facilities Provision – C Sargison (Manager Community and Recreation)**

C Sargison spoke briefly to the report reflecting on conversations with Community Boards and the Community & Recreation Committee. Pg 477 was referred to and staff recommended removing recommendation (i) based on neighbourhood feedback. Staff spoke of the demands of balancing the level of service and commented on reasoning behind the recommendations.

C Sargison spoke of community interest in setting up a Community House (hub) for community groups based in Rangiora, mentioning community building re-builds and feedback.

Councillor Felstead sought clarification on recommendation (c) wording referring to library square area, and potential feedback from sectors of the community and sought a wording change as a basis for district wide planning library service provision.

Councillor Blackie enquired how can an in-depth investigation for a library for an area such as Ravenswood occur until the area is developed, and queried the potential spending of $40,000k now. C Sargison commented on the need for more investigation to form a business case around both Pegasus and Ravenswood as several different options were available. Staff were aware of localised demand and thoughts, however the report not commit the Council to anything past the information stage.

Councillor Barnett commented on Ruataniwha as being the main library for servicing the eastern seaboard population and questioned why were options for Pegasus being considered when so much money had been spent at Kaiapoi. C Sargison acknowledged the reasoning for Ruataniwha, which experiences high usage, and an option for Pegasus is to do nothing.
There was a demand from the Pegasus community which resulted in a community building space and now people are going there with younger children other feedback is being received. It’s a matter of balancing the level of service. With the district population the main two libraries will always be Kaiapoi and Rangiora. A possible option is an electronic kiosk or possibly a permanent facility in Ravenswood or Pegasus. It may not be a full stand-alone facility but could be an annex of existing facility, hence further investigation to explore options.

Councillor Barnett asked what discussion had occurred for a combined Rangiora campus. Staff advised the property team would discuss that aspect at tomorrow’s Council meeting. There is still a need due to population and use that the Rangiora library would require an extension. J Palmer spoke of a campus assessment and timing of any upgrade in the 2020/25 years as there is a placeholder budget currently.

Moved: Councillor Brine Seconded: Councillor Gordon

THAT the Council

(a) Receives report No 171026115830
(b) Receives the Community Facilities Report (Trim 171017112201)
(c) Approves the level of service for provision of library space of 60m2 per 1000 population as the basis for district wide planning.
(d) Approves staff investigating off site storage space for library collection storage in either Rangiora or Kaiapoi and reporting back to Council.
(e) Approves the provision of $40,000 in Year 1 of the Draft LTP to allow for further investigation of the provision of a Library/Community Meeting Space in either Ravenswood Business Centre or Pegasus with such a facility coming on line in Year 10 of the Draft LTP.
(f) Approves the level of service for provision of community meeting space for new communities to service a population of 2,500 it is proposed that there is a facility to cater for around 80 people plus storage space. This can be stand alone or incorporated as part of a facility such as a Library.
(g) Notes that the only part of the District that does not meet this standard is Pegasus and Woodend depending on the speed of residential development.
(h) Notes that it is expected that the need for additional community facilities for meeting spaces in Rangiora will be met by developments currently being planned by the Anglican and Presbyterian Churches.
(i) Approves staff investigating the potential for using available Council Mixed Use Business Land in the Regeneration Area, for potential development of community owned buildings and notes that staff will prepare a report for Council’s consideration.
(j) Notes that there is no provision for further expansion or development of Aquatic Facilities in the District for the next ten years as the existing facilities have capacity to cope with projected growth.
(k) Approves the following financial provisions being included in the Draft LTP:
### LTP YEAR

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>Investigation into location of Library Ravenswood/Pegasus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>Further planning for library extension at Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$3M$</td>
<td>Detailed design and construction commencement of Rangiora Library extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>Car-parking development for land approved for community groups buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$3.5M</td>
<td>Completion of Rangiora Library extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>Landscaping/car-parking on land approved for community group’s buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3.9m</td>
<td>New Library at Ravenswood/Pegasus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(i) Circulates this report to the Boards.

Councillor Brine commented positively on the comprehensive report provided.

Councillor Barnett expressed concern that there was no Council facility that could handle more than 350 people for events, although acknowledged she was not fully aware of facilities being proposed by community or church organisations. Councillor Barnett spoke of the importance of maintaining a placeholder budget for facilities in Pegasus sooner than later and remarked on recreation facilities to cater for the growing older population across the district.

Mayor Ayers reflected on the importance of finding a balance of district wide facilities as well as individual township requirements. Mayor Ayers commented that Ravenswood should be referred to as North Woodend.

### 6.5 Community Team Funding – C Sargison (Manager Community and Recreation)

C Sargison spoke to the report and reflected on discussions held at the Community & Recreation Committee and options that where considered. It was noted figures had been slightly amended against the budget figures.

Councillor Barnett enquired if funding had been lost. Staff confirmed some external funding has been reduced and explained the circumstances. Staff were working with Greater Christchurch to lever funding and would continue to work with Central Government.

Moved: Mayor Ayers  Seconded: Councillor Gordon

THAT the Council

(a) Receives report No. 171107120563
(b) **Approves** the Community Team being staffed at a level of 5.15 FTE funded from rates which was the staffing level in 2016/17.

(c) **Notes** that external funding is anticipated of $80,000 which will fund project delivery.

(d) **Approves** a rating contribution of $709,551 for the Community Team being included in the Draft Long Term Plan.

(e) **Notes** that staff will continue to work closely with Central Government Agencies and will keep Council informed of any further potential partnering opportunities.

**CARRIED**

Against Councillor Williams

Councillor Barnett stated her appreciation of pressures on funding however there is a jump in funding and was mindful of how funds are spent. Councillor Barnett commented on a change of priorities from central government such as child poverty and mental health including alcohol and potential impact on future funding.

Councillor Williams stated he was in favour option (c) as he believed the more we fund projects, the less opportunity there is to receive funding from other places and therefore would vote against the motion.


D Roxborough spoke to the report, highlighting key progress and provided an updated on the current work programme status. The report covered both aspects of the wharf redevelopment as well as the overall Regeneration programme.

Councillor Doody referenced soil on-site and whether it could be reused or was it contaminated. D Roxborough explained the testing regime which will occur for all soil moved on site and staff were currently investigating volumes of soil required in various areas.

Councillor Barnett queried the feasibility of the work programme in the first two years. D Roxborough commented on the work programme and the drivers behind it, with most work occurring in Kaiapoi East and a smaller portion of work occurring in the Kaiapoi West regeneration area. As different works occur, staff assess projects and work on the many of the recreation and ecological linkages at the same time.

Councillor Williams sought clarification on the $400,000 component of the budget and whether it was related to pontoons. Staff spoke of the nett shortfall and the change of project scope from earlier proposals. It had been decided to sure up the wharf wall and enable dredging.

In a supplementary question Councillor Williams asked if the pontoon timeframe could be moved out and initially just complete the bank wall initially as it may assist financial pressures. Staff advised that was an option and decision available to the Council. C Sargison explained regeneration steering group discussions, affects from the development work further along, and community feedback seeking completion sooner than later.
J Millward explained how the regeneration projects were being funded, via an earthquake loan progressively spread over 25 years. J Palmer commented on the level of service and policy consideration around the pontoons rather than the timing of the expenditure.

Councillor Atkinson enquired if the pontoons are the only thing that could generate income via commercial boat users. Staff advised a report will be furnished to the Council at a later time, outlining income projections.

Moved: Councillor Blackie Seconded: Councillor Atkinson

THAT the Council

(a) Receives report No. 171109121919.

(b) Approves the budget for the Regeneration programme; noting that the proposed budget requests an additional $10,497,000 of funding in order to deliver the programme as outlined in this report, with a total programme value of approximately $18,381,000 expenditure.

(c) Notes that the overall Regeneration programme estimate and the timing of some key projects has changed since the last update in May/June 2017.

(d) Approves the budget for the Kaiapoi Wharf Marine Precinct and Riverbanks programme, which, after allowance for some reappropriation of existing budget components, includes an increase of approximately $450,000 over currently approved budgets, with some changes in the planned timing of expenditure.

(e) Notes that the overall Kaiapoi Wharf Marine Precinct & Riverbanks programme budget estimate and the timing of some key projects has changed since the last update in November 2017 (Trim: 171026116121[v2]).

CARRIED

Councillor Blackie commented on an excellent report outlining the intention to futureproof the project. He acknowledged the increased cost of with the piling works, however the steering group had been trimming other aspects of the regeneration related projects to assist a reduction of costs overall. Councillor Blackie was hopeful that the pontoon cost may be reduced when accurately priced and he was comfortable with current budgets, information and overall project timeframes.

Councillor Atkinson reflected on past discussions and debate through the process over the past year, when the regeneration steering group considered many different options, and altered plans for a better outcome both financially and amenity wise overall. He spoke of the benefits of strengthening and extending the river wall and the importance of the area overall being situated in the town centre. Councillor Atkinson spoke strongly of the importance of the river and the vitality it can bring to the heart of Kaiapoi. Councillor Atkinson reflected on the number of boats and visitors that utilised the river prior to the earthquakes and the income generated to the local community. The vision and reality is to build back the area better than before for the community and the benefit for all Councillor Atkinson remarked.

Councillor Doody stated she was supportive of the project and spoke of looking longer term by improving the vibrancy and economy of Kaiapoi by it becoming a destination town and people appreciating the river.
Councillor Williams supportive of the plan, but conscious of spreading cost on the ratepayers, however he stated he was more comfortable now that he had a greater understanding of the project.

Councillor Stewart stated she was comfortable with this budget and hopeful some costings may yet decrease. Councillor Stewart reflected on the focus of the river and the engagement with the town. She believed an upside of the earthquake was the opportunity to rejuvenate the buzz of the river town. Councillor Stewart acknowledged the budget shortfall but believed it was a sensible decision to strengthen the river wall.

Mayor Ayers commented generally on earthquake recovery projects and being paid from a particular funding source. He believed it was not beneficial to delay projects. Mayor Ayers stated the need to look at the programme as a whole and the relationship and impacts from one project to the next, including capacity to undertake the work and construction. Mayor Ayers commented on it being more than seven years since the quakes, and the changing situations of plans.

7. **BUDGETS**

7.1 **Roading**

K Stevenson presented the budget commentary. G Cleary noted several adjustments to information including direct payment to developers, Ivory Street widening and the $400,000 improvement component that can be utilised for any development works that may occur around the Red Lion Corner development.

Mayor Ayers commented on Skew Bridge. K Stevenson explained the new phase of finishing many major projects. J Palmer enquired if there was a need for a specific line item for Red Lion Corner, however staff believed not at this stage but would confirm any budget when development occurs.

Councillor Stewart sought clarification regarding Skew Bridge budget in 2020 and would like to see that work brought forward. K Stevenson explained planning was to commence in 2018/19 year, and the build occur in the following year. The West Kaiapoi work was spread over several years.

Councillor Gordon enquired if there was adequate funding for surface renewal ie tar/hot weather damaging. K Stevenson explained weather extremes, and was satisfied with the budget provision, however acknowledged Oxford Road issues. Roads were assessed regularly and provisions for any additional surfacing work if required. Following a supplementary question regarding Oxford Road/West Belt and Acacia Avenue being major arterials K Stevenson commented on the alignment of budgets and investment on levels of service.

Mayor Ayers commented on melting tar and if we do it different than in Australia as he had not experienced the same conditions. K Stevenson explained how roads are built and maintained with ongoing top-ups, and the need to sometimes clear the top layer and restart with new seal.

Councillor Felstead queried timing of Tram Road safety improvements and Coldstream Road. Staff commented on developer works and another budget, and acknowledged the timing issue for footpaths in Coldstream Road now hockey is in use there, but the matter would not be dealt with until indoor sports stadium was built. More planning is required and...
therefore staff are reluctant to put in infrastructure earlier until the planning has been undertaken. The budget was currently a placeholder.

Councillor Barnett referred to the Pegasus connection through to Gladstone Road and queried the project timing. K Stevenson explained Community Board and Council conversations held last year and the temporary access solution that is there currently. Permanent connection issues were explained. The appropriate time to undertake the connection work between the two areas is when the Woodend Bypass is built.

Councillor Barnett queried pg 12 budgets and area wide treatment decrease in funding. Staff explained low inflation in roading and contracting rates with no change to the level of service.

Councillor Barnett queried a change in operating surplus. J Millward explained roading revaluation changes and the adjustment being spread over three years.

Councillor Barnett queried pg 5 cost increases and management of roads. Staff advised of a Council briefing and the network is stable, acknowledging a need to move forward with more information on network strength; with increased information better outcomes will be enabled.

Councillor Barnett asked if 18 years was a realistic timeframe for road life. K Stevenson confirmed it was for this district, and spoke of risks if less was spent and the support from NZTA on the proposals going forward. Staff believe the current balance is optimal across the network. J Palmer commented on 50km of road being sealed each year which creates the perception of the roads being poor but it is across the district. Staff acknowledged higher volume roads receive a higher profile. This year the Council was spending more on hot mix rather than chip seal because of the type of urban roads being upgraded, but next year it is likely to be more chip seal roads as material purchase is based on need.

Councillor Barnett enquired if there was a higher level of service for entrances into towns contributing to improved economic development. K Stevenson discussed landscaping and entranceways into townships and cycleways that assists, and also reflected on Community Board discussions. There were no specific line items however Flaxton Road and Lineside Road improvements are included in the programme. Councillor Barnett expressed concerned that roading budgets were not enough. Staff commented on balancing planning, minor and major renewals and time factors.

Mayor Ayers enquired to what extent was it anticipated an increase on roads, particularly for connections between Kaiapoi and Rangiora and Ohoka Road use and does the level of service for the roads adjust. K Stevenson commented on Stone Street and how it becomes a renewal project, noted through inspections and assessments. He also commented on the Ohoka Road roundabout and not currently being at capacity, acknowledging the volume may change once roadworks to the south finish and the northern arterial is in full use.

Councillor Gordon commented on amenity landscaping for town entrances, and a recent meeting with Roading and Greenspace management, where a number of issues and differing level of service was discussed. Mayor Ayers instructed the staff and Councillor Gordon to involve all Rangiora-Ashley Councillors in any future discussions.

Councillor Doody sought clarity on private works for stock underpasses. Staff advised underpasses is classified under minor works.
Councillor Williams commented on town entrances, and the maintenance of gravel roads such as Boyes Road which is seeing an increase in use. Several other gravel roads were also mentioned in the Tuahiwi area. G Cleary commented on traffic volumes increases, junctions sealed and thresholds for road sealing.

In a supplementary query Councillor Williams was concerned with increase of accidents on mentioned roads. Staff advised recent accidents, including a rolled vehicle were non-injury with some people using the area like a race track. All gravel roads are graded regularly, often monthly.

Councillor Williams commented on increased truck usage and potentially damaging the road quicker. Staff commented on adjustments to the maintenance programme. Mayor Ayers suggested a memo outlining key unsealed roads with traffic volume information would be helpful to members, as he reflected on Thongcaster and Barkers Road outcomes.

Councillor Stewart enquired what the plan was for Bramleys Road which is a mix of seal and some gravel along its length. G Cleary confirmed 100m from Bramleys into Tuahiwi Corner was sealed including in front of ‘aunty pats’ property. Staff commented on options to seal and potential problems with rat run behaviour and negative issues that could be caused flowing on to other connector roads. General discussion on related matters with a future workshop were signalled.

J Palmer raised matters pertaining to two placeholder budgets being the town centre parking in Rangiora, with further information being available at the May deliberations; and the Park and Ride being subject to change from government priorities and no specific proposals. The timing and quantum on both projects could change.

Moved: Mayor Ayers Seconded: Councillor Atkinson

THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

CARRIED

7.2 Solid Waste

K Waghorn spoke to the budget highlighting key aspects, and adjustments including a weight change and minimum charge being reduced.

Councillor Barnett queried the decrease in bag costs. Staff advised the last waste audit indicated the weight in bags had increased meaning a better utilisation of the bag. In a supplementary question Councillor Barnett asked why greenwaste had increased $20. Staff advised greenwaste was disposed locally but it is now sent to Christchurch with higher transportation costs associated.

Mayor Ayers reflected on motel owner feedback, asking if the individual motel could decide what level of bin they require and rated accordingly. Staff commented that the recommendation from the hearing panel is included in rating policy and is trying to bring the situation in line with residential properties.

Mayor Ayers commented on charity shops and disposing of other peoples waste dumped at their sites and requested costs for vouchers for charity
shops to dispose that type of waste. J Palmer recommended a report through either Utilities and Roading Committee or the Hazardous Waste Working Party to look at matters any give consideration of any change. Councillor Brine wondered what consequences could result.

Councillor Williams enquired if there had been any consideration to greenwaste going to Kate Valley for methane use. Staff advised is it currently cheaper to send greenwaste to Christchurch for composting.

Moved: Mayor Ayers    Seconded: Councillor Atkinson

THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

**CARRIED**

### 7.3 Water

C Roxburgh spoke to key budget aspects and outlined reasoning for changes which included past budgets been underestimated for proposed work, so the increase reflected the forecast changes to maintain the operations plan.

Councillor Atkinson queried the variations in depreciation. Staff advised on the improved asset data capturing depreciation and the revalued assets which have increased. It was a combination of growth and change in pipe material and jointing type which affects the life span, particularly in Kaiapoi.

Councillor Barnett sought clarification of differences between 2018/19 and 2019/20 budgets enquiring if it was related to UV proposed changes and if it could be smoothed over several more years. J Palmer acknowledged comments and would check information during the meeting.

Councillor Barnett referred to the Darnley Reservoir with staff explaining emergency storage provisions.

Councillor Barnett queried other water budget aspects with staff commenting on growth modelling, development contributions and effects of various changes.

Councillor Williams queried depreciation of pipes and pipe failures. Staff explained issues often with joint (such as a glue process used 20 years ago), and it being more cost effective to replace the pipe now than dig up each joint.

Moved: Mayor Ayers    Seconded: Councillor Atkinson

THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

**CARRIED**

### 7.4 Wastewater

C Parton spoke briefly to the budget commentary, highlighting the interest in uptake to the proposed Tuahiwi scheme, reflecting on the Master Plan of proposed works and increased volume of proposed renewals required to maintain the appropriate level of service.
Councillor Atkinson enquired about the ocean outfall consent timeframe. G Cleary advised the consent renewal falls outside this LTP timeframe. However staff anticipate an issue with the flow due to growth and impact on consent conditions and outlined two options relating to the consent.

In a supplementary question Councillor Atkinson asked what budget allowance was there for preparation for the upcoming consent process. K Simpson advised $50,000 was included in budgets for undertaking a capacity assessment and modelling for future growth to then relate to consent. The consent for discharge finishes in 2039.

Councillor Williams enquired if there were any foreseeable issues with smells and compliance, such as sea foam matters. G Cleary commented on the Iwi Management Plan. Research on sea foam was continuing however it is not envisaged to produce an adverse result relating to the consent. Staff commented on botulism and undertaking best practice, with the removal of carcasses and sludge processing ensuring compliance with the consent. Community comment and expectations were acknowledged with the ongoing need for staff to communicate well. There are potential additional costs related to the consent however staff were still assessing the situation.

Councillor Barnett queried the Waikuku sewer budget decrease. C Parton advised it had been development driven and now no development was occurring.

Councillor Barnett queried I&I matters in Fernside and queried if an investigation should have occurred earlier. Staff acknowledged factors and noted staff were undertaking septic tank inspections and sludge work in Fernside with matters covered by existing budgets.

Councillor Stewart commented on the Eastern District Sewer being a placeholder until technology improved and enquired if there was any plan to review what we do with the effluent (ie generate power like Auckland), other than sending effluent to sea. G Cleary responded that staff were considering potential options that include environmental issues. He commented on the volume of discharge, storage, and technological improvements to assist with efficiency. Discussion on water content was also discussed with Mayor Ayers acknowledging its international issue, reflecting on inland cities and their processes.

Councillor Gordon commented on the need for environmental staff with G Cleary advising staff recruitment would begin the following month.

Moved: Mayor Ayers Seconded: Councillor Atkinson

THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

CARRIED

7.5 Drainage and Stockwater Races

O Davies advised operational budgets remain similar to previous years. Staff explained the process with drainage areas. O Davies spoke of changes in rates; referring to the Oxford Urban scheme and alignment of budgets with the work programme creating an overall decrease; whilst the Coastal Rural saw an increase of 25% due to a correction in property
numbers and the North Country subdivision (Waikuku), explaining the ongoing affect. Differences with the Central Rural scheme were explained due to changing from the Eastern Rangiora to the Rangiora Urban scheme. The Cust Rural was the smallest drainage scheme with an adjustment of the number of hectares in the scheme.

Staff advised there was currently no budget allowance for discontinuing glyphosate and using alternative mechanical methods.

Staff advised a steady approach was being taken with stockwater. Staff noted a change of land use with lifestyle blocks has had an impact, commenting on water conservation. A reduction of sprays would also occur where practical.

Councillor Felstead queried the Oxford Rural rate against the budgets and sought clarity on the rate movement. K Simpson acknowledged scope for a review, and Councillor Felstead’s suggestion of a discussion with the advisory group. Staff commented on lack of drainage work undertaken and how an increase in the level of maintenance would be justified to utilise the fund that had accumulated. J Millward concluded property had been rated correctly and explained equity balance that should be utilised on maintenance. Options were discussed including holding rates for three years and review at the next LTP.

Moved: Councillor Felstead    Seconded: Councillor Stewart

That the Council:

(a) Approves that the Oxford Rural drainage rate for Oxford Rural be held constant for the next three years.

CARRIED

Councillor Blackie raised the issue of the Clarkeville Rural scheme and balancing a 10% increase to enable more maintenance work to be undertaken due to demand and level of service. Staff were supportive of the suggestion.

Councillor Atkinson queried the reasoning behind the suggested increase. Mayor Ayers suggested staff return the following day with information related to reducing the deficient and works required particularly over the next three years.

Councillor Felstead queried Clarkeville information supplied. K Simpson explained the differences in the figures being averages, or changes to specific rate per hectare.

Councillor Meyer referred to Ohoka information and his preference to the rate remaining unchanged. Mayor Ayers clarified that would become a submission to the LTP.

Councillor Stewart queried Oxford Rural and Cust property in regard to the process for amalgamation. Staff advised a report could be provided to Utilities & Roading Committee to assist understanding of differences between the two groups. Councillor Stewart suggested a report to the advisory groups first before the Committee as their feedback was important.

In a related question Mayor Ayers queried the timing involved for changes to occur. Staff confirmed it was likely to be 12 months to process any change through amalgamation.
G Cleary commented on the flood programme in the LTP being projects.

Councillor Gordon queried errors in the budget. Staff commented on 11 properties covering 370ha intersecting with drainage areas and the information transfer between new computer systems. Staff would write to affected residents and could visit each property to explain the situation.

Councillor Stewart queried the Cust account and farms on part of an area. Staff explained the catchment area that affects the drains maintained by the Council and the rationale behind the drainage rate.

Councillor Doody asked if it was possible to amalgamate Oxford Rural with the Cust scheme. Staff advised that future option was not yet fully and explained different structure. A discussion with the advisory groups would also have to occur.

Moved: Councillor Felstead  
Seconded: Councillor Stewart

THAT the Council

(b) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

(c) Approves that the Oxford Rural drainage rate for Oxford Rural be held constant for the next three years.

(d) Notes tabled memo (Trim 180131009513).

CARRIED

Councillor Felstead appreciated the work and information provided by staff at short notice to assist the decision regarding the Oxford Rural drainage rate.

Councillor Stewart commented on the need to look at all schemes and build up a year of maintenance and smoothing across all drainage areas. Councillor Stewart also commented on limited representation on the various drainage schemes and improvements to be considered.

Mayor Ayers reflected on an earlier conversation regarding differences with amalgamating drainage areas or schemes.

7.6 Utilities and Roading Overheads

G Cleary spoke to the budget commentary, outlining key issues for 2018/19 with a position of environmental officer and other staff changes which were reflected in the budgets. He also commented on the roading budget and referred to pg 205, explaining costs.

Moved: Mayor Ayers  
Seconded: Councillor Atkinson

THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

CARRIED
7.7 **Project Delivery Unit**

K LaValley explained the budget, with the unit being a cost recovery unit and having no effect on rates. The increase is reflected with increased staff, technological improvements and overheads.

Councillor Barnett queried $160,000 increase in the budget. G Cleary advised the budget was for three new positions and matters of additional staff do not usually come to the Council. G Cleary explained how the unit operates with no rate impact.

Councillor Barnett requested in future years an improved commentary.

Moved: Mayor Ayers  Seconded: Councillor Atkinson

THAT the Council

(a) **Approves** the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

CARRIED

7.8 **Earthquake Recovery**

J Palmer spoke briefly to the budget commenting that much of this work will be finished over the next two years. Mayor Ayers commented on three regeneration budgets considered across the meeting process.

Moved: Mayor Ayers  Seconded: Councillor Atkinson

THAT the Council

(a) **Approves** the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

CARRIED

7.9 **Libraries and Museums**

P Ashbey commented briefly on the budget commentary, noting adjustments in year seven set to coincide with the proposed Rangiora library extension and increased volume of books.

Councillor Barnett queried a significant increase in training and operational expense from the previous forecast. Staff explained how staff time is spread across a number of services and a reduction in some areas.

Councillor Williams queried training such as anti-skid driver training. P Ashbey explained that library staff transfer services between libraries on a rotational basis and would often travel between Oxford, Kaiapoi and Rangiora. Most training related to technology and health and safety. Overall the library staff were provided limited training on a per volume of staff ratio. Whenever possible training is done via remote access linking into nationwide networks. J Palmer advised the basis of driver training and the different levels provided being dependant on a staff members role. Three levels of driver training was provided from desktop, to anti-skid to specialised 4wheel drive training.
Councillor Atkinson noted power charges reduced. Staff commented on the efficient systems at the Kaiapoi library, whereas previous budgets were estimates based on the Rangiora library.

Moved: Councillor Atkinson Seconded: Councillor

THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

CARRIED

7.10 Aquatic Facilities

M Greenwood spoke to the budget commentary indicating an increase due to growth of attendance, associated staff expenditure and cleaning budget.

Councillor Barnett queried charges for aqua aerobics of $1. Staff advised charges had not been increased for some time and were in line with Christchurch City, Selwyn and Timaru Districts, however the main driver for the increase related to staff costs as these types of programmes were very staff intensive.

Councillor Felstead noted that there was nothing in the budget related to Oxford renewals. C Sargison commented on the cyclic programme and major upgrade undertaken two years ago. There was money allocated in the outer years and any renewals are itemised under plant renewals.

J Palmer commented on the continuing pressure of wage costs and legislative requirements, such as minimum wage.

Councillor Williams enquired if Dudley Pool has more lifeguards than other centres. Staff did not believe that was the case, explaining factors such as windows and water effects with an independent assessment by Pool Safe who set requirements giving consideration of sightings and use, the physical area and the number of people in the water at any time. Pool Safe independently assess each Council pool, each year.

Moved: Mayor Ayers Seconded: Councillor Atkinson

THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

CARRIED

7.11 Community Development

T Sturley spoke to the budget briefly noting training for front line suicide prevention staff. It was advised the World Health Accreditation was being reviewed this year with Waimakariri one of 26 councils that participate in the accreditation. Further information will be presented to the Community & Recreation Committee in March outlining benefits of being WHO accredited for safer communities.

Councillor Atkinson queried the accommodation cost increase. Staff explained the corporate cost and larger area utilised.
Mayor Ayers thanked the Community Team for the work they undertake.

Moved: Mayor Ayers    Seconded: Councillor Atkinson

**THAT** the Council

(a) **Approves** the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

**CARRIED**

7.12 **Green Space and Community Facilities**

C Brown spoke to the budget, commenting on key aspects and referring to a separately circulated spread sheet containing additional information.

Mayor Ayers enquired why staff were suggesting two dog parks in Rangiora, Kaiapoi and Pegasus when Oxford is not anticipating a dog park for another ten years. C Brown commented that Oxford is rural area and there are more opportunities of where dogs can be exercised, however acknowledged a dog park is a meeting place for dog owners. Staff had considered the volume of projects and balancing affordability, timing and work required to be undertaken, level of service, which resulted in funding for the Oxford dog park being pushed to the outer years.

Councillor Doody enquired if there was a plan to tidy up trees in the proposed dog park area. Staff advised that as the area is currently leased out there is no proposal to undertake any tidying yet. Significant work is required to the trees.

Councillor Blackie sought clarification on the lease term. Staff advised the land was leased for grazing on a short term basis.

Councillor Barnett referred to the Ashley Gorge camp ground and if Enterprise North Canterbury link tourism to the camp. Staff explained the various agencies they work with and discussions relating to funding related to tourism activities such as toilet facilities.

Councillor Felstead queried budget for security cameras in Oxford. C Sargison advised an assessment was being prepared and information would be provided ahead of the May deliberations.

Councillor Stewart queried the opportunity to bring forward budget allocated for the Kaiapoi Lakes old dump site improvements. Staff spoke of prioritising and balancing projects and budget. Councillor Stewart referred to a project by the Kaiapoi urupa which is in year 10 and the need to move the project forward. Staff spoke of it being subject to discussions with the Runanga.

Councillor Barnett queried the possibility of selling the Cust Domain house. C Sargison explained it would require a process to divest it from the Council due to it being on reserve land. He commented on the current long term commercial lease arrangements and the upgraded work undertaken.

Moved: Mayor Ayers    Seconded: Councillor Atkinson

**THAT** the Council

(a) **Approves** the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

**CARRIED**
7.13 **Earthquake Recovery Community Facilities**

Moved: Mayor Ayers  Seconded: Councillor Atkinson

THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

CARRIED

7.14 **District Regeneration**

D Roxburgh spoke to the budget, acknowledging this was a new budget for the whole programme. Timeframes were based on directives from the Kaiapoi Regeneration Steering Group, with many projects being delivered in the first three years. Heritage, memorial gardens and mihi kai projects will be spread over a number years and will be staged with various developments and based on current greenspace management plans. The budgets are based on estimates and projects delivered, reflecting on provision for car parking, particularly boat trailers which is outlined in another report. D Roxburgh advised budgets are not included for the mixed business area as further information is required over time.

C Sargison commented on staffing levels would reduce in 2021/22 and an adjustment of $200,000 in the greenspace budget would be amended to reflect this.

Moved: Mayor Ayers  Seconded: Councillor Atkinson

THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

CARRIED

7.15 **Planning and Regulation Management Overhead**

N Harrison spoke to the budgets, noting the legal services fees and support and provision to test the market for service levels. He outlined the use of different lawyers dependent on the speciality situation requirements. An additional budget was included for the executive assistant support.

Councillor Gordon enquired if consideration had been given to bring legal representation in-house. Staff confirmed thought had been given, commenting on capacity of resource, requirements of a senior solicitor and the complimentary range of services required including administration. The timetabled legal services review would include reviewing the impact on the district plan and exploring further in-house options.

Moved: Mayor Ayers  Seconded: Councillor Atkinson

THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

CARRIED
7.16 Plan Implementation Unit

M Bacon spoke to the budget and use of consultants in the short term while vacancies are filled over the next few months. During 2019/20 the impact of District Plan processes will change the business model particularly relating to consents, therefore a comprehensive review to budget requirements will occur next year. Technology is assisting the unit with upcoming on-line consenting processes and improved communication with people seeking consents.

Councillor Williams enquired on work involving the Silverstream development. M Bacon outlined planning time covers for wider consent aspects such as the arterial road and other matters outside the consent that require investigation. The project work and budget requirements has fluctuations.

Councillor Felstead queried a proposed inspection fee, referencing minor consents. M Bacon commented on assessment requirements for minor and complex consents and whether on-site inspections are required for minor works such as vehicle crossings.

Moved: Mayor Ayers Seconded: Councillor Atkinson

THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

CARRIED

7.17 Building Unit

N Harrison spoke to the budget and provided an overview of the four areas within the unit consisting of 31 staff. The budget was based on 530 new build houses and is dependent on the number of applications that are submitted. He commented on the balancing of staff capacity with both skills and number of persons required to meet the level of service. Staff sought an increase in budget or the alternative was increasing fees. It was noted small fees and charges changes, which reflect legislation and demand.

Moved: Mayor Ayers Seconded: Councillor Atkinson

THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

CARRIED

7.18 Environmental Services

M Johnston commented on the new animal shelter advising that due to changes to current operational matters the timeframe of requiring a new shelter has been moved to the outer years. There has been a decline in number of dogs impounded, which may be linked to microchipping that was introduced in 2005.

Mayor Ayers enquired if people are having less dogs or smaller dogs, as section sizes decrease. Staff advised the ratio is still one dog to every three households.
Councillor Stewart enquired how many impounded dogs were euthanised. Staff advised of a 100% rate on rehoming dogs excluding dangerous dogs, and the relationship with rescue shelters.

Councillor Stewart queried the impact of Facebook. Staff confirmed social media often has a positive and quick outcome for missing pets.

Councillor Barnett sought an update on dog problems at Waikuku. Staff advised the situation had improved greatly from two years ago and was currently good. There were no issues currently at Pines Beach.

Councillor Barnett enquired if investigation of cats and feral cats is being considered. Staff advised that matter was not currently being considered.

Councillor Barnett enquired if there were expectations to increase revenue from parking enforcement. Staff explained costs associated with a parking warden and spoke of the level of service. Parking infringements were increasing which in turn increases revenue.

Councillor Barnett enquired when smart parking may be introduced. M Johnston explained what smart parking is and investigations undertaken on what other councils are using. The benefits were outlined and linkage with any future parking buildings, although currently we can accommodate parking needs. J Palmer advised further information relating to a refreshed town centre parking strategy would be provided to the Council in the coming months and further consideration can be given at that time.

Councillor Atkinson queried enforcement and public information. J Palmer commented on providing a level of service, including information on where spare parks may be.

Councillor Doody enquired if disability parking could be considered first for sensors/smart parking. Staff confirmed this was a feasible request.

Councillor Barnett asked if there are any concerns on communicating to the public about the budget and future technology. Staff offered positive assurance, commenting on the culture and education and ongoing communication with the community.

Councillor Blackie enquired how much disruption smart parking may cause to new road seal. Staff advised some sensor models can be ‘punched’ into the seal. There are various options currently available and technology is frequently changing.

Councillor Gordon queried parking for courier drivers. Staff advised matters would be considered with the refreshed parking strategy and alignment with the parking bylaw.

M Johnston commented on fees and charges in relation to fire risks such as long grass on property, and how matters were dealt with, particularly in Pegasus with absentee land owners. The steps taken for compliance and non-compliance was explained.

Mayor Ayers enquired at what level do staff consider property a fire risk. Staff advised the law refers to pending fire risk and discussed the variables, although generally 300mm or more of long grass is deemed a fire risk. Emergency provisions where explained and actions the Council can take. Ideally fire risk assessment is a role that would be undertaken by FENZ, however as they are still transition the Council is taking some lead.
Councillor Williams remarked on public comment and perception of the Council not mowing road verges. J Palmer confirmed it is a property owner who is responsible maintenance of grass and noxious weeds from their property to the middle of the road. The Council does maintain verges on strategic roads for safety.

Councillor Felstead queried FENZ responsibility. Staff commented on the Local Government Act section that has yet to be repealed, therefore Territorial Authorities still has some responsibility.

Mayor Ayers commented on the Pegasus situation. General discussion occurred.

Moved: Mayor Ayers Seconded: Councillor Atkinson

THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

CARRIED

7.19 Civil Defence Emergency Management

B Wiremu referred to the North Canterbury Neighbourhood Support (NCNS) proposal and withdrawal of $40,000 from the budget due to the current financial climate. Capital expenditures and re-synchronised budgets were briefly commented on. B Wiremu spoke of government changes to handling large scale emergencies, a recent governmental technical report and possible implications to Councils both regionally and locally if the government chooses to adopt many of the report recommendations.

Councillor Doody commented on her disappointment of the withdrawal of funding for NCNS. Staff advised it was identified as a stretch on the budget however submissions were expected, then the Council can consider.

Councillor Blackie queried recent media comments on Civil Defence in relation to the Canterbury region and government input/control. Staff commented on how Civil Defence relates to community response, explaining current Mayoral powers for declaring an emergency and proposed recommendations. Civil Defence may become a function of Ecan in the future, rather than WDC, but the Council may have local support for regional level matters. Currently Waimakariri is well supported for Civil Defence in comparison to some other districts nationally.

Mayor Ayers commented on the declaration process, and re-confirmed the order of powers pending availability, being Mayor Ayers, Councillor Felstead, Councillor Meyer, and Councillor Williams.

Councillor Gordon requested a workshop to refresh elected members in their role should a Civil Defence emergency be declared. Staff noted the request that could occur through the District Planning and Regulation Committee.

Councillor Gordon queried the withdrawal of funding from NCNS. B Wiremu advised Civil Defence had not funded the group previously but a previous Annual Plan submission suggested Civil Defence do support, hence the initial budget provision.
THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

CARRIED

7.20 Strategy and Engagement

S Markham spoke to the budget highlighting key aspects which included an executive assistant, Mahaanui Kurataiao Ltd (MKT), Maori support, website development and the growing demand of technology.

Councillor Atkinson questioned fees the Council pay and charges to other groups, and possible duplication of reports among other organisations, querying the value of the reports against the quality of the information. S Markham acknowledged the issue raised and the MKT as the mechanism for providing cultural knowledge, which was unlike like other consultants. There were different ways of viewing the information as it is Iwi knowledge and S Markham commented on the nature of the relationship.

Councillor Atkinson responded that he was pleased discussions were occurring and accepted there is special knowledge, and was seeking assurance that there was fairness on the supply and charging of information. S Markham advised the Council hold an annual agreement and the matter can be raised again at an appropriate time.

Councillor Barnett referred to pg 380 querying if regional planning had doubled in budget. S Markham spoke of collaborative relationships and the time involved, such as District Plan work and the relationships of having a Canterbury voice and the investment the Council is making.

Moved: Mayor Ayers  Seconded: Councillor Atkinson

THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

CARRIED

7.21 Customer Service

M Harris spoke to the budget, recommending increased charges for LIM’s and the Oxford Bulletin advertising. LIM’s expected to drop in quantity based on evidence. The Oxford Bulletin is a user pays service and needs to keep up with costs.

Councillor Stewart asked why the Council runs the Oxford Bulletin and if it was sold would the Council still operate it. S Markham reflected on the Bulletin being effectively a community noticeboard, the community it covers and of the past Council decision. Two years ago the Council reviewed options including selling to the Oxford Observer as it was seen as a role for two magazines. There would likely be community feedback if the Bulletin closed, however endeavours continue to make it cost neutral. Any discontinuation of the Bulletin is a political decision. S Markham spoke of past discussions with potential sales and acknowledged the Observer targets a different market. Both Mayor Ayers and J Palmer commented.
Councillor Williams enquired about other community magazines. Mayor Ayers responded, commenting on the Woodpecker and the Fernside News. The Oxford Bulletin is also a mechanism for the Oxford School newsletter to be distributed. Staff will talk to any parties who are interested in purchasing the Oxford Bulletin and bring information back to the Council and the Community Board.

Councillor Barnett queried the increase in customer service expenditure. M Harris explained an adjustment on resources from shared resources between LIM’s, rates administration and general administration therefore the adjustment is a reallocation. M Harris spoke of maintaining the name/address database and benefits such as targeted email/phone messages for boiled water matters, which had proven successful recently.

Moved: Mayor Ayers  Seconded: Councillor Atkinson

THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

CARRIED

7.22 Development Planning Unit

S Markham provided a brief overview of the unit and budget.

Councillor Barnett enquired if there was any budget for the Woodend Strategy. S Markham advised not currently, but it was incorporated in part of the review and staff did not believe any more funding was required.

Councillor Barnett sought clarification that the District Plan Review is a 10 year review. T Ellis explained the Council is required to review the District Plan every 10 years from operative date, which enables minor adjustments.

Moved: Mayor Ayers  Seconded: Councillor Atkinson

THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

CARRIED

7.23 Economic Development

S Markham spoke to the budget, commenting on the financial detail and that the district promotions contract is dealt with via another process, through annual business planning which goes through the Audit and Risk Committee. He reflected on 2017 information provided through the Audit and Risk Committee and referenced two elements for considering renewal of the Enterprise North Canterbury (ENC) contract. S Markham commented on the economic development grant and components involved. A portion of S Markham’s time is included in the budget. He explained how the $204,000 is a grant to enable ENC to function, resource and bid for other funding. A further update would be reported to the Council during the deliberations.
Councillor Barnett enquired if there had been any feedback on the quality of Wi-Fi. J Palmer acknowledged some areas of reception are patchy, but information indicates people are using it and downloading data as data use has been increasing steadily across all townships.

In a supplementary question Councillor Barnett enquired if more budget for Wi-Fi was required. S Markham advised more information would be coming to the Council later in the year.

Councillor Williams enquired if people were disconnected from use after downloading a certain volume of data. S Markham advised the bandwidth was set and it is a case of first user basis.

Moved: Mayor Ayers Seconded: Councillor Atkinson

THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

CARRIED

7.24 Finance

J Millward spoke to the budget outline, noting a cost share of a new executive assistant position. There were no other changes to previous budgets.

Moved: Mayor Ayers Seconded: Councillor Atkinson

THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

CARRIED

7.25 Information and Technology Support

J Simon briefly explained adjustments made to the budgets, commenting on key projects including business process mapping. Additional funding for E-services and the Health and Safety system and business intelligence reporting processes for management was being sought. Future proposals were outlined and J Simon provided an update on business improvement plans and community facilities including the electronic booking system. J Millward advised some projects were working in conjunction with other Councils in Canterbury. Overall there were many back office systems that interact with other systems to provide good reporting to the Council.

Councillor Williams queried the training increase, enquiring what was involved. J Simon explained two teams combined involves approximately 25 people which meant the budget shifted. The budget is for any technical training, professional development and includes staff time.

Moved: Mayor Ayers Seconded: Councillor Atkinson

THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

CARRIED
7.26 Museums

J Millward spoke briefly advising the budget was unchanged.

Councillor Williams enquired when the Council could withdraw from the Canterbury Museum partnership. J Millward advised it would require a change to the Act from Parliament. The Council has challenged the Museum on the fee charged, however Waimakariri residents are using the Museum. Staff had also requested a review of charging and the Museum has advised that they will undertake the review once the capital works programme is completed.

J Palmer explained a likely process to get changes made to the legislation which would require the support of local Parliamentarians.

Moved: Mayor Ayers Seconded: Councillor Atkinson

THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018-2028.

CARRIED

Mayor Ayers remarked on the value of the Canterbury collection being approximately $2 billion balanced against a building of several hundred thousand dollars. The Mayor spoke of the proposed development of Gallery House which is gift from Susan and Jim Wakefield, and that no further funding is being requested, that we are aware of. Mayor Ayers commented on changes to the Canterbury Museum Act that would affect other Councils.

Mayor Ayers commented as the North Canterbury representative on the Museum Trust Board that councillors currently do not advocate for the local museums. The Council is contributing to a Canterbury (major provincial museum). The Canterbury Museum is a major repository of north Canterbury items, and has many North Canterbury visitors. Furthermore the Museum has been investigating government funding to assist with completing the museum project. Mayor Ayers stated a review of the Act may come but it does not guarantee an exit strategy, as you may find community views different to that of your own.

Councillor Atkinson remarked on his views relating to the volume of funds transferred rather than necessarily exiting altogether. He also reflected on community views.

Councillor Williams believed the district cannot afford continuing to support the Canterbury Museum and would rather see further funding to local museums.


7.27 Property, Housing Elderly

R Hawthorne spoke to three significant issues. The Rangiora Service Centre budget had been discussed earlier in the meeting, secondly the housing budget proposed a significant stepped rent over the next six years, which was higher than previously indicated. This was based on an assessment of building life and has driven expenditure over the next ten years. Beyond that, when the buildings are approximately 90 years they
will require replacement and/or significant investment. The buildings are approximately 40 to 50 years old now. R Hawthorne commented on renewals of kitchens/bathrooms and roof/windows as they come to end of their economic life and will improve the quality for the tenants along with improved energy efficiencies.

Councillor Atkinson enquired on the communications programme to tenants and if there was any budget provision. R Hawthorne spoke of requirements to provide tenants with three months’ notice ie by the beginning of April.

J Millward commented on what is occurring around the country and the new Government may also re-look at tenant funding in the future.

Councillor Gordon referred to pg 436, camping grounds, enquiring when is the project going to be completed. R Hawthorne outlined the current situation and discussions with the three camp operators, who were all supportive of the direction. Valuation advice had been sought, followed by negotiations then there would be a report back to the Council. Timeframes were outlined and further discussions would be held over the next couple of months.

Councillor Barnett asked why does this Council own camp grounds and would we consider divestment? R Hawthorne explained the land ground lease arrangements and outlined discussions of the prospect of people taking over buildings. When reviewing buildings and camp layout it was acknowledged that it is not ideal in some situations. The raising of finance by tenants would require long term leases such as 25 to 30 years. Staff commented on the risks of infrastructure and management being separated out. The camps are generally located on reserve land, which has other cost implications if sold.

Mayor Ayers enquired how many buildings would there be on camp grounds that do not meet earthquake requirements. Staff advised approximately a dozen buildings currently do not meet the requirements.

Councillor Williams enquired if staff check that the standard of maintenance is to an acceptable standard. Staff explained the lease arrangements with the four different camp operators and regular inspections and ongoing communications.

Councillor Williams enquired why other Councils appear to make money out of their camp grounds. J Millward explained and further information would be provided to the Council in May.

Councillor Blackie queried the planned demolition of ablution blocks in relation to lease arrangements. R Hawthorne explained the situation and implications being considered.

Moved: Mayor Ayers Seconded: Councillor Atkinson

THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

CARRIED

Councillor Doody was supportive of the improvements to elderly persons’ housing.
Councillor Gordon reflected on the past and the management of the elderly persons’ units.

7.28 Water Unit

J Millward spoke to the budget, commenting on new staff, one filled a vacant position and one covering a maintenance position.

Councillor Stewart enquired about the certified laboratory at the Water Unit and whether they offered testing to residents, in particular to rural residents on private wells. J Millward advised this service had been offered in the past, but the systems have changed in recent years.

In a supplementary question Councillor Stewart enquired of the regulations and any costs to the Council for water testing, commenting on a group of residents who are at risk from contamination from shallow contaminated water supplies. J Millward advised further enquiries will be made and information fed back to the Council.

Moved: Mayor Ayers  Seconded: Councillor Atkinson

THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

CARRIED

Councillor Atkinson, offered praise to the Water Unit staff, noting that every comment he receives are positive and they do a very good job.

Mayor Ayers suggested a visit could be arranged to the Water Unit to meet the staff and gain a greater understanding of their work. J Millward agreed that such a visit could be arranged in the future.

Councillor Gordon reflected on favourable comments he had received about the work that the water unit staff undertake.

Councillor Meyer noted that the Water Unit team provide a valuable service to the community and also supported a visit to the staff to thank them for the work they undertake.

7.29 Governance and Secretarial

S Nichols spoke to the report outlining funding being requested is a direct result of legislation requirements. Over the last five years, there had been an average increase of 5% remuneration to each elected member each year, therefore the LTP budgets have reflected these 5% increases continuing.

S Nichols commented that the Representative Review must be undertaken every six years, and the process leading up to it takes approximately 18 months to work through, spanning two financial years. There is a high element of statistical work required in the process and currently the expertise is not available in-house, hence the request for an outside consultant in the short term at the appropriate stages of the process. Costs incurred in the second year of the review process are for statistical certification of boundary maps based on costs from the previous Review. In the outer years of 2026–2028 a place holder budget for anticipated changes to boundaries as a result of population growth has been factored.
The next Representation Review will be in 2020, although major changes are not anticipated until 2026.

Electronic voting has been considered for budgeting purposes, although the latest indications by the new government is that electronic voting will not occur for the 2019 triennium local body elections. Work is being undertaken behind the scenes on companies able to provide the software with appropriate security to the satisfaction of the Government. Indications are that electronic voting will occur in some form for the 2022 local body elections.

The four Community Boards are proposing a new scholarship fund becoming available and a report will come to the Council in May for consideration. This scholarship grant, if approved, could be available for individuals, and likely have a strong community leadership cornerstone.

Councillor Doody noted that Hurunui District Council have a scholarship system which works well. Mayor Ayers noted that now that tertiary education is available free, there could be other tertiary education that could be funded.

Riskpool funding is an adjustment based on previous years’ claims, and the next two months staff will be looking at further options.

Councillor Atkinson noted a budget anomaly for Woodend-Sefton Community Board operations. Staff noted that Woodend-Sefton and Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Boards’ budgets should be similar and staff would recheck the figures as it would be an allocation percentage apportionment formulation rather than any increase being required.

Councillor Williams asked if the funding provided under International Relations provides any economic benefit to the district. J Palmer responded that the value is more in a cultural sense, noting Zonnebeke and the Sister-City with Enshi. It was noted that almost all Councils across New Zealand have an overseas relationship, which provides benefits both culturally and educationally.

Councillor Williams suggested the visits are not providing any benefits to the district, noting that the Council costs over ten years would amount to approximately $250,000. J Palmer acknowledged there have been members of the local community who had visited China with possible business proposals, and that economic ties take some time to mature. J Palmer also said any business connections could be just for Waimakariri, but could also benefit Canterbury and perhaps the whole of New Zealand.

Moved:  Mayor Ayers  Seconded:  Councillor Atkinson

THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

CARRIED

Mayor Ayers noted from the Sister City Enshi view point, they look at this and it is not a one way arrangement. Whilst the Zonnebeke arrangement has not generated any economic benefit, it is a twinning arrangement which is different and it has been more in line with the World War One linkage and education and cultural connectedness.
Councillors offered thanks for the support they receive from the Governance staff at the Council. S Nichols noted the whole Governance/Administration teams are involved in supporting the running of the Citizenship Ceremonies which occur regularly, and the Community Service Awards.

Mayor Ayers noted that there is to be a review of how the Citizenship Ceremonies are conducted and extended an invite to all members to attend one of these ceremonies.

7.30 District Management

J Palmer briefly outlined the budget commenting on two new executive assistant appointments.

Moved: Mayor Ayers Seconded: Councillor Atkinson

THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018-2028.

CARRIED

7.31 Organisational Development and HR

J Palmer spoke to the budget outlining what areas it covers with no overall change. Following a question from Councillor Williams the budget areas were clarified.

Moved: Mayor Ayers Seconded: Councillor Atkinson

THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018-2028.

CARRIED

Moved: Mayor Ayers Seconded: Councillor Atkinson

(a) Adopt and confirm all proforma resolutions.

CARRIED

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 4.58PM ON THURSDAY 1 FEBRUARY 2018.

CONFIRMED

__________________________
Chairperson

__________________________
Date
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL HELD IN
THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA, ON TUESDAY
6 MARCH 2018, COMMENCING AT 1PM.

PRESENT:
Mayor D Ayers (Chair), Deputy Mayor K Felstead, Councillors N Atkinson, K Barnett,
A Blackie, R Brine (arrived at 2.03pm during item 8.3), W Doody, D Gordon, J Meyer,
S Stewart and P Williams.

IN ATTENDANCE:
J Palmer (Chief Executive) (departed 1.50pm until 3.30pm), S Markham (Manager,
Strategy & Engagement), K Simpson (3 Waters Manager), K Graham (Journey
Planner/Road Safety Co-ordinator), B Rice (Senior Roading Engineer), D Roxburgh
(Implementation Project Manager), and S Nichols (Governance Manager).
The meeting adjourned at 3.08pm and reconvened at 3.25pm.

1. APOLOGIES
Moved: Councillor Felstead  Seconder: Councillor Williams
An apology for lateness was received and sustained from Councillor Brine.
CARRIED

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
Nil.

3. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS
3.1 Community Service Award
Mayor Ayers welcomed Judge John Brandts-Giesen and family before presenting
Judge Brandts-Giesen with an award recognising his contribution to the
community.
Councillor Gordon read the citation outlining a few of Judge John Brandts-Giesen’s
many community achievements.
Judge Brandts-Giesen acknowledged the support of his wife, Jeanette.

4. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
4.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Tuesday
30 January to Thursday 1 February 2018
Moved: Councillor Barnett  Seconder: Councillor Doody
THAT the Council:
(a) Postpones the confirmation of the minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri
District Council held on Tuesday 30 January to Thursday 1 February 2018
until 3 April 2018.
CARRIED

4.2 Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Wednesday
7 February 2018
Moved: Councillor Felstead  Seconder: Councillor Meyer
THAT the Council:

(a) **Confirms** as a true and correct record the circulated minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Wednesday 7 February 2018, subject to minor amendments.

CARRIED

4.3. **Minutes of the public excluded portion of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Wednesday 7 February 2018**

The matter was dealt with in the public excluded section of the meeting.

4.4. **Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Tuesday 20 February 2018**

Moved: Councillor Atkinson  Seconder: Councillor Blackie

THAT the Council:

(a) **Confirms** as a true and correct record the minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Tuesday 20 February 2018.

CARRIED

**MATTERS ARISING**

Mayor Ayers raised the matter from the 7 February minutes, advising of the withdrawal of Councillor Doody from the Enshi visit due to family circumstances. Mayor Ayers provided an opportunity for another councillor interested to attend. No further interest was indicated.

5. **DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS**

Nil.

6. **ADJOURNED BUSINESS**

Nil.

7. **REGENERATION REPORTS**

7.1. **Dudley Drain Regeneration – Request to Bring Budget Forward and Award Contract 18/01 – K Simpson (3 Waters Manager) and G Boot (Senior Engineering Adviser)**

K Simpson spoke briefly to the report. The project was originally due to span two financial years, however scope work has been completed which enables the project to be undertaken this financial year.

Councillor Stewart enquired if this work was in addition to recent work. K Simpson advised the location was downstream from Hilton Street, and it will assist in increasing the capacity for drainage, and although not directly related, it would be beneficial and complementary to the recent works undertaken.

Moved: Councillor Blackie  Seconder: Councillor Atkinson

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No 180227020873.
(b) **Resolves** to bring forward $176,000 budgeted in the 2018/19 year (100470.000.5124) to the current year to enable the Dudley Drain Regeneration project in west Kaiapoi to be completed.

(c) **Authorises** Council staff to award 18/01 Dudley Drain Regeneration, Raven Quay to Hilton Street to Ongrade Drainage and Excavation Ltd for a sum of $94,734.78.

(d) **Notes** that this project is funded from the Dudley Drain Earthquake Repairs budget (100470.000.5124) and that providing recommendation (b) is adopted, there will be sufficient budget to complete the project this year.

(e) **Notes** that in accordance with the Conditions of Tendering, all tenderers will be advised of the name and price of the successful tenderer, and the range and number of tenders received.

**CARRIED**

Councillor Blackie commented on the ecological factors that were being considered.

Mayor Ayers spoke of the project being part of the regeneration work, therefore it was sensible to undertake the work as soon as practical.

8. **REPORTS**

8.1. **Naming of the Rangiora to Woodend Cycle/walkway - K Graham (Journey Planner/Road Safety Co-ordinator)**

K Graham spoke briefly to the report and reflected on a recent workshop with Councillors.

Moved: Councillor Gordon  Seconder: Councillor Williams

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No: 180223019153.

(b) **Approves** the name Rangiora Woodend Path for the cycle/walkway which runs between Rangiora and Woodend:

**CARRIED**

Councillor Gordon reflected on the last workshop discussions. It was practical to name the path with its function, being on the Rangiora Woodend Road, and a well-known area. Councillor Gordon spoke of the differences related to naming this path from the recently opened Passchendaele Memorial Path which had been through its own process.

Councillor Williams agreed to the logical name as it was a pathway between two points being Rangiora and Woodend.

Mayor Ayers was supportive of the motion and also reflected on differences with the Passchendaele Memorial Path. He commented that the Jill Creamer Trail in Woodend was a little different again, as it was a community driven project.

8.2. **Lees Road and Barkers, Kaiapoi Road Speed Limit – B Rice (Senior Roading Engineer)**

B Rice commented on the request for the speed limit change and outlined the processes undertaken to date. The changing nature of use of linkage roads Williams Street and Bayliss Drive was commented on and speed survey information indicated the appropriateness of the proposed speed limit. Staff
acknowledged some community support for 50kph, whilst other submitters had suggested 60kph. Staff commented on suggestions for some engineering works and future liaison with the local community as to what may be appropriate. Staff also signalled that any additional works would require additional funding.

Mayor Ayers queried the mean speed information contained in the report. B Rice spoke of assumptions and realistic achievable speeds.

Mayor Ayers enquired what would be an appropriate speed for Barkers Road. B Rice advised it was not realistic to achieve 50kph by most people given its rural environment and driver behaviour.

Councillor Atkinson remarked on speed limits of 50kph by the Kaiapoi Golf Course, and on River Road, being of a similar environment to that being discussed today, and enquired what was the mean speed in the vicinity of the Kaiapoi Golf Course. Staff were unable to confirm that information in the meeting, and suggested that any concerns in this regard were more appropriate to policing.

Councillor Blackie sought clarification of whether the balance of Lees Road would remain at 80kph limit. Staff confirmed that the whole of Lees Road and Barkers Road would be set to the speed the Council resolved today.

Councillor Meyer referred to a photograph showing letterboxes on the intersection of Lees and Barkers Road and enquired what engineering aspects could be considered to move the letterboxes off the road, as he understood the Postie drives on the wrong side of the road to undertake deliveries. Staff thought it was likely the placement of the letterboxes does not comply with the current code, and it has likely been a historic situation. Staff acknowledged that as part of the roading review the letterboxes’ positioning may need to be changed, in conjunction with a conversation with both NZ Post and the residents.

Councillor Meyer commented on 44 homes currently being built in the area and enquired how much traffic was likely to be created as a result of the localised population growth. B Rice advised increased traffic was based on 4400 trips a day and an assumption that 50 percent of vehicles go left or right at the intersection.

Councillor Barnett sought clarification of the speed change effect on the section of Williams Street, from Lees Road to the current 80kph sign. Staff commented that most traffic is going towards the State Highway which will be a changed speed area, however staff will look at the associated road.

Councillor Barnett enquired what consultation was undertaken in River Road and Chinnerys Road when 50kph was imposed in those areas. B Rice was unable to respond as he was not involved in those projects.

Councillor Barnett asked what expenditure will potentially be created for additional engineering measures if the speed limit is reduced to 50kph today and is there a requirement to implement engineering changes. B Rice commented that if 50kph were to be approved then the Council should probably urbanise that section of Lees Road with kerb and channel and footpath, but residents may have views.

Councillor Barnett asked if these roads should be considered in isolation or changes made to all roads that have been in a similar situation across the district. B Rice commented on maintaining consistency in an area. Councillor Barnett clarified she was referring to examples of Chinnerys and River Road
with 50kph in an urban environment. J Palmer commented that such matters should come before the Utilities and Roading Committee for future discussion relating to the level of service.

Councillor Atkinson referred to the end of Bayliss Drive, enquiring if an engineering option could consider a Give Way move to Lees Road, and an associated free turn into Bayliss Drive with that section becoming a 50kph area, and the other section through to Barkers Road remaining at 80kph. B Rice acknowledged the viewpoint commenting on the progress of the Sovereign Lakes development, impact to residents and implications to potential road layout changes.

Councillor Blackie sought clarification that the Council was only being asked to approve a speed limit change and not any engineering works. Staff confirmed that was the situation.

Moved: Councillor Meyer Seconder: Councillor Stewart

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180115002738.
(b) Approves the speed limit change on Lees Road and Barkers Road in Kaiapoi, to be reduced to 50kph as outlined below, and as shown in the attached plan (TRIM 171025114968)
(c) Notes that the Register of Speed Limits will be updated to include these changed speed limits.
(d) Notes that the Speed Limits Bylaw 2009 allows speed limits to be changed by Council resolution following consultation as required by the Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits (2017).
(e) Notes that the submissions on this proposal have been distributed to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board for their information.
(f) Notes that a copy of this report has been provided to the Runanga Liaison Committee.
(g) Supports engagement with affected property owners and the community to identify and assess options to provide suitable pedestrian, cycle and vehicle facilities on Lees Road.
(h) Notes that any works identified in (g) above will need to be prioritised with other Council projects.
(i) Circulates this report to all Community Boards.

CARRIED

Councillor Meyer remarked that he had received local feedback, and was well aware of the unique situation already outlined, and was conscious of safety factors. He commented on the increasing car movements per day, safety factors to be considered including letterbox location and observations of people walking a loop around the subdivision. Councillor Meyer stated the timing is right and acceptable for planning ahead for possible signage changes. Councillor Meyer believed changing the speed limit to 50kph would improve the environment for long term residents.

Councillor Stewart endorsed her colleague’s comments, and reflected that due to development growth if changes to the speed didn’t change now to 50kph, the Council would be in the position of reviewing the situation again in the near future. Councillor Stewart was supportive of the earlier suggestion from Councillor Atkinson to talk to residents about a potential Give Way sign change.

Mayor Ayers thanked staff for an informative report, and was supportive of the motion. He commented on the rural postal issue raised by Councillor Meyer,
and implications of changing from a rural to an urban postal delivery service. Mayor Ayers commented on the expense of engineering changes, however a Give Way sign is a traffic calming tool in itself, he believed.

Councillor Atkinson was supportive of the motion for a reduced speed limit of 50kph, explaining why he posed the question of changing the intersection, and the resulting reaction. Councillor Atkinson commented on the growth of the wider area, including State Highway changes that he believed will alter the dynamics of the area over time. He believed it was sensible to change the speed limit to 50kph now in preparation for the anticipated growth.

Councillor Barnett was supportive of the motion. Councillor Barnett remarked on her earlier line of questioning and personal experiences of Chinnerys Road; the impact of signage changes or when a road has additional engineering solutions. Councillor Barnett stated she was pleased the speed change was occurring before the growth, however would like to know what any changes will cost. Councillor Barnett also commented that it was good that a district speed limit review was occurring, but would be interested to see the funding component.

In his right of reply, Councillor Meyer was pleased the Council supported the motion.

**Late Item**

Moved: Mayor Ayers  Seconded: Councillor Felstead

That the Council

(a) **Accepts** a late report from Mayor Ayers regarding Appointments of Councillor to Portfolio, Committees, Outside Organisations to be considered as item 8.4 of this meeting.

**CARRIED**

8.3. **Appointment to District Planning and Regulation Committee – S Markham (Manager Strategy & Engagement)**

S Markham spoke to the report, proposing a Runanga representative be appointed to the District Planning and Regulation Committee (DP&R) for the purposes of the District Plan Review. S Markham reflected on recent briefing discussions, legislative changes and the importance of discussion with iwi at early stages of District Plan reviews and the appropriateness of consideration now. The recommendation is for the Mayor, as Iwi Relations Portfolio holder, to engage with Ngai Tuahuriri to identify a suitable representative with the right skill set and knowledge to be available to continue through to early 2020 until such time as a Council resolution is made to notify a proposed review.

Councillor Atkinson sought clarification on past conversations and further discussions being required to understand other whole of council issues and implications rather than just this topic before this stage occurred. S Markham apologised for any misunderstanding of context and referred to a briefing session at the latter part of last year related to the concept of such an appointment to the DP&R Committee. Staff were open to how the Council wished to proceed.

Councillor Stewart sought clarification on the scope of the role, including voting rights, and whether it relates solely to District Plan matters or all aspects that come before the DP&R Committee. S Markham clarified the appointment is only for the purposes that relate to District Plan business, with the representative exercising a voting right. Mayor Ayers outlined how the agenda could be sectioned to District Plan matters, in a similar manner to the Council that currently separates its Regeneration related reports prior to other Council
matters. Mayor Ayers also envisaged the Runanga appointee would participate all District Plan related workshops and retreats.

In a supplementary question Councillor Stewart enquired if this arrangement was acceptable to the Runanga. S Markham advised that several discussions had occurred and the Runanga are comfortable with a member fully participating in District Plan review matters only.

Councillor Gordon reflected on his understanding of the overall situation, which matched Councillor Atkinson’s earlier comments. Councillor Gordon commented that there are many implications and would appreciate more time to consider matters, therefore suggested the report lay on the table until further discussions with colleagues had occurred.

Councillor Doody queried the matter laying on the table with the Mayor advising about procedural motions.

Councillor Felstead asked if there was a timing constraint if the report was not approved today. S Markham commented that given the upcoming high workload related to draft chapters of the District Plan including overall strategic direction and another related to cultural values, it is beneficial to source a Committee member sooner, rather than later, to enable them to get up to speed as practically as possible.

Mayor Ayers suggested the Council discuss the matter further at the upcoming DP&R briefing scheduled for 13 March. Mayor Ayers asked if staff believe timing of the appointment is important because the Runanga require time to source the right person at hand. S Markham indicated the time to find the representative is likely to be considerable, and spoke of how crucial it is to get the right person who is available for the upcoming two years.

Councillor Brine arrived at 2.03pm during item 8.3.

Councillor Gordon asked that at the upcoming briefing staff could provide information outlining the role of MKT, cost, involvement and terms of reference. Mayor Ayers suggested that information could be provided at the end of the today’s meeting.

Procedural Motion
Moved: Councillor Atkinson  Seconder: Councillor Gordon

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives report No. 180223019257.
(b) Considers the question of the appointment to the District Planning and Regulation Committee by Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga be considered at the 3 April 2018 meeting and is to be preceded by a Council briefing on 13 March 2018.

CARRIED

8.4. Appointments of Councillor to Portfolio, Committees, Outside Organisations - Mayor Ayers.

Mayor spoke to the report outlining the proposal, following discussion with all councillors, and commented on the duration of Chairing the Community and Recreation Committee.

Mayor Ayers commented on conversations with the outside organisation, Wellbeing North Canterbury, and its preference for representation from the Kaiapoi area due to its significant involvement in that community. Mayor Ayers suggested the appointment be from outside of the Council and put forward Martin Pinkham, Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board member, outlining his reasoning which included Mr Pinkham’s involved with Kaiapoi High School
Board of Trustees. Mayor Ayers provided past examples of when an elected Board member had been appointed as the Council’s representative to outside bodies.

Councillor Barnett enquired how information would be received back from the Trust appointee to the Community and Recreation Committee, if it was not a councillor. Mayor Ayers commented on appointee responsibilities to any Trust. Mayor Ayers stated that if a person is an appointee to an outside body or Trust it is important to inform the Council during the portfolio updates section of the meetings. If the appointee is not a Councillor it is important that they regularly keep the portfolio holder informed, who in turn can inform the Council or relevant committee.

Councillor Doody enquired if the proposed Wellbeing North Canterbury Trust appointment was for a short term. Mayor Ayers clarified the appointments were until the end of the term, and the new Council would appoint again at the beginning of the October 2019 term.

Councillor Doody sought clarification of whether the Wellbeing North Canterbury Trust appointment would still sit under the Community and Wellbeing portfolio. Mayor Ayers reiterated the need for an appointee to raise matters with Councillor Barnett as the primary portfolio holder.

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180302022316.

(b) Notes under section 41A of the Local Government Act, the Mayor has the power to establish committees of the Council and to appoint the chairperson of each committee, and may make the appointment before the other members of the committee are determined, and may appoint him/herself.

(c) Revoke Councillor Stewart from the Audit and Risk Committee and appoints Councillor Stewart to the District Planning and Regulation Committee.

(d) Appoints Councillor Barnett to the Audit and Risk Committee.

(e) Appoints Councillor Barnett to the Community and Recreation Committee.

(f) Appoints Councillor Barnett as joint portfolio holder of the Community Development and Wellbeing Portfolio, noting Councillor Wendy Doody already holds a supportive role for this portfolio.

(g) Amends the timing of the second chair of Community and Recreation Committee held by Councillor Doody to 30 April 2018, rather than 31 October 2018, (as resolved by the Council in October 2016).

(h) Amends the timing of the third chair of Community and Recreation Committee held by Councillor Blackie to be from 1 May 2018 to 31 January 2019.

(i) Appoints Councillor Barnett as the fourth Chair of Community and Recreation Committee from 1 February 2019 to 9 October 2019.
(j) **Appoints** Councillor Barnett for Hearings, to the Hearings Committee.

(k) **Appoints** Martin Pinkham as the Council’s representative on the Wellbeing North Canterbury Trust.

(l) **Appoints** Councillor Blackie as the Council’s representative on the Waimakariri Art Collection Trust.

(m) **Appoints** Councillor Kirstyn Barnett to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board in accordance with section 19F of the Local Electoral Act 2001.

(n) **Notes** all appointments cease at the end of the 2016-19 Local Body Triennial term, being 12 October 2019, unless appointed to a Council Controlled Organisation (CCO) or specifically altered by the Council.

**CARRIED**

Councillor Gordon was supportive of the motion, reflecting on his 12 years of being on the Board of Wellbeing North Canterbury, and his personal experience with Martin Pinkham, who he believed had the relevant experience for the role. Councillor Gordon also congratulated Councillor Blackie on his appointment to the Art Collection Trust.

9. MATTERS REFERRED FROM COMMITTEES AND COMMUNITY BOARDS

9.1 **Renewal of District Promotions Contract with Enterprise North Canterbury for 2018-21 Period** – S Markham (Manager Strategy and Engagement)

(referred to report no. 180131009463 from the Audit and Risk Committee meeting of 13 February 2018)

S Markham spoke briefly to the report.

Moved: Councillor Felstead  Seconder: Councillor Atkinson

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Notes** that comprehensive reviews of District Promotions Services were undertaken in 2008 and 2014.

(b) **Notes** that the three-year District Promotions Contract, with Enterprise North Canterbury, expires on 30 June 2018 and that the contract provides for Council approval of an annual district promotions business plan setting out the scope of services that are to be provided from year to year.

(c) **Renews** the District Promotions Contract with Enterprise North Canterbury on similar terms and conditions as at present for a further three year period from 1 July 2018.

(d) **Authorises** the Chief Executive to execute, for the Council, a refreshed contract document with ENC to give effect to recommendation (c) above.

(e) **Agrees** that the next such review of the delivery arrangements for district promotions services, in terms of S.17A of the Local Government Act, be undertaken in 2020.
Notes that the Audit and Risk Committee, in the lead up to the approval of the 2018/19 district promotions business plan, intend to review the following elements of the promotions activity:

- The role/structure/process of the events grants budget with the Events Funding Panel and the Promotions Portfolio Holder;
- The role and function of a physical I-Site in the context of the changing marketing and i-SITE Network landscape which is rapidly moving online.

CARRIED

Against Councillors Stewart and Williams

Councillor Felstead stated matters had been well debated previously at the last Audit and Risk Committee meeting.

Councillor Stewart commented on a proposal seeking a 17a Review at the last Audit and Risk Committee, which Mayor Ayers declined. Councillor Stewart believed the matter should be reviewed now as 2020 is too far away. Councillor Stewart commented that some aspects such as events and promotion had been particularly reviewed and of the importance to determine if there are any outstanding issues in that area. Councillor Stewart stated she would vote against the motion as she strongly believed there needed to be a Section 17a review undertaken in the very near future.

Mayor Ayers clarified the meeting situation and the point of order raised at the past meeting. Councillor Stewart raised the matter again.

Councillor Williams stated he was not supporting the motion as he believed there was a doubling up on many services and the matter required a review on all spending and promotion aspects.

Councillor Barnett stated she would support the motion reluctantly as she did not believe the Council had an alternative proposal at this stage. Councillor Barnett remarked she could sympathise and understand Councillor Stewart’s views and stated she was not convinced the District Promotions contract was being carried out as effectively as it could, for Waimakariri in particular. Councillor Barnett also expressed concern at the staff turnover and associated recruitment expense. Councillor Barnett stated she would like to see what the Council is getting for its money, ‘bang for buck’ for rate payers; is it attracting the visitors from Christchurch, which is Waimakariri’s prime visitor market, and what are visitors spending their money on. Councillor Barnett stated she would like to see a review and a survey in Christchurch as to the awareness of Waimakariri and its attractions.

Councillor Gordon was supportive of the recommendation and remarked that he wondered how many reviews this organisation required, and reflected on challenges presented at each meeting, systems in place including a Statement of Intent which is reviewed yearly. Councillor Gordon commented on work that staff were undertaking in conjunction with himself as Town Centre Portfolio Holder on a draft Service Level Agreement for promotion organisations which includes a higher degree of accountability for funding. This current work will come before the Council in due course. Councillor Gordon indicated an upcoming meeting between Kaiapoi Councillors and Kaiapoi Promotions Association, welcomed any colleague feedback for both the district’s promotions associations and ENC itself that he could pass on.

Mayor Ayers was supported of previous comments from Councillor Gordon, reflecting on regular report-backs from ENC and the ongoing vague criticisms with no substance of examples to back up opposing claims. Mayor Ayers spoke of the work that ENC undertake that does not cross into the Council domain,
the value it adds to the District and the importance of continuing to work together.

Councillor Felstead, in his right of reply commented on past reviews held in 2008 and 2014 and remarked that he did not believe in reviewing for the sake of a review and queried the validity of there being anything to currently review.

9.2. **Classification of Reserve 1651, 470 Woodstock Road, Oxford – M Bail (Property Officer)**

(referred to report no. 180109001167 from the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting of 8 February 2018)

S Markham took the report as read.

Councillor Stewart queried the site being close to the river and impacts on requirements through Plan Change 5 and the limitation on nutrient levels, enquiring how this proposal impacts on the overall situation. S Markham advised a resource consent process does not affect the motion before the Council today and consenting matters are subject to separate conditions and another process.

Councillor Stewart commented on discharging nutrients to groundwater, enquiring if there is there any impact on the resource consent as the land held the wrong classification, and enquired if this question had been raised before. S Markham advised that matter had not been considered.

Moved: Councillor Felstead  Seconder: Councillor Atkinson

THAT the Council:

(a) **Approves** under the Reserves Act 1977 to classify the reserve described in the schedule as Local Purpose (Sewerage and Plantation) reserve, subject to the provisions of the Act.

**Canterbury Land District – Waimakariri District**

**Schedule**

**Area (Ha) Description**

- 87.4120 Reserve 1651 (*New Zealand Gazette* 1878 page 1670)

(b) **Notes** that a subsequent report will be presented should any objections be received following public advertising.

CARRIED

Councillor Felstead stated that this is just the designation approval and it was not appropriate to debate consenting matters as that is another process at a later time.

10. **HEALTH AND SAFETY**


Moved: Councillor Meyer  Seconder: Councillor Blackie

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180228020936.

CARRIED
Staff noted reference in the report to Courtenay Place, and the correction to Courtenay Drive.

11. COMMITTEE/WORKING PARTY/JOINT COMMITTEE MINUTES FOR INFORMATION

11.1. Minutes of a meeting of the Regeneration Steering Group held on 29 January 2018

11.2. Minutes of a meeting of the Community and Recreation Committee held on 13 February

Moved: Councillor Atkinson    Seconder: Councillor Felstead

THAT the information in Items 11.1 to 11.2 be received.

CARRIED

12. COMMUNITY BOARD MINUTES FOR INFORMATION

12.1. Minutes of a meeting of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board held on 18 December 2018

12.2. Minutes of a meeting of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board held on 8 February 2018

12.3. Minutes of a meeting of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board held on 12 February 2018

12.4. Minutes of a meeting of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board held on 14 February 2018

Moved: Councillor Doody    Seconder: Councillor Meyer

THAT the information in Items 12.1 to 12.4 be received.

CARRIED

Councillor Barnett acknowledged the Rangiora Rotary Club’s upcoming 75th anniversary and the valued contribution to the community.

Councillor Gordon advised he had organised a meeting with Mainpower to discuss underground cabling options on Kippenberger Avenue as he believed a more sustainable solution needed to be found.

13. CORRESPONDENCE

Nil.

14. MAYOR’S DIARY

14.1. Mayor’s Diary 30 January to 23 February 2018

Mayor Ayers commented generally on councillors participating in various cycle events over the past weekend.

Moved: Councillor Meyer    Seconder: Councillor Blackie

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report no. 180223019426.

CARRIED
15. COUNCIL PORTFOLIO UPDATES

15.1. **Iwi Relationships**

It was advised that the Council’s updated Cultural handbook had been distributed to all elected members.

Brief comment was made on the upcoming Hui with Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga and the Mayor advised he would report to the Hui of the matter lying on the table from earlier in today’s meeting.

15.2. **Canterbury Water Management Strategy**

Councillor Stewart reflected on recent Zone Committee workshops and the ongoing work for the Zone Implementation Plan Agendum (ZIPA). Councillor Stewart commented on Koura Creek, the structure of the creek and a recent site visit. Members were reminded of the goals of ZIPA and its linkage to the Sub-regional Catchment Plan.

Councillor Stewart advised she had attended three rural drainage group meetings and matters discussed included the maintenance budget being held with a year of reserve for on-going projects. Generally matters were well received on how these accounts will work over the next 10 years.

Councillor Stewart provided an update on the Stormwater Drainage Bylaw Hearing, which would reconvene later in the month.

Councillor Stewart advised that no Runanga representative had attended the Water Zone Committee meetings for some time, and remarked on the potential risk of such limited input into the process.

Mayor Ayers commented on paths around Northbrook Ponds and only a short distance of approximately 15 metres was required to link existing pathways.

15.3. **International Relationships**

Councillor Felstead reflected on the recent Passchendaele Trust meeting, where the focus on signage and information panels for the path had been discussed. The Trust were reviewing its Trust Deed information, however the situation may change to an Advisory Group. Mayor Ayers advised that the Trust scope would be required to be approved by the Council so there would be a report back in due course.

Councillor Felstead had attended a very successful day ‘Japan Day’ in Christchurch.

Councillor Felstead reflected on the upcoming visit to China and the attracted attention of social media, and that some comments were either incorrect or inappropriate.

15.4. **Regeneration (Kaiapoi)**

Councillor Blackie spoke of ongoing budget impacts for which staff were investigating alternative options.

Councillor Blackie reported that the Regeneration Steering Group had approved the concept at Murphy Park of moving the rowing activities up the river a short distance, and staff were currently working with the rowing clubs.

It was reported that the Charles Street pump will be left on site and will be transformed into a stage and observation platform.

Councillor Blackie provided an update on the Jones Street repairs and the positive food forest progress with continual growth of community involvement.
16. **QUESTIONS**

Nil.

17. **URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS**

Nil.

The meeting adjourned at 3.08pm and reconvened at 3.25pm.

18. **MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED**

*Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987*

Moved: Councillor Atkinson  Seconded: Councillor Felstead

**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>18.1</td>
<td>Minutes of the public excluded portion of Council meeting of 7 February 2018</td>
<td>Confirmation of minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>Minutes of the public excluded portion of the Community and Recreation Committee meeting of 13 February 2018</td>
<td>Receipt of minutes</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>Minutes of the public excluded portion of the Regeneration Steering Group meeting of 29 January 2018</td>
<td>Receipt of minutes</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>Report of Duncan Roxborough (Implementation Project Manager – District Regeneration)</td>
<td>Contract 18/04 Demolition of the old Pines Beach Community Hall</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>Report of Craig Sargison (Manager Community and Recreation)</td>
<td>Land Divestment Draft Agreement</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18.6 Report of Jim Palmer (Chief Executive)  Insurance Matter  Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7  Section 48(1)(a)

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>18.1 – 18.6</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>

CARRIED

**CLOSED MEETING**

The Public Excluded portion of the meeting occurred from 3.25pm to 4.29pm.

**19. NEXT MEETING**

The next scheduled meeting of the Council is on Tuesday 3 April 2018 commencing at 1pm.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 4.30pm.

CONFIRMED

________________
Chairperson

________________
Date
1. SUMMARY

This report proposes that the process of appointment of a representative of Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga to the District Planning and Regulation Committee (DPRC) be initiated by the Mayor. The purpose of such an appointment would be to assist the Committee in guiding the Review of the District Plan for Council’s consideration. This will help ensure the responsibilities of the Council under legislation and the spirit and intent of its Memorandum of Understanding with Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga are given effect to.

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180223019257.

(b) Requests the Mayor to recommend to the Council an appointee representing Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga to the District Planning and Regulation Committee for the purposes of contributing to the Committee’s work in preparing a proposed Reviewed Waimakariri District Plan

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 The DPRC has before it a significant programme of work over the next two years in preparing for the Council’s consideration a proposed Review of the Waimakariri District Plan made operative in 2005. In so doing, an overarching obligation on the Council under the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) is to recognise and provide for the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other Taonga.

3.2 A number of other provisions of the RMA and the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA) (see Section 7.2) mandate Councils to facilitate iwi participation in decision-making, particularly with respect to resource management matters. In line with its Memorandum of Understanding with Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga (MOU), the Council does this now in a number of ways such as through regular hui. Maahanui Kurataiao Ltd as specialist environmental consultants are providing significant information and advice on the District Plan Review but this is not governance level engagement. The MOU provides for appointment of Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga representation to committees of the Council.
4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. Ensuring meaningful engagement of Māori at formative stages of preparing resource management plans is recognised by Local Government New Zealand (LGNZ) as an important issue for the sector. In guidance material released in 2017 [http://www.lgnz.co.nz/assets/Uploads/44335-LGNZ-Council-Maori-Participation-June-2017.pdf](http://www.lgnz.co.nz/assets/Uploads/44335-LGNZ-Council-Maori-Participation-June-2017.pdf) they set out a number of options. This reflects the increasing importance attached to this issue by Government, as exemplified by the passage of amendments to the RMA last year under the banner of ‘Mana Whakahono a Rohe: Iwi Participation Arrangements’. These provisions provide for an extensive process of engagement with iwi in order to arrive at enhanced ways of securing iwi involvement in Council decision-making.

4.2. The precise means of doing so are not prescribed. A range of formal and informal means are available and in use across the country ranging from hui, through advisory groups, to formal committees and joint entities. Discussions with Ngāi Tūāhuriri through the regular forum with representatives attended for the Council by the Mayor and Chief Executive have noted the increasing importance being attached to participation at formative stages in RMA policy and plan development. This helps to ensure issues and concerns are identified and addressed earlier rather than later in submission and appeal processes.

4.3. An increasingly used way of ensuring this is through representation on standing committees of Councils charged with Review of the District Plan such as is the case with Selwyn District Council. They are undertaking a Review in a comparable timeframe to Waimakariri and have for this purpose appointed representatives from Ngāi Tūāhuriri and Taumutu Rūnanga to their District Planning Committee.

4.4. From available options for ensuring appropriately mandated Ngāi Tūāhuriri advice on cultural values related to resource management through the District Plan Review a similar appointment to the DPRC is considered the best option. Under Standing Orders, the Mayor has certain responsibilities in relation to Committee appointments. It is recommended he be requested to initiate the process with Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga of identifying a suitably qualified and available representative to join the DPRC on those occasions it is considering matters relating to the District Plan Review. It is envisaged this appointment would, with the agreement of the new Council in 2019 be for the duration of the preparation process until such time as when the Council is in a position to notify a Proposed Reviewed District Plan. This is currently projected to be in early 2020.

4.5. The Management Team have reviewed this report and support the recommendations.

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

The views of Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga representatives on the Joint Council:Rūnanga Liaison Committee have been canvassed and they support this proposal.

5.2. **Wider Community**

Views of the wider community on the matter have not been canvassed.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

An appropriate meeting allowance will need to be determined. It is envisaged the fees payable to elected members as RMA Hearings Panel members would act as a guide.
Upon identification of a suitable appointee for recommendation to the Council, the precise costs can be determined. It is anticipated this cost can be met from within existing budget.

6.2. Community Implications

Through legislation and its MOU based partnership, the Council has a particular relation with Ngāi Tūāhuriri people. It is envisaged this governance level input through Rūnanga contribution directly into DPRC recommendations on the Council’s key resource management document meaningfully acknowledges this relationship and will prove mutually beneficial in a better District Plan.

6.3. Risk Management

Having direct Ngāi Tūāhuriri involvement with the DPRC at a formative stage of the District Plan Review mitigates the risk of later divergence of view. This could otherwise arise through potential proposed provisions of the Plan that attract opposition through later statutory engagement processes.

6.4. Health and Safety

There are no particular health and safety issues that arise from extending DPRC membership.

7. CONTEXT

7.1. Policy

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

7.2. Legislation

Local Government Act 2002 - Section 14(1)(d), Section 81 (1) (a) & (b), Schedule 10, Clause 8:

14 Principles relating to local authorities

(1)(d) a local authority should provide opportunities for Māori to contribute to its decision-making processes;

81 Contributions to decision-making processes by Māori

(1) A local authority must—

(a) establish and maintain processes to provide opportunities for Māori to contribute to the decision-making processes of the local authority; and

(b) consider ways in which it may foster the development of Māori capacity to contribute to the decision-making processes of the local authority; and

8 Development of Māori capacity to contribute to decision-making processes

A long-term plan must set out any steps that the local authority intends to take, having undertaken the consideration required by section 81(1)(b), to foster the development of Māori capacity to contribute to the decision-making processes of the local authority over the period covered by that plan.

Resource Management Act 1991 – Section 6(e), Schedule 1 Clause 3b and all of Part 5 Subpart 2—Mana Whakahono a Rohe: Iwi participation arrangements:

6 Matters of national importance

In achieving the purpose of this Act, all persons exercising functions and powers under it, in relation to managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources, shall recognise and provide for the following matters of national importance:
(e) the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga:

Schedule 1 Preparation, change, and review of policy statements and plans

3B Consultation with iwi authorities

For the purposes of clause 3(1)(d), a local authority is to be treated as having consulted with iwi authorities in relation to those whose details are entered in the record kept under section 35A, if the local authority—

(a) considers ways in which it may foster the development of their capacity to respond to an invitation to consult; and

(b) establishes and maintains processes to provide opportunities for those iwi authorities to consult it; and

(c) consults with those iwi authorities; and

(d) enables those iwi authorities to identify resource management issues of concern to them; and

(e) indicates how those issues have been or are to be addressed.

7.3. Community Outcomes

The recommended course of action in this report furthers the following Council objective:

*Effect is given to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi*

- The Council in partnership with Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga continue to build our relationship through mutual understanding and shared responsibilities.

7.4. Delegations

The DPRC is delegated the authority to initiate the processing and reviews of the District Plan.
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REPORT FOR DECISION
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SUBJECT: Submission on Environment Canterbury’s Long-Term Plan 2018-28
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Department Manager pp Chief Executive

1. SUMMARY

1.1 The purpose of this report is to obtain approval to lodge a finalised Council submission to Environment Canterbury’s 2018/28 Long-Term Plan. The formal closing date for submissions to this document is Monday 26 March 2018, however, extension has been granted until Tuesday 3 April.

Attachments:


2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180321030611.

(b) Approves the draft Council submission to Environment Canterbury’s 2018/28 Long-Term Plan (No. 180321030611).

(c) Delegates to the Mayor and Chief Executive responsibility for approving any alterations, additions or deletions that may be required before the submission is due to be lodged prior to the closing date of 3 April 2018.

(d) Circulates copies of this submission to the Community Boards

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 Council makes submissions on Environment Canterbury’s Annual or Long-Term Plans where and when it deems this relevant. Most recently, submissions have been made on the 2016/17 Annual Plan and the 2015-25 Long-Term Plan.

3.2 The Council makes submissions it considers are relevant to matters which are of strategic or regional importance and which have a bearing on successful and sustainable outcomes being achieved in this District. These have included water management, biodiversity, air quality and public passenger transport.
4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. The Council’s submission to Environment Canterbury’s Long-Term Plans and Annual Plans is seen as an important opportunity for the Council to present its views about the Regional Council’s proposals for future programmes at governance level.

4.2. The relationship between the Council and Environment Canterbury is built on relationships between the two organisations at various levels. The introduction to the submission makes it clear that the relationships at staff level are valued.

4.3. The Council continues to support the work of the Regional Council with the Canterbury Water Management Strategy (CWMS), through the joint CWMS Waimakariri Zone Committee and the roll-out in mid-2018 of the Solutions Package.

4.4. The Council supports the focus on the biodiversity and biosecurity portfolio as a strategic priority for the region and fully support the importance of implementing the actions the recommendations made in the recent *Addressing New Zealand’s Biodiversity Challenge* report (prepared for Local Government New Zealand).

4.5. The Council submission encourages Environment Canterbury to demonstrate Regional leadership in the response to (in particular) adaptation to climate change, and work with this District and others to formulate and fund considered responses in the second and third year of the LTP once it becomes clearer what the Zero Carbon Act will require of local government.

4.6. The Council submission requests that the Harbour Master take a more proactive stance in assisting the Council to improve navigational safety in both the Kaiapoi and lower Cam Rivers.

4.7. A representative and more meaningful measurement of ambient air quality, in particular for particulate matter, remains within reach, however, the National Environmental Standards for Air Quality (NESAQ) for fine (PM$_{10}$) and ultra-fine (PM$_{2.5}$) particles needs to be reviewed and amended nationally to align with international best practice. The Council sees Environment Canterbury to be in a particularly influential position to work with the Ministry for the Environment to review and amend the NESAQ.

4.8. At a more practical level, the Council seeks support from the Regional Council for the implementation of the *Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016*, a proposed extension to the Waimakariri River Regional Park and rehabilitation of the Kaiapoi River.

4.9. The Management Team have reviewed this report and support the recommendations.

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

No views have been specifically sought from groups and organisations when preparing this submission.

5.2. **Wider Community**

No views have been sought from the wider community when preparing this submission.
6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications
There are no financial implications in preparing and making this submission.

6.2. Community Implications
There are no immediate community implications in preparing and making this submission.

6.3. Risk Management
There are no organisational risks associated with this submission.

6.4. Health and Safety
There are no health and safety risks associated with this submission.

7. CONTEXT

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

7.2. Legislation
Sections 93-97 of the Local Government Act 2002

7.3. Community Outcomes
There is a safe environment for all
- Harm to people from natural and manmade hazards are minimised and the District has the capacity and resilience to respond to natural disasters
- Our district has the capacity and resilience to quickly recover from natural disasters and adapt to the effects of climate change

There is a healthy and sustainable environment for all
- Harm to the environment from the impacts of land use, use of water resources and air emissions is minimised

Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable, affordable and sustainable
- Communities in our District are well linked with each other and Christchurch is readily accessible by a range of transport modes

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

Mike O’Connell
Senior Policy Analyst
In the Matter of

Environment Canterbury’s 2018/28 Long-Term Plan

Submission by

Waimakariri District Council

March 2018

Person for Contact: Geoff Meadows (Policy Manager)
1. Introduction

The Waimakariri District Council welcomes this opportunity to comment on the Environment Canterbury 2018/28 Long-Term Plan (LTP), and reflect on the ongoing relationship between the two Councils. The Council looks forward to contributing to further collaboration through the Mayoral Forum network of Regional Forums, and welcomes the recent establishment of the Climate Change Working Group.

Council staff are also enjoying positive working relationships with Environment Canterbury staff on the range of issues of principal concern to both organisations including the Canterbury Water Management Strategy, stormwater system management, public passenger transport and efforts to improve water quality in the Kaiapoi River. These relationships play an important part in the effective and efficient operation of both organisations, to the advantage of the people living in the Waimakariri District.

The Council is, nevertheless, concerned to ensure that the amounts paid in rates by people living in its District to Environment Canterbury are soundly based. Many of our ratepayers do not distinguish readily between the amounts paid to the District Council and to Environment Canterbury, and as the organisation that collects the rates for both Councils, this Council is often viewed as accountable. It is this concern together with the appropriateness of the proposed levels of service that prompt many of the Council’s comments on Environment Canterbury’s 2018/28 Long-Term Plan.

2. Summary of submission

The Council has restricted its feedback to commentary on the ECan Portfolios. In brief, the matters addressed in this submission focus on:

**Regional Leadership and Governance**

- Council support for ECan demonstrating leadership in the freshwater management and biodiversity portfolios as well as welcoming the establishment of the Climate Change Working Group.

**Freshwater Management**

- Council continues to support the work of ECan with the Canterbury Water Management Strategy (CWMS), through the joint CWMS Waimakariri Zone Committee.

**Biodiversity and Biosecurity**

- Council supports the focus on the biodiversity and biosecurity portfolio as a strategic priority for the Region

**Hazards Risk and Resilience**
The Council applauds the establishment of the new programme of work, Climate Change Integration
The Council also encourages ECa to demonstrate Regional leadership to lead the Canterbury response to climate change and work with this District and others to formulate and fund considered responses in the second and third year of the LTP
ECa’s Harbour Master is asked to take a more proactive stance in assisting the Council to improve operating navigation safety in both the Kaiapoi and lower Cam Rivers.
The Council requests that ECa consider widening its energy portfolio to work with stakeholders on the broader matters of energy security, reliability and affordability
In conjunction with the Council Kaiapoi River Rehabilitation Working Party, the Council requests ECa provide base ongoing funding of $25,000 per annum to enable its prioritised projects to be progressed.

Transport and Urban Development

The Council applauds steps being taken by ECa to better plan and invest in urban development and transport infrastructure and services.

Air Quality

The Council welcomes the strategic focus on addressing air quality issues, especially around home heating and applauds the introduction of the 'Healthier Homes Canterbury' voluntary loan scheme to assist Rangiora and Kaiapoi communities
The Council still has concerns around the current National Environmental Standard for Air Quality (NESAQ) being used for particulate matter. The Council draws attention to the issue then of anomalies associated with the NESAQ for PM10 being based on exceedances rather than on annual averages.

3. Regional Leadership and Governance
Continued collaboration over the Canterbury Water Management Strategy is supported and progress being made on Waimakariri Land and Water Solutions Programme, is pleasing, particularly the progress being aimed at completing the Zone Implementation Programme Addendum (ZIPA) during the 2018 calendar year.

It is noted that biodiversity is one of ECa’s two strategic priority programmes, and Council supports ECa to continue to show leadership in this programme by advancing a dialogue with Central Government to bring about recommendation #3 in the LGNZ 2017 biodiversity report\(^1\) regarding the ‘importance of a national plan and delivering joined-up action across all players’.

Within the Hazards/Risk/Resilience programme, the Council welcomes establishment of the Climate Change Working Group, recognising that programmes and initiatives which relate to mitigation of and adaptation to climate change are vitally important for the Canterbury region.

---

1. Addressing New Zealand’s Biodiversity Challenge
The Council also supports ECan’s role in the increasingly effective management of hazardous land and waste and associated collaboration with this Council on these issues.

**Plans, Consenting and Compliance**

The Council acknowledges ECan’s assistance with the District Plan Review.

This Council’s consent processing is moving towards full digitisation as part of the Council’s mobile data project, which will ultimately lead to data improvement for compliance work and will assist this Council to match (and hopefully exceed) the listed targets under 3.7.1 and 3.7.2 (p58).

The Council considers that the ECan programme generally aligns with our longer terms goals for the collection and analysis of compliance data. Feedback from our community does however point to concern about the proactivity of ECan in achieving consent compliance on a number of fronts.

4. **Freshwater Management**

The Council continues to support the work of ECan with the Canterbury Water Management Strategy (CWMS), through the joint CWMS Waimakariri Zone Committee. It is important that this initiative continues to be seen as involving wider stakeholder collaboration including the close relationship between our two Councils.

Of importance to the District is ongoing work on the Solutions Package and in regard to that programme of work, the Council acknowledges the commendable leadership ECan (in particular, via ECan Chief Scientist, Dr Tim Davie) has demonstrated in fronting the groundwater issue presentations to elected members and the media.

**Management Plan for the Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary**

The need to protect, and educate people about, the significant wildlife and cultural values associated with the Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary (Te Akaaka) was highlighted during the *Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016* submission process. The Hearing Panel considered that a management plan, incorporating a long term vision and agreed outcomes, needed to be developed for the estuary and this was included as action ARE.2 in the Bylaw Implementation Plan.

The development of a management plan for Te Akaaka may be considered by the Waimakariri Zone Committee as part of their Solutions Package for the ZIP addendum, and it is important that sufficient budget is included for this purpose within the next three years.

The Council supports this inclusion and highlights the strong views expressed by submitters to both the *Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016* and the Bylaw Implementation Plan, the significance of the wildlife in the estuary, and the progress needed to achieve the following agreed aspiration contained within the Implementation Plan:

‘The community, ECan, DOC, Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri, Fenton Reserve Trustees and the Council recognise the estuary is a wetland of international significance and actively seek to protect it’.

---

2 See additional comments below in regard to the Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016.
5. Biodiversity and Biosecurity

Biodiversity
Council supports the focus on the biodiversity and biosecurity portfolio as a strategic priority for the Region and fully supports advancing practical actions from the LGNZ think piece Addressing New Zealand’s Biodiversity Challenge. In particular, ECan has a key regional role around (R1) ‘the need for strong leadership and clarity of roles and responsibilities’ (recommendation #1). In March 2018, the Regional Planning Managers Group resolved to engage key Central Government agencies towards developing a Canterbury response to the think piece, and have scheduled to dedicate their next meeting in July 2018 for this purpose.

It is important that the conservation and enhancement of indigenous biodiversity on private land are well articulated and founded in practical actions.

Biosecurity
While the Regional Pest Management Plan is not directly an LTP matter, Council supports the adoption of the plan, and looks forward to seeing tangible results in the management and control of pest species within our District including Russell lupin and wilding conifers.

6. Hazards Risk and Resilience

Climate Change Integration Programme
The Council applauds the establishment of the new programme of work, Climate Change Integration. Mitigation of and adaption to climate change need to go beyond business-as-usual approaches and alter approaches to dealing with the direct and indirect impacts of a changing climate system on the hydrological system, rural and urban land use, urban development, planning, the transport system, the energy system (including electricity networks), social structures and governance structures; and recognize the myriad of interdependencies between the systems.

The Government’s response to climate change has been firmly signalled in its 100 Day Plan for Climate Change.

Furthermore, the Council notes the recent release of the new Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment’s (Simon Upton) report A Zero Carbon Act for New Zealand. While mitigation currently is a responsibility at a national level, local government will play an increasingly important role in relation to adaptation. In relation to local government, the Commissioner’s report states:

"While the responsibility for adapting to climate change is at present largely devolved to local government in New Zealand, it will also need to be considered in national planning and investments. Adaptation will have an impact on decision-making at both central and local government level, as well as decision-making within communities, by iwi, businesses and...

---

3 The 100 Day Plan for Climate Change (dated 20.12.2017) prepared by Ministry for the Environment for the Office of the Minister for Climate Change.
individuals. Any approach to adapting to the impacts of climate change needs to be coordinated across these many actors’

There is need to act now to ensure resilient systems are in place in place for both mitigating emissions and adapting to the effects of climate change in Canterbury. Early action provides more time and options for the transition to a low-emissions economy. Additionally, fewer sunk costs are likely to occur in investments that do not aid the transition. This is important for smaller councils like Waimakariri which have to defend annual rate increases to fund new infrastructure.

The Council encourages ECAn to demonstrate Regional leadership to lead the Canterbury response to climate change and work with this District and others to formulate and fund considered responses in the second and third year of the LTP, once it becomes clearer what the Zero Carbon Act will require of local government.

Energy

The production and end-use of energy (including electricity, heat, transportation fuels and biomass) is inextricably connected to climate change. With regard to energy, the Council notes in the LTP that energy management is largely limited to matters of energy efficiency and Regional Council responsibilities under the Energy Efficiency and Conservation Act 2001, broadly, insulating private dwellings for warmth and dryness to improve ambient air quality.

The Council requests that ECAn consider widening its energy portfolio to work with stakeholders on the broader matters of energy security, reliability and affordability and to (re)examine a number of local opportunities for development of renewable energy resources.

As recently as 2009/10, ECAn had an active energy portfolio. ECAn, together with Regional and national stakeholders (including the Canterbury Employers’ Chamber of Commerce, Transpower and Mainpower), developed a non-statutory Regional Energy Strategy, a strategy which at the time received strong endorsement from senior leaders and elected members and the support of central government to develop regional strategies of this nature.

The purpose of this strategy was to enhance the energy resilience of Canterbury, by ensuring a secure, reliable, affordable and sustainable energy system. It proposed three key directions that, when taken together, would keep options open (change in technology adoption and social responses), to ensure a diversity of energy sources and create an environment for innovation.

It is timely, given a LTP portfolio which includes ‘resilience’, for ECAn’s energy portfolio to be widened, utilising existing cross-boundary partnerships, e.g. the Resilient Greater Christchurch Plan, drawing upon funding streams which are being or have been established and are complementary to creating a resilient energy system.

The Government’s Confidence and Supply Agreement notes that the Government will request the proposed Climate Change Commission to plan the transition to 100 per cent renewable electricity (the Renewable Electricity Target) by 2035. This may very likely be mandated by the Carbon Zero Act.

Similarly to climate change, the Council encourages ECAn to demonstrate Regional leadership on energy, recommending firstly that the Region’s districts, energy end-users and energy companies
reinvestigate development in Year 1 of the LTP of a Regional Energy Strategy. Initially, this would derive a small rate burden but with the introduction of demonstration projects in Years 2/3, the strategy can become increasingly funded by external investors.

Navigation Safety in the Kaiapoi and Lower Cam Rivers

The Council has received a number of requests since 2014 from Kaiapoi River users for improvement to specific areas of the Kaiapoi River ‘navigation channel’, including from the Coastguard. The Kaiapoi River Rehabilitation Working Party (the Working Party), following receipt of this feedback, commissioned a detailed study in which report authors recommended further investigation into an option of targeted dredging of high spots in the river bed to create a minimum depth navigation channel in the Kaiapoi River.

The report recommendations state ‘a number of “high spots” exist in the channel, where depths are currently 1.0 – 1.5 m or less at low water and particular attention is required when navigating. Targeted dredging of these identified high spots could improve the safety of all vessels using the river, but particularly for Coastguard operations. This would also extend the tidal “window” for any deeper draught vessels that may in future use the Kaiapoi River’ (Marico Marine 2016, p.7).

Furthermore ‘the Coastguard representatives present for the scoping visit reported that they are currently able to use the river at all stages of the tide, albeit by navigating very carefully at low water. Having such minimal under-keel clearance is not ideal from a safety of navigation perspective, with the risk of grounding en-route to a rescue. Other river users currently restrict their passage to when the tide is higher, if limited by their vessels draught’ (Marico Marine 2016, p.21).

The report also notes ‘Coastguard reported their ideal operational depth would be a minimum of 1.5m water depth. This provides a small safety margin to prevent engine or propeller damage. The Coastguard need should be seen as a minimum, as to operate anything larger than a craft of the type used by Coastguard at present would be difficult’ (Marico Marine, 2016, p.8).

Taking into account of the consultant’s recommendations, the Council is now further investigating the potential targeted dredging of Kaiapoi River bed ‘high points’ and is in process of undertaking detailed dredging design and consent applications for the work, to lodge with ECAn.

The Council would appreciate the support of ECAn’s Harbour Master and river engineering teams in determining technical aspects of the proposed navigation channel requirements. It will also be seeking technical advice and support to assist the Council with the resource consents and design process.

The Harbour Master is also asked to take a more proactive stance in assisting the Council to improve operating navigation safety in both the Kaiapoi and lower Cam Rivers. This should include assistance to remove temporary fishing structures where these impede navigation in the rivers, and in particular in areas where access of the Coastguard may be reduced.

---

Kaiapoi River Rehabilitation Project Funding

The Working Party requests ECAn provide base ongoing funding of $25,000 per annum as a cost share with the Waimakariri District Council to enable its prioritised projects to be progressed.

It is noted that the Working Party resolved at its most recent meeting on 25 October 2017 to ask ‘that the Waimakariri District Council and Environment Canterbury each consider providing ongoing funding of $25,000 per annum through their Long Term Plans to enable continued staged implementation of the Kaiapoi River Rehabilitation Project’.

At this meeting, the Working Party endorsed the concept option described in the Marico Marine report to ‘dredge high spots in the river bed, which will improve safety at low tide for the Coastguard and other river users and recommends this option to the Waimakariri District Council and Environment Canterbury using available project funding in 2018/19 and 2019/20 as a priority project for implementation’.

The actual funding for dredging the proposed minimum depth navigation channel is currently being confirmed and will depend on scoping of detailed design and selected dredging and spoil disposal methods. The Council is requesting a cost share from Environment Canterbury of at least $25,000 per annum for this work in 2018/19 or 2019/20 (timing dependent on design and consenting inputs), in recognition of the public safety benefit of the proposed navigation channel.

Coastal Environment and Hazards

The Council has concerns about delay in the review of the Regional Coastal Environment Plan and suggests that an additional Level of Service, Measure and Target be incorporated in this Programme. The following wording is suggested:


Measure 6.X.1: The Canterbury Coastal Environment Plan is reviewed in Year 2 taking account of newly available coastal science data and information work.

Target 6.X.1: The Canterbury Regional Policy Statement is amended in accordance with statutory timeframes.

The Council would also like to see ECAn adopt a more consistent approach to the management of coastal hazards for those districts, including Waimakariri, with coastlines. This would include documenting coastal processes, beach profiles, sea level rise and potential impacts of climate change. The Council sees strong merit with matching the work on coastal hazards with the complementary approaches being proposed in the Climate Change Integration programme, and that this is best coordinated at Regional level.

7. Transport and Urban Development

Transport

The Council applauds steps being taken by ECAn to better plan and invest in urban development and transport infrastructure and services.
The issue of the provision of services between the major urban centres in the District, rather than simply running these as part of the service between the District and Christchurch, is an on-going concern. Council surveys of households living in recently completed dwellings in Rangiora and Kaiapoi have indicated that they are concerned about the distances to their town centres and the absence of public transport.

The provision of services originating and terminating within the District is a complex issue, and as it stated in its 2015-25 LTP submission, one that the Council would welcome the opportunity to continue to explore with ECan staff. A joint needs analysis could be undertaken in the 2018/19 financial year to address issues such as the impact of development that has occurred since 2015, projected areas available for development, and the current and future demographic characteristics of the District’s population, as these all impact on the demand for public transport.

The Carbon Zero Act (cited elsewhere in this submission) is due in 2019 and likely to require more direct action to be taken by Regional Councils to reduce transport sector greenhouse gas emissions. ECan also acknowledges (p.40 of the LTP Working Document) that it needs to be responsive to the pending Government Policy Statement on Land Transport 2018 which is likely to be more directive and require Regional Councils to consider options for increasing high-frequency bus routes, and the possible introduction of commuter rail between Christchurch and its satellite towns, including Rangiora and Kaiapoi.

While the 2014 Northern Commuter Rail Study showed for three key reasons that a commuter rail service between Rangiora and Christchurch was not viable in the short term, the Council remains committed to working with ECan on transport initiatives including the Greater Christchurch Future Public Transport Business Case, that is, what the public transport system might look like over the next 30 years.

The new Government has to that end committed an additional $100m from the National Land Transport Fund in capital investment to Greater Christchurch multi-modal public transport, including commuter rail from Rolleston to the Christchurch CBD as a first step. It is important that options for a comparable link to Rangiora are not diminished.

The other major urban centres of Auckland and Wellington have each in recent years mounted cases for and achieved significant strategic investment in public passenger transport system upgrades. Public passenger transport in Greater Christchurch requires comparable strategic development consistent with its growth and development as a metropolitan area. Significant regional leadership is required to achieve this.

**Urban Development**

The Council welcomes the opportunity to work with ECan on the 3-yearly capacity assessment of land available for feasible development required under the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity and any review of statutory documents such as the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement.

8. **Air Quality**

The Council welcomes the strategic focus on addressing air quality issues, especially around home heating. To that end, the Council applauds the introduction of the 'Healthier Homes Canterbury'
voluntary loan scheme and regards this as an important measure to assist Rangiora and Kaiapoi communities to live in a warmer and dryer home environment.

However, the Council still has concerns, and are the same concerns which it raised in its submission on the 2015/25 LTP, around the current National Environmental Standard for Air Quality (NESAQ) being used for particulate matter. The Council drew attention to the issue then of apparent anomalies associated with the NESAQ for PM$_{10}$ being based on exceedances rather than on annual averages in the submission to the Regional Council’s 2015/25 Long-term Plan. This point is re-iterated in this submission.

The trend data for exceedances (drawn directly from ECan’s air quality data) for Rangiora and Kaiapoi is shown in Figure 1.

![Image of Figure 1](image)

Figure 1 Annual exceedances in Rangiora and Kaiapoi and comparison with Christchurch airshed

While the number of high pollution nights exceeds the NESAQ, the Council contends the measure remains incorrect and gives the perception that winter ambient air quality in Rangiora and Kaiapoi is worse than what it is in reality. This is particularly important for the Kaiapoi airshed where PM$_{10}$ exceedances are unhelpfully enhanced by a particulate loading bias of coastal sea spray particles.

The Council contends this remains a flawed measure of air quality in the District (and indeed, regionally and nationally) and that the annual average concentration of PM$_{10}$ is the correct measure as shown in Figure 2. This has been borne out in the 2014 report on air quality by the then Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment, Dr Jan Wright. The points she made in that report in 2014 are still relevant in 2018. Four years on, the ECan trend data is showing that the air quality (in relation to PM$_{10}$) in Canterbury settlements continues to improve.

It is appreciated there are a handful of high pollution nights in our towns but the trend bears it out, even with an increasing population in Rangiora, that air quality is improving, chiefly via measure made in the Clean Heat and related programmes.

---

5 The state of air quality in New Zealand Commentary by the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment on the 2014 Air Domain Report
However, the World Health Organization (WHO) has four guidelines for particulate concentrations: two for PM$_{10}$ (one for short-term exposure and one for long-term exposure) and two guidelines for PM$_{2.5}$. WHO is clear that the long-term exposure guidelines are more important than the short-term exposure guidelines because the health impacts on the population are much greater. WHO recommend that the annual average take precedence over the 24-hour average.\(^6\)

![Annual average concentrations of PM$_{10}$ in Rangiora and Kaiapoi and comparison with Christchurch airshed](image)

In reality, the seriousness of such exceedances on public health are spurious using the current NES measurement. It is easy to gain the impression that once a guideline level is crossed, the effect of particulates on people’s health suddenly becomes much greater. However, this is not the case as there is no threshold in the dose-response curve for long-term exposure to particulates.

As noted in section 3.3, the degree of the exceedances (the height of the winter spikes) is not reflected in the PM$_{10}$ rule. There is no distinction between an exceedance of 51 μg/m$^3$ and an exceedance of 101 μg/m$^3$. This reinforces the perception of a threshold.

Dr Wright confirms this her report ‘There is no “safe” level of air pollution, and air quality in New Zealand is generally good and likely to continue improving.’ She adds that ‘the policy goal should be to ensure progressive improvement, and a rule could be designed in such a way as to incentivise this.’

In addition, it is now widely accepted among air quality scientists that PM$_{2.5}$ concentrations are a better indicator of health impacts across the population than PM$_{10}$ concentrations. This is because the smaller particles are, the more damaging they are to human health\(^7\).

The Council sees Environment Canterbury Councillors in a particularly influential position to work with the Ministry for the Environment to review and amend the NESAQ for the measurement of PM$_{10}$, namely:


\(^7\) WHO Air quality guidelines: Global update 2005: Particulate matter, ozone, nitrogen dioxide and sulfur dioxide.
- amend the NESAQ for PM$_{10}$ to be in line with best management practice elsewhere in the world and with WHO guidelines
- to mandate as soon as is possible the NESAQ for PM$_{2.5}$ line with WHO recommendations and best international practice.

9. Other comments

**Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 Implementation Plan**

In December 2017, the Council adopted the Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 Implementation Plan (attached to this submission) which was developed by a joint working party chaired by (the late) Councillor Peter Allen and consisted of WDC and ECan staff, Community Board members and representatives from Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga, Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust, Department of Conservation and the Ashley-Rakahuri Rivercare Group. A coastal advisory group is currently in the process of being set up to oversee the implementation of the Plan.

Sealing of the Kairaki Beach car park (**action PS.6**) was identified as a priority project to be funded in a 50/50 arrangement by ECan and the Council. The Council has allocated $80,000 in the 2019/20 financial year for this project and notes ECan has done the same.

The Council would like to reiterate its support for the continued inclusion in ECan’s LTP of $80,000 in 2019/20 for sealing the car park at Kairaki Beach.

**Kaiapoi River Channel Maintenance**

The Council is asking Environment Canterbury to work with it to implement a proactive maintenance, amenity, recreation and enhancement programme for the Kaiapoi River through the centre of Kaiapoi. This should involve an agreed programme for the control of willows, noxious and rank weeds and provision of amenity and landscaping including, potentially, selected areas of planting and open spaces on the lower banks of the Kaiapoi River to the water’s edge, implemented through the full extent of the town centre.

The proactive management of maintenance and amenity of the river in the town centre is similar to that already provided within every other town centre in New Zealand, where landscaping, urban design, naturalised areas and streetscape are recognised in strategies and management approaches in every jurisdiction. Kaiapoi is unique to New Zealand in that there is a river within the heart of the town immediately adjoining boutique shops, entertainment and dining facilities and civic structures. This requires a unique new management approach that includes flood protection and river engineering inputs as well as landscaping and amenity.

The management of the river is integral to the tourism values and general function of the town centre. It will likely also influence the overall success of the town centre redevelopment.

A decision on roles and responsibilities for maintenance of the river through the town centre is now critical.

The Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board also has concerns about the impact of Waimakariri River minimum flows on saltwater intrusion of the Kaiapoi River. It is important that the ECan science and monitoring budget is adequate to assess the cause and effects of these impacts conclusively. Now that the scientific data around the influence of the Waimakariri River on the Kaiapoi River is
available, it is important that ECAN takes into account what outcomes the community wants for the Kaiapoi River.

Enhanced linkage to the Waimakariri River Regional Park

There is an opportunity to enhance the linkages between the Silverstream Reserve and lower Silverstream through to the Kaiapoi River and town centre to the Kaiapoi Island to form a recreation and biodiversity ‘corridor’, thereby improving the connections with the Waimakariri River Regional Park.

This could be achieved through extending and connecting the existing separate amenity, recreation, landscaping and biodiversity projects along the margins of these waterways. The corridor would follow the path of the Kaiapoi River system beginning at the headwaters of the Silverstream near the Waimakariri River, creating a loop via the margins of these waterways to and along the Kaiapoi and Waimakariri Rivers back to the Silverstream source. These areas could be connected using existing land corridors including roads and stopbanks. This corridor would be formed and extended as a part of the ongoing development of the Waimakariri River Regional Park.

This extension would provide a valuable improvement to the management of the whole river system. It could logically be managed through an extension to this Regional Park work programme, as the Silverstream and downstream Kaiapoi River, prior to the early 1900’s, lay within an active branch of the braided Waimakariri River floodplain and were originally a part of the braided Waimakariri River ‘north branch’.

The Council now recommends the interconnection of remnants of the original braided channel with new biodiversity and recreational corridors, including extensions to the existing walking and cycling trails so that the values of the waterways and improvements made are more visible and accessible.

This proposal would sit within the budget envelope and scope of target 6.9.1 of the consultation document, which provides for a strategic review of parks and reserve land management in 2019/20.

The Council wishes to be heard in support of this submission. Thank you.
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1 This report requests Council to appoint three Councillors for the Hearing Panel for the Liquor Ban Bylaw review and the review of the Local Alcohol Policy.

1.2 The two reviews will be run concurrently and the hearings held at the same time because of the overlap of matters between the policy and bylaw. The deliberations will be clearly timetabled separately.

1.3 The proposed timing of these hearings is the week of 2 July 2018 with the deliberations meetings to be held in the week of 23 July 2018 with dates to be confirmed once Councillors are appointed.

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180321030359

(b) Appoints Councillors ______________, ________________ and ______________ to the Hearing and Deliberations Panel for the review of the Local Alcohol Policy and to the Hearing and Deliberations Panel for the review of the Liquor Ban Bylaw

(c) Appoints one of these Councillors, Cr ______________ as Chair of the two panels.

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 On 5 December 2017, Council supported the concurrent review of the Liquor Ban Bylaw and the Local Alcohol Policy to enable community responses to alcohol related issues in the one consultation rather than separating the processes.

3.2 The review of the bylaw is a statutory process, it being ten years since the last review. The changes to the *Local Government Act 2002*, necessitates a review of the bylaw before 18 December 2018 or it will lapse.
3.3 The review of the Local Alcohol Policy is an early review, three years instead of the statutory time frame of six years. On the first adoption of the Local Alcohol Policy in February 2015 it was decided to have an earlier review date to give a formal opportunity for the Council, its partner agencies and key stakeholders as well as the wider community, to consider the application and efficacy of the policy under the new regime.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. The review of both the bylaw and the policy require a special consultative procedure (SCP) set out in the *Local Government Act 2002* and the *Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012*.

4.2. Part of the SCP requires the Council to “provide an opportunity for persons to present their views to the local authority in a manner that enables spoken interaction between the person and the local authority…..”

4.3. The setting of a hearing panel at this meeting will facilitate the production of the consultation documentation.

4.4. The Management Team have reviewed this report and support the recommendations.

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

New Zealand Police and Medical Officer of Health are partner agencies in the review of the Local Alcohol Policy and are involved in the process.

Key Council staff and stakeholders such as the community boards, youth council and licensees are being consulted as the reviews progress.

5.2. **Wider Community**

The wider community will have the opportunity to express their views through the public consultation submission process.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

The cost of reviewing both the Liquor Ban Bylaw 2007 and Local Alcohol Policy 2015, is programmed and met from existing budgets and staff resources.

6.2. **Community Implications**

The Hearing Panel ensures submitters who want to present their submissions in person are given a reasonable opportunity to do so.

6.3. **Risk Management**

The Liquor Ban Bylaw 2007 review must be completed before 18 December 2018 or it will lapse under s11 of the *Local Government Act (Alcohol Reform) Amendment Act 2012*.

6.4. **Health and Safety**

Nil
7. CONTEXT

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

7.2. Legislation

- Local Government Act 2002, s83
- Local Government Act (Alcohol Reform) Amendment Act, s147
- Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012, subpart 2 local alcohol policies
- Sale and Supply of Alcohol Regulations 2013
- New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990

7.3. Community Outcomes

**There is a safe environment for all**

- Harm to people from natural and man-made hazards is minimised and our district has the capacity and resilience to respond to natural disasters.
- Crime, injury and harm from road accidents, gambling, and alcohol abuse are minimised.

**The distinctive character of our towns, villages and rural areas is maintained**

- The centres of our main towns are safe, convenient and attractive places to visit and do business.

**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.

7.4. Delegation

Delegation not required as this is a Council resolution.
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1. SUMMARY

1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek Council adoption of the final Waimakariri District Development Strategy (DDS) ‘Our District, Our Future - Waimakariri 2048’. The DDS has undergone significant community input to date. In December, decisions on comments were made by a panel appointed by Council. These decisions have now been incorporated into a final DDS document for Council approval.

1.2 Attachment (ii) to this report is a pre-print ready version of the DDS document showing where changes have been over the original that Council approved for consultation. The document remains themed around seven key areas being environment, growing communities, rural areas and small settlements, connections, economy, centres and community spaces and places. Key changes are summarised at section 4.2 of this report.

Attachments:
   i. Summary of Submissions, Officer’s Recommendations and Hearing Panel Recommendations (180103000103).

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180322031167.

(b) Adopts the final Waimakariri District Development Strategy (DDS) ‘Our District, Our Future - Waimakariri 2048’, noting recommendation (c) below.

(c) Nominates the District Development portfolio holder (Councillor Atkinson) to confirm any minor edits of the District Development Strategy (final print ready version) as required in conjunction with staff prior to finalising.

(d) Circulates a copy of this report to the Community Boards for their information.
3. **BACKGROUND**

**Background**

3.1. The District Development Strategy (DDS) is a high-level, long-range strategic document that provides a spatial framework to guide growth in the District over the next 30 years. It is informed by various community and technical inputs and also local, regional and national planning frameworks. The DDS is intended to outline directions for growth management and is designed to act as a broad statement of direction to inform more detailed decision making within the context of a long-term view.

3.2. The DDS forms part of the ongoing process to ensure that growth management, within the Waimakariri and Greater Christchurch context, is current and forward looking. It is projected that up to approximately 15,000 more houses might be required to accommodate growth, together with business, infrastructure and public facilities requirements, under the most likely growth scenario out to 2048. To prepare for growth, we need to ensure it is well planned, integrated and sustainable for current and future generations. Managing growth will help deliver economic, social, environmental and cultural benefits.

**Consultation and deliberations**

3.3. Attachment (i) includes a summary of consultation undertaken as part of the development of the DDS. The draft DDS document is arranged by seven themes and the most heavily commented on key strategic theme overall is ‘Our rural area and small settlements’, followed by ‘Our growing communities’. The least commented on key strategic theme overall is ‘Our centres’. Overall, the directions, initiatives and concepts proposed in the draft Strategy were largely supported by submitters.

3.4. Attachment (i) provides recommended staff and panel recommendations based on the comments received. The Panel comprised Mayor Ayers and Councillors Meyer, Atkinson and Williams. This panel was nominated by Council in June 2017 to make decisions on comments received during the formal public consultation undertaken for the draft ‘Our District, Our Future – Waimakariri 2048, District Development Strategy’ and to recommend a final District Development Strategy for Council approval taking into account those decisions.

3.5. Deliberations and decisions on the District Development Strategy and decisions occurred in December 2018 to coincide with decisions being made in response to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity (NPS-UDC). As the District Development Strategy has a focus on housing and business development capacity and spatial directions, it will play a key role in implementing the requirements of the NPS-UDC as a lead into desired Regional Policy Statement changes and the District Plan Review.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. Attachment (ii) sets out the recommended changes to the DDS based on the decisions of the Panel. Please note that this attachment relates to text changes only at this time and consequential changes are to be made to graphics including maps (such as the townships and the hazards map) and the timeline. It is recommended that Councillor Atkinson in his capacity as portfolio holder for District Development confirms the final changes before the document is sent to print and made available to submitters, stakeholders and the public.

**Key points of change**

4.2. The following summarises key changes to the DDS document as a result of decisions made by the Panel. These are:
Amendments to the executive summary reflecting changes to content including updated land needs for retail/commercial activities, monitoring of industrial demand and supply, preferences relating to a Rural Zone lot size increase, and recognition of the work undertaken to date (and on-going) in regard to the NPS on Urban Development Capacity.

The consultation section is updated, as set out above, and the prompting questions and ‘next steps’ removed.

In terms of Part 2, the Strategy’s vision is confirmed along with a note that recognises not only the District’s rural context and importance, but also the significant and growing townships that the majority of the District’s residents call home.

‘Our Environment’ includes additional text related to biodiversity management and puts in place direction for Council to clearly identify biodiversity issues and responsibilities for the district, including responsibilities and opportunities for coordination. Similar changes recommended by the Panel in relation to water management are made.

A new section on climate change is added, confirming feedback from commenters that climate change and its effects is a matter that Council, in conjunction with the community, must address within the context of risk and development.

In terms of urban growth directions, the broad growth directions for the towns were confirmed, but further noting that demographic changes may lead to the need to enable a wider change of housing choice.

At section 2.5, key decisions reflected in the DDS relate to exploring opportunities for increasing the minimum rural lot sizes in parts of the district, especially on good quality land to support primary production; and for rural residential development, adopt an approach that has a primary focus on creating new rural residential areas, with a secondary focus on enabling large lot intensification within existing rural residential areas where there is sufficient community support and servicing available.

At section 2.6, amendments are made to identify a desire to seek improved connections through outline development plans in growth areas, in consultation with infrastructure providers, and to consider and implement were appropriate the findings of the district wide speed management programme, which includes a programme to review speed limits.

Text has also been added in section 2.6 to note transport network constraints in the future, and in order to maximise travel efficiency over the next 30 years it will be important to match improvements in the transport network with changes in ‘how’ we travel.

For ‘Our Centres’, amendments have recognised a need for a strategic planning process to consider the provision of community facilities in North Woodend, and to develop an approach to confirm the future form and function of the existing Woodend town centre. Both these link to the identification of North Woodend as a possible Key Activity Centre.

The Panel reflecting on the role of Schools as part of the wider community’s social infrastructure and this is reflected in changes to section 2.9 of the DDS.

In regard to spatial growth directions, work to respond to the NPS – UDC was based on the same future population projections for the District. In turn, the NPS work has effectively confirmed the household projections used in the draft DDS (and for the
2018-28 LTP) i.e. approximately 15,000 houses should be anticipated over 30 years, that additional retail/commercial land up to 17ha should be planned for in and around the key centres and that opportunities for long term industrial land provision should be carefully monitored.

- Part 3 ‘Making it happen’ is updated to take into account the above.

**Next Steps**

4.3. Next steps for the DDS include finalisation of the document based on any minor feedback received, completing the document and images (final print ready version), making the document available to all that commented, stakeholders, interested parties and the public. The website will be updated. Reporting and progress updates will be made as required based on Part 3 of the DDS document.

4.4. The Management Team have reviewed this report and support the recommendations.

**5. COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

A number of groups and stakeholders made comment on the draft DDS. In addition, a number of these were contacted and involved in parts of the Strategy preparation. Staff worked with Mahanaui Kurataiao Limited in the preparation of the consultation material and the draft DDS. Briefings were carried out with the Community Boards and Board members were invited or attended the various workshop sessions and public drop-in sessions held to prepare and promote the DDS last year.

5.2. **Wider Community**

The DDS has involved a significant amount of community engagement and the outcomes of this engagement are reflected both in the draft DDS document and the recommended DDS for approval. More information and a link to the summary of the early engagement document comments is available on the project webpage waimakariri.govt.nz/DistrictDevelopment. Attachment (i) provides an additional summary.

**6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

There are no financial implications directly associated with the finalisation of the DDS. The DDS does however provide a framework for additional actions, such as informing the District Plan Review. Existing budgets or those sought through the 2018-28 LTP will apply to the implementation of the DDS.

6.2. **Community Implications**

Significant opportunities for community engagement have made available to date. Other opportunities will be associated with the actions that drop from DDS implementation. The overall implication for the community by adopting the DDS is the setting in place of an overarching strategy to guide decisions making in the areas that it addresses, including spatial planning directions and Council intend to inform the District Plan Review.

6.3. **Risk Management**

No risks are identified in relation to the recommendations.
6.4. **Health and Safety**

Not applicable.

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

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

7.2. **Legislation**


7.3. **Community Outcomes**

- There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision making that effects our District.
- There is a healthy and sustainable environment for all.
- There are areas of significant indigenous vegetation and habitats for indigenous fauna.
- Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality.
- The distinctive character of our takiwā - towns, villages and rural areas is maintained.

7.4. **Delegations**

Council approved the preparation of the DDS in 2016 and approved the formal public consultation approach and document in June 2017.
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Introduction and purpose

The draft Strategy provides a spatial framework to guide the anticipated growth of the Waimakariri District over the next 30 years and sets out broad directions for growth and development.

The purpose of this report is to:

- summarise the comments made in submissions received during the formal public consultation period for the draft Our District, Our Future – Waimakariri 2948, District Development Strategy;
- assist the hearing panel in understanding the overall key trends emerging from all submissions;
- provide recommendations to the Council’s hearing panel to inform their deliberations; and
- record the hearing panel recommendations.

This report utilises the Summary of Submissions report (dated August 2017) and the Officer’s Recommendations report (dated December 2017), and adds the hearing panel recommendations in response.

It is intended that a revised Our District, Our Future – Waimakariri 2048, District Development Strategy will then be presented to full Council for adoption in early 2018.

Background

The draft Strategy was released for public comment for five weeks ending 14 July 2017. Several engagement tools were utilised during this period including:

- The project webpage (waimakariri.govt.nz/DistrictDevelopment), which contains information about the project context, background and consultation process, as well as an electronic copy of the full and summary draft Strategy, an online feedback form, links to the collection of videos created to stimulate interest and discussion on the draft Strategy, and downloadable background documents
- A series of eight videos that were progressively released during formal consultation on the project webpage and via social media to stimulate interest and discussion in the draft Strategy – there were a total of 38,000 views of the videos over the consultation period and near 100,000 people (e.g. Facebook accounts) reached
- Social media alerts and information
- Hard copies of the full and summary draft Strategy made available at Council Service Centres and libraries
- A number of targeted emails to various stakeholders who have an interest in the project and/or who have been involved in the preparation of the draft Strategy
- Targeted meetings with key stakeholders, for example, Environment Canterbury, Christchurch City Council, New Zealand Transport Agency and others
- Drop-in sessions held in Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Oxford, Woodend, Loburn, Fernside and West Eyreton to provide the opportunity to discuss the draft Strategy and ask any questions of staff
- A special stakeholder event for individuals, groups and organisations who were involved in topic specific focus group meetings and/or Community Board hosted workshops in the preparation of the draft Strategy
- Newsletter content
- Newspaper advertorials and Community Noticeboard
Information on electronic boards displayed at Council Service Centres and libraries

The formal consultation period followed extensive community and stakeholder early engagement in the months leading up to the release of a draft Strategy. The early engagement process is summarised in the full draft Strategy.

The Council received 88 submissions during the five-week formal consultation period. Around a quarter of these represented groups/organisations. Submissions were accepted in hard copy i.e. letter or completed feedback form and electronically via email or the online feedback form. Over forty submitters spoke to their written submission in person. The hearing was held on 17 August 2017; the hearing panel consisted of Mayor Ayers and Councillors Atkinson, Meyer, Felstead and Williams.

The hearing panel met to consider the submissions and the officer’s recommendations on 13 December and comprised Mayor Ayers and Councillors Atkinson, Meyer and Williams.

Key Feedback
Feedback provided in the 88 submissions received was varied. The following pages provide a discussion of the most consistent, key points that were raised by a number of submitters in relation to each of the draft Strategy’s seven key strategic themes. These are:

1. Our environment
2. Our growing communities
3. Our rural area and small settlements
4. Our connections
5. Our economy
6. Our centres
7. Our community spaces and places

The most heavily commented on key strategic theme overall is ‘Our rural area and small settlements’, followed by ‘Our growing communities’. The least commented on key strategic theme overall is ‘Our centres’. Overall, the directions, initiatives and concepts proposed in the draft Strategy are largely supported by submitters.

The top five key submission comments made by the most number of submitters are:

1. The future of rural residential areas and living opportunities, including generally greater support for the extension of existing rural residential areas or a combination of extension and intensification of existing rural residential areas, than for intensification only. A number of submitters propose specific locations for a new Rural Residential Zone.
2. The future of rural development, including support for increasing the minimum lot size in the Rural Zone from the current 4 hectares, with generally greater support for increasing this throughout the Rural Zone as opposed to in only parts of the Rural Zone.
3. Support for directing the bulk of residential growth to the District’s existing main towns of Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend/Pegasus and Oxford.
4. Support for intensifying the urban environment to address an aging population, smaller household composition and demand for mixed housing styles.
5. Issues related to water quality and management, seeking the protection and/or enhancement in the District’s drinking and recreation water quality and supply.
The above are further explored throughout the following pages. It should be noted that discussion in the following pages summarises the views of submitters only and officer recommendations; they are not the views of the Council.

1. Our environment

Almost half of all submitters (36) specifically provided comments relating to the draft Strategy’s key strategic theme 1 ‘Our environment’. This section proposed:

- Protect our natural environment by focusing residential and business growth within and around the District’s existing urban environments
- Continue current initiatives and consider new opportunities to protect and enhance significant areas of native flora and fauna
- Continue to protect and enhance the coastal environment through existing plans and programs and new initiatives
- Reduce further declines in water quality by directing growth to areas serviced by reticulated Council services and continue to fulfil an advocacy role on water quality
- Protect our communities by providing for growth in areas that are not susceptible to unacceptable natural hazards
- Investigate and support cost effective ‘green’ design and technology in subdivision and buildings
- Continue to work with Ngāi Tūāhuriri to identify and classify wāhi tapu me wāhi taonga as required
- Continue to work with Ngāi Tūāhuriri to create a heritage and mahinga kai area in the Kaiapoi Red Zone

In summary, the key trends emerging from submissions in relation to ‘Our environment’ are:

- Enhance and protect waterways and water quality – drinking, recreation, conservation, streams/rivers/lakes, greywater
- Locate growth in areas that are not subject to unacceptable risks from natural hazards and mitigate effects of climate change
- Protect and enhance biodiversity and encourage native flora and fauna
- Support exploration of utilising green technologies

Water quality

More than half of the submitters who commented on themes relating to ‘Our environment’ have concerns about water quality, initiatives to address these and Council’s and Environment Canterbury’s role in the matter. Submitters agree that retaining, enhancing and/or protecting the quality of drinking and recreation water in the District’s rivers, streams, lakes, wells/bore and reticulated water supply is critically important and requires stringent monitoring. Elevating nitrate levels and contaminants are a concern for some submitters. It is recommended by some that the management of water quality should be improved, either by Environment Canterbury, who have principle responsibility, or that Council should take on a greater role than advocacy in this matter. The implementation of, and link to, established relevant planning frameworks is considered important, including the Canterbury Water Management Strategy, Regional Land and Water Plan and the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee programme. Some activities specifically are thought to cause poor water quality and supply outcomes and should be restricted or mitigated against, including unsustainable rural activities such as intensive farming and dairy farming, lifestyle blocks
requiring private wells and septic tanks, bottling of groundwater for commercial purposes, and stormwater management practices.

**Officer Recommendation**

1. Based on the responses, water quality is a significant concern for many submitters. Water quality is principally managed by ECan. Continue to work with ECan and the Zone Committee to improve water quality in the District.

**Panel Recommendation**

The panel were mindful of the significant issues around water and water management. The panel resolved to agree with the officer’s recommendation, noting the need to also include Ngai Tahu, Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga and the wider community in resolving the issues. The panel recommended that the DDS be amended to clarify the Council’s role on water management, including through three-waters infrastructure as set out in the LTP.

**Natural hazards**

Fifteen submitters specifically support protecting communities by providing for growth in areas that are not susceptible to unacceptable natural hazards. Effects of natural hazards need to be planned for and mitigated, for example through coastal planting and foundation requirements. Three submitters recommend the adoption of a 1:200 year event flood hazard risk assessment for planning residential areas and a 1:100 year event flood hazard risk assessment for planning commercial areas. Another suggests committing to a 1:500 year event flood plain plan is unrealistic. MainPower New Zealand Ltd submits that, while it supports avoiding areas at risk from natural hazards for future residential and commercial growth in principle, the existing Canterbury Regional Policy Statement requires that critical infrastructure is continued and expanded while mitigating potential risks from natural hazards. Therefore, avoiding areas subject to natural hazards is desired but not unavoidable in some instances. Related to the matter of natural hazards is a general desire by a few submitters to mitigate the effects of climate change.

**Officer Recommendation**

1. Continue to protect communities by providing for growth in areas that are not susceptible to unacceptable risk from natural hazards.
2. Continue to implement the flood management and other hazards approach required in the CRPS.

**Changes required to the DDS**

None identified.
Identify more clearly climate change effects on natural hazards, e.g. rainfall intensity, ground water changes and drought.

**Panel Recommendation**

The panel noted the District’s vulnerability to natural hazards and the risks these imposed on the community. The panel resolved to agree with the officer’s recommendation, but requested that the DDS include the most up-to-date flood modelling and a separate section on climate change.

**Biodiversity**

Eleven submitters call for initiatives to protect and enhance the District’s biodiversity, through planting native vegetation, establishing esplanade reserves and biodiversity corridors, and protecting existing nodes and natural habitats of indigenous flora and fauna. One submitter recommends that the Council adopts the Canterbury Biodiversity Strategy as a basis for identifying, protecting and managing the natural environment and that Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Outstanding Natural Features are protected, enhanced and managed. Another urges Council to work beyond its regulatory framework in this matter and undertake bolder initiatives for managing the environment.

**Officer Recommendation**

1. Continue to provide opportunities to enhance the District’s biodiversity through Council works, reserves management and Council support for the Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust and grants.
2. Continue to apply the Canterbury Regional Biodiversity Strategy to the district.
3. Continue to explore opportunities to protect and encourage the retention and enhancement of privately owned indigenous biodiversity through the district plan review.

**Changes required to the DDS**

- Refer to the Canterbury Regional Biodiversity Strategy.
- Reference Zone Committee and CWMS work programme, goals and outputs.
- Include clearer statements supporting a stronger approach to maintaining and enhancing indigenous biodiversity, including in the bulleted list of actions on page 14 that explain what the Council will do.
- Strengthen and more closely align the language and actions in the implementation tables (page 49) with the Our Environment section text.

**Panel Recommendation**

The panel agreed with those submitters seeking to protect and enhance the District’s biodiversity. The panel accepted the officer’s recommendations but requested that the DDS signal a stronger approach to protection (including through monitoring and enforcement under the district plan), enhancement and education. The panel recommended that the Council prepare a more detailed,
separate statement on biodiversity issues and opportunities in the District, covering roles and responsibilities of the various agencies involved. The panel also recommended that significant indigenous biodiversity on Council land be included as protected listed sites through the upcoming district plan review.

**Green technology**

A few submitters (8) support the Council in investigating cost effective ‘green’ design and technology in subdivision and buildings, for example, more environmentally sustainable greywater solutions, solar and wind power generators, and ‘blue-green’ infrastructure.

**Officer Recommendation**

1. Continue to explore opportunities to incorporate ‘green technology’ in the Council’s Engineering Code of Practice review.
2. Continue to explore opportunities to enable and support ‘green technology’ and low impact subdivision design through the district plan review, including through outline development plans for new growth areas.

**Panel Recommendation**

The panel discussed the opportunities for the Council to further utilise green technology, noting the environmental and financial benefits of a network approach versus site-by-site responses (including ‘off the grid’). The panel agreed with the officer’s recommendations and considered that the Council should take a more proactive approach to take advantage of green technology.

**Culture**

Support for continuing to work with Ngāi Tūāhuriri to identify and protect wāhi tapu me wāhi taonga, recognising the Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan, and including traditional English heritage in aspects relating to cultural diversity is also mentioned.

**Officer Recommendation**

1. Continue to work in partnership with Ngāi Tūāhuriri to identify and protect wāhi tapu me wāhi taonga through the district plan review.

**Changes required to the DDS**

None identified.
Panel Recommendation

The panel supported the officer’s recommendation, but noted that the Council should also work with ECAn and other agencies to protect wāhi tapu me wāhi taonga.

Other

A number of submitters also explicitly support protecting the natural environment by focusing residential and business growth within and around the District’s existing urban environments. This is further discussed in the next Section 2. ‘Our growing communities’. A few other comments relating to ‘Our environment’ were made by submitters.

Officer Recommendation

1. See recommendations in the next section (Section 2 our growing communities) relating to urban growth matters.

Panel Recommendation

The panel noted the officer’s recommendation.

2. Our growing communities

More than half of all submitters specifically provide comments relating to the draft Strategy’s key strategic theme 2 ‘Our growing communities’. This section proposed:

- Broad residential growth directions for Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend/Pegasus and Oxford
- Undertake further work to determine the specific growth areas through the NPS-UDC and the district plan review
- Advocate for a greater mix of housing choices that suit smaller households and enable intensification in the District’s main towns
- Enable opportunities that contribute to meeting the need for affordable housing

In summary, the key trends emerging from submissions in relation to ‘Our growing communities’ are:

- Support for the bulk of residential growth directed to the District’s main towns, and support for specific growth directions proposed
- Support for intensification of residential development to support an aging population, smaller household compositions and demand for a mix of housing typologies
- Some proposals for alternative growth directions than were signalled in the draft Strategy
- Some opposition to particular growth directions signalled in the draft Strategy
**Growth directions**

More than half of the submitters (25) who commented on ‘Our growing communities’ support the proposal to direct most of the anticipated residential growth towards the District’s main towns, in order to maximise efficiencies in infrastructure, achieve critical mass for business, services and amenities, and protect the natural environment and productive rural area. Some submitters specifically support particular proposed growth directions, namely:

- Woodend/Pegasus’ proposed growth direction to the north of Ravenswood
- Rangiora’s proposed growth direction and quantity of growth to support it as the principle District town
- Rangiora’s specifically proposed growth direction to the east along Kippenberger Avenue
- Rangiora’s specifically proposed growth direction to the (south) west with a desire to retain Lehmans Road as a Rangiora urban boundary
- Kaiapoi’s proposed growth direction to the east, with a desire to programme development to Lees and Clifford Roads at an early stage

Some submitters propose alternative or additional specific growth directions, such as:

- Extend Rangiora’s urban area beyond South Belt Road (currently zoned Residential 4B)
- Extend Rangiora’s urban area to include land east of Townsend Road
- Extend Rangiora’s urban area to the north and south of Johns Road and east of Lehmans Road for the immediate future (next 3 years)
- Extend Rangiora’s urban area towards the west, including specifically land zoned Residential 4A east of Lehmans Road
- Rezone land north of Lees Road to Barkers Road for residential/business use in Kaiapoi
- Extend Oxford’s urban area towards the east to connect to the land currently zoned Residential 4A, instead of toward the south
- Extend Oxford’s urban area by intensifying the existing currently zoned Residential 4A area south of Oxford Road
- Two submitters recommend developing ‘new towns’ instead of extending the District’s main towns: Ashley and in the Eyreton/Eyrewell area

A few submitters are opposed to some particular proposed growth directions, including:

- Proposed growth to the east of Rangiora as this is seen as unrealistic due to single land ownership, lack of availability and poor land conditions
- Proposed growth to the southeast and southwest of Rangiora due to perceived localised poor ground conditions and stormwater management issues
- Proposed growth for Kaiapoi due to risk of flooding and effects of natural hazards and climate change
- Proposed growth for Rangiora and Woodend/Pegasus as this will exacerbate flooding issues for Kaiapoi due to stormwater runoff
- Existing Ravenswood due to poor design with the desire to rezone some of the area
- Proposed growth toward the south of Oxford as this is seen as less desirable than growth toward the east
- Desire to contain Rangiora and Kaiapoi

**Officer Recommendation** (note this includes recommendations responding to business growth directions covered in Section 5 Our Economy)
1. Regarding extending Rangiora’s urban area beyond South Belt Road and including land east of Townsend Road for residential development, this area is outside the Infrastructure Boundary (IB) and subject to flooding. This option should be explored should the need arise in the future. This should be ‘softly’ signalled in the DDS in the text, recognising further opportunities and constraints analysis will be required, including whether the area is better for business activities.

2. Regarding extending Rangiora’s urban area to the north and south of Johns Road and east of Lehmans Road in the immediate future (next 3 years) for residential development, the zoning for this area could be progressed under the district plan review, informed by the NPS Urban Development Capacity.

3. Regarding the DDS proposed business zone extensions to the south west of Southbrook, there was general opposition to this due to concerns over loss of rural character, localised poor ground conditions and stormwater management issues. It is therefore recommended that the arrows signalling business development to the south west are removed (Fernside Road direction).

4. Regarding extending the business land to the south, between Fernside and Lineside Road and to the east of Southbrook, surprisingly there were no comments from landowners in these areas, either for or against this proposal. It is recommended that these arrows remain however, the accompanying text should be amended to identify that these are possible business areas in the long term if demand is identified through the NPS‐UDC.

5. Regarding rezoning land north of Lees Road to Barkers Road for residential/business use in Kaiapoi, this is outside the IB and the DDS indicates that additional growth areas will be considered holistically in the future, after the areas inside the IB are developed. This approach is recommended instead of piecemeal (and out of the IB) rezoning now.

6. The business area proposed for south of Kaiapoi received a submission in opposition from the majority landowner. Staff have informed them of the rates implications of a change in zoning. Council’s asset managers have raised significant issues regarding wastewater to the south of Kaiapoi, due to existing services already being near/at capacity, regardless of type of land use in this location. Apparently this is difficult to resolve due to high cost and distance to connect to existing infrastructure. It is recommended that the feasibility of a wastewater service upgrade is investigated for a wider area and that the business arrow includes an eastwards extension, with text which explains the Council’s approach (i.e. explore infrastructure costs and rezone later if feasible). The amended text should also identify that this is a possible business area in the long term if demand is identified through the NPS‐UDC. It is recommended that further consultation is undertaken with the landowners in this location.

7. Consider the opportunities for Kaiapoi provided by a remodelled airport noise contour as part of the district plan review.

8. Regarding extending Oxford’s urban area towards the east to connect to the land currently zoned Residential 4A, instead of toward the south, the proposal has merit within the context of medium to long term land needs, but will require further consultation with the affected landowners and will also be influenced by the long term demand identified through the NPS‐UDC.

9. Regarding extending Oxford’s urban area by intensifying the existing currently zoned Residential 4A area south of Oxford Road, the proposal has merit but will require further consultation with the affected landowners. If landowners are in agreement, and it is demonstrated that there is
demand for additional residential development in Oxford (in addition to that proposed under recommendation 8 above) it is recommended referencing this option in the final DDS.

10. Regarding proposed growth toward the south of Oxford, comments presented at the hearing indicated this area would be better zoned for business given the business activities located in the area. This will require further consultation with the affected landowners and further analysis of business land needs and anticipated timing. If landowners are in agreement, it is recommended that the residential arrow is replaced with a business arrow in the final DDS. This could include immediately adjacent areas on the western side of Harewood Road.

11. Regarding developing ‘new towns’ Ashley and in the Eyreton/Eyrewell, the majority of comments were not in favour of extending small settlements such as Ashley. Asset managers have advised there is a likely high cost of servicing Ashley with likely effects on planned servicing works in Rangiora (i.e., would need to bring planned service upgrades forward with major financial implications). Further detailed investigation is required, particularly economic, of feasibility of further residential development. It is therefore recommended that these options are not identified in the final DDS at this point, pending this further work and an identified need for additional residential zoned land.

**Changes required to the DDS**

- Make the changes identified in the above recommendations.
- Recognise that schools are social infrastructure and refer to working with MOE on opportunities for new and expanded schools and for the multi-use of school sites.
- Add a requirement to take into account existing strategic infrastructure on the town 2048 ‘snapshots’ and in the implementation table on page 50.

*Note: These recommendations may be influenced by the future development strategy to be prepared under the NPS-UDC.*

---

**Panel Recommendation**

The panel agreed with the officer’s recommendations except where set out below.

The panel was concerned with an urban extension to the South of Kaiapoi (Officer Recommendation No. 6) and recommended that appropriate provisions be included in the district plan if this area was re-zoned to ensure the gateway area to Kaiapoi was aesthetically pleasing. The panel also noted that the zone provisions and likely mix of activities in this location would be informed by infrastructure constraints.

Regarding extending the business land to the south, between Fernside and Lineside Road and to the east of Southbrook (Officer Recommendation No. 4), the panel noted the lack of comments from affected owners and recommended that more investigations were required through the district plan review on the most appropriate location for this business zone extension. The panel recommended including the land between Boys and Marsh Road as part of this investigation.

Regarding the proposed residential growth extension south of Oxford, the panel requested that the arrow remain, but that the text be amended to identify that further consultation is required with the
Intensification

Around half of the submitters who commented on ‘Our growing communities’ support the proposal to advocate for a greater mix of housing choices and enable intensification in the District’s main towns. This is seen as addressing the demands of an ageing population and projected smaller household composition. Innovative, comprehensive developments applying good urban design principles and Universal Design/Life Mark design standards to ensure accessibility and that are well connected to town amenities, social and transport network should be encouraged and incentivised. Affordable housing for lower income households and larger homes/lots for larger families and investment conscious buyers should be planned for to ensure a good mix of housing styles. Regeneration of existing urban areas must however avoid creating isolated enclaves of aged segregation or resulting in poor quality infill that does not retain the character of neighbourhoods. Conversely, more ‘retirement homes’ are recommended by a few.

Officer Recommendation

1. Continue to advocate for a greater mix of housing choices and enable intensification in the District’s main towns.

2. Enable a greater mix of housing choices and higher density to be achieved in the District’s main towns through the district plan review.

Changes required to the DDS

None identified.

Panel Recommendation

The panel supported the officer’s recommendations but sought that the DDS both provide for and encourage a greater range of housing types that enable higher density to be achieved. The panel requested that the DDS note housing demand (i.e. for different densities) will change over time.

The panel also noted the need to recognise and protect heritage and character features in areas such as Seddon Street in Rangiora.
**Other**

Some other comments include that the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity (NPS-UDC) housing and business land assessment should be completed before the Strategy is finalised; that growth beyond the greenfield priority area as per Map A of Chapter 6 in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS) cannot be supported at this time; that Statistics New Zealand’s medium growth projection should be utilised for planning purposes; that more certainty about sequencing of development should be provided; and that the rem modelled Christchurch International Airport noise contour should be taken into consideration once this has been done. A few other comments relating to ‘Our growing communities’ were made by submitters.

**Officer Recommendation**

1. Align the DDS with the NPS-UDC in terms of timing and content by:
   - delaying the final DDS publication to incorporate NPS-UDC demand and capacity data (draft due February 2018); and
   - providing flexibility to respond to further NPS-UDC input through the district plan review.

2. Enable consideration of a remodelled airport noise contour for Kaiapoi, noting the work to be commenced by CIAL and acknowledging the changes and timing of changes required to the CRPS.

3. Continue to work with the UDS Partnership on greater Christchurch’s spatial planning, with the output informing the CRPS and district plan review.

**Changes required to the DDS**

1. Update the growth projection, demand and capacity figures once received.

2. Amend the town growth directions maps accordingly.

3. Ensure the DDS more clearly explains how further input from greater Christchurch’s spatial planning under the NPS-UDC will be accommodated in the DDS.

4. Identify in the DDS that the CIAL noise contours are being remodelled. Include the CIAL airport noise contours on Figure 12. Add a reference to the CIAL noise contours in the Kaiapoi Snapshot “where are we now”.

5. Amend the growth directions section of the table on page 50 (‘provision of zoned land’ entry) to refer to existing strategic infrastructure.

**Panel Recommendation**

The panel supported the officer’s recommendations and agreed that a 3-yearly DDS review (with the first being undertaken in 2020), as set out in the draft DDS is appropriate.
3. Our rural area and small settlements

Around two out of every three submitters made a comment relating to the Strategy’s key theme 3 ‘Our rural area and small settlements’, voicing views and concerns about the future of small settlements and options proposed against rural development and rural residential development.

This section proposed:

- Retain the character of the District’s existing small settlements
- Work with Ngāi Tūāhuriri to provide Papakāinga housing on Māori land
- Options for rural development:
  - Increase the minimum lot size (from the current 4ha District Plan minimum) throughout the Rural Zone
  - Increase the minimum lot size in parts of the Rural Zone
- Options for rural residential development:
  - New rural residential areas identified and co-located with existing rural residential areas or on the edge of existing towns
  - Intensification within existing rural residential areas (enable larger lots to be subdivided down to 2500m²)

In summary, the key trends emerging from submissions in relation to ‘Our rural area and small settlements’ are:

- Desire to retain small settlement character and values
- A general greater support for increasing the minimum lot size in the District’s Rural Zone than increasing it in only parts of the Zone
- A general greater support for extension of existing rural residential areas or a combination of both extension and intensification of existing rural residential areas, with a number of locations for new rural residential development proposed

Small settlements

Many urged that the character of small settlements and villages must be retained with a growing population. Greatly expanding small settlements such as Woodend Beach for example would threaten its character. Meeting the demand for further rural residential development must be balanced with protecting the rural village character that is valued by residents within small settlements. Some recommend that growth in coastal settlements is constrained due to risks from natural hazards.

Officer Recommendation

1. Provide for limited growth in small settlements that maintains their character by developing appropriate provisions as part of the district plan review.

Changes required to the DDS

None identified.

Panel Recommendation
The panel noted the comments concerning the character of small settlements and, in accordance with the officer’s recommendation, recommended that the DDS adopt an approach of providing for limited growth in small settlements in order to maintain their character.

Rural development

Option 1 for rural development (increasing the minimum lot size throughout the Rural Zone) generally gained more support by submitters than increasing the minimum lot size in parts of the Rural Zone only. However, less than twenty submitters make their stance quite explicit. Submitters here believe there is ample supply of 4ha lots in the District already that experience a relatively quick ‘ownership turnover’. It is believed that most ‘lifestyle’ might actually prefer smaller lots as 4 hectares are too large to manage but too small to farm economically, and that increasing the minimum lot size will help protect productive rural land. Some suggest a new minimum lot size, such as 10 hectares and 400 hectares. A few suggest that existing 4 hectare (or less than 5 hectares) blocks ought to be further subdivided to meet the demand for rural residential living options.

Those few submitters who support Option 2 for rural development (increase minimum lot size in parts of the Rural Zone) suggest criteria for the location of rural ‘lifestyle’ development, such as on poorer soils in order to protect valuable farming land, where infrastructure can be cost effective, where lots are well connected to main roads, where there is natural drainage, and in areas not susceptible to flooding. Christchurch International Airport Limited urges Council to increase the minimum lot size within the remodelled noise contour once this has been determined in order to reduce the risk of reverse sensitivity associated with airport noise.

Some suggest specific boundaries for allowing rural development such as the area west of Two Chain Road, east of Whites Road, north of Cust Main Drain and south of Eyre River. Others recommend allowing rural development only immediately adjacent to Rural Residential Zones in order to connect with existing communities and avoid sporadically located development. Another submitter suggests increasing the minimum lot size for ‘as of right’ subdivision (e.g. 20 hectares), allowing cluster subdivision (e.g. 0.5 hectares) and setting aside a larger area for primary production. Rural land could be set aside to create a ‘transferable development right’ to allow subdivision to smaller densities which could be supported through policies to ensure a designed approach is achieved.

Only two submitters suggest retaining the status quo and another two believe Council needs to make its own preferences and rationale more explicit and provide more information in order to allow the community to make informed decisions. Another recommends that a rural lot size should be determined by use as future technologies in rural production will likely have a great effect on land use and requirements.

A few submitters urge Council to provide more protection for existing ‘lifestyle’ block owners to ensure land use change adjacent to rural development lots is appropriate (such comments were made with specific reference to the recent plastics factory set up in the Rural Zone). This particular topic is covered further under ‘Our economy’. It is suggested by one submitter that amenity standards could be tightened especially where ‘lifestyle’ blocks are likely to cause concern in closely settled locations.
1. Continue to explore options for increasing the minimum rural lot size as part of the district plan review. This will further test community appetite for lot size and district locations.

2. Explore tools such as ‘cluster development’ to manage rural character.

3. Explore district plan provisions that better manage non-rural activities in rural zones.

**Changes required to the DDS**

Amend the DDS to identify the feedback received in response to the options and in accordance with the recommendations above.

**Panel Recommendation**

The panel noted that the issue of lot size was significant and considered that the DDS needed to be clearer as to where future lifestyle properties should be located. Consistent with the Federated Farmer’s submission, the panel preferred that new 4ha lots should be located on low quality land.

Regarding non-rural activities in the rural zone, the panel were well aware of the community’s concerns on these activities. The panel supported the officer’s recommendations, noting that the district plan was the appropriate tool to further consider and address these issues.

**Rural residential development**

Comments regarding the future of rural residential development approaches and the Options considered are more varied. Generally, there is greater support for Option 1 (new rural residential areas identified and co-located with existing rural residential areas or on the edge of existing towns). Fewer submitters explicitly support Option 2 (intensification within existing rural residential areas) – here submitters see potential for efficiencies of land use and avoidance of subdividing productive rural land. Some acknowledge that intensification of existing areas could be problematic in achieving a desired design and infrastructure outcome and could be inconsistent with existing property owners’ expectations. A number of submitters suggest that both Options 1 and 2 could be combined where appropriate and practicable.

Many who support the concept of creating new rural residential areas (in the current Rural Zone, at times within established 4 hectare lot ownerships) suggest particular locations; often the submitters own land and wish to develop this with appropriate zoning in place.

- Around the boundary of the Ravenswood urban subdivision
- At the edges of District’s main towns, allow subdivision to 1-2 hectares to provide ‘buffer zone’, in line with a ‘peri-urban’ development strategy
- Swannanoa, including Tram Road adjoining Swannanoa
- Easterbrook Road existing ‘lifestyle’ development cluster
- Island Road existing ‘lifestyle’ development cluster
- Ashley adjacent to existing village, including to the north
- A strip of land west of Rangiora
- Immediately west of Rangiora (Lehmans Road / Oxford Road)
- Mandeville North (in various directions)
Where new rural residential areas are suggested that expand existing nodes, submitters argue that transport and infrastructure servicing efficiencies could be achieved and that such extensions could benefit from the already established social, community and business network (e.g. in Mandeville North). A few oppose any further rural residential development in the District.

Environment Canterbury provides a reminder that the expansion of any rural residential area must be located so it can be economically provided with reticulated water and sewer, and stormwater treatment and disposal systems. It also needs to be able to be integrated with existing towns and transport networks according to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. At the same time, Environment Canterbury cautions that intensification of any rural residential area must not be a transition to full urban development. One submitter suggests the creation of a new Residential 4C Zone which would allow an average lot size of 2500m² to meet most buyers’ demands.

**Officer Recommendation**

1. Adopt an approach that has a primary focus on creating new rural residential areas, with a secondary focus on large lot intensification within existing rural residential areas where there is majority community support and sufficient infrastructure to ensure efficient servicing. These are to be further assessed and delineated through the Rural Residential Development Plan and district plan review.

2. Continue to explore district plan provisions that better manage non-rural activities in rural zones.

3. Consider reverse sensitivity provisions for new rural residential areas in the district plan review.

**Changes required to the DDS**

Make changes to respond to the above recommendations.

**Panel Recommendation**

The panel noted the comments in response to this topic. In considering this matter the panel was mindful of other community feedback received on this matter, such as through the Council’s 2006 Residential 4 (rural residential) zone survey.

The panel agreed with the officer’s recommendations, but recommended clarifying that the Rural Residential Development Plan will apply across the entire district rather than just that part within Greater Christchurch.
Other

A few submitters caution against the risks associated with reverse sensitivity on traditional rural activities. This applies to both rural development and rural residential development. A few other comments relating to ‘Our rural area and small settlements’ were made by submitters.

**Officer Recommendation**

1. Consider reverse sensitivity provisions for new rural residential areas in the district plan review.

**Changes required to the DDS**

None identified.

**Panel Recommendation**

The panel noted that reverse sensitivity on traditional rural activities was an issue needing to be addressed as part of the district plan review and supported the officer’s recommendations.

4. Our connections

Almost half of all submitters (39) made a comment relating to the Strategy’s key theme 4 ‘Our connections’. This section proposed:

- Provide for continuing improvement in connectivity within our growing District, including enhancing opportunities for walking and cycling
- Continue to work with Greater Christchurch partners on improved connections with Christchurch and public transport services in the District
- Integrate new urban growth areas into the Council’s existing reticulated infrastructure networks
- Continue to explore infrastructure provision options in smaller settlements, including within Maori Reserve 873 (at Tuahiwi)
- Continue to explore opportunities to achieve culturally acceptable approaches to stormwater management
- Incorporate ‘green’ technologies into the Council’s Engineering Code of Practice where they reflect industry best practice and are cost effective
- Maintain the current approach of apportioning infrastructure costs to development rather than the wider community

In summary, the key trends emerging from submissions in relation to ‘Our connections’ are:

- Support and/or call for public transport improvements, including bus services, rail and other modes in order to reduce the reliance on private vehicle use and protect the environment
- Call for specific roading, traffic or speed improvements
- Support for walking and cycling initiatives
- Call for considering reticulated/mains infrastructure for small settlements and/or rural areas
- Support for exploring and advocating for the use of green technologies
Council should produce a long term transport network plan

Public transport

Sixteen submitters specifically support the provision of improved public transport services. Often these comments support a general improvement; other times submitters seek a specific bus route or connection, including between Woodend/Waikuku/Pegasus and Rangiora, Rangiora and Christchurch (direct), Kaiapoi and ‘shopper buses’. Council is urged to provide greater advocacy to Environment Canterbury in this regard. Light rail is also sought by some and Park and Ride is suggested at Townsend Road by one submitter.

Roading, traffic and/or speed improvements

Specific roading, traffic and/or speed improvements are sought by some (14). These include:

- Widen North Eyre Road
- Two-way South Eyre Road bridge
- More bridges across the Waimakariri River
- Reduce speed limit on Island Road
- Support Silverstream and Townsend Road projects
- Realign proposed Woodend bypass towards the west to improve access to Rangiora
- Upgrade roads between Rangiora and State Highway 1
- Complete / accelerate Woodend bypass
- Widen Lineside Road between Southbrook and Rangiora
- Build new strategic road from Ashley Bridge to beyond Waimakariri River, through Swannanoa and Mandeville North
- Fernside Road access and/or traffic is problematic
- Percival Street works will improve traffic congestion
- Generally better link District to Christchurch, Christchurch Airport and Lyttelton Port

Officer Recommendation

1. Continue to seek transport improvements in the District such as the Woodend bypass to improve accessibility in accordance with the DDS.

2. Explore opportunities for improved connections through Outline Development / Structure Plans as part of re-zoning through the district plan review.

3. Consider the district wide speed management programme which is to be presented to Council and Community Boards early in 2018. This will include a programme to review most of the speed limits in the district in accordance with NZTA’s speed management guidelines and speed limit setting rule.

4. Some of the remaining comments are too detailed for the DDS and will therefore be provided to the Council’s roading team for consideration. Others relate to NZTA projects (e.g. the Woodend Bypass).

Changes required to the DDS

- Refer to the importance of irrigation infrastructure and Christchurch International Airport.
- Further expand in the DDS on the need for an integrated approach between infrastructure and future growth and how this will be delivered, e.g. through the district plan review.
Panel Recommendation
The panel was supportive of improved accessibility, including public transport, in the district. The panel agreed with the officer’s recommendations.

Walking and cycling

Some submitters (14) support walking and cycling initiatives and improved opportunities, particularly projects that will/would enhance access to the main towns of Rangiora, Kaiapoi and Woodend and to Christchurch to improve commuting options. Pedestrian access to the proposed Key Activity Centre at North Woodend and from Southbrook Park to Townsend Road are also sought. New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) supports the draft Strategy’s focus on walking and cycling but seeks a change in language to reflect a “more efficient transport network with increased transport choices”.

Officer Recommendation

1. Continue to seek transport improvements in the District to improve accessibility in accordance with the DDS.

2. Explore opportunities to provide better pedestrian accessibility to North Woodend and Southbrook Park to Townsend Road.

Changes required to the DDS

-Add references to pedestrian accessibility to North Woodend (in conjunction with NZTA along SH1 & Ravenswood developer) and Southbrook Park to Townsend Road.

-Review NZTA’s proposed wording changes and amend if required.

Panel Recommendation
The panel considered the comments, noting the need to consider pedestrian accessibility to North Woodend and the Council’s Walking and Cycling Strategy (2017-2022) and agreed with the officer’s recommendations.

Services to small settlements

A few submitters (8) seek the Council to provide reticulated services and mains connections to small settlements and rural residential areas; one submitters explicitly cautions against this as the cost to
ratepayers would be too high. A few (5) support exploring the use of green technologies in infrastructure planning and provision, including innovative developments using waterways and overland flow paths in adopting sustainable drainage management systems for urban and rural areas to achieve better environmental and community outcomes. Others (4) seek Council to develop a long-term transport network plan to outline how the transport network would develop over the next 30 years.

**Officer Recommendation**

1. Infrastructure provision is directed by the Council’s 30 year infrastructure strategy 2015-2045 (and the draft 2018-48). Based on responses there is not a strong desire to change the Council’s current approach which requires reticulated services to be provided to small settlements such as rural residential areas.

2. Continue to explore opportunities to incorporate ‘green technology’ in the Council’s Engineering Code of Practice review, noting there are only a few submissions supporting this.

3. The Council will continue work with Greater Christchurch partners (CCC, NZTA, ECan, and Selwyn DC) concerning long-term transport network planning, acknowledging any changed government priorities.

**Changes required to the DDS**

None identified.

**Panel Recommendation**

The panel agreed with the officer’s recommendations, noting that Maori Reserve 873 is a small settlement that the Council also requires to connect to reticulated services.

**Other**

A few specific stakeholders seek the consideration and recognition of the constraints and/or opportunities presented by other existing external infrastructure that impact on growth directions, including irrigation infrastructure, the Christchurch International Airport noise contour and the MainPower distribution network. NZTA is generally supportive of the draft Strategy but urges Council to consider in more detail travel behaviour to manage future travel demand, the potentially significant role of technology changes in assisting with people’s transport choices, promotion of individual modes within a ‘transport system’, and a clear transport vision and how this would support urban growth outcomes.

A few other comments relating to ‘Our connections’ were made by submitters.

**Officer Recommendation**
1. Infrastructure constraints should be considered when considering growth directions, including the CIA noise contour. The Council should further engage with major infrastructure providers as part of the district plan review.

2. The Council should continue developing a long term strategic transport plan in parallel with the District Development Strategy. This will include all transport modes (including public transport, walking / cycling, private car, and freight), and is being developed in collaboration with our partners (ECan, NZTA, and CCC).

3. The DDS includes an emphasis on developing business and employment opportunities within the District. This is expected to reduce demand for travel to Christchurch to do business and to work. The Council’s Journey planner is working with our partners to encourage behaviour change towards walking / cycling and public transport. The Council should continue to consider travel behaviour and technology changes when considering urban growth as part of its transport vision. This should be further considered as part of the district plan review.

4. Make the changes identified below.

Changes required to the DDS

- Acknowledge the joint work of Environment Canterbury, CCC and NZTA in the Executive Summary.
- Clarify (on page 26) that the southbound lane on the Waimakariri SH Bridge is for high occupancy vehicles at morning peak.
- Add a reference to page 51 (to the 'transport network liaison and advocacy' implementation action) to progressing a Travel Demand Management programme as part of partnering with Greater Christchurch.
- Add a reference on page 51 to the long term strategic transport plan being prepared by the Council.

Panel Recommendation

The panel considered the MainPower distribution network, agreeing that this should be considered further when considering rezoning as part of the district plan review. The panel noted that the Council had a journey planner who is considering travel behaviour and future travel demand.

The panel agreed with the officer’s recommendations but requested that Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu is also acknowledged in the DDS executive summary.

5. Our economy

Half of all submitters commented on matters relating to the Strategy's key theme 5 ‘Our economy’. This section proposed:

- Provide for continued business activities appropriate for their location within existing towns
- Consider further provision for greenfield business land in Rangiora and Kaiapoi
- Progress the planning for the Mixed Use Business Regeneration Areas (Red Zone) in Kaiapoi
- Continue to provide for business activities within both rural and residential zoned areas, but manage the type and nature of these activities to minimise significant adverse effects on adjoining communities
- Closely monitor land use take up and development and business trends to be able to respond more quickly as demand and preferences change
- Consider increased support for attracting new business to the District to provide more local jobs

In summary, the key trends emerging from submissions in relation to ‘Our economy’ are:

- Council should restrict and/or carefully manage business activities in the rural and residential zones
- Support for indicative growth directions for future business land proposed in the Southbrook area and south of Kaiapoi
- Opposition for indicative growth directions for future business land proposed in the Southbrook area and south of Kaiapoi
- Support for generally expanding the District’s business and employment stock to minimise employment leakage

**Business activity in rural or residential zones**

The most frequent concern voiced is that of business activities occurring in the rural or residential zones. At least fifteen separate submitters explicitly wish Council to restrict further non-agricultural business activities in the Rural Zone to minimise adverse effects on adjoining communities; a few also extend this caution to the residential zones. Notably, the Council’s consent to allow a plastics factory to set up in the Rural Zone has caused angst among submitters. This activity, submitters believe, causes unacceptable air, noise and traffic impacts. Other submitters explicitly oppose a number of other business activities in the Rural Zone, such as dormitories for workers, large agricultural contracting businesses, intensive animal farming, mining, quarrying and fracking, as these are thought undermine rural character.

Conversely, a few submitters (7) support non-agricultural business activities setting up in the rural or residential zones, as these can promote diversity of employment choice, be of small scale and not adversely affect anyone, would not be able to absorb the overheads of locating in an established business zone, and have a role in supporting the local community. However, these submitters agree the location and management of these must be carefully considered and the public notified.

**Officer Recommendation**

1. The issue of business activity occurring in rural and residential areas is clearly of concern to many commenters. Continue to seek better management of non-rural and non-residential activities occurring in rural and residential areas through the district plan review, with a key focus on scale to enable small activities with few adverse effects.

**Changes required to the DDS**

Refer to irrigation infrastructure and its contribution to the District’s economy.

**Panel Recommendation**
The panel noted the issue of business activity occurring in rural and residential areas and considered that scale was a key matter to consider when assessing these activities in these locations. The panel was clear that the district plan should adopt an approach of better management of these ‘out-of-zone’ activities. The panel considered that the example business provided (the plastics factory) should be considered as part of the district plan review.

The panel agreed with the officer’s recommendation but did not consider it necessary to refer to irrigation infrastructure in the ‘Economy’ section of the DDS as this section principally covers non-rural business activity.

*Business growth directions*

There is equal support and opposition to proposed growth directions for business land in the Southbrook area and south of Kaiapoi among submitters. Support is more explicitly stated for proposed Southbrook growth directions; submitters generally support critical mass and infrastructure efficiencies that would be generated through an expansion of the Business Zone at Southbrook and believe this would attract more business and employment opportunities to the District. A few submitters urge the Council to provide certainty over business land requirements now and rezone appropriately.

Some are opposed to proposed business land growth directions. Specifically, submitters oppose the following:

- South / west of Fernside Road in Southbrook as this would reduce the productive rural environment and disrupt ‘lifestyle’ communities (several)
- East of Flaxton Road in Southbrook as this would reduce the productive rural environment
- Southbrook extension to the east as this would split the area and make it difficult for infrastructure to respond
- South of Kaiapoi
- Expansion beyond the greenfield priority boundaries of Map A Chapter 6 in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (Environment Canterbury)

A few urge Council to introduce a buffer between business zones and any residential activities.

A few submitters (5) suggest alternative new areas to zone for business activities, including north of Kaiapoi at Lees Road and Williams Street to accommodate a commercial service area, south of Oxford from the existing urban boundary and west of Harewood Road, and the Townsend Road area in Southbrook.

*Officer Recommendation*

1. See the earlier growth directions section for recommendations.

2. Include provisions that manage the interface between business and residential activities through the district plan review.

*Changes required to the DDS*

As per the earlier growth directions recommendations.
Panel Recommendation

The panel agreed with the officer’s recommendations, stating that the district plan needed to adopt an approach that better manages the activity interface.

The business growth directions recommendations were discussed earlier in this report.

Other

Some submitters provide their general support for attracting businesses to the District to provide more local jobs, increase self-sufficiency, provide opportunities for young people, and create a more diversified local economy. The role of Enterprise North Canterbury is also supported.

A few other comments relating to ‘Our economy’ were made by submitters.

Officer Recommendation

1. The comments are noted. Continue to provide, but better manage the relationship between quarrying and adjacent activities.

Changes required to the DDS

None proposed.

Panel Recommendation

The panel noted that enabling quarrying was necessary, but that this activity could cause significant amenity concerns in the local environment. The panel agreed with the officer’s recommendations, stating that the district plan needed to adopt an approach that better manages the activity interface.

6. Our centres

Twenty submitters provided comments relating to the Strategy’s key theme 6 ‘Our centres’. This section proposed:

- Identify further opportunities for intensified residential and business development focused in and around the town centres of Rangiora and Kaiapoi
- Make best use of existing Business 1 zoned land in the main centres of Rangiora and Kaiapoi
- Consider an area for the expansion of the Rangiora town centre to the east/northeast, including large format retailing
- Commence a review of the Rangiora Town Centre Strategy in 2018/19
- Complete in 2018 a review of the 2011 Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan, and confirm an implementation plan for this and the mixed use Business Area adjoining the town centre
- Consider provision for large format retailing in or adjacent to Woodend and Kaiapoi
- Confirm the Woodend/Pegasus Key Activity Centre at a location within the business area at North Woodend (Ravenswood)
- Continue to support the centres of Woodend, Pegasus and Oxford
- Continue to monitor progress made against the Oxford Town Centre Strategy

In summary, the key trends emerging from submissions in relation to ‘Our centres’ are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre vibrancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Town centres must be vibrant and unique, with intensified retail, civic, entertainment and residential activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Access, parking, and connections through public transport are important in making our centres function well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A general support for longer term expansion directions of the Rangiora Business 1 Zone and support for further development in/adjacent to Kaiapoi town centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Support for separating Large Format Retail and industrial activities from core town centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Support for confirming the Woodend/Pegasus Key Activity Centre at North Woodend</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Officer Recommendation

1. The comments are noted and supported. These matters (retail vibrancy, residential intensification, public facilities, urban design and accessibility) will be considered through the district plan review.

2. Continue to maintain and develop / review town centre plans for the district’s main towns.

Changes required to the DDS

-None identified.

Panel Recommendation

The panel agreed with the officer’s recommendations noting the importance of maintaining functioning town centres.

Expansion
The possible long term expansion directions of the Rangiora Business 1 Zone proposed in the draft Strategy are generally supported by the few who provided comment. Some provide specific additional suggestions including extending the existing zone to include the north side of Blackett Street and King Street and rezoning the Business 2 land in/adjacent to the centre to Business 1, while also extending both Business 1 and Business 2 land to the east. However, it is important to ensure the core centre does not lose focus or become fragmented. Kaiapoi town centre development is also supported, particularly its rivertown niche market.

**Officer Recommendation**

1. The support for the proposed expansion is noted. The Blackett Street and King Street extensions into the residential zone is not supported by current demand evidence. Zone extension matters will be further considered as part of the planned review of the Rangiora Town Centre Strategy and district plan review.

2. The Kaiapoi comments are noted and will be considered through the Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan 2011 review and the district plan review.

**Changes required to the DDS**

As per the earlier growth directions recommendations.

**Panel Recommendation**

The panel agreed with the officer’s recommendations, noting that the district plan and relevant town centre plans will consider expansion options in more detail.

**Large Format Retail (LFR)**

A few submitters (6) made comments about the appropriateness and/or location of Large Format Retailing (LFR) activities and relationship with industrial Business 2 zoned land. Generally, they agree that LFR and industrial activities should be geographically separated from core town centres (e.g. in Business 2 zoned land or in the case of Rangiora, adjacent to existing LFR at the East Belt end of High Street). This leaves town centres to house boutique and small grain retail along with other appropriate activities that make them successful and vibrant. One submitter opposes further LFR development altogether.

**Officer Recommendation**

1. The comments about LFR location and town centre functions are noted. This will be further explored through the district plan review and Rangiora and other town centre strategies / plans.

**Changes required to the DDS**

None identified.
Panel Recommendation

The panel considered that LFR needed to be expressly provided for in the district and agreed with the officer’s recommendations that this should be progressed through the district plan review and Rangiora and other town centre strategies / plans.

Key Activity Centre (KAC)

Four submitters specifically commented about the proposed location of Woodend/Pegasus’ Key Activity Centre (KAC) at North Woodend; they all agree this is the best location. NZTA suggests that the value of the State Highway 1 as a significant link from Picton to Christchurch should be recognised in discussion of centres in the Woodend/Pegasus area, and that potential impacts on the future Woodend bypass alignment be considered alongside the role, design and function of the KAC.

Officer Recommendation

1. The support for the Woodend / Pegasus KAC being located at North Woodend are noted. The exact location will be determined through the district plan review through working with developers, the community, NZTA, and will consider transport links and connectivity to existing Woodend.

2. NZTA’s comments are noted. Further discussions will be required with NZTA to identify and confirm issues and options for the future Woodend bypass alignment and the current SH1 designated land through Woodend.

Changes required to the DDS

-Describe North Woodend as the preferred location of the KAC in the text and on the map.

-Confirm the nature of the any appropriate provision for new community facilities in the North Woodend KAC.

-Note the opportunities available in the current SH1 corridor area with the proposed bypass.

Panel Recommendation

The panel discussed options for providing community facilities in North Woodend and determined that this should be considered through a specific future strategic planning process, as opposed to the DDS.

The panel also noted that, as the timing and nature of development of the Woodend Bypass and development of the KAC at North Woodend clarifies, the Council should develop an approach to confirm the future form and function of the existing town centre, and that this should be signalled in the DDS.

Other
A few other comments relating to ‘Our centres’ were made by submitters.

7. Our community spaces and places
Twenty-five submitters provided comments relating to the Strategy’s key theme 6 ‘Our community spaces and places’. This section proposed:

- Explore opportunities to provide additional greenspace or utilise existing greenspace in different ways in existing urban areas, as well as continue to plan for new greenspace in new urban areas to meet agreed Levels of Service
- Develop a Community Facilities Strategy, a Sports Field Strategy, an Aquatic Centres Capacity Study and a finalised Indoor Courts Proposal to appropriately plan for meeting the demands from population growth and growth directions

In summary, the key trends emerging from submissions in relation to ‘Our community spaces and places’ are:

- Community centres, libraries, meeting spaces are important in connecting communities
- Innovative and well-designed greenspaces are important, especially with intensification
- Cost of assets is concerning, especially indoor courts facility, but are lacking facilities
- Need to plan for schools
- Need to plan for appropriate facilities in Woodend/Pegasus area (acquire land in North Woodend)

Greenspaces
Submitters made a few comments relating to green spaces. It is thought green spaces, local and regional parks, reserves, green corridors, transitional spaces, quality public realm and playgrounds are critically important in creating a good quality of life, especially with planned intensification of living environments. A botanic garden in Rangiora could be considered, as well opportunities for playground, sports and community facilities along corridors and waterways.

**Officer Recommendation**

1. The comments are noted.

**Changes required to the DDS**

None required.

**Panel Recommendation**

The panel agreed with the officer’s recommendations.

**Facilities**

A couple of submitters identify a lack of indoor courts facilities in the District, but four caution against the cost of providing such facilities, especially for an aging population on fixed incomes. It is
suggested that such a facility could adopt a user-pays funding model and/or that ratepayers’ money is better spent elsewhere.

A few submitters identify the need to plan for educational facilities, for example a secondary school at North Woodend. Rural schools can provide a community hub. The Ministry of Education encourages Council to support it in addressing the needs for new or extended schools in growing towns, mitigate access and safety effects, and explore opportunities to share facilities including open spaces and community facilities.

A few submitters encourage the Council to plan for adequate community facilities, including sports facilities, a library and swimming pool, at North Woodend to meet the needs of the Woodend/Pegasus community and look to acquire necessary land now. Two submitters also seek a permanent, purpose-built community centre at Pegasus.

**Officer Recommendation**

1. Continue to work with the Ministry of Education as required to achieve beneficial outcomes for the community. The DDS is one of the Council’s tools that supports the Ministry of Education in planning for education.

2. Explore community facilities needs and opportunities in the district, including at North Woodend and Pegasus as part of the proposed facilities strategies.

**Changes required to the DDS**

None proposed.

**Panel Recommendation**

The panel agreed with the officer’s recommendations. The panel noted their earlier recommendation re providing community facilities in North Woodend through a specific future strategic planning process.

**Other**

Generally, submitters agree that community spaces and places are important in supporting a connected and thriving community. A few other comments relating to ‘Our community spaces and places’ were made.

**Officer Recommendation**

1. The comments are noted.

**Changes required to the DDS**

None required.
**Vision, strategic aims and other comments**

Submitters were asked whether they agree with the proposed vision and strategic aims of the draft Strategy. The proposed vision ‘Our District – the very best of town and country’ is generally supported by those who provided comment, as are the seven key themes and underpinning strategic aims. One submitter believes a separate principle addressing environmental issues and sustainability, Kaitiakitanga and creativity/innovation is required. Another cautions that ‘environmentally rich and sustainable’ is too vague to be a strategic aim.

A number of other comments were made by submitters relating to the proposed vision, key themes and strategic aims.

**Officer Recommendation**

1. Environmental issues and sustainability are already addressed as Strategic Aim number 1. Kaitiakitanga is already covered in the principles. Creativity/innovation are covered in the business strategic aim but could be further identified in the principles.

**Changes required to the DDS**

Add a principle covering creativity / innovation.

**Panel Recommendation**

The panel agreed with the officer’s recommendations.
Mayoral foreword

- He Kupu Whakataki a Te Koromatua

The Waimakariri District Council is pleased to present this Our District, Our Future – Waimakariri 2048, District Development Strategy. It marks an exciting and very important milestone in planning for the long term growth and form of our District. This document is for the community to comment on – your thoughts, and the resulting final Strategy, will provide the framework for how we respond to Waimakariri’s anticipated growth over the next 30 years.

The Waimakariri District is one of the fastest growing districts in the country. About 260,000 of us currently call this District our home and by 2048 our population may approach 97,000. This means we need to accommodate approximately another 15,000 houses, with their consequent effect of needing to plan for good infrastructure, community facilities, green spaces, business land and town centres which will meet a growing community’s needs and expectations. All the while, we need to ensure that we safeguard our natural environment and protect our people from risks associated with natural hazards.

We want to make sure our District continues to be a place where people want to be and one that offers the ‘very best of town and country’ into the future. Accordingly, this draft Strategy proposes some general residential growth directions for our main towns, gives the context for considering our major growth areas, explains how we manage living and non-agricultural business activities in the rural area in the future, and provides the platform for how we meet the needs of our people through community facilities, infrastructure and connections. It also sets out general areas where we might expand our stock of business land in the longer term and provides some guidance for the planning of our town centres.

This draft Strategy is underpinned by expert advice, technical best practice information, and importantly, what you have told us in the recent months leading up to now about what you value about our District and what you wish to see changed or improved. We are deeply thankful for your contribution and thoughts to get us to this point. We now hope you will tell us if we have got it right in this draft Strategy.

David Ayers
Mayor of Waimakariri District
Waimakariri 2048 District Development Strategy
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Executive summary

- Te Whakarāpopototanga Matua

The Waimakariri District is one of the fastest growing districts in New Zealand. It is projected that approximately 15,000 houses might be required to accommodate growth, together with business, infrastructure and public facilities requirements. To prepare for growth, we need to ensure it is well planned, integrated and sustainable for current and future generations. Managing growth will help deliver economic, social, environmental and cultural benefits.

Informed by various community and technical inputs, and the local, regional and national planning frameworks, this Strategy sets out broad directions for growth and development, acting as a platform to inform decision making within the context of a long-term view. This document forms part of the ongoing process to ensure that growth management, within the Waimakariri and Greater Christchurch context, including through joint work with our key Greater Christchurch Strategic Partners, is current and forward looking.

It is anticipated that additional feasible greenfield residential land and intensification opportunities are needed in the District’s main towns of Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend/Pegasus and Oxford. Up to 17 hectares of additional retail/commercial land may be required in Rangiora/Kaiapoi over the next 30 years. Given the level of existing vacant industrial land it is not clear as to the extent of additional industrial land within the next 30 years that may be required. However, ongoing monitoring and review of uptake in existing industrial zoned land will be required to consider how land supply is meeting demand into the future. If policies promoting greater local self-sufficiency are given effect to in regional planning documents then additional medium-term supply may be justified. Approximately 10 hectares of additional retail/commercial land and 17 to 33 hectares of additional feasible industrial business land will be required in Rangiora/Kaiapoi over the next 30 years. Rather than identifying specific areas, this Strategy outlines broad growth directions for the main towns and acknowledges that further analysis will be
required to determine the exact growth areas. This Strategy seeks to retain the spatial character of the District’s small settlements by providing for development that is largely consistent with historic growth rates. This Strategy also proposes that non-agricultural business activities in the rural area are managed better to avoid adverse effects on character, amenity and rural production. For rural areas, this Strategy proposes increasing the minimum lot size in parts of the District. For rural residential development, this Strategy proposes an approach that has a primary focus on creating new rural residential areas, with a secondary focus on enabling large lot intensification within existing rural residential areas where there is sufficient community support and servicing available. Furthermore, the Strategy suggests options to change the way that rural and rural residential development is managed and seeks comments from the community on these.

Improvements to the transport network within the District and between the District and Christchurch, including walking and cycling, will be planned and advocated for, while new urban growth areas will be integrated into the Council’s existing reticulated infrastructure networks. Furthermore, it is anticipated that community facility provision will match community needs as our population grows.

Current initiatives will be continued and new opportunities considered to protect and enhance significant areas of native flora and fauna, and to protect and enhance the coastal environment. This Strategy seeks to protect the community from natural hazard threats by avoiding areas of significant natural hazards when planning growth directions. The Council will continue to fulfil its advocacy role on water quality as well as work with Ngāi Tūhuriri to identify and classify wāhi tapu me wāhi taonga as required. Cost effective ‘green’ design and technology in subdivision and buildings will be investigated and supported where appropriate. The Council will also continue to explore opportunities to achieve culturally acceptable approaches to stormwater management, and also infrastructure provision options in smaller settlements, including within Maori Reserve 873.

This Strategy has been developed with significant community engagement, both in the preparation of a draft Strategy and the opportunity for the community to comment on the draft Strategy through a formal consultation process mid-2017. This Strategy informs and closely aligns with the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity, which sets out the objectives and policies for providing development capacity under the Resource Management Act 1991. This is a draft Strategy for public feedback. Your input is important to let us know if we got it right and, if not, what needs to be changed and why. We would like your comments by 14 July 2017. A final District Development Strategy, based on comments received and any further information, will be considered by Council.
for adoption in late 2017.
WHAT?

- The Waimakariri District will likely experience a relatively high level of growth over the next 30 years.
- Additional feasible greenfield residential land is needed in Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend/Pegasus and Oxford.
- Approximately 15,000 new houses could be required to meet population growth by 2048.
- Additional retail/commercial land will be required in Rangiora/Kaiapoi.
- Intensification opportunities will be explored within areas of Rangiora, Kaiapoi and Woodend/Pegasus.
- In partnership with Ngāi Tahu, the Council will progress work that supports the development of Papakāngā housing on Maori land in the District.
- The character of existing small settlements in the District will be retained.
- Options to better manage future development (residential and non-rural business activity) in the District’s rural areas will be considered.
- The minimum rural lot size in parts of the District will be increased.

WHY?

- Provides for anticipated growth.
- Achieves a sustainable urban growth pattern.
- Protects our communities from known natural hazards.
- Supports existing towns.
- Supports the efficient provision of infrastructure.
- Retains small settlement and rural character.
- Provides opportunities for environmental enhancement.
- Protects and enhances our District’s economy.
Part 1
Introduction - Wāhanga 1: Kupu Whakataki

This Section provides a description of the Waimakariri District, explains what the District Development Strategy is and why it is needed. It provides background information on how the draft District Development Strategy has been prepared to date, key overarching influences and proposed next steps in its development. A glossary of terms and abbreviations is provided at the end of this document.

1.1 The Waimakariri District - Te Takiwā o Waimakariri

The Waimakariri District lies to the north of the Waimakariri River and covers some 225,000 hectares, extending from Pegasus Bay in the east to the Puketeraki Range in the west. It is bounded to the north by Hurunui District and to the south by Christchurch City, and Selwyn District. The largest towns in the District are Rangiora and Kaiapoi, which are located within commuting distance of Christchurch City. In addition to the towns of Woodend, Oxford and Pegasus, there are beach settlements at Wakuku Beach, Woodend Beach, The Pines Beach and Kaiakī, and rural villages located at Cust, Sefton, Ashley, Ohoka and Tuahiwi.

The District sits within the takiwā (territory) of Ngāi Tahu, which is one of 18 Ngāi Tahu regional papatipu rūnanga, constituted under the Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu Act 1996 to represent mana whenua interests.

The ancestral occupation of, and interaction with, the Canterbury region occurred initially by Waitaha then Ngāi Mamo, who, in turn, were succeeded by the settling of the hapū, Ngāi Tūhātara and the sons of Tūhuriri: TaaneTiki, Moki and Tūrakautahi. Ngāi Tūhātara would later become known as Ngāi Tūhuriri after the fall of Kaipōi Pā. The waka (canoe) that brought them to the region was the Makawhau, whose captain was the rangatira (chief), Maka.

Figure 1. Waimakariri District location

Descendants of Ngāi Tūhuriri (along with other Ngāi Tahu whanui) have resided in the area for over 40 generations and, together with others who identify themselves as having NZ Maori ancestry, represent 7% of the District’s population.

There were several important Ngāi Tahu settlements in the area, most notably the pa of Taurakautahi, known as Kaiapoi, which was a principal settlement of Ngāi Tahu. Today, the hapū, Ngāi Tūhuriri is based at Tuahiwi, to the north of Kaiapoi. The rich Ngāi Tahu history and tribal authority is underpinned by spiritual and whakapapa connections, occupation, land, resource use and management thereof.

During the early years of European settlement, Kaiapoi developed as a river port. Rangiora was the area’s main market town, Woodend serviced local settlers with such things as flour milling, flax milling and brick making, and the development of Oxford was based on timber milling.
The roles of the District’s main urban areas have changed during recent years, mainly as the result of population growth. In the rural areas, until the middle of the 20th century, extensive agricultural and pastoral farming predominated. More recently, horticultural and forestry have gained in importance, although dairying and rural-based industries continue. Today, 7% of the District’s labour force is involved with agriculture, forestry and fishing.

Despite population growth over recent years, Waimakariri has retained its rural and small town character with just over one-third of residents living in rural areas and rural villages.

The Waimakariri District has had an increasing population trend over the past twenty-year period, from 33,000 in 1996 to 57,800 in 2016 (see Figure 2).

The additional population has contributed to an average growth rate of 2.7%. As a comparison, the overall growth rate for New Zealand for the same time was 1.2%. With this level of growth, the Waimakariri District has been one of the fastest growing districts in New Zealand.

Figure 3 indicates where this growth has occurred in the District as a percentage of total growth according to building consents for houses over the past twenty years. Additional information relating to population in the Waimakariri District can be found on the District Development Strategy webpage.
1.2 What is the District Development Strategy and why is it needed? - Ko hea te Takitau Te Rautaki Whana me te tana orongo?

This draft, Our District, Our Future - Waimakariri 2048, District Development Strategy is a high-level strategic document intended to provide a framework to guide development in the District over the next 30 years. It focuses on several aspects of development including our towns, rural areas, business areas, community facilities and our natural environment.

By the end of 2048, approximately 15,000 more houses are projected to be needed in the District, together with supporting business, infrastructure and public facilities requirements. This Strategy will influence the timing and location of growth and make sure that it is achieved in an integrated way. This will allow the Council and the Waimakariri community to plan for expected growth, rather than react to change, and provide a clear direction for public and private investment. Strategic planning for development also ensures that resources, work programmes and services work towards the same outcomes.

The Canterbury earthquakes of 2010 and 2011 had a significant impact on the population and functioning of some towns and communities within the District, particularly Kaaoopi, The Pines Beach, Karaki, and the town centres of Rangiura and Kaipoi. After more than five years of earthquake recovery activity, the Council’s focus has shifted toward District regeneration, resilience and developing an explicit long-term development strategy for the management of growth.

The final Strategy, once adopted by Council, will be a key reference point to inform decision making within the context of a long-term view. It will set out directions for growth and development, which the Review of the District Plan and other Council planning processes will seek to give effect to. In particular, the Strategy will help to inform the Council’s response to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity (NPS-UDC), which came into effect on 1 December 2016 (see Section 1.4).

1.3 How has the Draft District Development Strategy been developed? - He pēhea te hanga hukihuki o tēnei rautaki whakawhanake?

In the latter part of 2016, in order to understand the community’s priorities and views about issues and opportunities for the District over the next 30 years, the Council produced and publicly launched an early engagement document, Our District, Our Future – Waimakariri 2048, Your Early Thoughts. This document introduced the District Development Strategy project; proposed a long-term vision and principles; and asked a number of questions centred around seven key strategic themes to begin a conversation with the community.

KEY STRATEGIC THEMES:
A public launch event was held in November 2016 which attracted some 80 people who participated in group exercises to consider what they would like to see changed over the next 30 years and what they would not like to see changed, as well as debating long-term growth options. In addition to the launch feedback, more than 30 submission comments were received on the early engagement document and inform these are the development of a draft Strategy where relevant.

The draft Strategy was released for public comment for five weeks in May 2017. 88 comments were received and a hearing was held in August where over 40 submitters spoke to their comments. The comments received have informed this final Strategy. A District Development Strategy project webpage was developed; a project display was hosted at the Kaiapoi Christmas Carnival 2016; awareness was raised via social media channels such as Twitter and Facebook; meetings were held with key stakeholders to identify their particular issues, priorities and views; and seven topic-specific focus group meetings were held over February and March 2017. Finally, in March 2017 each of the Waimakariri District Community Boards hosted a District Development Strategy workshop and commented [AW2]: Timeline to be updated.
In addition to community feedback and early engagement, the Council reviewed existing reports on what the community values about living, working and playing in the Waimakariri District and what changes they would like to see. A number of expert reports were also commissioned. These included population projections for the District, a retail assessment, business land and Key Activity Centre advice, and advice on transport in the future. These documents and other relevant background information are available on the project webpage. In addition, two Inquiry by Design workshops were held with key Council staff to discuss assumptions, constraints and opportunities, residential growth options, town centres and the future of the local economy.
1.4 Planning context - Te Horopaki Whakarite

This Strategy has been informed by various plans, strategies and policy statements, and once completed, it will influence district-level documents. The following Section identifies the main planning influences, which are considered in more detail in the background reports available on the project webpage.

Regional planning framework

The need for a District Development work programme was identified in the late 1990s to early 2000s to provide strategic direction for residential growth and infrastructure in the District. This work was captured in Waimakariri District’s Vision 2020 and Directions for Growth 1997 to 2016. The Council’s vision for the District was embedded in the Urban Development Strategy (UDS), developed with strategic partners for the Greater Christchurch area in 2007, which identified, among other things, a broad settlement pattern for the Greater Christchurch area up until 2041. This included the supply of residential and commercial land, improved transport choices and providing living environments that support healthy communities.

The Land Use Recovery Plan (LURP) was developed by the Greater Christchurch partners in 2013 and put in place land use policies and rules to assist rebuilding and recovery of communities in the Greater Christchurch area that had been disrupted by the earthquakes.

The LURP confirmed directions for growth previously signalled in the UDS but added additional residential and business land with sufficient development capacity until at least 2028. This is framed within an Infrastructure Boundary with additional development capacity. This, together with identified priority growth areas, was inserted by Ministerial Direction into the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement 2013 (CRPS) as Chapter 6.

Chapter 6 of the CRPS is therefore significant for the future development of Waimakariri. The CRPS also contains direction on other topics that are relevant to the District Development Strategy such as natural hazards, the coastal environment, fresh water, and indigenous biodiversity. The Council must give effect to the CRPS via the Waimakariri District Plan. The District Plan must also ‘give effect’ to any national policy statements. Where a regional plan introduces provisions that affect land use, Council must consider the implications of this and change the District Plan if necessary.

Figure 5 identifies Greenfield Priority Areas and the infrastructure supported boundary, as reflected in the CRPS.

National planning framework

Several Acts guide planning in New Zealand, the main ones being the Resource Management Act 1991 (the RMA), the Land Transport Management Act 2003 (the LTMA) and the Local Government Act 2002 (the LGA). The statutory framework for land use planning is largely contained within the RMA. The purpose of this Act is to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources. The LTMA sets out requirements for the operation, development and funding of the land transport system. The LGA also contains requirements local government must meet in planning and carrying out its functions, particularly in terms of long-term financial planning.

The National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity (NPS-UDC), which came into effect on 1 December 2016, identifies the Waimakariri District as a high growth urban area (i.e. projected to grow by more than 10% between 2013 to 2023). As a result, it requires the Council to provide sufficient development capacity to meet demand for residential and business land over a 30-year period, including 15-20% additional development capacity to ensure there is competition in the housing and business markets. To determine the required level of development capacity to meet the population growth in the District, the NPS-UDC requires Councils to develop three reports. These are:
As the District Development Strategy covers housing and business development capacity, it will play a key role in implementing some of the requirements of the NPS-UDC.

Local planning framework
The following policies, strategies and plans provide a framework for the development and implementation of the District Development Strategy. At the same time, this Strategy provides an overarching strategic framework for a number of other Council documents and functions.

- Quarterly reporting on indicators relating to housing & business development capacity
  - On a quarterly basis, councils will monitor a series of indicators relating to the demand and supply for housing and commercial development within their districts

- Three yearly Housing & Business Development Capacity Assessments
  - The focus will be determining demand for housing and business (including different types, floor areas, locations and price points), and then ascertaining the level of development capacity that will be needed to meet this demand.

- A Future Development Strategy (to be developed every three years with the first strategy to be completed by 31 December 2018)
  - This will demonstrate the broad location, timing and sequencing of additional housing and business land over the next thirty years to make sure the District has sufficient development capacity.

As the District Development Strategy covers housing and business development capacity, it will play a key role in implementing some of the requirements of the NPS-UDC.

External influences on the DISTRICT DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY
- Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy
- National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity
- Land Use Recovery Plan
- Canterbury Regional Policy Statement
- Resilience Strategy
- Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan
This is a Draft Strategy for public feedback. Your input is important—let us know if we got it right.

1.5 Next steps - He Mahi Hei Whai Ake

This is a draft Strategy for public feedback. Your input is important to let us know if we got it right and, if not, what needs to be changed and why. To help continue this conversation with our community and key stakeholders, the Strategy includes some questions to prompt discussions and comments. Please read this document and fill out the feedback forms to provide your feedback by any of the other electronic means.

We would like your comments by 14 July 2017.

After the close off for receiving comments, there will be an opportunity for additional feedback and input from comments in a Council panel. A final District Development Strategy, based on draft-stage feedback and any further information including updated expert advice is intended to be considered by Council for adoption in late 2017.
Part 2
The proposed District Development Strategy
- Wāhanga 2: Te Mahere Rautaki Takiwā kua tūtohi

This Section sets out the proposed development strategy for the District. It provides a vision and shows where development could occur over the next 30 years in response to the anticipated growth and planning drivers. This Section also presents a number of options for development in rural and rural residential areas for consideration and comment by the community. Pages 4 and 5 earlier in this document provide an overall District snapshot of what this draft Strategy proposes and why. Pages X to X later in this document provide snapshots of what is proposed for each of the District’s main towns of Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend/Pegasus and Oxford.

2.1 Vision - Te Moemoeā me Ngā Hua Matua

Planning for the future growth of the District needs a clear vision that draws on the wider context, the key issues and opportunities for the District, and early comments received. Such a vision then translates into more tangible strategic aims that are aspirations in the context of our key strategic themes that this Strategy is based on.

This Strategy’s Vision recognises not only the District’s rural context and its importance to the District, but also the significant and growing townships that the majority of the District’s residents call home.
2.2 Principles - Ngā Mātāpono

The key principles for the context, development and implementation of this Strategy are identified in Part 3. A principle that is particularly important for the implementation of this Strategy is the Council’s relationship with Te Ngāi Tūhuriri Rūnanga.

The Ngāi Tūhuriri kaumatua are knowledge holders of mātauranga mana whenua. Te Ngāi Tūhuriri Rūnanga and the Waimakariri District Council first entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (“MOU”) in 2003 and this has recently been renewed. The goal of the agreement is to give effect to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi by the Council working in partnership with Te Ngāi Tūhuriri Rūnanga to continue to build our relationship through mutual understanding and shared responsibilities.

2.3 Our ENVIRONMENT - To Tatou Taiaro

Strategic aim: culturally rich with links to our heritage
Strategic aim: environmentally rich and sustainable
What we are going to do:

- Identify biodiversity issues and opportunities for the District, including identifying agency roles and responsibilities and opportunities for coordination.
- Protect our natural environment by focusing residential and business growth within and around the District’s existing urban environments.
- Continue to protect significant natural areas and explore opportunities for incentivising further protection and enhancement through the district plan review, including through monitoring and enforcement.
- Continue current initiatives such as grants and support for the Te Kohaka o Tuhakura Trust and consider new opportunities to protect and enhance significant areas of native flora and fauna, including significant indigenous biodiversity on Council land.
- Reduce further declines in water quality by directing growth to areas serviced by reticulated Council services and continue to fulfil an advocacy role on water quality.
- Protect our communities by providing for growth in areas that are not susceptible to unacceptable natural hazards risk.
- Investigate and support cost effective ‘green’ design and technology in subdivision and buildings through the district plan review and the Council’s Engineering Code of Practice.
- Continue to work with Ngāi Tūhurū to identify and classify wāhi tapu me wāhi taonga as required.
- Continue to work with Ngāi Tūhurū to create a heritage and mahinga kai area in the Kaiapoi Red Zone.
Native flora and fauna (indigenous biodiversity)

Waimakariri District demonstrates a landscape transition from ‘highly developed/modified’ plains environments to ‘less developed, but still modified’ foothills and inland basins, to the ‘relatively unmodified’ subalpine-alpine areas. As with the rest of Canterbury, there has been substantial loss of indigenous biodiversity since human settlement. Habitat loss or change has been mainly caused through deforestation, burning, drainage, cultivation and other development, and the introduction of new species. Continuing habitat loss and change, and the impacts from animal and plant pests remain the main threats to indigenous biodiversity today. Due to significant changes since human settlement, most of the District (and almost all of the lowland areas) now has low overall biodiversity values.

The remaining significant biodiversity features of Waimakariri District include remnants of dry plains Kānuka woodland, and the network of lowland-coastal wetlands along Pegasus Bay. In addition, the braided Waimakariri and Rakahuri/Ashley estuaries rivers are both internationally significant habitats, forming an ecological link between the mountains and the sea and support breeding populations of a range of characteristic, but threatened, birds – Wrybill, Banded Dotterel, Black-Fronted Tern and Black-Billed Gulls.

The Lees Valley inland basin contains regionally-significant wetlands that support red tussock and sedge-rush vegetation, and dry shrubland-grassland communities on a naturally rare and threatened inland alluvial fan ecosystem. Extensive mountain beech forests remain on the frontal ranges and in the headwaters of the Rakahuri/Ashley and Townshend Rivers further inland.

Indigenous biodiversity is managed by the Council through both regulatory and non-regulatory approaches. Regulatory approaches include the District Plan and the Northern Pegasus Bay bylaw. A number of non-regulatory initiatives are also undertaken in the District that support biodiversity and the remaining natural areas on the plains. These include the Ashley River/Rakahuri Rivercare Group which monitors and provides protection for rare birds nesting in the Rakahuri/Ashley Riverbed at Rangiora; the continuing development of Matawai Park, an area of 4.4 hectares in Rangiora, featuring native flora mainly endemic to Canterbury; and continued restoration of the Tīhātara Coastal Park to its natural condition, including the restoration of Ngai Tahu’s Te Teapepatu Lagoon and establishment of biota nodes. In addition, there are a number of areas held in Queen Elizabeth II National Trust Covenants.

The Council is a signatory to the Canterbury Regional Biodiversity Strategy and is committed to supporting the maintenance and enhancement where appropriate, of indigenous biodiversity through its activities.

In addition to the above current initiatives, the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee has been exploring and undertaking opportunities for indigenous biodiversity enhancement as part of implementing the Canterbury Water Management Strategy.

Early community engagement feedback comments indicated environment requested the Council undertake additional indigenous biodiversity initiatives when considering growth options. Native bird habitats were specifically identified. This Strategy’s proposed identified growth approach will support protecting our natural environment by focusing residential and business growth within and around the District’s existing modified environments, thereby avoiding significant natural areas and areas where there are identified indigenous biodiversity values (see also Section 2.5). The Council will also identify biodiversity issues and responsibilities for the District, including identifying agency roles, responsibilities and opportunities for coordination. The Council will continue to protect significant natural areas and explore opportunities for incentivising further protection and enhancement.

Our District. Our Future
Coastal environment

The coastal environment is made up of areas with natural character such as estuaries, coastal wetlands and dune systems, as well as the rural and urban areas bordering these. A wide range of cultural, recreational and natural values are present that contribute to people’s appreciation of its attributes. Under the District Plan, the coastal environment generally comprises Rural and Residential 3 Zoned land (small settlements and beach settlements). In addition to privately owned land, the area includes large areas owned by the Council, the Crown and areas managed by Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust to maintain and enhance natural character areas and values. The Council will continue to support the Trust’s 200-year plan to replace exotic species with natives in the dune system. Additional opportunities to better manage the coastal environment will be considered as part of the District Plan Review by, for example, defining the coastal environment.
**Water**

Groundwater quality is varied throughout the District, with the deep secure aquifers generally meeting drinking-water standards without any treatment. Poorer quality groundwater occurs naturally in some areas, often linked to organic-rich coastal soils and sediments in old swamp areas.

Water quality for swimming ranges from excellent to poor, reflecting effects from higher intensity land use in many parts of the District.

Groundwater allocation in the Waimakariri Canterbury Water Management Strategy (CWMS) Zone has increased significantly over the last decade with about 70% of all allocable water having been allocated for the zone as a whole. Currently approximately 70% of the consented groundwater use is for agriculture, with approximately 25% used for community water supply. Early community comments supported protecting or improving water quality (rivers, streams and groundwater).

Environment Canterbury manages the quality and quantity of both surface and groundwater in the district, while the Council principally provides reticulated water supplies, wastewater schemes and drainage services.

Community feedback on the draft Strategy identified water quality, improvement initiatives and the respective roles of the Council and Environment Canterbury as key concerns. Under the proposed identified growth management approach, development of the existing main towns will accommodate most of the expected growth and be serviced by reticulated Council infrastructure networks. This will support water quality improvements.

The Council will also continue to fulfil its water quality responsibilities by working with Environment Canterbury and through the Land and Water Regional Plan and the Canterbury Water Management Strategy, and with Ngāi Tahu, Ngāi Tuahuriri Runanga and the wider community. This includes meeting Council’s undertakings on the Waimakariri Zone Implementation Program to improve waterway health, protect coastal and foothill biodiversity, manage the Ashley/Rakahuri River, and advocate good water nutrient management practice.

Rules in the *Land and Water Regional Plan* and any rules arising from the *Zone Implementation Plan* Sub-regional Chapter are/will be important for water management, and will take into account the requirements of the *National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2014*. Furthermore, issues relating to water quality are addressed through regional and district resource consent processes, which are designed to manage water quality as well as a number of other factors.

Wāhi tapu me wāhi taonga

Descendants of Ngāi Tūāhuriri (along with other Ngāi Tahu whanui) have resided in the area now known as the Waimakariri District for over 40 generations. This rich Ngāi Tahu history and tribal authority is underpinned by spiritual and whakapapa connections, occupation, land and the use and management of resources.

While the entire catchment is of interest and significance to Ngāi Tūāhuriri as their takiwā, there are a number of sites and places within the Waimakariri and Rakahuri catchments that are described by mana whenua as wāhi tapu (places of particular significance) me wāhi taonga (places treasured).

Recognising and protecting wāhi tapu me wāhi taonga from inappropriate disturbance or damage is very important to Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri. The Council will continue to work with Ngāi Tūāhuriri, Environment Canterbury and other agencies to identify and classify specific wāhi tapu me wāhi taonga in the District Plan and any other relevant documents, recognising the values-based policy set out in the *Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan 2013*. 

---
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Natural hazards

Like most districts within New Zealand, Waimakariri District is subject to potential natural hazards including flooding, fire, wind, earthquakes, liquefaction, and coastal hazards such as erosion, tsunamis and sea water inundation. The potential consequences from natural hazards increase with population growth and development in identified hazard areas. With the population predominantly located on the Rakahuri/Ashley and Waimakariri floodplains, flooding and land deformation from ground shaking are the main damaging effects likely to occur, outside of seasonal risks such as fire.

Risk can be reduced and community resilience increased by avoiding high hazard areas, retaining natural defences, using sound engineering in design and construction, and being prepared for natural hazard events. Comments received during the Strategy’s development urged the Council to identify areas of high risk from natural hazards, avoid development in areas with known constraints from flooding or sea level rise, and have planning in place that enables an effective response to hazards.

Figure 7. District’s main town constraints
These comments are consistent with the Council’s approach in Draft District Plan Change 27 covering natural hazards management, which recognises changes in approaches to natural hazard management since the District Plan was developed, and utilises recent technical information. They are also consistent with the proposed growth approach, under which the identified growth areas generally avoid known areas of high flood and land deformation hazard, and areas susceptible to sea level rise and other coastal hazards. Avoiding natural hazards where possible, rather than undertaking wide scale engineering works to mitigate the various effects, is considered the most appropriate approach for new development. It is also consistent with higher order planning documents such as the CRPS, which the Council is required to give effect to. For example, the CRPS directs the Council to consider 1:200 year and 1:500 year flood events and to provide for critical infrastructure where avoidance is not possible.

Climate Change
Climate change is anticipated to increase the risks from natural hazards. For example, rainfall intensity, seawater inundation occurrences and drought are all expected to increase with climate change. The Council’s development decisions, especially for new growth and intensification areas, are informed by hazards identification and modelling which includes climate change considerations.

Figure 7 shows the key environmental constraints that inform proposed broad residential growth directions outlined in this Strategy.

Sustainable communities and ‘green’ technologies
Community feedback supported enabling and encouraging new buildings, subdivisions and long-term planning to use innovative, sustainable and cost effective alternatives to compliment current practice. This might include greater use of sources of energy such as household solar and wind generation, positioning of new housing to optimise insulation, ventilation and solar orientation, and rainwater collection.
Sustainable housing solutions and a holistic, long-term approach to subdivision design, with a view to developing sustainable communities and exploring incorporating ‘green’ technologies are matters that are emerging and are likely to further develop over time. Aims for new subdivisions are that they are safe and accessible for all ages and life stages providing people with alternative living choices. Sustainable design will be encouraged and may include features that are eco-friendly, energy efficient, affordable and use natural resources in an effective way. The Council will look to incorporate industry best practices, including sustainable design practices, into subdivision design requirements.

The Council will continue to encourage sustainable building technologies through its partnership, advocacy and regulatory roles as appropriate. Sustainable building design, including providing for a range of housing options, will also be advocated.
Strategic aim: consolidated and integrated urban growth that provides housing choice

Over the past 30 years, Waimakariri has been one of the fastest growing districts in New Zealand. The estimated resident population more than doubled from about 25,800 in 1986 to approximately 57,800 in 2016 and is projected to grow to between 86,200 and 109,000 residents over the next 30 years (based on Statistics New Zealand medium and high population projections). A ‘medium to medium high’ growth projection appears most likely at present. Close monitoring of trends and changes will remain important.

Based on the remaining vacant land in our townships (including growth areas already identified in the LURP), it is likely that more greenfield land will be required for the growing population. As an indication of the size of land that could be required, the amount of additional greenfield residential zoned land could be similar to the overall size of either the Ravenswood or Pegasus developments. The final determination of the exact amount of land required will be determined through the NPS-UDC and the District Plan Review.

What we are going to do:
- Plan land for new houses within broad residential growth directions for Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend/Pegasus and Oxford (see Figures 11-14).
- Undertake further work to determine the specific growth areas through the NPS-UDC and the District Plan Review.
- Advocate for a greater mix of housing choices that suit smaller households and enable intensification in the District’s main towns.
- Enable opportunities that contribute to meeting the need for affordable housing.

Community feedback on accommodating the District’s anticipated growth generally supported providing for growth around towns in the existing eastern District such as Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend/Pegasus, as well as Oxford. Such locations would maximise the efficiency of infrastructure, services, amenities and transport, and would create critical mass for business and retail. Generally, the creation of new towns was not supported, principally to retain existing District character and to support efficient use of infrastructure. Intensification within existing towns was well-supported to avoid further urban sprawl whilst also catering for an aging/mixed population seeking smaller section sizes and diverse housing styles as well as proximity to amenities and services. The majority of comments were not in favour of developing new towns: Ashley and Lynden/lyrewell.

Community feedback on the specific proposed growth directions for Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend/Pegasus and Oxford was mixed, with some support and opposition for the areas identified and alternative sites identified.

The growth approach proposed and the location of possible future growth directions for Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend/Pegasus and Oxford recognises feedback from these early community comments and the various opportunities and constraints identified such as natural hazards, serviceability and location choice (see Figure 7 for the key constraints).
For Rangiora, it is proposed that residential growth is anticipated to occur to the east and to some extent to the west. In addition to the identified constraints, focusing the majority of Rangiora growth to the east better positions Rangiora town centre in the middle of an overall settlement pattern, and provides close proximity for new residential land to existing and proposed community facilities in the east. If in the future further residential areas are required, the area south of South Belt and east of Townsend Road should be considered, recognising that this area may be better suited to business activities. For Woodend/Pegasus, growth is largely proposed identified for the north of Woodend, supporting the North Woodend (Ravenswood) development and for Kairaki, to the east. Oxford’s demand for new households over a 30-year period can be met in part by developing existing vacant land and/or intensifying or changing the density in existing zoned areas, particularly rural residential use at the fringes of the town.

Some greenfield growth in Oxford is proposed to the south.

The proportion of residents aged over 65 years is projected to grow from one in six now, to one in three by 2048. The average number of people per household is also expected to decrease from 2.6 now to 2.4 over the next 30 years.

Given these demographic changes, it is necessary to plan for housing choices that suit smaller households and encourage an increase in intensification close to the main town centres or within appropriate greenfield developments. It will still be necessary to provide for large lot residential development to provide housing choice.

The proportion of residents aged over 65 years is projected to grow from one in six now, to one in three by 2048. The average number of people per household is also expected to decrease from 2.6 now to 2.4 over the next 30 years.

Given these demographic changes, it is necessary to plan for housing choices that suit smaller households and encourage an increase in intensification close to the main town centres or within appropriate greenfield developments.
The broad directions for greenfield residential growth for the District’s main towns are set out in Figures 11 to 14. Further work will be carried out to identify and confirm the exact locations and extent of these residential growth areas, together with the intensification opportunities within existing urban areas. These will be enabled through the District Plan Review and other planning tools. Proposed business growth directions shown Figures 11 and 12 are discussed in Section 2.7 (‘Our economy’).

There are a number of identified cultural and heritage sites, mainly clustered in eastern areas. It is important to protect these sites and the Council has advocacy and regulatory roles in regards to these as part of the established relationship with Te Ngāi Tūhoe Rūnanga.
There are a number of small towns and settlements in the District. The beach settlements comprise Waikuku Beach, Woodend Beach, The Pines Beach and Kairaki. Each of these are unique in character and demonstrate a close association with the coast. Notably large parts of The Pines Beach and Kairaki were red-zoned following the Canterbury earthquakes. Settlements further inland comprise for example Sefton, Ashley, Cust, Tuahiwi and Ohoka. Each of these towns respond to their historic context and location within the District.

These small settlements have not experienced the same growth pressures as the District’s larger centres. There have been 106 building consents issued for new houses in the period 2006 to 2016 for the Residential 3 Zone, with the majority of these in Waikuku (35), followed by The Pines Beach/Kairaki (30), then Ashley (17). Early Community comments feedback from the community sought to limit further growth in these settlements to protect their unique character, and avoid natural hazard impacts for beach settlements. These comments reflect policies within the operative District Plan that seek to maintain the compact form of the settlements.

The growth approach proposed enables existing vacant areas in the small settlements to develop and provides for some further ‘organic’ expansion opportunities, generally consistent with historic growth rates. By focusing most new greenfield and intensification development in the District’s larger towns, the character of the District’s small settlements will generally be retained. This approach accords with initial the majority of feedback received on small settlements and the constraints that apply to some of them. By focussing most new development outside of the small coastal settlements, the identified natural and cultural values in these settlements are protected and desired outcomes for the area achieved.
Rural and rural residential development

What we are going to do:

- Continue to provide for agricultural activities and supporting infrastructure
- Improve management of additional non-agricultural business activities in rural areas, including location
- Seek community feedback on options for how the District provides for rural and rural residential development in the future
- Explore increasing the minimum rural lot sizes in parts of the district, especially on good quality land to support primary production
- Explore tools such as cluster development to manage rural character
- For rural residential development, adopt an approach that has a primary focus on creating new rural residential areas, with a secondary focus on enabling large lots for intensification within existing rural residential areas where there is sufficient community support and servicing available
- Review the Rural Residential Development Plan for the whole district
- Consider including additional reverse sensitivity provisions for new rural residential areas in the District plan review
- Continue current initiatives and consider opportunities to protect and enhance significant areas of native flora and fauna as part of new rural and rural residential development
- Determine whether there are additional significant natural areas that should be identified and protected in the reviewed District Plan
- Determine whether there are any existing areas of rural living that could be defined as a lifestyle area, small settlement or similar

Rural areas make up the majority of the District. Agriculture and rural activities play a major part in the District’s economy, employment and character. While there has traditionally been a view that primary production activity should be the predominant form of economic activity in rural areas, as indicated later in the ‘Our Economy’ Section there are a large and growing number of other business activities occurring in the District’s rural areas, which also provide economic benefits. This trend could however cause adverse impacts on the character of our rural and rural residential areas and existing farming activities, or could undermine our established business areas within towns, which have infrastructure in place.
It is proposed that this Strategy identifies that new non-agricultural business activities in rural and rural residential areas will be more carefully managed by the District Plan in order to manage adverse impacts on such matters as rural character, productivity, rural infrastructure, amenity, and to support the District’s existing and proposed business areas. This approach is supported by early community feedback, which asked the Council to limit or at least control non-agricultural commercial or industrial activities which operate in the Rural Zone.
The District Plan allows for subdivision and the building of a house in the Rural Zone on a lot of not less than 4 hectares. Over the last 10 years, approximately one quarter of all new houses in the District were located in rural areas, with 73% (1278) of these established on 4-4.99 hectare lots. These small holdings, or lifestyle lots, (which are commonly lots less than 8 hectares) make up a significant and growing proportion of the rural area in the Waimakariri District. Indeed, the largest single category of lot size (by number of lots) in the Rural Zone is 4-4.99 hectares (2,121 lots). If these trends were to continue, given these trends, it is anticipated that approximately 3,650 additional lifestyle lots of between four and five hectares would be created by 2048 (more than double the existing number) if the current District Plan rules remain unchanged.

While lifestyle lots are a feature of the District and many enjoy the open spaces, the most frequent comment made during early community consultation was a desire to restrict further subdivision of rural land into lifestyle lots due to these undermining rural character, impacting on productive rural land uses, resulting in isolated living with limited social, commercial or retail support, and relying on private cars to access goods and services. The Draft Strategy asked the community for comment on two options: 1) increase the minimum lot size from the current 4 hectare minimum throughout the district, or 2) increase it in parts of the district. The feedback was inconclusive on these options. Other comments suggested subdividing existing 4 hectare lots into mixed or smaller sized lots, or allowing a second house on a 4 hectare lot, in order to avoid reverse sensitivity to rural activities. Comments were made on infrastructure demands from lifestyle lots, with some suggesting the Council consider installing reticulated sewage networks in the rural area to avoid contamination of private bores; conversely others sought continued independence from costly additional infrastructure.

Based on the feedback received the Council will explore increasing the minimum rural lot sizes in parts of the district, especially on good quality land to support primary production.

This Strategy therefore identifies a number of high level possible options for consideration.

The District Plan also provides for ‘rural residential’ development (Residential 4A or 4B Zones) which generally involves between one and two households per hectare (5,000m² and 10,000m² lots), and some higher density ‘large lot’ residential development consisting of between two and four households per hectare (5,000m² and 2,500m² lots). The District Plan identifies rural residential areas at: Mandeville North; Fernside; Ohoka; Clarkville; Swannanoa; Loburn; Waikuku; Waikuku Beach; Ashley; Waiora Lane; West Eyreton; and at the outskirts of Rangiora, Woodend, Kaiapoi and Oxford.

Early community feedback comments about rural residential areas options proposed in the draft Strategy were mixed, with most supporting new rural residential areas being identified and co-located with existing rural residential areas, or on the edge of existing towns, some suggesting that many people do not actually want or need 4 hectares of land and that there is greater demand for the 1-2 hectare lot which could form compact villages serviced with water, sewer and stormwater infrastructure. A smaller number supported intensifying within existing rural residential areas. It is anticipated that there will be continued demand for rural residential development over the next 30 years. If further opportunities for this type of development are provided they must meet the existing requirements, such as being able to connect to Council reticulated wastewater services and avoid high hazard and significant natural and cultural areas.
The Council will provide for both options identified in carefully considered locations, has not identified a preferred strategic option for managing additional housing development in rural areas over the next 30 years. However, given the significant lifestyle rural residential development that has occurred and the often associated adverse effects on rural character, transport networks, primary productive potential, and the District’s natural resources, a reduction in lifestyle development from the status quo is proposed. Likewise, a preferred strategic option has not been identified for providing additional rural residential development over the next 30 years.

High-level possible approaches for consideration and comment are set out on the following page. Under each option, it is anticipated that adverse effects from residential, primary production and non-agricultural production business activities will be managed more effectively through amended District Plan consistent. It is also envisaged that the Council will continue to provide community facilities such as passive recreation spaces in rural areas that continue with current levels of service.

Given the predominantly rural location of the District’s significant natural and indigenous biodiversity areas, rural and rural residential development in the Rural Zone has the potential to adversely affect or enhance these important natural values depending on the nature of the development. Options for enhancement should be considered as part of each option approach.
2.6 Our, CONNECTIONS 
- Ō Tātou Horonga

Strategic aim: well-connected through infrastructure

What we are proposing:
• Provide for continuing improvement in connectivity within our growing District, including enhancing opportunities for walking and cycling.
• Seek improved connections through updating development plans in growth areas, in consultation with infrastructure providers as part of the district plan review.
• Consider and implement where appropriate the findings of the district wide speed management programme, where studies support the lowering of speed limits.
• Continue to work with Greater Christchurch partners on improved connections with Christchurch and public transport services in the District, including through developing a long term strategic transport plan.
• Explore opportunities to provide better pedestrian accessibility to North Woodend (in conjunction with NZTA and the Ravenswood development).
• Integrate new urban growth areas into the Council’s existing reticulated infrastructure networks.
• Continue to explore infrastructure provision options in smaller settlements, including within Maori Reserve 873 (at Tuahiti).
• Continue to explore opportunities to achieve culturally acceptable approaches to stormwater management.
• Incorporate ‘green’ technologies into the Council’s Engineering Code of Practice where they reflect industry best practice and are cost effective.
• Maintain the current approach of apportioning infrastructure costs to development rather than the wider community.

Infrastructure is critical for sustainable development of the District. Infrastructure includes the District’s roads and other transport links, telecommunications, power, water (including irrigation), stormwater and wastewater networks and the Rangiora Airfield and Christchurch International Airport. If an area cannot be accessed or have services provided, redevelopment or more intensive development and the use of that area will often be constrained. Sometimes this constraint is physical, i.e. there is insufficient potable water available, sometimes it is cost prohibitive i.e. it is too expensive to extend a Council sewer network to service only a few houses, and sometimes it is temporal i.e. services can be provided but not for a period of years. In some instances there are a number of constraints. It is not uncommon for development to have an adverse impact on existing infrastructure, for example new noise sensitive development under the airport noise contour (see Figure 7). In order to efficiently provide infrastructure for future development, an integrated approach to infrastructure provision with suppliers (including the Council) is...
Transport

The transport network provides access to employment, services, education and recreation. It supports residents and businesses. With 11,000 Waimakariri residents (42% of the District’s usually resident workforce) travelling to Christchurch for work and about 2,000 of our daytime workforce commuting...
Connections between Waimakariri District and Christchurch City are critical to meeting demand and the expectations of commuters. Future growth in residential and business activities needs to be supported by efficient and effective transport networks. State Highway 1 and the rail corridor also provide key freight routes between the north and Christchurch.

The Government is investing around $600 million in upgrading the northern and western Christchurch road corridors. With the completion of the Western Belfast Bypass (2018) and the Northern Arterial extension (2020), the current congestion at peak traffic times on the northern motorway is projected to ease, resulting in greater reliability of travel time. A third northbound lane from Christchurch is planned across the Waimakariri motorway bridge, together with a cycle lane. A third southbound lane to Christchurch has also been proposed. However, as the District grows there will be a challenge in maintaining the time people expect a commute to take. With 86% of commuter trips by cars carrying just one person, improving vehicle occupancy as well as public transport services is key.

The Government is also planning the construction of a Short Eastern Bypass at Woodend by 2027. The Council will continue to advocate for a timely commencement of this project in order to ease transport pressures, provide more certainty for a growing community, and support the connectivity of North Woodend (Ravenswood) in light of its proposed Key Activity Centre status (refer to Section 2.6 ‘Our Centres’) and signalled residential growth opportunities.

Travel connections now and in the future were a focus for many who provided comments during the community engagement. Improvements in commuting to and from Christchurch and public transport (via a rail link, park and ride and bus services) were consistently sought to reduce congestion, increase travel time predictability and reduce reliance on cars. It was also thought important to enhance and extend safe and separate walking and cycling networks.

It is also important to note that emerging transport technologies and developments in transport services may impact the community and the environment. Autonomous vehicles, electric vehicles, greater use of transport as a service (as opposed to vehicle ownership), enhanced digital connectivity and smartphone technology for determining the most efficient mode and route in the future all have the potential to change transport infrastructure requirements considerably, by possibly altering trip patterns. While such changes are very difficult to plan for due to emerging changes in technology, the preferred growth approach is flexible enough to accommodate change. Continual monitoring of change integrated with flexible transport provision approaches will be critical.

Transport connections now and in the future were a focus for many who provided comments during the community engagement. Improvements in commuting to and from Christchurch and public transport (via a rail link, park and ride and bus services) were consistently sought to reduce congestion, increase travel time predictability and reduce reliance on cars. It was also thought important to enhance and extend safe and separate walking and cycling networks.

A greater focus on travel behaviour (i.e. more people in less vehicles) was raised as a way to manage future demand. It is also important not only from a travel point of view, but also from amenity, environmental and economic perspectives and includes the continued protection of the rail corridor to enable commuter rail travel in the future, should regional and national policy approaches support this. The Council also has a supporting role in providing park and ride facilities.

Medium-term public transport initiatives planned include Metro bus service improvements, bus priority lanes between the Belfast and Chaney’s off-ramp, and travel demand management.

The Council will continue to work with the Greater Christchurch partners on regional public transport improvements within the context of the Urban Development Strategy, and with the New Zealand Transport Agency over transport network matters; acting as an advocate for appropriate provision of public transport in order to reduce congestion and meet the needs of our growing communities. This is important not only from a travel point of view, but also from amenity, environmental and economic perspectives and includes the continued protection of the rail corridor to enable commuter rail travel in the future, should regional and national policy approaches support this. The Council also has a supporting role in providing park and ride facilities.

Medium-term public transport initiatives planned include Metro bus service improvements, bus priority lanes between the Belfast and Chaney’s off-ramp, and travel demand management.
Potential changes in development density in the long-term proposed under the growth approach support existing and new walking and cycling networks through cost efficiencies and use. Current major cycling and walkways projects to be completed in 2018 include a shared 6.5km path connecting Rangiora to Woodend and an 8km shared path linking Rangiora and Kaiapoi. These projects combined are expected to go some way to assist commuting choices and network efficiency, as well as increase safety and recreation opportunities. In 2018, the Council updated its Walking and Cycling Strategy and new initiatives will continue to be identified and advocated for completion, subject to funding.

As the Waimakariri River will continue to be a key network constraint, in order to maximise travel efficiency over the next 30 years it will be important to match improvements in the transport network with changes in ‘how’ we travel.

Three waters infrastructure
Infrastructure services for stormwater, wastewater and potable water range from individual sewerage and water systems (such as in rural areas) to Council provided reticulated (piped) schemes. There has been a shift in recent years to connecting-up small community schemes to larger reticulated schemes, and it is expected that this trend will continue. The Council has invested heavily in response to higher growth rates, including those driven by the 2010 and 2011 earthquake events. Two major infrastructure investment decisions are an example of this:

• The construction of the $36 million Eastern Districts Sewerage Scheme that connects and treats wastewater from nine eastern towns and communities (95% of properties in the District). The Eastern Districts Sewerage Scheme has capacity for projected growth until at least 2050. It also provides improved environmental benefits by replacing discharges to lowland rivers and streams or disposal onto land with an ocean outfall; and

• A $16 million major upgrade of the Rangiora water supply in 2011 that includes a new deep artesian water source with multiple bores and in-ground infrastructure. With the completion of all planned bores in the borefield and additional reservoir storage, sufficient capacity has been provided for a doubling in the size of Rangiora’s population, thereby providing sufficient capacity to match the demand forecast by the growth projections.

The Council’s commitment over the past decade to major investment in infrastructure to cater for growth means that when considering development in the District over the next 30 years, the ‘backbone’ of the major infrastructure is already in place. The only work now required to meet growth demands is to integrate new development areas into the existing systems, and respond to national policy requirements and meet the changing expectations of the community regarding the standard of services provided.

The Council will also continue to explore opportunities to achieve approaches to stormwater management that are important to Ngāi Tūhuriri and incorporate ‘green’ technologies into its Engineering Code of Practice where they reflect cost effective best practice. The growth approach proposed supports in principle the efficient provision of in-ground infrastructure as the existing network can be expanded and supported by collocated and more compact development. Well-planned growth enables the Council and developers to work together to provide key infrastructure at the right place, standard and time.
2.7 Our ECONOMY - Ō Tātou Īhanga

Strategic aim: employment and business opportunities that enhance District self-sufficiency

What we are going to do:

- Provide for continued business activities appropriate for their location within existing towns
- Consider providing for new further provision for greenfield business land in Rangiora and Kaiapoi if demand warrants this
- Progress the planning for the Mixed Use Business Regeneration Areas (Red Zone) in Kaiapoi
- Continue to provide for business activities within both rural and residential zoned areas, but manage the type and nature of these activities and boundaries to minimise significant adverse effects on adjoining communities
- Closely monitor land use take up and development and business trends to be able to respond more quickly as demand and preferences change
- Consider increased support for attracting new business to the District to provide more local jobs
The District is home to more than 6,300 businesses and a large skilled labour force. The construction and utilities sector is the District’s biggest employer followed by the professional services sector, and wholesale and retail (rural business activities are addressed in the rural section). Business activity is critical in supporting a thriving community.

Key locations for these business activities are the six zoned business areas within the District, principally located in the District’s main towns. These are the District’s industrial and commercial hubs, providing for retail and commercial services in town centres (typically Business 1 Zones) and industrial activities (typically Business 2 Zones). There are also business spot zones for specific purposes. In total, over 275 hectares of land in the District is currently zoned for business activity and another six hectares is ‘in the pipeline’. A further nine hectares of additional land for mixed-use business activity has also been identified in the Kaiapoi Recovery Plan (Red Zone) areas adjacent to the Kaiapoi town centre.

In addition to the zoned business areas, a significant number of industrial, commercial and other non-agricultural activities are also occurring in the Rural Zone with 45% of all the District’s construction and manufacturing activities located within rural areas. Likewise, the residential zones accommodate a significant proportion of the District’s businesses, with working from home opportunities responding to an identified need. These can be appropriate as long as any adverse amenity impacts on neighbours and distributional effects on the District’s main town centres are managed. Industrial and commercial activity growth over the last 10 years has also been faster proportionally in both rural and residential zones than the District’s business zones. This trend may continue in the future, especially within the commercial and professional services sector given the increasing ability to run a business from home.

Early Community feedback comments received on the District’s economy largely focused on creating local jobs, the location of business growth areas and which industry sectors should be fostered and grown. Creating more local employment opportunities would assist in increasing self-sufficiency and hence ease commuting pressures. A range of views in relation to the most appropriate places to grow the District’s business areas were given including consolidating business zones around existing nodes and restricting commercial and light industrial activities in the Rural Zone. These range from:
• Enabling appropriate commercial and light industrial activities in the Rural Zone;
• Concentrating commercial activity in Rangiora to achieve a critical mass, proximity to rail and efficiencies gained from co-location with other business activities;
• Identifying North Woodend (Ravenswood) as a key location for businesses seeking a State Highway 1 location;
• Locating industry to the south of Kaiapoi;
• Consolidating business zones around existing nodes and expanding as necessary.
With just over 100 hectares of remaining vacant business industrial land in the District (which includes some large lots in Southbrook and yet-to-be developed land at North Wondern), projections indicate that it is likely the District will need between 17 to 33 hectares of additional greenfield business zones over the next 30 years. However, ongoing monitoring and review of uptake in existing industrial zoned land will be required to consider how land supply is meeting demand into the future in accordance with this additional land will provide for business growth and development choices through to 2048. The final determination of the exact amount of land required will be completed by early 2018 in response to the NPS-UDC requirements identified in Section 1.4 and in light of sub-regional planning processes.

The growth option proposed identified provides for continued business activities in identified business areas within existing towns, and potentially new greenfield business zones beyond the existing infrastructure supported boundary in Rangi ora and south of Kaiapoi if there is demand. This is to accommodate, in the long term, additional business (predominantly industrial development) through to 2048. Providing opportunities for co-located business activities and ancillary support services, should attract employment rich businesses to the established towns and the District more generally. A more distributed growth pattern would not support business co-location and support services to the same extent.

Possible locations for this new business zoned land are identified in Figures 11 and 12 (see pages 41 and 43). Further work will be undertaken to identify and confirm the actual greenfield locations and extent, together with providing for different types of business activities within existing urban areas. These will be enabled through the District Plan Review.
Opportunities will continue to be provided for business activities to operate and establish within both rural and residential zones, but with revised District Plan controls on activities and their scale to better manage amenity effects and avoid impacts on established rural and residential activities. The provision of suitable local convenience retailing in smaller rural settlements will be explored with the community as part of a proposed review of the Rural Residential Development Plan (adopted in 2010). Currently, the CRPS restricts these urban activities outside of the urban areas of the eastern part of the District.

It is difficult to determine and plan for rapid changes in technology with precision. For example, the trend towards more digitally connected and mobile workers might lead to lower office space requirements. In order to be flexible and respond to changes, the Council will monitor land use up-take and business and employment trends. The Council will also work with developers to encourage the provision of adaptable, multi-use buildings.

The Council supports business development in the District through dedicated staff and funding for Enterprise North Canterbury (ENC). ENC was established by the Waimakariri and Hurunui District Councils in 2003 to promote economic development in North Canterbury and work alongside businesses to develop an innovative and prosperous area. ENC has a programme to attract new businesses and jobs to the District and consideration will be given to further developing this.
The District currently contains a number of centres of differing size and function. These include the Key Activity Centres (KACs) of Rangiora and Kaiapoi as well as the Oxford and Woodend town centres. KACs are commercial centres identified as focal points for employment, community activities and the transport network that are suitable for intensive mixed-used development, as required to be identified by the CRPS. More generally, town centres should be vibrant, economically well-functioning, attractive, portray their unique character and values, be accessible and pedestrian-friendly with good parking, and be well connected to public transport and cycleways.

Both the Rangiora and Kaiapoi town centres suffered from the effects of the Canterbury earthquakes and have seen extensive (re)development with a combination of Council and private development projects progressing under frameworks put in place by town centre strategies. Many of the key actions within these strategies are now completed, providing the opportunity to reassess the District’s centres’ roles and function, as does the Waimakariri Residential Red Zone Recovery Plan which identifies approximately nine hectares of land adjoining the existing Kaiapoi town centre for future mixed use business activity. For Woodend/Pegasus, opportunities for further development appear constrained in the existing Woodend centre while some progress is occurring at North Woodend (Ravenswood) and Pegasus centres.

What we are going to do:

- Identify further opportunities for intensified residential and business development focused in and around the town centres of Rangiora and Kaiapoi
- Make best use of existing Business 1 zoned land in the main centres of Rangiora and Kaiapoi
- Consider an area for the expansion of the Rangiora town centre to the east/northeast, including large format retailing
- Commence a review of the Rangiora Town Centre Strategy in 2018/19
- Complete in 2018 a review of the 2011 Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan, and confirm an implementation plan for this and the Mixed Use Business Area adjoining the town centre
- Consider provision for large format retailing in or adjacent to Woodend and Kaiapoi
- Confirm provision for large format retailing in or adjacent to Woodend and Kaiapoi by 2019
- Undertake a strategic planning process to consider the provision of community facilities in North Woodend through the district plan review
- Develop an approach to confirm the future form and function of the existing Woodend town centre
- Continue to support the centres of Woodend, Pegasus and Oxford
- Continue to monitor progress made against the Oxford Town Centre Strategy
- Confirm the Woodend/Pegasus Key Activity Centre at a location within the business area at North Woodend (Ravenswood) through the district plan review
- Undertake a strategic planning process to consider the provision of community facilities in North Woodend
- Develop an approach to confirm the future form and function of the existing Woodend town centre
- Continue to support the centres of Woodend, Pegasus and Oxford
- Continue to monitor progress made against the Oxford Town Centre Strategy
Retailing trends are evolving and there are some key drivers of change at play as consumer expectations increase, catchments widen, online shopping becomes more prevalent and large format retailing (LFR) i.e. ‘big box’ store centres or ‘supercentres’ take more of a centre stage in shopping patterns. It will continue to be vital that town centres provide a ‘lifestyle’ centre which contains activities such as community, civic, recreational and entertainment so they are places where people like to go and carry out business.

Early Community feedback comments received from the community generally supported providing for LFR separately to the town centre, and background analysis indicate that Rangiora is the logical place for LFR whilst still protecting the centre’s character, given its location within the District and its current retail offerings. Some noted that Rangiora East had developed as a de-facto LFR location which is appropriate as, although separate, it is well connected to the town centre.

Other Early comments also suggested the future of the Kaiapoi town centre needs to be well defined and should draw on the town’s heritage and historic river town focus in style and retail activity. Many agreed with the draft Strategy proposal suggest that North Woodend (Ravenswood) should be the future KAC for Woodend/Pegasus, that strategic transport links are needed to support this, and that transport network impacts are appropriately considered.

The growth approach proposed identified supports the existing KACs in Rangiora, Kaiapoi and Woodend/Pegasus by providing further opportunities for residential and business development focused in and around these towns. This helps these centres to be vibrant, accessible and with a continued focus for community services.

The approach proposed sees Rangiora continuing its primary centre role in the District. Accordingly, and with anticipated population growth in the centre’s catchment, it is projected that the centre could sustain a further increase in retail Gross Floor Area (GFA) by 2048. In addition to this, there will likely be requirements for office space and other appropriate centre activities such as community and entertainment facilities.
The current Business 1 Zone in Rangiora could be extended in the direction in the diagram to accommodate growth over the next 30 years. Good progress has been made to make better use of existing zoned town centre land in recent years and such efforts will be continued and advocated for. Comprehensive regeneration and redevelopment of current town centre land, particularly in light industrial or residential use, will be sought. Beyond this, this draft Strategy proposes directions for extending the current Business 1 Zone to the east and north/east, as indicated in Figure 8. Such proposals will be further investigated in a review of the 2010 Rangiora Town Centre Strategy in 2018/19 and be confirmed through the District Plan Review.
Figure 9. Kaiapoi Town Centre

Kaiapoi's demand for commercial floor space over the next 30 years will be met by the directions outlined in the diagram (potentially in the order of between 6-9 hectares (approximate). Most of this will be via the new Mixed Use Business land that was identified immediately adjacent to the existing Business 1 Zone in Kaiapoi through the 2016 Waimakariri Residential Red Zone Recovery Plan. In light of this, and in recognition of the need to appropriately integrate these new areas with the existing Kaiapoi town centre and identify new opportunities for the existing centre, the 2011 Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan will be reviewed in 2018. This Plan may signal District Plan changes, including rezoning of the Recovery Plan (Red Zone) areas.
The exact spatial locations of the Rangiora and Kaiapoi KACs are well defined, being largely the business 1 zoned areas. However, this is not the case in Woodend/Pegasus. With projected population growth in the Woodend/Pegasus area catchment, it has been identified that more than 14,000m² of additional retail floor space could be sustainable in a KAC by 2043, which translates into the provision of up to 5 hectares of KAC land. It is not considered practicable to expand the small existing Woodend town centre, which is surrounded by primarily residential activities, to provide for a single, contiguous area of land that could become a KAC. The planned commercial location at North Woodend (Ravenswood) benefits from its central location in Woodend/Pegasus, its proximity to State Highway 1 as a significant link from Picton (Wellington) to Christchurch, its consented and anticipated commercial activity and its land availability to accommodate a centre of the size required. Based on this analysis and community feedback received it is therefore proposed that the KAC will be defined located at North Woodend with further work required through the district plan review to identify the exact location and ensure good town centre outcomes are achieved. Further discussions will be required with NZTA to identify and confirm issues and options for the future Woodend bypass alignment and the current State Highway 1 designated land through Woodend. As the timing and nature of development of the Woodend Bypass and development of the KAC at North Woodend clarifies, the Council will develop an approach to confirm the future form and function of the existing town centre, noting the opportunities available in the current State Highway 1 corridor. At the same,
the existing centres at Woodend and Pegasus will continue to be supported.
1. SUMMARY

1.1. There are four distinct purposes of this report. Each of these is detailed below.

1.2. The first is to seek approval from Council to bring forward funding of $35,720 into the 2017/18 financial year for a wastewater reticulation main extension in Tuahiwi Road. This budget was approved by Council on 7 November 2017, and funding for this extension was placed in the draft Long Term Plan for the 2018/19 financial year. This timeframe does not meet the required timeframe of Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga (the Runanga) and therefore needs to be accelerated. The amount of $35,720 provides for design fees and 25% of the cost of installing the main. The remaining 75% of the construction cost will remain in the 2018/19 financial year budget.

1.3. The second is to seek approval from Council to accept $33,000 from the Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga (the Runanga) toward the extension of wastewater reticulation in Topito Road from the existing Turiwhaia pump station to the vicinity of 61 Topito Road to serve a proposed development at 233 Tuahiwi Road. The total cost of this main extension is estimated at $86,109, with the Council portion estimated to be $53,109. This will be a new budget item placed in the draft Long Term Plan by staff submission for the 2018/19 financial year.

1.4. The third is to request funding of $8,908 for the current financial year to begin design of the main extension in Topito Road.

1.5. The fourth is to update Council on efforts toward developing a master plan for improving wastewater service in the Tuahiwi area.

Attachments

i. Map showing Tuahiwi Road Main Extension
2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180219017018.

(b) Approves the request to bring funding of $35,720 forward from the 2018/19 financial year in the draft Long Term Plan to the current financial year of 2017/18 for design and partial construction of the main extension in Tuahiwi Road.

(c) Approves a budget of $8,908 for the current financial year of 2017/18 to design a wastewater main extension in Topito Road.

(d) Agrees to enter into a private agreement with Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga to receive $33,000 (incl. GST) towards the cost of implementing a STEP sewer main in Topito Road from Tuahiwi Road to 61 Topito Road at a total cost of $86,109.

(e) Notes that additional works to develop a master plan for wastewater service in the Tuahiwi area will be conducted in parallel to these main extensions, with extensive public engagement with residents of the Tuahiwi community beginning later in 2018.

3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

Tuahiwi Road Reticulation Extension

3.1. At a meeting on 7 November 2017, Council approved a request to enter into an agreement with Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga to receive $33,000 toward the construction of a wastewater reticulation main in Tuahiwi Road and to fund the remaining cost of this construction. Council’s portion of this construction is estimated to be $76,470. This is detailed in Trim report number 171020113861. The location of this main is shown in Figure 1.

3.2. Council’s portion of the design and construction of this wastewater main was included in the draft Long Term Plan for the 2018/19 financial year, with design currently planned to commence in July 2018.

3.3. Recent discussions with representatives of Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga indicate that this timeframe is not adequate and will potentially hinder progress toward development of single-family cluster housing in the Tuahiwi area.

3.4. In order for development to progress in the timeframe desired, design and construction of the main extension needs to begin before the start of the 2018/19 financial year.

3.5. Resources internal to Council’s Project Delivery Unit (PDU) can design and call for tenders for the main extension in the timeframe required to service the development. Therefore, Council staff requests that funding for design and 25% of construction of this main extension be made available in the 2017/18 financial year. The amount of funding to be brought forward into the current financial year is $35,720. The remaining amount of $45,750 will be placed in year 1 of the draft Long Term Plan.
**Topito Road Extension**

3.6. During a recent meeting with representatives from Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga, plans to construct cluster housing at 233 Tuahiwi Road were also discussed. The builder of these homes wishes to connect to Council’s wastewater scheme.

3.7. A wastewater reticulation extension along Topito Road from the existing Turiwhaia pump station to the vicinity of 61 Topito Road would be required for these new homes to connect to Council’s scheme. The cost of this main extension is estimated to be $86,109 for construction, professional fees, and contingency. The location of this main is shown in Figure 2.

3.8. The Runanga has offered to contribute $33,000 (incl. GST) toward the extension of this main. The balance of the works is $58,059 after the Runanga contribution is deducted. This amount would be paid by Council. Budget provision for this main extension will be placed in year 1 of the draft Long Term Plan by staff submission.

3.9. These costs would be recovered by a connection cost of $3,056 per property. This was arrived at by assuming that the 9 existing properties along Topito Road that aren’t connected to public reticulation would connect to the system and that two additional properties along Topito Road will develop to their full potential in the next 10 years. This yields a total of 19 new connections to share in the Council-funded portion of $58,059 for the new reticulation system.

3.10. To ensure that the timeframe of the developers is met, design and tendering for the works needs to commence in the current financial year. Resources internal to PDU can design and call for tenders for the main extension in the timeframe required to service the development. Therefore, Council staff request that funding for the design of this main extension in the amount of $8,908 be made available in the 2017/18 financial year.

**Master Plan for Wastewater Service in Tuahiwi**

3.11. In addition to these main extensions in the Tuahiwi area, Council staff will begin working on a master plan for servicing the Tuahiwi community with reticulated wastewater. This master plan will include anticipated reticulation extensions needed, estimated upgrades to the Turiwhaia pump station, and funding strategies for the work necessary to upgrade wastewater service in the Tuahiwi community.

3.12. A significant portion of this planning process will involve consulting with the Tuahiwi community to identify those properties that plan to develop in the next 10 to 15 years, as well as existing properties that don’t plan to develop but that would still like to connect to a public wastewater system.

3.13. This information, along with estimated costs for reticulation and pump station upgrades, will be used to develop an appropriate development contribution for the Tuahiwi scheme.

3.14. The main output of this master plan will shape the extent of the public wastewater scheme in the Tuahiwi area.
4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. The public has not been consulted on this matter to date; however, funding for the main extension in Tuahiwi Road is included in the Long Term Plan which is currently out for public consultation. Therefore, the public will have ample opportunity to review that project.

4.2. Extensive public consultation will be conducted as part of the master planning efforts. This consultation will be geared toward identifying those properties which might develop in the future and those properties that have a desire to connect to a public wastewater scheme in the future.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. Council faces the following financial implications to service Tuahiwi village with wastewater service.

5.1.1. To extend wastewater service along Tuahiwi Road, Council’s share is $76,469.

5.1.2. To extend wastewater service along Topito Road, Council’s share is $53,109.

5.1.3. Once upgrades to the existing Turiwhaia pump station are required, Council’s share will be approximately $1.934M.

5.2. These costs will be recovered through development contributions over a period of time as properties connect to the sewer system.

5.3. Council is at risk of development in the area not proceeding as planned or existing properties choosing to not connect to the sewer system. If Council chooses to install the infrastructure to service planned growth in the area but this development does not occur, then Council has no means to recover the infrastructure costs incurred.

6. CONTEXT

6.1. Policy

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

6.2. Legislation

The Local Government Act of 2002 is relevant in this matter.

6.3. Community Outcomes

This report relates to the following community outcomes:

- Core utility services are provided in a timely, sustainable and affordable manner.
Figure 2 – Topito Road Main Extension
1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to seek Council approval to enter into private agreements with Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga and private property owners to extend the STEP sewerage scheme in Tuahiwi to facilitate development in accordance with revised planning provisions applying to MR873.

Attachments:
iv. Map of the Tuahiwi village area

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(f) Receives report No. 171020113861.

(g) Agrees to enter into a private agreement with Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga to receive $33,000 towards the cost of implementing a STEP sewer main in Tuahiwi Road from Topito Road to Waikoruru Road at a total cost of $109,470 (incl. GST).

(h) Approves a connection charge of $2,250 per dwelling unit for the first ten units to connect to the sewer along this length of Tuahiwi Road.

(i) Notes that those connecting to the service would be required to also pay development contributions required for the Eastern Districts Sewerage Scheme Ocean Outfall and the Woodend reticulation system and treatment plant at the sum of $9,471.

(j) Notes that further extensions of the STEP scheme in the vicinity will likely give rise to the need to upgrade the capacity of the Turiwhaia pumping station and further recoveries of these costs will need to be made via an additional development contribution.

(k) Notes that the costs of that upgrade is included in draft LTP budgets for the Council's consideration in January 2018.
3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. Land Use Recovery Plan Action 21 directed the Council to change its District Plan in 2015 to facilitate residential development on Maori land in Maori Reserve 873. This includes provision for phased cluster housing on conforming rural zoned properties.

3.2. Since these provisions became operative, a number of Whanau groups have progressed development proposals but none have gone onto completion at this stage. While issues of financing and finalising arrangements among descendant owners have been causes for delay, so too has arrangements to provide for and fund necessary servicing.

3.3. Unlike development of contiguous lots within a subdivision under the control of a single party, this situation involves discontinuous properties, multiple owners and parties who wish to progress incremental development for residential purposes over extended periods. Financing networked water and wastewater services in this situation is problematic and a barrier to expeditious development.

3.4. Recent discussions with the Upoko of Ngai Tuahuriri, Te Maire Tau, have sought to progress servicing along a segment of Tuahiwi Road between Topito Road and Okaihau Road and along Topito Road for approximately 970 metres south of Tuahiwi Road. Water service is available along most of the length of these sections, but the current STEP sewerage scheme does not provide service for any of the area along Tuahiwi Road and most of the area along Topito Road.

3.5. To accelerate this servicing of wastewater, a funding contribution of $66,000 has been put forth by the Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga. This contribution would be divided equally between the two segments, or $33,000 per road, to be serviced and would be seen as a means of accelerating development in the area and leveraging the recently-adopted planning provisions for MR 873.

In the interim to facilitate development along Tuahiwi Road, a wastewater main would be extended from the existing Turiwhaia Pump Station to Waikoruru Road. The total cost for this extension would be approximately $109,469. After the Rununga contribution of $33,000 is subtracted from this amount, a total of $76,469 would be funded by the Council. To recover these costs, a connection charge of $2,250 per property wanting to connect would be required.

The connection cost of $2,250 was arrived at by assuming that, in the next 10 years, the 20 existing properties along Tuahiwi Road would connect to the new reticulation system and that an additional two parcels would be developed to their maximum 7 residences per parcel. This yields a total of 34 connections that would share in the Council-funded portion of $76,469 for the new reticulation system.

In addition to these connection costs, persons wanting to connect to the reticulation system in Tuahiwi Road would need to pay the following costs:

- Development contributions – costs that contribute to recouping the cost of the existing reticulation system and treatment plant infrastructure in Woodend and in the Eastern Districts Sewer Scheme.

- Onsite costs – the costs to install infrastructure within the property boundary to convey wastewater to the public mains, i.e. septic tanks, pumps, and service laterals. These costs would apply to new development requiring an entirely new septic system or homeowners choosing to replace their existing septic tank...
and pump. If a homeowner has an adequate septic tank and chooses to retain that tank and pump, then these costs would not apply.

The table below details each of these costs for the first ten connections along Tuahiwi Road.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Connection Cost</td>
<td>$2,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Development Contributions (DC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Woodend DC</td>
<td>$231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Eastern Districts DC</td>
<td>$9,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Onsite Costs</td>
<td>$16,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Total incl. GST</td>
<td>$28,281</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 – Costs Associated with Wastewater Connection

3.6. Wastewater flows for up to ten new connections in the Turiwhai pump station catchment can be accommodated within the existing pump station. The above costs apply to those first ten houses to connect along Tuahiwi Road. Additional development beyond these ten homes, whether they occur along Tuahiwi Road, Topito Road, or elsewhere in the Turiwhai pump station catchment, will trigger an upgrade to the pump station and reticulation downstream of the pump station. This upgrade would be funded by new development, replacements, and level of service charges. Provision for the pump station and reticulation upgrades is proposed in year two of the LTP budget at a cost of $1.934 Million. These costs would be recouped through development contributions and rates. Appropriate development contribution costs will be determined in the next financial year as part of the design of the pump station and downstream reticulation.

To achieve a sustainable solution, considerable engagement and consultation with the community will be required to determine an appropriate scale of reticulation upgrade and its feasible uptake duration.

3.7. Council staff are aware of a proposed development at 80 Topito Road. If this development moves forward as planned, then Council staff may bring forward a similar proposal for wastewater infrastructure along Topito Road.

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

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. Community views were canvased in relation to the planning provisions facilitating additional residential development in rural zoned MR873 and factored into the decision-making on the Plan Change at that time.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. Council faces the following financial implications to service Tuahiwi village with wastewater service.

5.1.1. To extend wastewater service along Tuahiwi Road, Council faces a financial contribution of $76,469. To service development in Tuahiwi Village beyond the ten homes mentioned earlier in this report, Council
faces a $1.934M cost to make upgrades to the Turiwhaia pump station and downstream reticulation. These costs would be recovered over a period of time as properties connect to the sewer system.

5.2. Council is at risk of development in the area not proceeding as planned or existing properties choosing to not connect to the sewer system. If Council chooses to install the infrastructure to service planned growth in the area but this development does not occur, then Council has no means to recover the infrastructure costs incurred.

6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. **Policy**

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

6.2. **Legislation**

The Local Government Act of 2002 is relevant in this matter.

6.3. **Community Outcomes**

This report relates to the following community outcomes:

1. Effect is given to the Treaty of Waitangi.

2. There is a safe environment for all.

Simon Markham
Strategy & Engagement Manager

Chris Parton
Wastewater Asset Manager
1. SUMMARY

1.1. This report is to update the Council with progress on the Oxford Rural No.1 source upgrade project, and to seek approval to proceed with physical works before obtaining consent to take water from the new well.

1.2. The scheme is currently on a permanent boil water notice as a result of turbidity issues with its current source. A preliminary programme has been produced showing that the source upgrade could be completed by October 2018 if staff wait until the date it is expected that consent will be granted to take water from the new well before constructing any additional infrastructure.

1.3. There are two key ways in which the boil water notice could be lifted earlier. These are:

1.3.1. If construction of the pipeline commences at the earliest opportunity following tender opening (but before consent is granted to take water from the well), the new source could be online by August 2018.

1.3.2. If the offer to use a deep private well is taken up, this could be online within approximately 4 – 6 weeks (May 2018) if it was able to be made a priority by all parties involved. This would however come at a cost of approximately $125,000 to connect in a temporary manner.

1.4. Two key decisions are required from Council as to whether to wait until consent is granted to take water from the well before starting construction works, and also whether to invest in the temporary connection of the private deep well to allow the boil water notice to be lifted at the earliest possible opportunity.

Attachments:

i. Analysis of Costs for Connection of Temporary Connection of Private Well (Trim 180306023700)
ii. Submissions on Resource Consent CRC183143 (180326032508).

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180322031037.
(b) **Notes** that submissions on the consent application to take water from the new McPhedrons Road well have closed, and that it is considered likely that this will require the consent to go to a hearing with an earliest decision date by 6 June 2018.

(c) **Notes** that there is a risk that the consent will not be obtained or will be obtained with conditions that are not favourable to Council.

(d) **Notes** staff consider Council has a good case for obtaining a consent with conditions in favour of the Council based on the importance placed on high quality drinking water, the low quality and health risk associated with the existing source, the steps that Council has already taken to obtain a source in a other locations, and the limited impact on other consent holders.

(e) **Approves** staff proceeding with the physical works to complete the upgrade prior to the decision on the resource consent to take water from the well.

(f) **Approves** the early adoption of the budgets for the project which are included in the draft 2018-28 Long Term Plan, and for these budgets to be available to spend within the 2017/18 financial year, noting the projected timing of expenditure within the contents of this report.

(g) **Approves** an additional Source Upgrade budget of $300,000 for the project to be split evenly between renewals and level of service (the renewals portion is to reflect that the upsized pipe is replacing an existing pipe).

(h) **Delegates** the authority to award the pipeline construction contract to Management Team at an estimated cost of $1,200,000 within a total project budget of $2,900,000.

(i) **Notes** that it is anticipated that the above steps will allow the new source to be online by 15 August 2018.

(j) **Notes** that it is not recommended to proceed with the temporary connection of the private well due to the cost of $125,000.

(k) **Circulates** this report to the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board for their information.

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1. The Oxford Rural No.1 water supply scheme is currently on a permanent boil water notice as a result of turbidity issues with its current source.

3.2. A new well has been drilled, developed and tested but the consent application to take water from the well is currently on the critical path. It is normal to wait for the final decision on the consent application prior to proceeding with the remaining physical works to complete the project. There is however an opportunity to accelerate the completion of the project by commencing further construction works prior to the decision on the resource consent being issued.

3.3. Staff briefed the Council on the boil water notice and the progress with the source upgrade project on 7 February 2018 and indicated that they would report back following closing of submissions on the consent application.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. It has been identified that due to the public health risk presented by the current source, which has led to a boil water notice being issued on this scheme, that it is a priority to complete this project as soon as is possible.
4.2. A complication to the above is that the consent to take water from the well has not yet been granted. This introduces the requirement for a decision as to whether to proceed with construction of the infrastructure prior to the consent being issued which introduces some risk, versus the option of waiting for the consent decision before proceeding further with physical works construction which would result in a later completion date.

**Resource Consent**

4.3. On 7 March 2018 submissions on the consent application closed. There were 4 submissions received. These submissions can be summarised as follows:

- One was in support of the application. This was from the Canterbury District Health Board. They had indicated that they would like to be heard if the application goes to a hearing, however they do not wish to trigger a hearing occurring.

- There were two submissions opposing the application. The reason for the opposition in all cases was due to concerns about drawdown on private bores used for farming purposes, and also in one case concerns about a drinking water supply protection zone extending onto their farmland. One of these submissions had requested to be heard regarding their submission.

- One submission noted that some concerns about drawdown on their private bore, but indicated that they neither supported nor opposed the application (presumably recognising the community benefits in the project).

4.4. Based on the above it can be concluded that it is likely that the consent will go to a hearing so that the two submitters who had requested to be heard (one in opposition and one in support) have an opportunity for this to occur. Staff have suggested to the submitter that a pre-hearing meeting be held to address the concerns raised, with the aim of the submitter withdrawing their request to be heard. It is however acknowledged that the likelihood is that the hearing will be required.

4.5. Given that a hearing will likely be required, the following timeframe is expected for a decision on the consent application.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Expected Date</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consent Hearing</td>
<td>14 May 2018</td>
<td>Early possible hearing date indicated by Environment Canterbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Following Hearing</td>
<td>6 June 2018</td>
<td>15 working days after hearing date.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6. Consideration has been given as to the risk of Council not gaining consent to take water from the well. While there is no way to predetermine a hearing panel's decision, the risk of not obtaining consent is considered to be very low. This is based on conversations that staff had with Environment Canterbury (Ecan) staff prior to the well being drilled. The key points noted in this meeting are listed below. Also noted is what has eventuated since the initial meeting.

4.6.1. It was noted that the proposed new well would likely have some interference effects on neighbouring wells. This is due to the high concentration of wells in the area making this almost unavoidable. Initially it was estimated that the number of wells effected could be up to 18, and that the amount of interference could be between 1m – 9m (depending on specific location of bore, and specific aquifer parameters). Report 161028111305 has details on initial estimates of potential interference.
The actual amount of drawdown predicted following drilling and testing of the new well has been calculated at 1.5 – 2.5m out of total existing drawdown on those wells of 11 – 12m. This means that the new Council well will contribute approximately 20% of the total drawdown already existing on those wells. More detail on the drawdown effects can be found on page 16 of the Assessment of Environmental Effects or AEE submitted with the consent application (record number 180326032513).

It can be concluded that the actual amount of drawdown resulting from the new well, and the number of wells effected, is at the lower end of what was estimated prior to the drilling of the well.

4.6.2. The consent would likely go to a hearing if it was opposed by one of the affected well owners. This is what has eventuated.

4.6.3. Council had demonstrated at considerable cost attempts made to minimise effects on neighbouring bore owners by drilling in the west Rockford Road area. This however was unsuccessful with either no or very low yielding wells being established. This in turn by a process of elimination had forced Council to explore an area that does have a high concentration of existing wells.

4.6.4. Council has a legislative requirement to comply with the Drinking Water-standards for New Zealand, and the drilling of a new deep well is the only practicable way identified of achieving this.

4.6.5. The need to ensure high quality water is available for public supply is recognised in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, the Land and Water Regional Plan, and is also identified as a priority outcome in the Waimakariri CWMS Zone Implementation Programme. These matters would need to be recognised in a potential future hearing.

4.7. Following the meeting it was assessed that the only option available to Council to upgrade the scheme to achieve compliance with the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand was to drill a deep well in an area where other wells may be affected. However, based on the above points the risk of not gaining a consent from such a well would be very low. This gave staff and Council the confidence to proceed with the drilling of the well. Since that initial meeting and the assessment of risk by Council staff, nothing has occurred to reduce the level of confidence that the consent to abstract water from the well will be granted.

Timetable of Physical Works

4.8. There are five key components of work required for the completion of this project. These are summarised below as well as their current status and expected costs.
Table 2: Summary of projected outstanding costs to the project and timeframes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Outstanding / Estimated costs ($,000)</th>
<th>Timeframe and Status</th>
<th>Early Completion Date</th>
<th>Late Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17/18</td>
<td>18/19</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Hearing 14 May, Decision 15 days after.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaining of the resource consent to take water from the new well.</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>6 June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of the pipeline to deliver water from new well to View Hill Reservoir</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>15 August if awarded on 11 April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation of well pump and construction of wellhead.</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>$160</td>
<td>27 July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of electrical and treatment building</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$130</td>
<td>$230</td>
<td>8 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation of power cables and transformed to bring power to new site</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td>$55</td>
<td>Quote presented to Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Remaining Capital Cost (Sum of above)</td>
<td>$1,015</td>
<td>$645</td>
<td>$1,660</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.9. The following conclusions can be drawn from the table above:

- The earliest achievable completion date is 15 August 2018. This would require:
  - Council approving construction on the pipeline to commence prior to the consent to abstract water from the well being granted.
  - Council adopting $1,000,000 of budget proposed within the draft Long Term Plan for the 2018/19 financial year as part of the multi-year project with $575,000 to be spent within the 2017/18 financial year.
  - Of this budget proposed for the 2018/19 financial year, $500,000 was previously included as part of setting budgets for the 2017/18 Annual Plan, and $500,000 of renewals funding has been added as part of the draft 2018-28 Long Term Plan to reflect that the larger diameter pipeline from the new well is replacing an existing asset.
  - In the event that the tendered price for the pipe construction contract is over $1,000,000 Council delegating Management Team to award this (which would usually require Council approval to award, which would not be able to be gained until the May Council meeting). If the tendered price was less than $1,000,000 Management Team would have the delegation to award this contract.
  - Council approving an additional budget of $300,000 if the tendered price for the pipe construction contract is the value estimated of $1,200,000. If the tendered price is less than $900,000 this additional budget would not be required, and if the tendered price is more than $1,200,000 the additional budget required would be more than $300,000. Staff are
expected to have the tendered price available at the time of the Council meeting.

- If construction of the pipeline does not commence until after the consent is granted, the earliest achievable completion date is 11 October 2018 (two months later than the earliest achievable date). This may be later if the consent decision is delayed due to an appeal.

4.10. The projected costs and the current and proposed budgets are summarised in Section 6.1.

Private Well Connection

4.11. A private resident on Rockford Road has offered the use of a private deep well for the scheme in order to supply a higher quality water source in the interim period before the final upgrade is implemented.

4.12. Staff have assessed this option and consider it to be physically feasible. The water is considered to be of a sufficient quality for the scheme (based on water quality tests taken several years ago). The well draws from the same aquifer as the Council well on Rockford Road that was drilled previously which has been determined to be of a high quality, but insufficient quantity for the scheme.

4.13. This would involve a temporary connection at an estimated cost of $125,000. The use of the well would be available up to October 2018 which is the start of the irrigation season, by which time it is expected that the new source would be online, although this would be relatively tight.

4.14. Some of the materials used for the temporary connection could be recovered for potential re-use on other projects, however the majority of the costs would be sunk.

4.15. This cost of $125,000 equates to approximately $380 + GST per connection on the scheme, or capital repayments of $31 per connection per year for a 25 year period.

4.16. It is anticipated that this could be implemented in 4 to 6 weeks. This would be subject to availability of the following key contractors and other key tasks being completed:

- 4.16.1. Electrical contractors who would work with the Council’s control systems engineer
- 4.16.2. The Council’s Water Unit to install the pipework and chlorine dosing equipment.
- 4.16.3. Project Delivery Unit staff to facilitate the works.
- 4.16.4. A pump maintenance contractor to service the well pump
- 4.16.5. Staff working with Ecan to temporarily change the nature of the consent to allow the well to be used for public water supply as opposed to irrigation.
- 4.16.6. The documentation of some form of written agreement that may be required with the landowners regarding the use of the well, and reimbursement of power costs.

4.17. While the above is all possible, it would require reprioritisation of existing resources to achieve this. It is recommended that it would be preferential to focus time, resources and finances on implementing the long-term solution as soon as is practicable rather than implementing the temporary solution above.

4.18. The Management Team have reviewed this report and support the recommendations.
5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

5.2. The Canterbury District Health Board have provided a submission in support of Council’s consent application to take water from the well proposed to be the new source for the scheme.

5.3. **Wider Community**

5.4. The Oxford Rural No.1 water supply scheme was consulted prior to the drilling of the three wells that have been drilled on the scheme so far in the aim of providing an upgraded source.

5.5. A public meeting was held in February 2018 regarding the permanent boil water notice that has been issued on the scheme. Residents argued their extreme dissatisfaction with the continued boil water notice. This results in significant hardship for residents. There was a strong view explained that the Council shall provide drinking water standard compliant water with urgency.

5.6. Three property owners in the area have made submissions to Council’s resource consent application to take water from the new bore, two of which opposed the application.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

6.2. If construction of the pipeline commences prior to the consent being granted to take water from the new well, there would be some risk of a lost investment if consent for that well were never able to be gained. This is considered to be a very low risk, given the points noted in the Issues and Options section regarding the resource consent.

6.3. The following table summarises the expected costs and existing and proposed budgets for the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Remaining Capital Cost (Sum of Table 2)</strong></td>
<td>$1,015</td>
<td>$645</td>
<td>$1,660</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Remaining Professional Fees</strong></td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommended Project Contingency</strong></td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>$160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Required Remaining Budget</strong></td>
<td>$1,145</td>
<td>$725</td>
<td>$1,870</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source Upgrade Budget – Level of Service</strong></td>
<td>$570</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$1,070</td>
<td>$1,404,098 budget this financial year, less $834,329 spent to date equals $570,000 remaining for 2017/18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source Upgrade Budget - Renewal</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Budget Available or Proposed in draft LTP</strong></td>
<td>$570</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,570</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Surplus / Shortfall</strong></td>
<td>-$575</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>-$300</td>
<td>Potential $300,000 shortfall identified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4. It is noted that there is a potential budget shortfall of $300,000 based on the estimates carried out on the outstanding work.
6.5. It is also noted that in order to implement the solution as soon as is practicable some of the budget that is to become available next year when the draft Long Term Plan is adopted would need to be brought forward to the current financial year.

6.6. In order to allow the completion of the project within the timeframes such that there is sufficient budget available within the appropriate financial year, it is recommended that budget be approved as per the table below (numbers struck through are current budget figures either in the current financial year’s budget, or proposed as part of the draft Long Term Plan):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4: Proposed changes to existing budgets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Upgrade Budget – Level of Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Upgrade Budget – Renewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*570,000 represents the remaining available budget from the current year’s budget of $1,404,000

6.7. The proposed budget increase of $300,000 is split evenly between renewals and levels of service budgets. The project’s driver is to improve the water quality which is a level of service improvement, however it is recognised that as part of installing the larger diameter pipe that an existing smaller diameter AC pipe is being renewed.

6.8. The capital repayments on the additional $300,000 are calculated at $21,286 per year, which equates to a rate increase of $16.2 per unit of water on the scheme.

6.9. The proposed changes in budget are based on estimates for the remaining physical works. At the time that the report was written the price for the pipe installation contract was not known, but this will be known at the time of the Council meeting. If the outcome of the price opening changes the recommendations of this report, this will be discussed at the meeting with an alternative set of recommendations presented.

6.10. Community Implications

6.11. The community implications of the permanent boil water notice are significant. For this reason it is recommended that the timeframe until the source be upgraded be minimised.

6.12. Risk Management

6.13. The risk associated with the consent application for the well being unsuccessful was managed through a meeting to discuss the issue with Ecan prior to the drilling of the well.

6.14. There is still some residual risk that the consent application may be declined, however this risk has been assessed as being low. In the event that this occurred, Council would appeal such a decision and would be confident of gaining consent following the appeal process. This is primarily due to the very high value that is placed on high quality drinking water, the very low quality of the existing source, and the efforts that Council has gone to in order to find a suitable source for the scheme.

6.15. As well as the possibility of the initial decision not being in Council’s favour, and Council being required to appeal this decision, there is also the possibility that the initial decision may be in Council’s favour but could be appealed by one of the submitters who appealed the application. This potential appeal could delay the issuing of the consent. If Council opts to construct the infrastructure prior to gaining consent, moderate delays to the consent
process would not affect the overall programme. If however Council were waiting to gain consent before starting construction, delays to the consent process would have direct delays to the overall programme. Based on this it is preferable that construction start at the earliest opportunity rather than waiting for the outcome of the consent process.

6.16. If the physical works were completed prior to the consent bring granted, staff would recommend to Council that the new source come online due to the health risk associated with the existing source.

6.17. The risk with the opposition to the application are also being managed through a planned meeting with the applicant that opposed the application and asked to be heard. This is planned for early April, and staff will be able to advise Council on the outcome of this meeting at the Council meeting.

6.18. **Health and Safety**

6.19. The current water supplied to the Oxford Rural No.1 scheme members carries a level of risk to public health that is considered to be unacceptable. For this reason a boil water notice has been required to be issued on the scheme to manage this risk.

6.20. The Health and Safety risks associated with the construction works associated with this project will be managed through the Council’s usual health and safety management systems.

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

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

7.2. **Legislation**

7.3. Section 69 of the Health (Drinking Water) Amendment Act 2007 is relevant in this matter.

7.4. **Community Outcomes**

7.5. The following community outcomes are relevant in this matter:

- There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision making that effects our District
- There is a safe environment for all
- Core utility services are provided in a timely and sustainable manner
- People have wide-ranging opportunities for learning and being informed

7.6. **Delegations**

7.7. The Council has the delegated authority to award construction contracts to the value of greater than $1,000,000. It is recommended that this authority be delegated to the Management Team to reduce delays in the physical works contract being awarded following the tender evaluation process being completed.
Colin,

The purpose of this memo is to document investigations and options for the connection of the
Colt Trustee Limited and Waifora Trustee Limited well, known as Deep Well and located at 762
Rockford Road, to the Oxford Rural No.1 Water Supply Scheme reticulation.

Subsequent to discussions between you and Anne Reid, Mark Andrews and I visited Anne and
Allan Reid at 762 Rockford Road to ascertain the Deep Well location, it’s electrical and control
system, wellhead security and likely connection point/s for rising main/s to connect to
reticulation.

1. **Background**

   Key points from discussions with Allan and Anne Reid and site observations were:

   1. Power supply – the transformer is 55kVA and it runs the farm dairy shed, well
      pump, 3 phase plugs etc.
   2. The well pump is installed 100m below ground and the riser is 8” diameter.
   3. The well controls is by pressure and low level alarm also the Pivot Irrigator
      control box.
   4. The well pump is controlled by softstarter.
   5. They are subscribed to DataCo with electronic and telemetric flow metering.
   6. From the well card the well is 155m deep and is screened between 143.5 and
      155m. Initial water level 30.95m bmp (below measuring point), highest water
      level 24m bmp and lowest water level 35m bmp.
   7. For water level graph and well card please see
   8. The well pressure gauge is measured at surface level and typically runs between
      55 to 80PSI (379 to 551kPa).
   9. The well pump requires servicing (bearings whining).
   10. The well head requires sealing about the casing and stock exclusion fencing
       installed
   11. There are two connections to the above ground pipework at the well head. One
       to facilitate addition of fertiliser and a second take off. Both would require
       capping, chlorination and testing to confirm no residual chemicals exist.
   12. A liquid fertiliser storage tank needs to be emptied and removed (3.5m from
       wellhead).
   13. Any additional EI&C required is readily accommodated in the existing electrical
       shed.
   14. An existing irrigation hydrant could be used to connect the proposed pipe/s to
       reticulation.
15. It was agreed in principle that water mains could be laid above ground (with exception of the accessway) from the well or irrigation hydrant to the Rockford Road Wellhead by following fencing and boundaries or to reticulation in a direct line from the well head to reticulation in the road.

16. The well could be utilised until next irrigation season (circa October) by which time the McPhedrons Road well would be online.

17. There was no discussion on any lease agreement of cost to Council in using the well however, Council should consider such an agreement.

2. Hydraulic Analysis
The View Hill reservoir is base 364m RL and inlet approximately 366.5m (estimate). The well at surface level is 345m RL (19m static head). The distance from the well to the reservoir is approximately 2.7km. The head loss for the 665m long dual 125mm OD PE pipes from Deep Well to the Rockford Road Well and balance of 150mm pipe from Rockford Road Well to the View Hill Reservoir is in the order of 20m @ 17 L/s making the total head at the wellhead approximately 39m (17L/s @ 380 kPa). The Deep Well pump being capable of 379 to 551 kPa should be able to deliver at least 17 L/s to the View Hill Reservoir excluding service connection draw-off along the route.

3. Options to Connect Deep Well
Three options (with brief descriptions of work required below) were considered to connect Deep Well to existing reticulation:

A. Deep Well is upgraded to VFD Drive (to be controlled by pressure) and is connected to the Rockford Road well via two 665m lengths of 125mm O.D. PE mains where chlorination and SCADA equipment is utilised. **The cost estimate for this option A is $124,600 including engineering and 15% funding contingency.**

B. Deep Well is upgraded to VFD Drive (to be controlled by pressure) and is connected to the Rockford Road 150mm AC reticulation via two 180m lengths of 125mm O.D. PE mains. Chlorination and SCADA equipment is installed at the well. **The cost estimate for this option B is $199,000 including engineering and 20% funding contingency (due to higher uncertainty of costs than option A).**

C. Deep Well discharges to a balancing tank under basic level control where transplanted surface pumps, pipework and chlorination equipment from the Rockford Road headworks are installed in a box container and SCADA equipment bought and installed. The Surface pumps are connected to the Rockford Road 150mm AC reticulation via two 180m lengths of 125mm O.D. PE mains. **The cost estimate for this option C is $211,000 including engineering and 20% funding contingency (due to higher uncertainty of costs than option A).**

Due to high cost and complexity of design, options B and C have been discounted from further analysis.

4. Option A Detailed Description
Figure 1 below shows a proposed alignment for the 665m long dual 125mm O.D. PE100 mains which would be laid on the ground to save on cost. The pipes would be buried across a single accessway. The mains could be connected to the well head directly. The pipes would then connect via a manifold upstream of the Rockford Road well and water would pass though the existing chlorine dosing and sampling system which would then be controlled as normal via radio from SCADA. The Deep Well pump would be controlled via a retrofitted variable frequency drive (VFD) that would be controlled by pressure. The pump would shut down when the pressure sensor senses high pressure, and would be programmed to restart every 30 minutes. This is a similar operating system to the Cust Water Supply Scheme Springbank Well 2 emergency backup control
system, which is utilised during communications loss. Other work would require modifications to the Rockford Road headworks, removing a pump on the View Hill Line and replacing it with a spool to allow water to be drawn from the View Hill line and pumped to Chalk Hill Tanks. The tanks at Rockford Road Headworks might be bypassed/isolated in this configuration.

Subject to Contractor availability, option A could be deployed within 4 weeks from approval.

Figure 1: Dual rising mains alignment, Deep Well to Rockford Road Well

5. **Option A Cost Estimate**

A cost estimate compiled for option A is included in the following table. Please note that subject to the Asset Managers thoughts regarding risk, it might be possible to reduce the capital cost in the order of $3,000 by excluding the requirement for preconstruction and during construction PE weld tests.
### Option A - Connect Deep Well to Rockford Road Well Cost Estimate

**Description of Works:**
Deep Well is upgraded to VFD drive to be controlled by pressure. The well head itself requires new concrete surround and a 5m radial stock exclusion fence installed. Dual 125mm O.D. PE pipes are connected to existing wellhead pipework and laid above ground in paddock then under driveway and along boundary fence in the berm to the Rockford Road well. The pipes are connected to a manifold connection to existing well head pipework upstream of chlorination equipment. SCADA at the Rockford Road Well is utilised and the Rockford Road well pump is turned off. Minor pump house manifold work at the Rockford Road Headworks is required to allow a bypass.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>SCHEDULE ITEM</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>RATE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PRELIMINARY &amp; GENERAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Contract Management and Reporting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Traffic Management and Control</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Site Establishment and Setting Out</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Erosion &amp; Sediment Control</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>As-built information</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Health and Safety Provision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Locate &amp; Avoid Existing Services (including grounding)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2  | SUPPLY & INSTALL WATER MAIN |
|    | Includes supply and instalation of all materials, fittings, bends, fire hydrants, trenching, pipe, importing bedding material, backfilling to trenching specifications including disposal of spoil, surface reinstatement, testing and markings, |
| 2.1 | DN125 PE/100 PN12.5 pipe only 100m Costs | 1330 | m | $20.00 | $26,600.00 |
| 2.2 | Lay dual DN125 PE/100 PN12.5 pipe above ground including E/F welding | 1 | LS | $8,050.00 | $8,050.00 |
| 2.3 | Trench and install dual mains across driveway | 8 | m | $120.00 | $960.00 |

| 3  | CONNECTIONS |
| 3.1 | Connect new DN125 PE pipes to Deep well connection - all materials and work required. | 1 | LS | $2,500.00 | $2,500.00 |
| 3.2 | Connect new DN125 PE pipes to Rockford Road well connection - all materials and work required. | 1 | LS | $6,000.00 | $6,000.00 |

| 3.5 | Reinstall grass berms (trench reinstatement) | m | $15.00 | $ - |
| 3.6 | Reinstall metal driveways | 8 | m | $50.00 | $400.00 |
| 3.7 | Reinstall chip seal road crossings | m | $72.00 | $ - |

| 4  | MISCELLANEOUS |
| 4.1 | Upgrade Well Head and enabling work including fencing | 1 | LS | $10,000.00 | $10,000.00 |
| 4.2 | Electrical Controls | 1 | LS | $5,000.00 | $5,000.00 |
| 4.3 | Wet Pump VSD | 1 | LS | $10,000.00 | $10,000.00 |
| 4.4 | Well pump contribution (maintenance) | 1 | LS | $2,500.00 | $2,500.00 |
| 4.5 | Rockford Road Headworks Modification (manifest) | 1 | LS | $2,000.00 | $2,000.00 |
| 4.6 | DN125 MDPE Butt Weld “Prefcon” Pipe Weld Test & Report | 2 | ea | $750.00 | $1,500.00 |
| 4.7 | DN125 MDPE Butt Weld “During Construction” Pipe Weld Test & Report | 2 | Ea | $750.00 | $1,500.00 |
| 4.8 | Sterilise and flush all Mains | 1 | LS | $1,800.00 | $1,800.00 |
| 4.9 | Pressure Test | 1 | LS | $1,200.00 | $1,200.00 |
| 4.10 | Build channel works about wellhead to divert overland flow and fencing | 1 | LS | $2,200.00 | $2,200.00 |
| 4.11 | Demolish pipework and reinstat at completion | 1 | LS | $6,000.00 | $6,000.00 |

| 6  | TOTAL (GST exclusive) | $92,060.00 |

| 7  | Contingency | 10% | $9,206.00 |

| 8  | Construction Total | $101,266.00 |

| 9  | Professional Fees | 7% | $7,088.62 |

| 9  | Project Cost | $108,354.62 |

| 10 | Funding Contingency | 15% | $16,263.19 |

| 11 | TOTAL (GST exclusive) | $124,807.81 |
6. **Risks**

The Deep Well well head does not comply with requirements of the Drinking Water Standards for New Zealand for secure status, as it lacks adequate bore casing protection and fencing to exclude livestock. The paddock surface drains across the wellhead meaning fecal matter passes about the bore casing. There is also a liquid fertiliser tank within 3.5m of the well head that will need to be emptied and removed. Similarly the private irrigation pipelines and pipework downstream of the flow meter have been used with a fertiliser additive. Therefore pipework downstream of the flow meter would need to be disconnected and the well head thoroughly cleaned, disinfected and testing for contaminants prior to being used for a community supply. The well pump is understood to be defective and requires maintenance before use (bearing replacement). All of these risks can be managed at a cost which has been allowed in the option A estimate. The extent of grouting around the well casing below ground level is unknown, therefore a channel/bund would need to be constructed to divert stormwater containing any contaminants around the perimeter of the well head fencing.

7. **Recommendation**

Should the Water Asset Manager choose to proceed, it is recommended that the Water Unit, Nairn Electrical and Hall Machinery be engaged directly on separate contracts with PDU project managing the works.

As discussed above, option A could be deployed within 4 weeks of approval at an estimated cost in the order of $124,600.
12 March 2018

Waimakariri District Council
Attn: Colin Roxburgh
Private Bag 1005
Rangiora 7440

Dear Mr Roxburgh

Resource Consent Application – Submission Period Closed

Applicant: Waimakariri District Council
Application Number: CRC183143

The submission period for the notification of your application has now closed. Environment Canterbury has received submissions in respect of the above resource consent application. Please find attached copies of the submissions and a summary list.

As submitters wish to be heard, a hearing is expected to be held.

Although a hearing date has not yet been set, a hearing is required to be completed 75 working days (or by 26 June 2018) after the close of submissions.

There is also an opportunity for a pre-hearing meeting (prior to the formal hearing) to clarify issues regarding your application which could result in parties withdrawing their right to be heard.

Please be aware that you will need to provide us with briefs of evidence that you intend to present to support your application at least 10 working days before the hearing date.

Timeframe extension or suspension

The timeframes may be extended by us if special circumstances arise that require more time for consideration. We will be in touch immediately if this becomes the case.

If you require more time to consider how to progress your application, you are able to place your application on hold i.e suspend the application for up to 130 working days at any time until the close of the hearing If you wish to do this please advise in writing of the time required.

Hearing Required

Please note that there are additional charges, which will be incurred in holding a hearing. A copy of the ‘RMA Charges Fact Sheet’ is enclosed for your information. If you do not wish to proceed with your consent application, contact me as soon as possible to avoid further costs being incurred.
Please contact me if you have any queries.

Yours sincerely

Alison Cooper
Consents Planning – Hearings

Cc: Pattle Delamore Partners
    PO Box 389
    Christchurch 8140
    Emailed: ryan.nicol@pdp.co.nz
**Submissions for WDC - Oxford water (1803)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitter</th>
<th>Summary of Submission</th>
<th>Applications</th>
<th>Support/oppose</th>
<th>TBH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury District Health Board - Community and Public Health (Healthy Physical Environments) Attn To: Bruce Waddleton</td>
<td>SUB031442</td>
<td>CRC183143</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gleneyre Farm, Lees Valley Station PO Box 28085 Beckenham Christchurch 8242</td>
<td>SUB031443</td>
<td>CRC183143</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Holdings (2001) Limited 77 Watsons Reserve Road RD 1 Oxford 7495</td>
<td>SUB031444</td>
<td>CRC183143</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiri Kiri Farm Limited 345 Kiri Kiri Road RD 1 Oxford 7495</td>
<td>SUB031445</td>
<td>CRC183143</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 submissions received in total. 0 submission(s) were late with 0 granted a waiver.
Submission on Application for Resource Consent
Section 96 on the Resource Management Act 1991

To: Environment Canterbury
PO Box 345, Chistchurch

Submitter: Canterbury District Health Board
Attn: Bruce Waddleton
Community and Public Health
C/- Canterbury District Health Board
PO Box 1475
Christchurch 8140

Applicant: Waimakariri District Council

Consent Type: Groundwater take

Proposed Activity: To take groundwater for a Community Drinking Water Supply near McPhedrons Road, Oxford

Application Ref: CRC183143
SUBMISSION ON APPLICATION FOR RESOURCE CONSENT

Name of submitter
1. Canterbury District Health Board (CDHB).

Application to which submission relates
2. Waimakariri District Council application to take groundwater for a Community Drinking Water Supply near McPhedrons Road, Oxford

Relevant parts of application
3. The submission relates to the entire application.

Detail of submission
4. The submitter is responsible for promoting the reduction of adverse environmental effects on the health of people and communities and to improve, promote and protect their health pursuant to the New Zealand Public Health and Disability Act 2000 and the Health Act 1956. These statutory obligations are the responsibility of the Ministry of Health and, in the Canterbury District, are obligations are carried out under contract by Community and Public Health under Crown funding agreements on behalf of the Canterbury District Health Board.

5. The Ministry of Health requires the submitter to reduce potential health risks by means including submissions on resource consents to ensure the public health significance of potential adverse effects area adequately considered by consent authorities.
General comments

6. The Oxford Rural 1 Community Drinking Water Supply is currently sourced from 2 surface water galleries in the Waimakariri River. The water is chlorinated, however, does not fully comply with the microbiological requirements of the Drinking Water Standards for New Zealand 2005 (Revised 2008) as there is no barrier to protozoan contamination nor stable turbidity to ensure effective chlorine disinfection. Due to the issues with turbidity this supply is on a permanent boil water notice. The supply therefore presents an unacceptable risk to public health. The Canterbury District Health Board (CDHB) acknowledge the significance of this application for the Waimakariri District Council (WDC) in achieving their responsibilities under the Health Act to protect public health.

Ground water sources in most cases provide better quality source waters for drinking water supplies than surface water bodies. They are inherently less subject to contamination especially when over 100m deep due to the strata that protects the water body. The initial water quality information which accompanies this application, supports this assertion. When a drinking water supply has a good quality source water, it is easier and more economical to treat than a surface water body which suffers turbidity issues with every wet weather event. These issues need to be a consideration given that this water is for human drinking water.

In addition, it is vital to recognise the importance of the Canterbury Water Management strategy (CWMS) in relation to this application. Community supplies are identified as a First Order Priority under the CWMS and quality drinking water is listed as a supporting principle. The CDHB agree with the strategy in that these principles are fundamental in achieving the vision of the CWMS and in doing so recommend that the consent is granted.

Decision sought

7. The CDHB seeks the following decision:

The CDHB seeks the application be granted as sought
**Conclusion**

8. The CDHB does wish to be heard in support of this submission.

9. If others make a similar submission, the submitter will not consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.

**Person making the submission**

Dr. Alistair Humphrey MPH MHL FAFPHM FRACGP
Public Health Physician, Canterbury District Health Board

**Date:** 5/03/2018

**Contact details**

Bruce Waddleton
For and on behalf of
Community and Public Health
C/- Canterbury District Health Board
PO Box 1475
Christchurch 8140

P +64 3 364 1777
F +64 3 379 6488

Bruce.waddleton@cdhb.health.nz
From: bdalton@grasslands-llc.com
To: Hearings
Subject: Notifications Consent Submission: Group 341
Date: Monday, 5 March 2018 1:10:52 p.m.

Group ID: 341

Name: Gleneyre Farm, Lees Valley Station

Care of: Brandon Dalton

Mailing address 1: PO Box 28085

Mailing address 2:

Suburb: Beckenham

Town/City: Christchurch

Post-code: 8242

Country: NZ

Mobile phone:

Work phone:

Home phone: 03 312 4877

Email: bdalton@grasslands-llc.com

Contact by email: Yes

Is a trade competitor: No

Directly affected: Yes

Consent support/hearing details

- CRC183143: oppose | WANT to be heard | WILL consider a joint hearing

Reasons comment:

We oppose the consent for CRC183143 for bore BW22/0088 due to likely adverse affects on two of our wells L35/0825 (89.25m deep) and BW22/0051 (120m deep). We have had issues over the previous two summers with low flows and low water levels cutting out the pump for L35/0825, which we have had to address by lowering the pump. This well is only 920m from the new WDC bore. If the new bore is pumped at 30 L/sec it will almost certainly impact our ability to utilise our existing well, as its doubtful that further demands on the groundwater system can be sustained. Additionally, we are concerned that the creation of the Community Drinking-water Supply Protection Zone around bore BW22/0088 will adversely impact our farming operation by restricting activities that we may do on adjacent paddocks.

Consent comment:

We wish the consent authority to deny the consent in its current form or to determine an
alternative that does not impact our existing bores.
Group ID: 341

Name: Kiri Kiri Farm Ltd Oxford

Care of: Darin Bradley

Mailing address 1: 345 Kiri Kiri Rd

Mailing address 2:

Suburb:

Town/City: Oxford

Post-code: 7495

Country:

Mobile phone: 021689096

Work phone:

Home phone:

Email: kirikirifarm@scorch.co.nz

Contact by email: Yes

Is a trade competitor: No

Directly affected: Yes

Consent support/hearing details

- CRC183143: neither | NOT to be heard | will NOT consider joint hearing

Reasons comment:
Kiri Kiri Farm Ltd operates the dairy farm with bore B220089 and Bw220071 next to proposed water supply bore. We have existing effluent discharge consents not mentioned in council application and our groundwater consent which expires this april but has had new consent granted to include new bore B220089 which was tested for effects. Our concerns are for the protection of our existing effluent discharge consents as this side of our farm the discharge does not affect any neighbours. And our Irrigation bores which see large drops in static water levels through each season we have observed which may be different to nearest monitor bores.

Consent comment:
We want to see our existing bores not affected any more than we have been able to affect any neighbouring existing bores so we are against the granting of this consent if the granting of it adversely effects our bores. We have recently seen static water levels at
62mtr bgl through December and February and ask if this will exacerbate effects on our bores. The per second take should be adjusted downwards to the level where affects are within the current effects rules.
Group ID: 341

Name: Trinity Holdings (2001) Ltd

Care of: Lance and Wendy Main

Mailing address 1: 77 Watsons Reserve Road

Mailing address 2:

Suburb: R.D.1

Town/City: Oxford

Post-code: 7495

Country: New Zealand

Mobile phone: 0274587377

Work phone:

Home phone: 034241195

Email: landwmain@farmside.co.nz

Contact by email: Yes

Is a trade competitor: No

Directly affected: No

Consent support/hearing details

- CRC183143: oppose | NOT to be heard | will NOT consider joint hearing

Reasons comment:
The proposed take of water will have a direct and immediate effect on 2 of our wells (L35/1074 and L35/0875) and may adversely effect the viability of our business. We irrigate a dairy farm at minimal rates (3.1ml/day over 2/3 of the farm). This farm sustains 3 families. We are Lead With Pride Elite accredited so are running an environmentally and economically sustainable enterprise with high environmental, animal health and Human Resource standards. Considering this area is red-zone and currently over-allocated water wise it would be unlikely we would be able to get a consent to take water from another source let alone find it. Income from this farm could be significantly impacted from even a small draw down. A reasonable proportion of this income is used for environmental monitoring and mitigations - including but not exclusively moisture meter, recycling, planting, continuing development of effluent and irrigation efficiency. Any reduction in income would decrease the availability of adequate funds to continue improving our environmental imprint.
Consent comment:
Consider a lower volume take which may decrease the impact on neighbors' wells/properties and livelihoods. Ensure affected bore owners who may find alternate supply are granted consent for new sources.
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT FOR DECISION

FILE NO and TRIM NO: DRA-16 / 180322031170[v03]

REPORT TO: Council

DATE OF MEETING: 3 April 2018

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

SUBJECT: 20 February 2018 Storm Event

1. SUMMARY

1.1 The purpose of this report is to inform the Council of the affect the 20 February 2018 storm event had on the 3 Waters infrastructure in the District and to seek approval of new budget to undertake works at Springbrook and Southbrook / South Belt in Rangiora.

1.2 The storm event was predominantly focussed in the coastal areas with Rangiora and Woodend receiving over 100mm in 12 hours. While no significant issues were reported in Woodend, stormwater flooding and sewer overflows were experienced in Rangiora and stormwater flooding was experience in Kaiapoi.

1.3 The flooding in Springbrook resulted in the internal flooding of a recently constructed residential house and the flooding in Southbrook / South Belt resulted in the internal flooding of a commercial building.

1.4 New budgets are requested in the current financial year to be funded from the Rangiora Urban drainage budget and Roading capital works budget to undertake flood mitigation works.

1.5 These budgets are currently not included in the draft Long term Plan as the need for the works was not known about until after the 20 February 2018 storm event. Given the importance of these work to mitigate against future flood events, it is recommended that these works are undertaken this financial year as emergency works.

1.6 Council staff have informed Environment Canterbury that the works on the North Brook and Railway Drain, to mitigate the flooding in Springbrook, will be undertaken as emergency works and resource consent for the these works will be applied for retrospectively.

Attachments:
   i. Springbrook Factual Report (Trim 180308024550)
   ii. Concept plan for Southbrook / South Belt Road drainage works
   iii. Central Rangiora Sewer Upgrades – Works Programme
2. **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180322031170[v03].

(b) ** Approves** a new capital budget of $400,000 in 2017/18 under the Rangiora Urban drainage account for works on the North Brook and Railway Drain, to mitigate the flooding in Springbrook.

(c) **Notes** that this results in an increase of $3.82 per property or 2.3% increase in the Rangiora Urban drainage account from 2018/19.

(d) **Notes** that flood modelling of the further works is currently being undertaken to confirm that no additional further works are required to provide the required level of flood protection for the Springbrook development.

(e) **Approves** a new capital budget of $20,000 in 2017/18 under the Rangiora Urban drainage account and $36,000 in 2017/18 under the Roading capital work account for works at the Southbrook / South Belt intersection.

(f) **Notes** that the Roading budget of $36,000 includes $20,000 for drainage works and $16,000 for road-marking works.

(g) **Notes** that $20,000 of the drainage works and $16,000 of the road-marking works will be separately funded by NZTA, through existing approved budgets.

(h) **Notes** that works on the North Brook and Railway Drain, to mitigate the flooding in Springbrook, will be undertaken as emergency works and resource consent for these works will be applied for retrospectively.

(i) **Circulates** this report to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board for information.

3. **BACKGROUND**

**20 February 2018 Storm Event**

3.1 The forecast and potential severity of Cyclone Gita was well published by the media and Metservice. Council staff had therefore undertaken the following event preparation work:

- Temporary pumps were deployed on Tuesday morning.
- Maintenance crews were deployed to check pump stations, inlet grills / screens, flap gates and key sumps.
- Maintenance contractors on standby, including sucker trucks.
- EOC was signaled to be set up by 5:30pm.

3.2 The rainfall that occurred during the storm event was predominantly focussed in the coastal areas of the District, with Rangiora and Woodend receiving over 100mm in 12 hours (refer Table 1 below).

3.3 It is noted that following the 20 February 2018 storm event, the cumulative rainfall over the past 12 months is currently at over 1,000mm in Kaiapoi and 1,100mm in Rangiora, where the average annual rainfall in these areas is 600-650mm. Additionally the groundwater levels in the District are very high and the undercurrents are still flowing as a result of the rainfall that has occurred since July 2017.
Table 1 – Rainfall depths during the 20 February 2018 Storm Event

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>ARI</th>
<th>Total Depth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>12 Hour</td>
<td>53.5 years</td>
<td>102.2 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>12 Hour</td>
<td>19.8 years</td>
<td>74.6 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend</td>
<td>12 Hour</td>
<td>51.8 years</td>
<td>100.0 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>24 Hour</td>
<td>4.7 years</td>
<td>89.8 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>12 Hour</td>
<td>4.6 years</td>
<td>51.6 mm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 During the event maintenance crews were deployed mainly to Kaiapoi to ensure the stormwater pump stations remained operational and to manage the wastewater system, particularly the sucker trucks to prevent overflow in the Hills Street area. Field crews were also sent to Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Ashley/Sefton, Mandeville and Waikuku to inspect in known areas of historical flooding.

3.5 Flooding was reported in Kaiapoi and Rangiora and sewer overflows were reported in Rangiora. Turbidity issues were also experienced on the Oxford Rural No.1 and Oxford Rural No.2 water supplies which resulted in a precautionary boil water notice being issued on the Oxford Rural No.2 water supply – note that the permanent boil water notice remains in place on the Oxford Rural No.1 water supply.

3.6 The main areas of flooding where further investigation work is required are listed below and discussed further in Section 4 of this report.
- Stormwater
  - Springbrook, Rangiora
  - Southbrook Road / South Belt, Rangiora.
  - Hilton Street, Kaiapoi
- Wastewater
  - Church Street / King Street / Johns Road, Rangiora

3.7 There were a total of 208 drainage related service requests over the week of the 20 February 2018 storm event. All of these service requests have been acknowledged. However, there are still a number of these that need an engineering assessment in order to reply with advice or a proposal to resolve the particular issue.

3.8 There were 15 reported external overflows from the wastewater system and one internal overflow, which were predominantly located in the Church Street, King Street and Ward Park area of Rangiora. The external overflows were cleaned up and the area disinfected by the Water Unit and the internal overflow was professionally cleaned by OCS Group NZ.

3.9 The inlet screen at the Rangiora wastewater treatment plant experienced an operational fault, which caused the network to back up in the Railway Road and Newnham Street area. The screen was removed and the system bypassed for the duration of the storm event. The screen was replaced later that week, however this system has now been superseded by the new Rangiora WWTP inlet works which is currently being commissioned.

3.10 The sucker truck operation in the Hills Road area continued until about 3am on the 21 February 2018 and managed to keep the surcharged system to a level that it did not adversely affect the operation of the toilets in the area. Upgrades are proposed to address this issue and funding is included in the draft Long Term Plan (refer TRIM 170928105216).

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

Springbrook Stormwater Flooding
4.1. Following the flooding in the Springbrook area during the 20 February 2018 storm event (refer to Attachment i), three phases of emergency works are identified:

- Response Works – Completed on the night
- Further Works – Additional works to reduce the risk of flooding.

4.2. Following construction of the response and immediate works, the risk of flooding to the Springbrook subdivision from the Railway Drain via the overflow has been reduced. However, a significant residual risk of flooding of the Railway Drain Overflow remains as the North Brook is hydraulically linked to the drain via twin culverts (under the footpath at the downstream end). These culverts have no backflow protection to prevent backflow of the North Brook up the drain. The risk is currently being managed by Council staff by a plan to deploy temporary works if another event were to occur, but this is only viable as a very short term measure.

4.3. The level of protection provided by further works options is currently being assessed using a hydraulic flood model. However, hydraulic separation of the Railway Drain Overflow from the North Brook upstream of the fish pass is essential.

4.4. There may also be a requirement to incorporate some additional elements of work to provide the required level of protection. Therefore the potential options for further works have been split into two parts:

a. Part 1: Hydraulic separation of the Railway Drain Overflow from the upper section of the North Brook Ponds and reconnect to downstream from the fish pass.

b. Part 2: (Part 2 works would only be progressed if the model predicts additional protection is required). This could include:

   - Modify fish pass spill levels
   - Upsize the culvert at the inlet to the main detention pond,
   - Create an overflow structure from the main detention pond, discharging to a point near Spark Lane.

4.5. The concept designs, high-level costs and comments/advantages/disadvantages for the Part 1 Further Works are shown in Tables 2, 3 and Figure 1 below. The works description in Table 2 below denotes the different works that could be employed to make up the works package for Options A through to G.
Table 2 – Part 1 Further Works Option Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Works Description</th>
<th>Retain Open Drain</th>
<th>Convert open drain to planted swale (with perforated drainage pipes)</th>
<th>Construct bund along Northern Spring Brook Overflow Drain</th>
<th>Retrofit Check valve to Railway Drain Overflow Culverts</th>
<th>Grout / Seal Railway Drain Overflow Culverts</th>
<th>Connect railway drain overflow to downstream of fish pass using open channel</th>
<th>Connect railway drain overflow to downstream of fish pass using pipes</th>
<th>Construct SW Pumping station at downstream end of Railway Drain Overflow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colour on Figure 1</td>
<td>Pink</td>
<td>Pink</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Purple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Cost</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
<td>$89,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$51,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$217,000</td>
<td>$855,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Works Package Options**

- **A**
- **B**
- **C**
- **D**
- **E**
- **F**
- **G**

Options identified with orange cells have been eliminated from further consideration – refer to Table 2 for further details.
Options identified with green cells denote recommended options for further consideration.
Options identified with red cells denote options that are viable to construct but not recommended.
Figure 1 – Part 1 Further Works Options (Refer to Table 2)
### Table 3 – Part 1 Further Works Option Costs and Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Residual Risk of Flooding</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Speed of design and construction</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A      | Very High –               | Not priced     | Short                            | Effectiveness reliant on check valve achieving effective seal.  
Prolonged surcharge in the North Brook will cause water to pond/spill from Railway Drain Overflow.  
**Does not provide sufficient protection – not considered further.** |
| B      | Moderate                   | Not priced     | Extended                         | Prolonged surcharge in North Brook will cause water to pond in the Railway Drain Overflow.  
Bund potentially required to extend full length of drain and to a height in excess of 1m above current top of bank at the downstream end.  
Risk of flooding/ponding from run-off from private property.  
Land purchase or easement required for bund or drain re-alignment – Land unlikely to be available and residents value aesthetics of drain.  
**Not viable to construct – not considered further.** |
| C      | Moderate                   | Not Priced     | Extended                         | Large volume of earthworks required (due to topography)  
Adjacent landowners (not currently affected by flooding) would prefer not to have more drains/water around them.  
Increased maintenance and access requirements for open drain.  
**Not considered further following initial resident consultation – not considered further** |
| D      | Moderate                   | $280,500       | Moderate                         | Some land owners value aesthetics of open drain, others more concerned by flood risk.  
Risk of stagnant water / mosquitos / midges due to intermittent base flow from springs.  
Increasing base flow from upstream Railway Drain (low flow pipe) would increase risk of flooding and increase storm flows.  
Limited access and more complex to maintain. |
| E      | Moderate to Low            | $357,500       | Moderate                         | Some land owners value aesthetics of open drain, others more concerned by flood risk.  
Increased level of treatment from swale with scruffy domes to accept stormwater flows.  
Potentially intermittent base flow from springs conveyed to North Brook (reduced risk of stagnant water / mosquitos / midges).  
Mown swale and pipes easy to maintain. |
| F      | Moderate to Low            | $918,500       | Extended                         | A very hard engineered option requiring land with good access, power and telemetry to be resilient.  
Generator or easy access for plug in required for resilience.  
Existing point of discharge to the North Brook might be retained. |
| G      | Moderate to Low            | $976,500       | Extended                         | A very hard engineered option requiring power and telemetry to be resilient.  
Generator or easy access for plug in required for resilience  
Existing point of discharge to the North Brook might be retained. |
4.6. All options in Table 3 do not provide a secondary flow path, therefore careful consideration of design flows will be required and validated as part of the detailed design stage. Initial cost estimates have been prepared assuming conveyance of 50 year peak flow from the existing Railway Drain Overflow catchment (excluding Railway Drain Overflow operation or supplementary base flow from the Railway Drain).

4.7. Option E offers the greatest protection of the options identified and also reduces the risk of stagnant water in an open drain (and risk of mosquitoes or midges). Option D is less resilient because it would be reliant on the integrity of an inlet structure and the open drain, access to which is restricted. Options D and E are also likely to be relatively swift to procure when compared to Options F and G. Although option E is a more robust option, Council understand that several stakeholders would prefer Option D because it enables the aesthetic value of the drain to be retained. Council staff will undertake additional consultation with stakeholders prior to progression of the detailed design of further works.

4.8. Part 2 Further Work Options would only progress if the model predicts that Part 1 options (in conjunction with response and immediate works already undertaken) do not reduce the risk of flooding sufficiently. The preliminary flood modelling results should be known by 3 April 2018. The high level scope and costs associated with the Part 2 Further Works Options are identified in Table 4 and on the concept sketches in Figure 2. Based on preliminary modelling it is not expected that these will be necessary.

Table 4 – Part 2 Further Works Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>High Level Cost Estimate (including 30% Contingency and Professional Fees)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Modify fish pass spill levels and North Brook Ponds operating level by physically modifying concrete outlet structures.</td>
<td>$60,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Upsize Culvert at inlet to the main detention pond (which may compromise the level of treatment afforded by the pond)</td>
<td>$57,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Create a deep water overflow structure near the Spark Lane paper road that will spill to the Northbrook near Spark Lane (via a new drain in the Spark Lane paper road).</td>
<td>$530,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.9. Part 2 Further Works Options H to J have been prepared with a view to limit the level of surcharge in the North Brook Ponds. These options are likely to reduce the effectiveness of treatment provided by the North Brook Ponds but are anticipated to reduce the risk of flooding affecting people and property.
Figure 2 – Part 2 Further Works Options Plan

- **Option H** - Modify fish pass spill levels
- **Option I** - Upsize culvert at inlet to North Brook Treatment Ponds
- **Option J** - Create a deep water overflow structure and overflow drain
Southbrook / South Belt Stormwater Flooding

4.10. Flooding was experienced at the Southbrook Road / South Belt intersection (refer photograph in Figure 3 below). Upgrades to the stormwater system were undertaken as part of the intersection upgrade undertaken last year. This included the construction of a new 900mm pipe to supplement the existing 525mm pipe, which was an upgrade identified following the June 2014 flood.

Figure 3 – Flooding at Southbrook Road / South Belt Intersection

4.11. It is understood that flooding of this intersection was potentially caused by a combination of the flooding factors:

- The quantity of flow down the kerb and channel in Percival Street exceeded the inlet capacity of the sumps at the intersection.
- The level of flow within the Middle Brook restricted flow discharging from the stormwater system.
- The bark from adjacent landscaping was caught within the sump inserts (a.k.a.: Ecosol Litter Baskets / Enviropods), which restricted the intersection draining down after the peak of the storm had passed.

4.12. The 525mm pipe has been inspected since the event and confirmed to be in a good condition apart from a small amount of concrete in the pipe where it appears a temporary repair has been made presumably by a third party that had damaged the pipe. This will be remedied but is not believed to have affect the operation of the system during the storm event.

4.13. A review of the system identified the following:

- The double sumps only have 225mm laterals and do not have any rear entry inlets.
- There is no connection between the 525mm pipe and 900mm pipe downstream of Matawai park.

4.14. Two options were considered to address these above:

4.14.1. Option 1 – Sump Upgrade & Connection (Cost estimate - $95,000)
o Install two high capacity sumps (Hush Pits) on Percival Street, with 450mm laterals.

o Install a 525mm connection from 525mm pipe and 900mm pipe at the low point in Percival Street

o Install a rear entry kerb block on the sump in South Belt.

4.14.2. Option 2 – Sump Upgrade (Cost estimate - $60,000)

o Install high capacity sump (Hush Pit) at the low point on Percival Street, with a 450mm lateral.

o Install a rear entry kerb block on the double sump on Percival Street, with a 375mm lateral.

o Install a rear entry kerb block on the sump in South Belt.

4.15. Option 2 (refer Attachment ii) for concept plan, is the recommended option as the main reason for the flooding at the intersection was the inlet capacity of the sumps.

4.16. The sump inserts were removed following the flood event and have not been reinserted. Further work is proposed to be undertaken to ensure the devices have an appropriate bypass or overflow, particularly in areas where there is no defined secondary flow point. There is a draft Sump Insert Strategy which is an internal document, developed by the Roading and Drainage teams, that sets out criteria for the placement and selection of sump inserts. This strategy will be updated with the learnings from what occurred at this intersection during the event.

4.17. It is noted that the overflow level on South Belt is currently at about the same level at the commercial building at 1 Percival Street (Kings Mowers & Heating), which is the same level that existed prior to the intersection upgrade. Therefore there is no overflow to prevent flooding of this building, which makes the operation of the stormwater system more important.

**Hilton Street Stormwater Flooding**

4.18. Flooding was experienced in the Hilton Street area west of Rich Street. This flooding had previously occurred during the July 2017 event. It is suspected that the stormwater pipework on the south side of Hilton Street is partially or fully blocked, which is preventing discharge into Dudley Drain. Some of the properties on the southern side of Hilton Street are lower than the road level, therefore depend on this stormwater pipe to be fully functioning in order to drain.
4.19. The system is currently being fully CCTV inspected, from Rich Street through to Dudley Drain, and jetted out to ensure the stormwater pipe is operational.

Church / King / Johns Wastewater Overflows

4.20. There were a total of 16 overflows reported in the Church Street, King Street, Johns Road and Ward Park area of Rangiora. This is an area of known hydraulic capacity issues which will be addressed as part of the Central Rangiora Sewer Upgrade project, however the new system will not be extended to this area until 2020/21 based on the current programme of works (refer Attachment iii).

4.21. Further investigation work is currently underway to determine if there maintenance issues, such as fat build up, in any of the areas that may be exacerbating the capacity issue. It is noted that the non-return valve that was installed on the property in Fraser Place adjacent to Ward Place appears to have addressed the issue for this particular property.

4.22. The Management Team have reviewed this report and support the recommendations.

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

Springbrook Residents

5.2. A street meeting was held with residents on 26 February 2018 and weekly updates have been emails out since the meeting. A residents meeting was held on the 15 March 2018 to discuss the response, immediate and further works proposed. Liaison with individual property owners has been undertake as necessary regarding insurance and building floor levels.
5.3. The majority of residents were not keen on option to extend the drain to the rear of the properties on Springbrook Close, due to the perception that it would increase the risk of flooding that are currently unaffected.

5.4. Further consultation with residents will be required to confirm the preferred option, however initially, residents appeared to be in favour of Options E. It is noted that Options F and G were not tabled at the meeting and are not considered to present a better outcome as they rely on pumps rather than gravity.

Rangiora-Ashley Community Board

5.5. A staff briefing was given to Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting on the 14 March 2018 on the work proposed works on the North Brook and Railway Drain, to mitigate the flooding in Springbrook.

5.6. **Wider Community**

5.7. The wider community has not been consulted regarding the options or flooding.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

**Springbrook Works**

6.2. The cost estimate for the Springbrook works comprises of the following works listed in Table 5.

| Stage               | Cost   | Comment                                           |
|---------------------|--------|                                                  |
| Response Works      | $5,000 | Bund works and temporary pump.                   |
| Immediate Works     | $35,000| Bund extension/formalisation, overflow creation, Raupo removal and survey work. |
| Further Works       | $360,000| Option D – Drain works and new piped outlet.     |
| TOTAL               | $400,000|                                                  |

6.3. It is recommended that these works are funded from the Rangiora Urban drainage account, which would increase the Rangiora Urban drainage rate by $3.82 per property or 2.3% from 2018/19 onwards. This would increase the currently predicted rate increase for the Rangiora Urban drainage rate from a 4.8% increase to a 7.1% increase in 2018/19.

**Southbrook / South Belt Works**

6.4. The cost estimate for the Southbrook / South Belt works comprises of the following works listed in Table 6.

| Stage               | Cost   | Comment                                           |
|---------------------|--------|                                                  |
| Drainage Works      | $60,000| Option 2 – Sump upgrade.                         |
| Road-Marking Works  | $32,000| Remaining costs for intersection upgrade (refer TRIM 171213135786). |
| TOTAL               | $92,000|                                                  |
6.5. It is recommended that the drainage works are funded as follows:

- $20,000 under the Rangiora Urban drainage account
- $20,000 under the Roading capital work account
- $20,000 from existing approved budgets funded by NZTA.

6.6. It is recommended that the road-marking works are funded as follows:

- $16,000 under the Roading capital work account
- $16,000 from existing approved budgets funded by NZTA.

6.7. The remedial works on the Hilton Street stormwater flooding and Church / King / Johns wastewater overflows issues are currently expected to be able to be managed within existing operational budgets.

6.8. Community Implications

6.9. The flooding that occurred has implications on residents no being able to obtain insurance in the future if the flooding is not mitigated.

6.10. The flooding also has an implication on the setting of floor levels within the Springbrook development. One property house construction has needed to raise the slab level by 60mm to comply with the approved building consent. Advice has also been given for another 3 properties that the proposed floor levels need to be raised by up to 115mm to comply with the approved building consent.

6.11. Risk Management

6.12. There remains a risk of flooding during future storm events until the proposed works are undertaken. Therefore these works are planned to be implemented as soon as possible.

6.13. While the response and immediate works have reduced the risk of flooding at Springbrook there is still a residual level of risk of flooding in the 50 year event through backflow from the North Brook into the lower end of the Railway Drain via the existing culverts. The further works are necessary to mitigate this risk.

6.14. The level of protection afforded by the proposed works at Springbrook is currently being modelled and will be tabled at the Council meeting if available.

6.15. There will always be a residual flood risk at the Southbrook / South Belt intersection due to there being no formal overflow before the commercial building floor level is inundated.

6.16. Health and Safety

6.17. Safety in Design will be formally considered and documented as part of the detailed design stage.

7. CONTEXT

7.1. Policy

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

7.3. Legislation
7.4. The Building Act via the New Zealand Building Code requires flooding protection of habitable buildings in the 50 year return period storm event.

7.5. The Environment Canterbury Regional Policy Statement requires new buildings to provide 200 year flood protection.

7.6. **Community Outcomes**
   - There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision making that effects our District
   - There is a safe environment for all
   - There is a healthy and sustainable environment for all
   - Core utility services are provided in a timely and sustainable manner

7.7. **Delegations**

7.8. Management Team authorised the Immediate Works package.

7.9. Council has the authority to approve setting a budget and approving a project to reduce the risk of flooding to properties in Springbrook affected by the 20 February 2018 rainfall event.
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT FOR INFORMATION

FILE NO and TRIM NO: DRA-16 / 180308024550
REPORT TO: Gerard Cleary, Manager Utilities and Roading
FROM: Mark Andrews, Civil Engineer (WDC Project Delivery Unit)
SUBJECT: Springbrook Flooding 20 February 2018 Factual Report - Draft

1. SUMMARY

1.1 This factual report documents the events and actions completed during the storm event of the 20 February 2018. It has been prepared using event data captured in TechOne, time stamped photographs and information from field monitoring teams and residents.

Attachments:
  i. Appendix 1 – Photographs from the Event
  ii. Appendix 2 – Concept Sketches of Immediate Works

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Manager Utilities and Roading:

(a) Receives report No. 180308024550.

(b) Notes that this is a factual record of the events and actions that occurred near the Springbrook / North Brook Pond area during the 20 February 2018 rainfall event.

(c) Notes that there is a residual risk of flooding from the overflow drain because it is hydraulically linked to the North Brook (via the twin culverts at the downstream end of the drain). This is being managed by staff and contractors until a permanent solution is constructed.

(d) Notes that a separate options report is being prepared to confirm the level of protection provided by response works constructed during the flood event and to identify options and high level costs to further reduce the risk of flooding in the Springbrook and North Brook Ponds area.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 The 20 February 2018 rainfall event included a period of prolonged and locally intense rainfall.

3.2 During the morning of 20 February 2018 members of Utilities & Roading and Project Delivery Unit formed field monitoring teams that were deployed in the early afternoon through to the evening to monitor designated areas, report back to the central event team and raise service requests using the snap send solve mobile application.

3.3 Upon receipt of resident phone calls, service requests were raised and field monitoring teams were directed to attend properties or concentrate on specific areas. Information from the field monitoring teams was then fed back from site to the central event team.
3.4 Photographs from the site monitoring team and those subsequently received from residents are included in Appendix 1.

3.5 Initial phone calls were received from 2 and 4 Willowby Close at circa 16:00 due to the quantity of water flowing down the road from the driveway of 12 Springbrook Close. The site monitoring team was on site at circa 17:00, spoke with residents and reported the extent of flooding (refer Service Request DR1800211).

3.6 The field monitoring team observed a significant quantity of water flowing down the driveway of 12 Springbrook Close, and a lesser quantity from the garden of 14 Springbrook, which then flowed down Springbrook Close (via the road) discharging to the Stormwater Management Area to the south of 3 Springbrook Close. The field monitoring team contacted the central event team, and requested that the drainage maintenance contractor attend site. The field team worked with the maintenance contractor to implement emergency mitigation measures to alleviate the flooding.

3.7 The field monitoring team observed that the owner of 12 Springbrook Close had put sand bags against their door openings but water had started to enter the building. The owner had used a small excavator on their site to build a bund along the western side of the building and re-profile the driveway in an attempt to direct water away from the building and adjoining land, out on to the road.

3.8 Shortly after the field monitoring team got to 12 Springbrook Close a larger excavator arrived on site (the owner owns an infrastructure company) to create a bund between the slab of 5 Spring Lane and the existing footpath within the reserve (adjacent to the twin culverts under the path). Following construction of the bund flood water did not flow over the slab of 5 Spring Lane but did pond around it before spilling down the driveway of 5 Spring Lane. Depth of flow discharging to the road from the driveway of 5 Spring Lane was in the order of 25mm.

3.9 The site monitoring team observed that the water level in the North Brook Ponds was high. The water in the roadside swale of Springbrook Close and in the swale to the rear of 2, 4, 10 and 12 Willowby Close was significantly less than its maximum capacity.

3.10 The drainage maintenance contractor attended site and widened a natural depression in the bank near the entrance to the pond and fish pass (refer to Point A in Figure 1). This was completed in order to reduce the level of surcharge in the North Brook, improve hydraulic performance and reduce the surcharge effect at the twin culverts to the rear of 5 Spring Lane and 12 Springbrook Close.

3.11 It was observed that the 1200mm diameter concrete culvert at the inlet to the North Brook Settling Pond (identified at Point B on Figure 1) was operational but water was backing up in Railway Drain and flowing over land and over a natural weir structure at the head of the drain along the south west boundary of Spring Lane / Springbrook Close (identified at Point C on Figure 1)

3.12 Stormwater in the drain was flowing down the existing channel to the twin culverts to the rear of 5 Spring Lane and 12 Springbrook Close (Point D on Figure 1). The water in the downstream North Brook was very high and this, in conjunction with the capacity of the twin culverts being exceeded, resulted in breakout from the drainage channel which ponded and subsequently flowed overland.

3.13 The drainage maintenance contractor constructed a bund to match the existing top of bank at Point C, successfully reducing the flow down the drain and through private property. However, the risk of the surcharge from the North Brook (via the twin culverts at the
downstream end of the drain) could not be mitigated without further elevating the risk of flooding in the event that the emergency bund overtopped or breached.

3.14 A pump was deployed to the site to pump water from the railway drain overflow into the North Brook in the event that heavy rain returned.

3.15 Following construction of the bund at Point C and abatement of the locally intense rainfall, water levels downstream of the emergency bund subsided, darkness fell and following discussions with residents, the site team returned to the Rangiora Service Centre for debrief.
Figure 1 – North Brook Ponds Plan

- North Brook Railway Drain
- North Brook Settling Pond
- Point A (refer Item 3.9)
  - Natural depression in Bank made wider
- Point B (refer Item 3.10)
  - DN1200 Concrete Culvert (under footpath)
- Point C (refer Item 3.10)
  - Natural Weir Structure into drain – Bund constructed per Item 3.12
- Point D (refer Item 3.11)
  - Twin DN750 Culverts under footpath

Key:
- Normal / Primary Flow Path
- Event flow paths (additional to normal flow paths)
- Drainage infrastructure
- Sewer Infrastructure
- Potable Water Infrastructure
- Lot Boundaries
- Indicative positions of bunds constructed by owner of 12 Springbrook Close

Indicative position of slab at 5 Spring Lane
Indicative position of house at 12 Springbrook Close
Overland flow path into Springbrook development SW Treatment Area

North Brook Treatment Ponds
North Brook
Bridge over North Brook and North Brook Fish Pass
1m x 1.4m wide concrete box culvert forming inlet to North Brook Treatment Ponds

1m x 1.4m wide concrete box culvert forming inlet to North Brook Treatment Ponds
4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. Subsequent to the response works (undertaken on the afternoon and evening of 20 February 2018), a secondary phase of immediate works has been planned for accelerated implementation (due to commence 19 March 2018). This includes consolidating and extending the emergency bund identified in item 3.12 above and creating a secondary overland flow path at the entrance to the North Brook settling pond. The level of service provided by these emergency works is currently being confirmed. Concept sketches of this secondary phase of emergency works are included in Appendix 2.

4.2. A further report is being developed to prepare options to further reduce the risk of flooding and the residual risk of interaction with the North Brook at the twin culvert to the rear of 5 Spring Lane and 12 Springbrook. The options report is anticipated to be submitted to meet the agenda closing date (20 March 2018) for the 03 April 2018 Council meeting.

4.3. Environment Canterbury (ECan) have been notified regarding the requirement to undertake emergency works (Refer Trim: 180301022032 and 180306023611).

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

The affected residents were engaged directly by the field monitoring team following receipt of service requests. The field monitoring teams communicated this information to the central event team. Subsequent to the event a communication network has been established and meetings held with those residents directly affected in the Springbrook subdivision.

Following the event residents provided photographs of the flooding which have been included in Appendix 1.

5.2. **Wider Community**

A report on the flooding across the District will be presented to the Council meeting on 03 April 2018.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

Reacting to the rainfall event and implementing emergency works will have incurred direct council costs. These will be addressed as part of the subsequent report to Council on 03 April 2018.

6.2. **Community Implications**

The flooding directly affected residents within the Springbrook subdivision. Flooding was constrained to external flooding of roads, external flooding to gardens/sections at 5 and 7 Spring Lane and 14 Springbrook Close and internal and external flooding of 12 Springbrook Close.

6.3. **Risk Management**

Emergency works were completed during the event, however the risk of the surcharge effect from the North Brook (via the twin culverts at the downstream end of the drain) could not be mitigated without further elevating the risk of flooding in the event that the...
emergency bund breached or overtopped. This is mitigated in the interim by staff and contractors attending the site during any significant rainfall event. A permanent solution to this issue will be required as part of the further works.

Immediate works, (to consolidate that constructed on the night) are anticipated to start during the week commencing 19 March 2018.

A separate report will be presented to Council on 03 April 2018 identifying the level of protection afforded by the emergency works, 50 year flood level information and potential options and costs associated with further works to reduce the risk of flooding.

6.4. Health and Safety

One of the options considered on the night of the flooding was to create a secondary overland flow path at the inlet to the North Brook Settling Pond. However, the likely existence of services was identified, the position of which was not known, and therefore this work was not undertaken.

There were no known H&S incidents or accidents associated with the Springbrook emergency works during the rainfall event of 20 February 2018.

7. CONTEXT

7.1. Policy

This matter is a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

7.2. Legislation

This report is intended to be a factual report and is not seeking approvals.

7.3. Community Outcomes

- There is a safe environment for all.
- There is a healthy and sustainable environment for all
- Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality
- Core utility services are provided in a timely and sustainable manner

7.4. Delegations

This report is intended to be a factual report and is not seeking approvals.
Appendix 1 – Photographs from the event

Photo 1 - Rear garden of 12 Springbrook Close – looking towards drain

Photo 2 – Flooding at rear of 12 Springbrook Close
Photo 3 - Flooding at side of 12 Springbrook Close

Photo 4 – Footpath at Twin Culverts looking back towards 12 Springbrook Close and 5 Spring Lane
Photo 5 – Footpath at Twin Culverts looking back towards concrete pad of 5 and roof of 7 Spring Lane

Photo 6 – Driveway of 12 Springbrook Close
Photo 7 - Road looking up driveway to 12 Springbrook Close

Photo 8 - North side of Garden of 14 Springbrook Close (adjacent to 12 Springbrook Close driveway)
Photo 9 - North side of Garden of 14 Springbrook Close (adjacent to 12 Springbrook Close driveway)

Photo 10 - Flow down driveway of 12 Springbrook (taken from garden of 14 Springbrook Close)
Appendix 2 – Concept Sketches of Immediate works (Consolidation of reactive works)
Secondary Overland Flow Path at discharge point to North Brook Settling Pond
Northbrook Ponds / Springbrook emergency works.

Typical X-Section of 2nd stage overland flow path

Planted Banks (1:2) - Grass - Planted Banks (1:2)

Min=3.5m
Raise northern bank of railway drain and widen and raise the bund (constructed during the event) at head of Railway Drain Overflow
Create deep water channel (minimum 3m wide, circa 2m deep) through Rushes / Raupo at downstream end of North Brook Treatment Ponds (near the fish pass).
MATAWAI PARK

NOTES:

1. ALL CONSTRUCTION INTERFACES SHALL BE SAW-CUT WITH A NEAT VERTICAL EDGE, ALLOWING FOR A MINIMUM 150mm OVER-CUT PRIOR TO RESURFACING.

2. ALL REINSTALLATION OF ADJACENT FOOTPATHS SHALL BE 20mm ACS, WHILE REINSTALLATION OF THE ADJACENT CARRIAGeway SHALL BE 80mm ACS. ALL CONSTRUCTION INTERFACES ON THE CARRIAGeway SHALL BE SEALED WITH A PMB BANDAGE SEALANT.

3. REFER TO APPENDIX B FOR LOCATION OF EXISTING SERVICES. THE CONTRACTOR IS REQUIRED TO LOCATE THE EXISTING SERVICES, MARK ON SITE AND POT HOLE AS REQUIRED TO CONFIRM DEPTH OF SERVICES PRIOR TO COMMENCING WORK ON SITE.

4. ALL WORKS TO COMPLY WITH THE WDC STANDARD CODE OF PRACTICE.

5. ALL ROAD MARKING TO BE REINSTATED AS PER MOTSAM.

6. PERCIVAL STREET IS A HIGH-VOLUME LEVEL ONE ROAD. TEMPORARY TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT MAY BE AS PER A LEVEL 1 ROAD, BUT ALL TEMPORARY SIGNAGE SHALL BE TO LEVEL 2 DIMENSIONS.

EXISTING DOUBLE SUMP SW023648
INSTALL PRE-CAST REAR-ENTRY KERB BLOCK ON EXISTING SUMP AND MODIFY SUMP WALL TO SUIT.
BREAK OUT EXISTING 225mm OUTLET PIPE AND INSTALL NEW 450mm PIPE FROM DOUBLE SUMP TO EXISTING MANHOLE SW023650.

EXISTING SINGLE SUMP SW023659
INSTALL PRE-CAST REAR-ENTRY KERB BLOCK ON EXISTING SUMP, MODIFIED TO SUIT.

EXISTING DOUBLE SUMP SW023657
AND INSTALL NEW "HUSH PIT", BREAK OUT EXISTING 225mm OUTLET PIPE AND REPLACE WITH NEW 450mm OUTLET PIPE CONNECTING INTO NEW MANHOLE SW023666.

REMOVE EXISTING DOUBLE SUMP SW023657
AND INSTALL NEW "HUSH PIT", BREAK OUT EXISTING 225mm OUTLET PIPE AND REPLACE WITH NEW 450mm OUTLET PIPE CONNECTING INTO NEW MANHOLE SW023666.

INSTALL NEW 1050mm PRECAST MANHOLE WITH KORUM LID AT THE JUNCTION OF THE EXISTING 525mm STORMWATER PIPELINE AND THE NEW 450mm OUTLET FROM THE HUSH PIT. MANHOLE TO BE LOCATED AT EXISTING SW NODE SW023666.

BLOCKAGE TO REMOVED APPROXIMATELY 5m SOUTH OF SW NODE SW023666. BLOCKAGE APPEARS TO BE CONCRETE SLUMP.

EXISTING DOUBLE SUMP SW023648
INSTALL PRE-CAST REAR-ENTRY KERB BLOCK ON EXISTING SUMP, AND MODIFY SUMP WALL TO SUIT.

BREAK OUT EXISTING 225mm OUTLET PIPE AND INSTALL NEW 450mm PIPE FROM DOUBLE SUMP TO EXISTING MANHOLE SW023650.

EXISTING DOUBLE SUMP SW023648
INSTALL PRE-CAST REAR-ENTRY KERB BLOCK ON EXISTING SUMP AND MODIFY SUMP WALL TO SUIT.
BREAK OUT EXISTING 225mm OUTLET PIPE AND INSTALL NEW 450mm PIPE FROM DOUBLE SUMP TO EXISTING MANHOLE SW023650.

EXISTING SINGLE SUMP SW023659
INSTALL PRE-CAST REAR-ENTRY KERB BLOCK ON EXISTING SUMP, MODIFIED TO SUIT.

EXISTING DOUBLE SUMP SW023657
AND INSTALL NEW "HUSH PIT", BREAK OUT EXISTING 225mm OUTLET PIPE AND REPLACE WITH NEW 450mm OUTLET PIPE CONNECTING INTO NEW MANHOLE SW023666.

REMOVE EXISTING DOUBLE SUMP SW023657
AND INSTALL NEW "HUSH PIT", BREAK OUT EXISTING 225mm OUTLET PIPE AND REPLACE WITH NEW 450mm OUTLET PIPE CONNECTING INTO NEW MANHOLE SW023666.

INSTALL NEW 1050mm PRECAST MANHOLE WITH KORUM LID AT THE JUNCTION OF THE EXISTING 525mm STORMWATER PIPELINE AND THE NEW 450mm OUTLET FROM THE HUSH PIT. MANHOLE TO BE LOCATED AT EXISTING SW NODE SW023666.

BLOCKAGE TO REMOVED APPROXIMATELY 5m SOUTH OF SW NODE SW023666. BLOCKAGE APPEARS TO BE CONCRETE SLUMP.

EXISTING DOUBLE SUMP SW023648
INSTALL PRE-CAST REAR-ENTRY KERB BLOCK ON EXISTING SUMP AND MODIFY SUMP WALL TO SUIT.
BREAK OUT EXISTING 225mm OUTLET PIPE AND INSTALL NEW 450mm PIPE FROM DOUBLE SUMP TO EXISTING MANHOLE SW023650.

EXISTING SINGLE SUMP SW023659
INSTALL PRE-CAST REAR-ENTRY KERB BLOCK ON EXISTING SUMP, MODIFIED TO SUIT.

EXISTING DOUBLE SUMP SW023657
AND INSTALL NEW "HUSH PIT", BREAK OUT EXISTING 225mm OUTLET PIPE AND REPLACE WITH NEW 450mm OUTLET PIPE CONNECTING INTO NEW MANHOLE SW023666.

REMOVE EXISTING DOUBLE SUMP SW023657
AND INSTALL NEW "HUSH PIT", BREAK OUT EXISTING 225mm OUTLET PIPE AND REPLACE WITH NEW 450mm OUTLET PIPE CONNECTING INTO NEW MANHOLE SW023666.

INSTALL NEW 1050mm PRECAST MANHOLE WITH KORUM LID AT THE JUNCTION OF THE EXISTING 525mm STORMWATER PIPELINE AND THE NEW 450mm OUTLET FROM THE HUSH PIT. MANHOLE TO BE LOCATED AT EXISTING SW NODE SW023666.
1. **SUMMARY**

The purpose of this report is to appoint the Council representation at the 2018 Anzac Day services around the District, and for the representative(s) to lay the wreath on behalf of the Council.

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No 180321030283.

(b) Appoints Mayor Ayers and Councillors ……………………..…..to attend the Kaiapoi RSA Dawn Parade at 6.30am Wednesday 25 April 2018 and lay a wreath.

(c) Appoints Mayor Ayers and Councillors ……………………..…..to attend the Kaiapoi Anzac Day parade at 10am Wednesday 25 April 2018 and lay a wreath.

(d) Appoints Mayor Ayers and Councillors ……………………..…..to attend the Rangiora Anzac Day parade at 11.30am on Wednesday 25 April 2018 and lay a wreath.

(e) Appoints Councillor ……………………..to attend the RSA service at the Rangiora High School at 9.30am on Wednesday 25 April 2018 and lay a wreath.

(f) Appoints Councillors ……………………..…..to attend the Oxford Anzac Day parade on Wednesday 25 April 2018 at 9.30am and lay a wreath.

(g) Appoints Councillor ……………………..…..to attend the Cust and West Eyreton Anzac Day parade held at the Cust Community Centre on Wednesday 25 April 2018 at 10am and lay a wreath at Cust.

(h) Appoints Councillor ……………………..…..to attend the Cust and West Eyreton Anzac Day parade held at the Cust Community Centre on Wednesday 25 April 2018 at 10am and lay a wreath at West Eyreton.

(i) Appoints Councillor ……………………..…..to attend the Fernside Anzac Day parade on Wednesday 25 April 2018 at 10am and lay a wreath.

(j) Appoints Mayor Ayers and Councillors ……………………..…..to attend the Tuahiwi Anzac Day parade Wednesday 25 April 2018 at 2pm on and lay a wreath.
Appoints Mayor Ayers and Councillor …………………………….. to attend the 11am Ohoka Anzac Day service on Tuesday 24 April 2018 at Ohoka Hall, Mill Road and lay a wreath.

Appoints Councillor …………………………….. to attend the Sefton Anzac service on Tuesday 24 April 2018 at 6pm and lay a wreath.

Appoints Councillor …………………………….. to attend the Woodend Anzac service on Tuesday 24 April 2018 at 6pm and lay a wreath.

Notes the Community Boards will be represented and lay wreaths at Kaiapoi, Rangiora, Oxford, West Eyreton, Cust, Ohoka, Ashley War Memorial, Fernside, Tuahiwi, Rangiora High School, Woodend and Sefton Services.

Circulates a copy of this report to the Community Boards.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1. Anzac Day is on Wednesday 25 April 2018 and it is normal for a representative of the Council to be in attendance at each service to lay the wreath on behalf of the district. Wreaths are also laid at Rangiora and Kaiapoi on behalf of the people of Zonnebeke, Belgium to support the twinning relationship between the two districts. A reciprocal arrangement is made with the District of Zonnebeke.

3.2. Wreaths will also be laid by the Community Boards at Kaiapoi, Rangiora, Oxford, West Eyreton, Cust, Ashley War Memorial, Fernside, Tuahiwi. The Boards will be also represented at Ohoka, Fernside, Rangiora High School and Woodend services in conjunction with the Council representatives and wreath laying.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. The times of the services are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Cenotaph Dawn Service</td>
<td>6.30am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Cenotaph (Trousselot Park)</td>
<td>10.00am (assemble cnr Davis and Sewell St by tennis courts 9.45am)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora High School</td>
<td>9.30am (assemble 9.20am)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Cenotaph</td>
<td>11.30am (assemble at RSA 11.15am)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Town Hall</td>
<td>9.30am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cust Community Centre</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernside Hall</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuahiwi (Urupa)</td>
<td>2.00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka Hall</td>
<td>11am (Tuesday 24 April) at the Ohoka Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sefton Cenotaph</td>
<td>6pm (Tuesday 24 April) in the Sefton Domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend Community Centre</td>
<td>6pm (Tuesday 24 April)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2. The Rangiora service will be held at the Cenotaph. The Rangiora RSA will also lay wreaths at the Rangiora High School.

4.3. The Kaiapoi service will be held in Trousselot Park. Members are also invited to the dawn service being held at the war memorial, Raven Quay at 6.30am. Community participation will be welcomed at this service. A breakfast for 100 people will follow the dawn service at the Kaiapoi Club. This is a pre-ticketed event.

4.4. The Oxford service will be held at the Oxford Town Hall and the Cust/West Eyreton service starts at the Cust Community Centre and then moves to the West Eyreton Hall.
4.5. Four services are held in the district prior to ANZAC with one being at the Ohoka Hall (Mill Road), and another at the Sefton Domain. This year a new service will occur at the Woodend Community Centre at the same time as the Sefton service. Members of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board will also support the Sefton and Woodend services.

4.6. A service is also held at the Ashley war memorial on Tuesday 24 April and supported by members of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board.

4.7. The Management Team have reviewed this report and support the recommendations.

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

Staff assist the local RSA representatives with traffic management plans, advertising of services and service sheets. There is public expectation of ANZAC Services occurring.

5.2. Wider Community

Advertising will be made prior to the day outlining the time and place of ceremonies in the district and inviting all members of the community to attend one or more service.

5.3. The community anticipates ANZAC services will be held in the District.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

The costs for wreaths, advertising and incidental costs are met from the Governance budget. Advertising will be made prior to the day outlining the time and place of ceremonies in the district and inviting all members of the community to attend one or more service. Service sheets are also produced in-house for several of the smaller community services.

6.2. Community Implications

Not applicable.

6.3. Risk Management

Not applicable.

6.4. Health and Safety

Local RSA’s host the services, and are responsible for traffic management plans and all organisation.

7. CONTEXT

7.1. Policy

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

7.2. Legislation

Not applicable.

7.3. Community Outcomes

People are friendly and caring, creating a strong sense of community in our district.

Delegations

Not applicable.
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1. This report is to seek Councillor(s) to accompany the Mayor and Chief Executive to the Local Government New Zealand Conference (LGNZ) and LGNZ Excellence Awards being held in Christchurch in mid-July 2017.

**Attachments:**

i. LGNZ Conference and Awards Programme (Trim 180323031402)

ii. Policy of Conference and Training Course Attendance.

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180322031071.

(b) **Approves** Councillors ............... ............... attending the Local Government New Zealand Conference on 15-17 July 2018 in Christchurch, accompanying the Mayor and Chief Executive.

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1. Each year the LGNZ hold a national conference in a different location within New Zealand; this year being at Christ’s College, Christchurch.

3.2. The Conference will also hold the LGNZ Excellence Awards, which recognise outstanding leadership and impact across community events, infrastructure and economic development.

3.3. Previous attendees have been Councillor Doody in 2017 at Auckland, Councillors Allen and Doody in 2016 at Dunedin, Councillor Atkinson in 2015 when the conference was held at Rotorua, Councillor Felstead in 2014 at Nelson and Councillor Barnett attended the Hamilton conference in 2013.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. This year’s theme is “we are firmly focused on the future: Future-proofing for a prosperous and vibrant New Zealand.” There will be a strong focus on leadership and
addressing the big challenges and opportunities facing New Zealand and its communities.

4.2. The conference attracts approximately 500 participants including international keynote speakers. Attendance enables knowledge sharing and networking opportunities as the programme is designed to be a platform to discuss topics such as regional development, financial performance, good governance and localism.

4.3. The Council Policy states the Mayor, one councillor and Chief Executive represent the Waimakariri District Council at the LGNZ Conference. It is preferable that the Deputy Mayor attends one such conference during the 2016-19 term.

4.4. With the Conference being held in Christchurch for 2018, there is an opportunity for the Council to consider more councillors attending than stated in the policy, as accommodation and travel (flight) costs will not be involved.

4.5. The Council may also wish to amend the Policy to enable more members than the Mayor and one other Councillor attend if the LGNZ National Conference is held in Canterbury, whilst the current policy remain unchanged, when the Conference is held in other provinces.

4.6. The Management Team have reviewed this report and support the recommendations.

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations
Not sought.

5.2. Wider Community
Not sought.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications
Full conference (three days) early bird registration cost is $1,410 if booked/paid by 25 May. This full conference cost increases $100 after 25 May for standard registration.

Attendance for Sunday only or Monday only is available at a rate of $720 per day. The option of half day attendance on the Tuesday is available at a rate of $520.

The full conference registration includes attendance at conference business sessions (Sunday – Tuesday), delegate bag, daily catering, Simpson Grierson welcome reception and the Fulton Hogan conference dinner and EXCELLENCE Awards function.

The breakfast session and council hosted tours are an additional charge.

Costs are met by the training and travel operational Governance budget which has a current balance of $14,018.

6.2. Community Implications
The conference provides benefit, particularly to new members, to gain a greater understanding about Local Government and provides both learning and networking opportunities.

6.3. Risk Management
Not applicable.
6.4. **Health and Safety**  
Not applicable.

7. **CONTEXT**

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

7.2. **Legislation**  
Not applicable.

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

Governance: There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision making that effects our District.
LGNZ Conference Programme 2018

Saturday 14 July

Te Maruata hui

Sunday 15 July

9.00am - 6.00pm
Registration desk open
Christ's College, Auditorium foyer, 33 Rolleston Ave
Barista coffee available in the Dining Hall from 2pm sponsored by Fonterra

9.30am-11.30am
Council hosted tours
Connected communities at the heart of our resilient city
City smarts in an emerging creative city
Ticketed event. Departing from Christ's College, 33 Rolleston Ave.

9.30am
National Council meeting
followed by lunch Rydges Latimer, Clarendon Room, 30 Latimer Square
Members only

9.30am-11.30am
Young Elected Members catch up
Bunsen Cafe, The Arts Centre Members only

12.00pm
Local Government New Zealand AGM
Rydges Latimer, Ballroom, 30 Latimer Square
Followed by a photo of all Mayors and Chairs
Coach transfer to Christ's College available immediately following AGM

From 2.00pm
Afternoon tea
Christ's College Dining Hall, 33 Rolleston Ave

2.45pm
Member only meetings

- Mayors Taskforce for Jobs AGM
- Regional Sector meeting
- Young Elected Members meeting
- Te Maruata Roopu Whakahaere

Christ's College, 33 Rolleston Ave Members only

4.15pm
Mihi Whakatau and opening ceremony
Christ's College Auditorium, 33 Rolleston Ave
Dave Cull, President, LGNZ
Lianne Dalziel, Mayor, Christchurch City Council

4.45pm
Government's address
Christ's College Auditorium
5.00pm  **LGNZ President's address**  
Christ's College Auditorium  
**Dave Cull**, President, LGNZ

5.15pm  **Opening keynote address: Building resilience for a vibrant and prosperous future**  
Infrastructure, environment and future proofing our communities in the global context.  
Christ's College Auditorium, 33 Rolleston Ave

Welcome from Simpson Grierson

5.55pm to 7.30pm  **Followed by Simpson Grierson welcome reception**  
Christchurch Art Gallery

---

**Monday 16 July**

*All conference sessions on Monday 16 July take place at Christ's College, 33 Rolleston Ave.*

7.00am  **Transpower breakfast session with Robett Hollis**  
Ticketed event. Rydges Latimer  
*Kindly sponsored by Transpower*

8.30am  **Master of ceremonies**

8.40am  **Creating resilient, sustainable and liveable places**  
Place-making for resilient communities.  
*Kindly sponsored by Chorus*

9.25am  **Building a strong community - a tale of a new region**  
The Canterbury region's collaboration and vision for a new life, new identity and new opportunities.  
Chair:  **Joanna Norris**, Chief Executive, ChristchurchNZ  
**Malcolm Johns**, Chief Executive, Christchurch Airport (CIAL)  
**Josiah Tualamali**, Chair, PYLAT Council - Pacific Youth Leadership and Transformation  
**Arihia Bennett**, CEO, Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu  
*Kindly sponsored by NZ Transport Agency*

10.05am  **Morning tea**

10.45am  **Building strong local economic prosperity**  
Social, cultural, economic and environmental policy settings can place New Zealanders among the most prosperous and happiest people in the world.  
**Michael Dunlop**, Acumen Republic  
**Oliver Hartwich**, NZ Initiative  
**Martine Udahemuka**, NZ Initiative  
**Margaret Jefferies**, Chair, Project Lyttleton

11.25am  **Inspiring Maori connections to grow thriving, prosperous communities**  
How to interact and engage appropriately with Maori as a strategic partner.  
**Associate Professor Te Maire Tau**, Director, Ngai Tahu Research Centre

12.05pm  **Lunch**
1.05pm  **WE ARE Leading our response to climate change: adapting to the changing environment**
Climate change adaptation and mitigation.
Minister for Climate Change, **Hon James Shaw**
LGNZ representative
*Kindly sponsored by Ministry for the Environment*

1.45pm  **WE ARE Working together to tackle three waters infrastructure challenges facing New Zealand**
Healthy and resilient water sources.
**Simon Upton**, Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment
LGNZ representative
*Kindly sponsored by DairyNZ*

2.25pm  **Presentation of Minister of Local Government EXCELLENCE Award for Outstanding Contribution to Local Government**
**Hon Nanaia Mahuta**, Minister of Local Government
*Kindly sponsored by Te Tari Taiwhenua Internal Affairs*

2.35pm  **Afternoon tea**

3.00 - 5.00pm  **Interactive sessions** (delegates select an interactive workshop or the city walking tour)

**Interactive workshops (at the venue)**
1. Building excellence in locally delivered infrastructure and services
2. The challenges of climate change decision making and opportunities for adaption
3. Working together to protect and improve New Zealand's water and environment

**City walking tour (offsite - tour departs from Christ's College)**
Christchurch resilience tour

**Fulton Hogan conference dinner and LGNZ EXCELLENCE Awards**
Wigram Air Force Museum

---

**Tuesday 17 July**

9.00am  **Minister of Local Government address**
Hon Nanaia Mahuta, Minister of Local Government

9.20am  **Inspiring health and wellbeing of our communities**
Healthy communities lead to prosperous, resilient and vibrant communities.
**Deidre Otene**, CEO, The Moko Foundation

10.15am  **Morning tea**
11.00am  
Harnessing localism and empowering communities to succeed
Social groups making positive change in their communities.
_**Angela O'Leary**, Hamilton City Council and **Julie Nelson**, Joint Chief Executive, Wise Group
**Michelle Sharp**, Trustee, Akina Foundation
*Kindly sponsored by Creative New Zealand*

12.00pm  
Closing keynote: Shaping the future of our communities
Leadership, infrastructure, environment, sustainability, localism, arts and culture, economies and future proofing our communities.
**Daniel Flynn**, founder and managing director of Thankyou
*Kindly sponsored by GHD*

12.45pm  
**Early bird registration prize draw**

12.50pm

1.00pm  
**Conference closing address**

1.00pm  
**Lunch**
CONFERENCES AND SEMINARS

CONFERENCE AND TRAINING COURSE ATTENDANCE

Local Government Conference

The Mayor, one Councillor, together with the Chief Executive Officer, may represent the Council at the Local Government Conference.

Approval for Members Attendance

The Mayor, or in his/her absence, the Deputy Mayor, will approve all training courses, conferences and seminars attended by members of the Council. This will be reported as part of the Mayor's monthly report to the Council.

Attendance at overseas conferences shall be approved by the Council.
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT FOR DECISION

FILE NO and TRIM NO: RGN-02/ 180222019119(v02)

REPORT TO: Regeneration Steering Group

DATE OF MEETING: 5 March 2018

FROM: Michelle Flanagan, Landscape Planner – District Regeneration
Ken Stevenson, Roading Manager
Duncan Roxborough, Implementation Project Manager – District Regeneration

SUBJECT: Kaiapoi East Regeneration Area – outstanding roading repairs.

SIGNED BY: ____________________________
Department Manager

______________________________
Chief Executive

(for Reports to Council or Committees)

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to seek Regeneration Steering Group approval to progress
the concept design for permanent repairs to unrepaired roads in the Kaiapoi East
Regeneration Area. This includes permanent repairs to Jones Street, Charles Street,
Jollie Street, and Cass Street (between Jones Street and the sport and recreation reserve),
and Cass Street (between Jollie Street and Hall Street).

1.2. Jones Street is the last roading project in the Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery
Programme. There is currently a budget of $580,000 available for the repair of Jones
Street. Options for the repair of Jones Street are not covered in this report and will be
specifically workshopped with the Regeneration Steering Group.

1.3. Repairs to Charles Street, Jollie Street and Cass Street are part of the Regeneration
Programme. There is currently a budget of $1,810,000 allocated for the repairs to Charles
Street, Jollie Street and Cass Street.

Attachments:
i. Map - Kaiapoi East Regeneration Area, outstanding roading repairs (180223019136).

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Regeneration Steering Group recommends:

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180222019119.

(b) Approves staff progressing the concept design of permanent repairs Charles Street with
a primary purpose of providing vehicle access to Jollie Street and adjacent reserve and
land uses and on-street parking.
Approves staff progressing with the concept design of permanent repairs to Jollie Street with a primary purpose of providing vehicle access reserve and rural land uses and on-street parking.

Approves staff progressing with the concept design of permanent repairs to Cass Street (from Jones Street to the Kaiapoi East sport and recreation reserve) with a primary purpose of providing vehicle access to the sport and recreation reserve.

Approves staff progressing with the concept design of permanent repairs to Cass Street (from Jollie Street to Hall Street) with a primary purpose of providing vehicle access to the boat ramp in Askeaton Park.

Notes that the preliminary concept designs and refined cost estimates for Charles Street, Jollie Street, Cass Street (from Jones Street to the Kaiapoi East sport and recreation reserve), and Cass Street (from Jollie Street to Hall Street) will be presented at a staff briefing to the Regeneration Steering Group later this year for feedback.

Notes that there is currently a budget of $1,810,000 allocated for the repairs to Charles Street, Jollie Street and Cass Street.

Notes that the repair options for Jones Street will be presented in a separate workshop session; and subsequently a separate report will be presented.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1. The Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery Programme included repairs to damaged roads in Kaiapoi, The Pines Beach and Kairaki. Works outside the Regeneration Areas have been completed. Due to uncertainty around future land uses and activities, works within the Regeneration Areas were placed on hold until the approval of the Waimakariri Residential Red Zone Recovery Plan (Recovery Plan). Approval of the Recovery Plan, and more detailed planning of the land uses and activities included within it, means that roading works within the Regeneration Areas can now be considered. This primarily concerns the Kaiapoi East Regeneration Area.

3.2. There are two key Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery projects within the Regeneration Areas that are currently underway. In Kaiapoi South the earthquake damaged parts of Courtenay Drive and Charters Street are being rebuilt. In Kaiapoi East, the new road link between Feldwick Drive and Cass Street is under construction. Both these projects are due for completion in June 2018.

3.3. Minor works are also planned for Blackwell Crescent and Moore Street (in Kaiapoi East) in 2018. This includes the construction of turning heads to make these no-through roads, and repair of kerb and channel and the road surface as required. There will be no change to residential property access.

3.4. Jones Street (in Kaiapoi East) was included in the Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery Programme, and was shown as remaining open in the Recovery Plan. It is the last roading project in the Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery Programme that requires completion. Options for repairs (and associated timing and level of service) to Jones Street are not considered in this report, and will be reviewed during a workshop session with the Regeneration Steering Group; to be followed by a separate report.
3.5. There are also other roads in the Kaiapoi East Regeneration Area, outside the Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery Programme, that require work to address earthquake damage. These roads suffered various damage to the road surface and base, kerb and channel, and footpaths. There are also localised drainage issues. Currently there is a 30km/hour speed limit on these streets. To address this earthquake damage, and support the implementation of the Recovery Plan, the following roads require permanent repairs:

- Cass Street:
  - Between Jones Street and the sport and recreation reserve; and
  - Between Jollie Street and Hall Street
- Charles Street: east of the supermarket to Jollie Street; and
- Jollie Street

3.6. Permanent repairs to these roads were not included in the Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery Programme since the roads were initially assumed (prior to the development of the Recovery Plan) to be redundant, and a provision was therefore made in the Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery Programme to decommission these roads. These roads were all identified as ‘roads-to-remain’ in the Regeneration road-stopping plans and permanent repairs are now included as part of the Regeneration Programme.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

Jollie Street

4.1. The primary purpose of Jollie Street, in implementing the Recovery Plan, is to provide vehicle access to Cass Street and adjacent land uses. Jollie Street will provide vehicle access to:

- The sport and recreation reserve and dog park
- Two residential properties (at 65a Cass Street and 10 Feldwick Drive)
- The rural area (generally east of the current Feldwick Drive)
- The future Memorial Gardens (east of Jollie Street); and
- The Askeaton Park boat ramp (via Cass Street)

Jollie Street will also provide on street parking for users of the sport and recreation reserve and future Memorial Gardens.

Charles Street

4.2. To implement the Recovery plan the primary purpose of Charles Street is to provide vehicle access to Jollie Street and Cass Street. Charles Street will also provide vehicle access to adjacent land uses. Under the Recovery Plan, Charles Street will provide vehicle access to:

- The sport and recreation reserve (primarily the dog park)
- The adjacent riverbanks reserves (Morgan Williams Reserve, Corcoran Reserve, Askeaton Park), and elements of the wharf and marine precinct
- The motor caravan park
- The existing caravan dump station
- The boat parking area; and
- The mixed-use business area (primarily that fronting Charles Street).

Charles Street will also provide on-street parking for users of the sport and recreation reserve, riverbanks reserves and mixed-use business area.
Cass Street (between Jones Street and the sport and recreation reserve)

4.3. To implement the Recovery Plan, the primary purpose of Cass Street (between Jones Street and the sport and recreation reserve) is to provide vehicle access to the sport and recreation reserve. It may also provide access to the mixed-use business area.

4.4. While the Cass Street legal road corridor will remain, the physical road will terminate at the sport and recreation reserve car park. It is likely the reserve car park will be gated, and locked at night. Therefore, a facility for vehicles to turn will need to be provided at the entrance to the car park.

4.5. Cass Street (between Jones Street and the sport and recreation reserve) could also provide on street parking for reserve users.

Cass Street (between Jollie Street and Hall Street)

4.1. The primary purpose of Cass Street (between Jollie Street and Hall Street) is to provide access to the boat ramp in Askeaton Park, the Kaiapoi East rural area (generally east of Feldwick Drive), and to utility facilities. Cass Street will also provide access to one private residential property (at 10 Feldwick Drive). This section of Cass Street would essentially be a reserve accessway through a rural area.

4.2. Given that the primary purpose of this section of Cass Street is to provide access to the boat ramp and rural area, the level of service on this road could be reduced to match the purpose. Continued use of the current road to provide this access is not recommended as it is a wide corridor with the kerb, channel and road surface in poor condition. Reducing the level of service could include narrowing the road (still enabling two-way traffic however), having an unsealed surface and drainage via a swale system.

4.3. Staff have not developed concept designs for Charles Street, Jollie Street, Cass Street (between Jones Street and the sport and recreation reserve) and Cass Street (between Jollie Street and Hall Street). Given that these roading works support the implementation of the Recovery Plan, and in the case of Jones Street are a key link, staff are seeking approval to progress concept designs. Preliminary concept designs and cost estimates will be bought back to the Regeneration Steering Group for discussion in a staff briefing later this year.

4.4. The Management Team have reviewed this report and support the recommendations.

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

5.1.1. The Kaiapoi Rugby League Club and Kaiapoi Softball Club, who are potential future key users of the Kaiapoi East sport and recreation reserve, were consulted on reserve road access options in July 2017 (refer Section 5.2.2 below).

5.1.2. Private property owners at 14 Jones Street, 65a Cass Street, 10 Feldwick Drive and will be affected by the roading repairs to Jones Street, Jollie Street, and Cass Street (between Jollie Street and Hall Street) respectively. Staff are proposing to engage with these residents regarding a suite of servicing matters in the near future.
5.2. **Wider Community**

5.2.1 The wider community was consulted on the roading options for Kaiapoi East during the development of the Recovery Plan. The new Kaiapoi East road link and the retention of Jones Street was shown in both the Preliminary Draft and Draft Recovery Plan and confirmed in the approval of the Recovery Plan in 2016.

5.2.2 The closure of Cass Street at the Kaiapoi East sport and recreation reserve, and the retention of Jollie Street was included in consultation on reserve roading access options undertaken in July 2017. At its 7 August 2017 meeting the Regeneration Steering Group considered the consultation feedback and recommended that Council support the closure of Cass Street and retention of Jollie Street for access to the sport and recreation reserve. The Council endorsed this recommendation at its 5 September 2017 meeting.

5.2.3 It is proposed to undertake community consultation on the draft concept plans for the permanent roading repairs on Jones Street, Charles Street, Jollie Street, Cass Street (between Jones Street and the sport and recreation reserve) and Cass Street (between Jollie Street and Hall Street). The outcomes of this consultation will be reported to the Regeneration Steering Group.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

6.1.1 Jones Street is included in the Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery Programme. There is currently $580,000 allocated in the 18/19 financial year.

6.1.2 Charles Street, Jollie Street, Cass Street (between Jones Street and the sport and recreation reserve) and Cass Street (between Jollie Street and Hall Street) are part of the Regeneration Programme and there is budget allocated for these projects in the 2018 LTP. The adequacy of this budget provision will be influenced by the level of service established during the concept design.

6.1.3 The repair of these roads do not qualify for NZTA funding from the Emergency Works Category because they are in the residential red zone for which the roads are no longer required. They are new roads required for a new land use purpose. However, these roads have been included in the 2018-21 NZTA programme in the Low Cost / Low Risk Category and are expected to be approved for a 51% subsidy, which has been assumed in the course of establishing the Regeneration budgets in the 2018 LTP.

6.2. **Community Implications**

6.2.1 The Kaiapoi East community has experienced difficult road conditions for some time and are keen to see the network permanently repaired.

6.3. **Risk Management**

6.3.1 At this point in the Kaiapoi East roads reinstatement (for the retained roads); the key risk is around appropriate definition of the purpose of the retained roads, and where these sit in the road network hierarchy. This will inform subsequent decisions around Level of Service provisions to be designed into the roads, and hence the fitness for end-purpose, and associated budget requirements. At present there has been an assumed Level of Service for these affected roads, in order to establish a draft budget for the 2018 LTP planning process.
6.4. **Health and Safety**

6.4.1 The repairs to the damaged roads in East Kaiapoi mitigates the health and safety issues associated with the use of earthquake damaged roads and footpaths.

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

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

7.2. **Legislation**

7.2.1 The Greater Christchurch Regeneration Act 2016. The Recovery Plan has been prepared in accordance with this Act and the divestment of the land in the Regeneration Areas from the Crown to the Council is conditional upon the agreed land uses being implemented. The roading repairs are a key component of the implementation of the Recovery Plan.

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

7.3.1 Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable and sustainable

7.4. **Delegations**

7.4.1 In accordance with the delegations policy and the Regeneration Steering Group Terms of Reference; the proposed next steps would be for staff to commence concept designs and workshop these with the Regeneration Steering Group, followed by a formal report on the preliminary designs which would then be referred to Utilities and Roading Committee for approval.

7.4.2 If as a result of the preliminary design and updated costs estimate there is an apparent budget shortfall, then any request for additional budget would need to be endorsed by the regeneration Steering Group and referred to Council for final decision and approval.
NOTES:
1. ALL LAND-USE BOUNDARIES AND EXTENTS SUBJECT TO SURVEY.

PRELIMINARY
1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report is to inform the Utilities and Roading Committee on progress with consultation for the Poyntzs Road source upgrade project, and seek approval on the proposed way forward.

1.2 It was originally intended that in order to progress the Poyntzs Road source upgrade project, staff would consult with the West Eyreton and Summerhill water supply advisory groups, prior to meeting with the relevant community boards in February 2018 then consulting with the wider communities in March 2018.

1.3 At a meeting with the advisory groups on the 7th of February 2018 the advisory groups raised some concerns with the funding options presented, and the subsequent reports to the community boards were withdrawn until these issues could be addressed. In the meantime however consultation on the draft 2018-28 Long Term Plan has commenced which includes allowance for this project.

1.4 This has raised an issue in that consultation will be undertaken on the Long Term Plan, which includes the budget for the Poyntzs Road source upgrade, while the required targeted consultation with the water supply advisory groups, the two community boards and the wider communities has not been able to be completed.

1.5 It is proposed as a solution to this issue of timing that the Utilities and Roading Committee resolve that staff will not commence implementation of the solution until the required consultation has taken place, but the that the budget is recommended to remain in the 2018/19 financial year.

Attachments:
Nil.

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee recommends:
THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180305022630.

(b) **Notes** that staff have not been able to complete the required community consultation with the Poyntzs Road, West Eyreton and Summerhill water supply schemes regarding the proposed Poyntzs Road source upgrade prior to or to coincide with the draft 2018-28 Long Term Plan consultation.

(c) **Notes** that the budget allowance of $793,000 for the Poyntzs Road scheme source upgrade in the 2018/19 financial has been included for consultation as part of the draft 2018-28 Long Term Plan.

(d) **Resolves** that the physical works that this budget is intended for will not be implemented until Council has specifically approved this occurring, following consultation with the relevant advisory groups, community boards and communities.

(e) **Notes** that this strategy will give staff the required time to undertake the necessary consultation, without requiring that the project be delayed for an unnecessarily long period of time.

(f) **Notes** that the significant rating implication of the proposed expenditure does not eventuate until the 2019/20 financial year, by which time targeted consultation will have been completed.

(g) **Circulates** this report to the Oxford-Ohoka and Rangiora Ashley Community Boards for their information.

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1. On the 5th of September 2017 the Council endorsed the preferred option for upgrading the Poyntzs Road scheme by connecting it with the West Eyreton scheme, and approved staff to consult with residents along the potential pipe routes to help inform the rates projections prior to wider community consultation (refer to report 170816088611).

3.2. It was intended that staff would then consult with the West Eyreton and Summerhill water supply advisory groups, prior to meeting with the relevant community boards in February 2018 then consulting with the wider communities in March 2018.

3.3. At a meeting with the advisory groups on the 7th of February 2018 there were some concerns raised regarding the funding options presented. For this reason reports to the community boards were withdrawn until staff could undertake further analysis of options before reporting back to the advisory groups, and then to the boards.

3.4. In the meantime staff have been preparing for consultation based on the draft 2018-28 Long Term Plan. This includes budgets allowance in the 2018/19 financial year to implement the proposed source upgrade option of joining the Poyntzs Road scheme with the West Eyreton scheme (which is also the source for the Summerhill scheme).

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. Based on the points noted in Section 3, an issue has been raised in that consultation will be undertaken on the Long Term Plan, which includes the budget for the Poyntzs Road source upgrade while the required targeted consultation with the water supply advisory groups, the two community boards and the wider communities has not been able to be completed.
4.2. Ideally prior to the draft Long Term Plan consultation staff would have been able to present options to the water supply advisory groups and the community boards that they would have approved feeding into consultation material for the wider community. This would have allowed targeted consultation with the communities to have taken place prior to or in conjunction with the draft Long Term Plan consultation.

4.3. It is proposed as a solution to this issue of timing that the Utilities and Roading Committee resolve that staff will not commence implementation of the solution until the required consultation has taken place, but that the budget remain in the 2018/19 financial year.

4.4. This will allow staff the necessary time to undertake consultation with the seven key stakeholders (West Eyreton Water Supply Advisory Group, Summerhill Water Supply Advisory Group, Oxford-Ohoka Community Board, Rangiora-Ashley Community Board and the three respective water supply schemes) with the necessary time to allow feedback to be heard and considered, while still allowing financially for the works to occur once consultation is complete.

4.5. The approximate revised timeframe for this project is as per the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workshop Funding Options with Water Supply Advisory Groups</td>
<td>April – May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed Design</td>
<td>May – September 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet with Oxford-Ohoka and Rangiora-Ashley Community Boards regarding commencing consultation.</td>
<td>June 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Approve Consultation Commencing</td>
<td>June 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation with Communities</td>
<td>July – August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Decision and Approval to Proceed with Recommended Option</td>
<td>October 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendering of Physical Works</td>
<td>October - November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award of Construction Contract</td>
<td>November / December 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*subject to agreement being reached with community boards, advisory groups and community.

4.6. The Management Team have reviewed this report and support the recommendations.

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

5.2. As is noted in Section 4, consultation with the West Eyreton and Summerhill Water Supply Advisory Groups and the Oxford-Ohoka and Rangiora-Ashley Community Boards is required to be undertaken. Initial meetings with all parties was undertaken in 2017, and with the advisory groups in February 2018.

5.3. Wider Community

5.4. The consultation with the four parties noted above is required to be undertaken prior to engagement with the Poyntzs Road, West Eyreton and Summerhill communities.

5.5. Initial consultation has been undertaken with residents along potential pipe routes for the proposed pipe between West Eyreton and Poyntzs Road. This was to help inform staff of the viability of both routes as well as inform rating impact assessments that is required for the next stage of consultation.
6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

6.2. A capital budget of $50,000 in the 2017/18 financial year and $793,000 in the 2018/19 financial year has been allowed as part of the draft 2018-28 Long Term Plan.

6.3. These budgets result in rating projections increasing from $573 per 2 unit connection in 2017/18 to $1,800 per 2 unit connection in 2022/23. Similarly increases for 19 unit connections are projected from $1,083 in 2017/18 to 3,517 in 2022/23.

6.4. As part of this project staff will consider whether this increase can be phased in to smooth the initial impact.

6.5. The above rating projections do not allow for a capital contribution from the Poyntzs Road scheme to the West Eyreton and Summerhill schemes as part of joining. This is one of the funding options proposed to be consulted on following discussions with the Water Supply Advisory Groups, which would increase Poyntzs Road rates further while causing a reduction in West Eyreton and Summerhill rates.

6.6. If the preferred funding option involves a capital contribution from Poyntzs Road, the rating increases to Poyntzs Road may be greater than currently signalled in the draft Long Term Plan. This is a challenge with the draft Long Term Plan being prepared while there are still several funding options being considered for a given project, and will need to be addressed as part of the targeted consultation.

6.7. Community Implications

6.8. There is a risk that these increases projected for Poyntzs Road may result in questions of financial affordability of rates. This will need to be addressed as part of the consultative process.

6.9. Alternatively, if no contribution is made from Poyntzs Road to West Eyreton and Summerhill, this may raise questions of fairness and inconsistency as the Summerhill scheme previously made a contribution to West Eyreton as part of joining.

6.10. Risk Management

6.11. The Poyntzs Road scheme does not meet the current Drinking Water Standards in terms of treatment of protozoa, as well as having nitrate levels increasing towards the maximum acceptable value.

6.12. The Water Safety Plan for the scheme states that the source will have been upgraded during the 2016/17 financial year which has not occurred. There is a risk if there are undue delays to the project Council may not meet its obligations under the Health (Drinking Water) Amendment Act to take all practicable steps to comply with the Drinking Water Standards for New Zealand.

6.13. To address the risks noted, a balance is required to be found between addressing the health risk presented by the scheme, the need to consult appropriately, and managing the financial implications of the proposed upgrade.

Given that the scheme does not comply with the current drinking water standards, it is deemed to present a health risk in particular in terms of protozoa as well as there being a risk of nitrate levels becoming an issue in the future.

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

This matter is not a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy. It is however acknowledged that this project is forecast to result in significant rating increases to the residents on the Poyntzs Road scheme. As such it is proposed that the consultation be carried out in line with the special consultative procedure despite this project not triggering the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

7.3. **Legislation**

7.4. Section 69 of the Health (Drinking Water) Amendment Act 2007 is relevant in this matter.

7.5. **Community Outcomes**

7.6. The following community outcomes are relevant in this matter:

- **There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision making that effects our District**
- **There is a safe environment for all**
- **Core utility services are provided in a timely and sustainable manner**
- **People have wide-ranging opportunities for learning and being informed**

7.7. **Delegations**

7.8. This report does not require any financial delegation to approve.
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SUBJECT: Enterprise North Canterbury Half Year Report to December 2017, Draft Statement of Intent for year beginning 1 July 2018; and, Six Month Promotions Report to December 2017

SIGNED BY:
(for Reports to Council, Committees or Boards)

1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report asks the Committee to receive, for information, Enterprise North Canterbury’s (ENC) Half Year overall report and Six Monthly Promotions report, each for the period 1 July - 31 December 2017. There are no material variances relative to plan to note. It also provides, for comment, a draft Statement of Intent (SOI) for the 12 months period from 1 July 2018. The Board of ENC will provide a draft final SOI for Council approval at a later date in accordance with ENC reporting requirements as a council controlled organisation (CCO).

Attachments:

i. Half Year Report to December 2017, including Profit & Loss budget analysis (180313026396 & 180313026398)
ii. Draft Statement of Intent from 1 July 2018 (180313026402)
iii. Six Month Promotions Report to December 2017 (180313026417)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Audit and Risk Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 180313026438

(b) Receives the ENC’s Half Year Report to Dec. 2017, including profit and loss budget analysis

(c) Provides comment on ENCs Draft Statement of Intent for the 2018/19 year

(d) Receives the Six-Month Promotions Report to December 2017

3. BACKGROUND

3.1. Reporting relationships with ENC are established as a result of it being a Council Controlled Organisation (CCO). Six month and annual reports are provided as is a draft SOI for comment prior to it being recommended by the ENC Board to the Council. The Council recently resolved to renew the District Promotions Contract with ENC for a further
three-year period. That Contract provides for the contractor to prepare, and for Council to approve an Annual District Promotions Plan and for ENC to report against it at six months and at year’s end.

3.2. **Attachment I** is the Half Year Report on overall operations to December 2017, including a profit and loss budget analysis. The ENC Board adopted it on 7 February 2018 for provision to the Council (WDC) to meet the reporting requirements of the 2017/18 Statement of Intent.

3.3. **Attachment ii** is a draft Statement of Intent for the year beginning 1 July 2018. The Local Government Act (LGA) requires that a CCOs draft SOI be made available to the parent Council(s) each year for their comment. The draft SOI was approved on 7 February 2018 by the ENC Board for respective Council’s comments.

3.4. **Attachment iii** is the Six Monthly Promotions Report to December 2017. Enterprise North Canterbury, on behalf of the WDC, promotes the District as an innovative and progressive place to live, work, stay, play and prosper.

3.5. The Promotions Report sets out the activities delivered against the four key goals as at December 2017.
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4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. The half-yearly overall report on ENC activities indicates satisfactory non-financial and financial performance against targets and there are no significant financial variances of note. The draft SOI follows an established format addressing the purposes for which ENC was established and contracted to WDC. Comment is invited on the draft SOI for the ENC Board to take into account in any revisions prior to recommending to the Council for approval.

4.2. The six months report on district promotions provides greater detail on activities relative to plan. Financial results with the explanations of variances provided are satisfactory. appended to the report are notes relating to the role and activities of the ENC Business Support Manager and the Council’s Business and Centres Manager. These staff members will attend the Committee meeting to expand on their comments and answer questions as required from the Committee.

4.3. The Management Team have reviewed this report and support the recommendations.
5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

Ongoing dialogue that ENC has with the local business sector and visitor industry assisted with the preparation of the Draft Statement of Intent and the District Promotions Business Plan that has been reported on.

5.2. **Wider Community**

Previously reported to the Council during 2017 as part of overall findings of the 2016 Customer satisfaction survey, are wider community views of the Councils activities related to economic development and district promotions. Through oversight, these have not specifically been reported to the Audit & Risk Committee, but are summarised in the two graphs below.

Pleasing increases in satisfaction and reduction in dissatisfaction were recently recorded for both encouragement of business activity and promotion of the District. The link below provides further information on survey methodology and results.

http://www.waimakariri.govt.nz/__data/assets/pdf_file/0026/36917/5-2016-District-Development.pdf
6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

During the 2017/18 year ENC will receive from the WDC through the Economic Development (ED) grant $197,490 to enable the organisation to function and leverage other funding contributions.

Through the District Promotions Contract, payments of $373,770 are made for services, and $47,370 as an events grant fund for distribution by an independent Event Fund Advisory Group made up of external representatives. The anticipated allocation of these funds by major area of activity is as follows:

- Business Promotion - $104,000
- Visitor Promotions and Coordination - $125,000
- Events Grants and advice - $102,000
- Visitor information Centre operations - $90,000

ENC formally reports at six monthly intervals, and meets regularly with WDC staff to monitor progress and address any issues that arise.

6.2. **Community Implications**

Among other advantages, supporting and enabling the growth in the local economy; visitor industry partnering and promotions; and, attracting new business to the district through ENC programmes have benefits in increased local business sector strength, more local jobs, retained retail expenditure and increased town centre vitality.

6.3. **Risk Management**

The ENC Board meets regularly to oversee implementation of agreed plans and programmes in accordance with the accountability requirements of ENC being a CCO.
ENC formally reports to the Council at six monthly intervals, and meets regularly with WDC staff to monitor progress and address any issues that arise.

6.4. Health and Safety

ENC operates at arm’s length from the WDC and manages its own health and safety programme.

7. CONTEXT

7.1. Policy

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

The relevant council strategic policy context is provided by its Local Economic Development Strategy. This sets out the Council’s intent with respect to, among other strategic directions, Business and Visitors.


7.2. Legislation

Local Government Act S.10 Purpose of Local Government and Part 5 Council- controlled organisations and council organisations

7.3. Community Outcomes

Community outcomes that are particularly relevant to this report are:

Businesses in the District are diverse, adaptable and growing

• There are growing numbers of businesses and employment opportunities in our District

The distinctive character of our takiwā - towns, villages and rural areas is maintained

• The centres of our towns are safe, convenient and attractive places to visit and do business

7.4. Delegations

Delegation S-DM 1022 provides for delegated authority to the Audit and Risk Committee to monitor the performance of Council Controlled organisations and to review and provide comments on draft Statements of Intent.
1. Introduction

This report has been prepared to meet the reporting requirements of the Statement of Intent for the 2017/18 year and follows the format of the Annual Business Plan.

2. Nature and Scope of Activities

The vision of ENC is:

“To foster an Exceptional North Canterbury by encouraging the development of exceptional businesses and experiences”

ENC’s role is to enable and empower others in the engine room of the regional economy to do better: to export more; to employ more people in well-paid jobs; and to contribute to the growth in the wealth of our community. This is achieved via a number of programmes. Core funding from the Waimakariri and Hurunui District Councils is leveraged with contracts from central government and supported by project-specific funding from local industries.

3. Activity Report

GOAL ONE Developing Exceptional Businesses (including Agriculture)

Objective 1.1 Support existing businesses by the provision of training, coaching, and mentoring services and networking opportunities

a. Deliver the Regional Business Partner Capability Voucher Programme

Target: 62 Capability Assessments and issue $80,000 NZTE Vouchers while achieving a minimum of 80% satisfaction of services through NZTE annual customer survey and refer a minimum of 24 businesses to Business Mentors NZ

In the first six months of this year ENC have:

- Undertaken 51 full capability assessments (82% of target)
- Issued 44 vouchers worth a total of $53,100 to 39 businesses to assist with training or coaching (75% of target)
- ENC assisted 6 businesses with access to Callaghan Innovation funding (target 1)
- Referred 19 businesses to Business Mentors NZ (79% of target)
- Received a net promoter score for North Canterbury of +62.5 (target +50)
b. Provide Training to Local Business Owners and Managers

**Target:** Run at least 20 workshop/seminars with 160 business people attending, with a minimum of 80% of participants finding the overall standard to be very good or excellent

In the first six months of this year ENC have:

- Run 7 courses comprising of 20 half day workshops YTD with 77 businesses with 100% satisfaction from participants.
- Held free coaching sessions as part of a new initiative at the Business Centre “Talk with the Experts”. We had 19 participants in the two months since it commenced.
- We held a similar event for food and beverage businesses with experts from Food South and the Food Innovation Network. Six businesses attended these meetings.

We have a good programme of workshops scheduled for February to June 2018.

c. Provide Networking Functions at least three times a year

**Target:** At least 60 people attending each networking event and fully sponsored

ENC hosted two networking functions, fully sponsored with 169 business people attending (an average of 84).

d. Support local businesses by referring them to the appropriate agency

**Target:** A minimum of 30 businesses referred to external agencies for funding

69 businesses referred to external agencies after a formal interview.

- 13 referrals to CECC courses
- 6 referrals to other training
- 21 referrals to advanced business programmes
- 169 referrals to business service providers
- 379 referrals to free online resources

Overall, 109 businesses have been assisted in some positive fashion over the six month period.

e. Expand ENC’s Business Partner Programme to provide increased services to local businesses

**Target:** Secure and increase of 10% financial commitments from business partners

We currently have 11 active Business Service Partners. They are BNZ, SRB Law, Corcoran French, ARA, The Mark, North Canterbury Business Services, IT Simply, Successful Tradie, Success Factor, IT Online and Luckman and Associates (new partner).

We established a ‘Talk with the Experts’ series where we invite people to talk with experts on a subject one-on-one for 40 minutes at no charge. This provides expertise to our businesses and a chance for our Business Service Partners to show their value.

f. Maintain a strong communication programme with businesses

We continue to produce business relevant content for our website and published 27 stories about new businesses setting events, award winners, who’s coming, new legislations for business and new programmes for ENC (talk with the experts, helping business).
**i. ENC Website and social media**
The website of [www.northcanterbury.co.nz](http://www.northcanterbury.co.nz) is constantly updated with new and informative content.

**Website stats:**
- Sessions: 19,808, Users: 14,348, Page views: 43,150.
- Facebook: Our page likes are 1,107

**ii. Newsletter**
ENC produced six electronic newsletters this period to approximately 2,500 recipients with an open rate of 25%.

**Objective 1.2 Celebrate and recognise business leaders in the region**

**North Canterbury Business Awards 2018**
ENC can confirm that the 2018 business awards will go ahead. We have secured sufficient sponsor support. They are:

- BDO (Professional Services), Continental (Excellence in Retail), Hanmer Thermal Pools and Spa (Tourism and Hospitality), Hellers (New Emerging Business), Spark (Innovation and Technology), The North Canterbury News (People’s Choice), Pak n Save (Community Enterprise) and ECAN (Environmentally Sustainable Business Award). The launch will be in April 2018 culminating in a Gala Awards Dinner to be held 31 August 2018.

**Objective 1.3 Undertake analysis of regional employment opportunities and trends**
We completed our October Business Confidence Survey in association with Research First. The analysis of this survey is available on our website. It was distributed to Councils, businesses, local media and interested parties.

**Objective 1.4 Assist Hurunui Town Development**
The Amberley Study - 13 Individual business owners were interviewed as part of the Amberley study, feedback collated, and a report drafted. The results were presented to Council and members of the business community who participated. Moving forward, ENC have agreed to establish a business forum for the area early in 2018. We will invite all Amberley business owners to participate in what could potentially be an ongoing platform for information sharing between the business community and council.

**Objective 1.5 Recovery of Hurunui Businesses**
- We were successful in a $14,420 application to DIA for wages for a project manager (Michele)
- Rangiora Toyota continues to sponsor the vehicle used by Michele to visit businesses. Russell Lane has been very supportive and he has now issued ENC with a brand new four door Toyota Hilux. We are most grateful.
- ENC sponsored a $3,000+GST Spring radio campaign over three weeks to boost the numbers to the Spring Festival and running a competition for a weekend stay in Cheviot. Cheviot Promotions reported the advertising was a huge success with record numbers attending.
- The Business Recovery Grant opened for further applications. Business owners were informed and encouraged to submit an application. Several businesses thought not to apply due to receiving insurance payments for “loss of income”. At least 5 businesses applied for the BRG extension, 3 of them were declined.
$10,000 worth of 100% voucher funding from MBIE was made available in July 2017 for earthquake impacted businesses in the Hurunui. This was to meet the full cost of any support and services to individual businesses required for sustainability. This has all been utilised.

ENC offered to underwrite businesses accountants bills up to $1,000 which was to be reimbursed if their BRG application was successful. One applied for this support.

Businesses in Cheviot and Greta Valley reported they were busy following the road opening on Friday 15th December. All were hoping this is an indication on what the new normal may look like. Trucks were consistently passing through including coaches full of people who stopped in Cheviot.

Objective 1.6 ENC Business Centre

a. Business Centre Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full Year Budget</th>
<th>Actual YTD</th>
<th>% Budget Delivered YTD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Room Hire</td>
<td>$15,700</td>
<td>$7,318</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catering</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$3,560</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Sponsorship

Although we had two sponsors withdraw from bronze sponsorship we had three new ones sign up including Misco Joinery, Hire Access and Ray White. Spark and BDO have signed up for a further one year Silver sponsorship.

c. Communications and marketing of the Business Centre

- Business Centre brochures were edited and distributed to service centres and put in every training workbook. All external bookings for the business centre spaces, since opening, are being contacted to refresh their engagement with ENC. The sales and marketing plan is being reworked with new targets.
- On 26 July we hosted a networking function with the Board and Sponsors who appreciated the opportunity to meet each other.
- On 17 August, ENC organised a PLC House tenant morning tea which improved our understanding of all businesses in the building, and was an opportunity to promote ENC and our role in the Waimakariri and Hurunui Districts.

1.7 Other Projects

a. Waipara Wine Growers, now North Canterbury Wines

ENC agreed to part fund a marketing strategy for the North Canterbury Wine Growers Assn. We did this in partnership with Hurunui Tourism and the Wine Growers Assn members. Brown Bread were engaged to facilitate a workshop (held October) and write the marketing strategy which was to align the wineries of North Canterbury into one inclusive marketing strategy; introduce, grow and establish the brand in the on and offline world, create followers and fans for North Canterbury wines and identify unique media and partnership opportunities. This was completed and presented to the group in December. The strategy has now been adopted and made available to ENC.

b. Wheels to Wine Cycleway development

ENC CEO met with Geoff Gabilities, commercial cycle operator and Graeme Abbot from Hurunui Tourism to discuss the concept of a two day cycle trail that starts in the City, includes the Waimakariri, and finishes up in Waipara. Graeme has funded a feasibility study.
to develop the concept and costings of a trail. ENC pulled together interested parties who could be involved to progress this.

The concept got great buy-in from everyone with realistic understanding of time frames, and cost parameters being understood. The key to making the project work is the collective will, intellect and experience of all parties. The next steps to seek support from all four Councils and investigate their appetite for joint funding of a role to drive the project.

**GOAL TWO: Promote Waimakariri District**

A full report on this contract is provided directly to the Waimakariri District Council.

4. **Financial Performance**

The Profit and Loss Account contained in *Appendix 1* shows performance for the first 6 months of the year.

YTD Income is $7k above budget, key variances include:
- Business Training is up $18k due to timing of workshops
- Visit Waimakariri income is down $14k due to timing of programmes (OVG in particular)
- EQ Support is $6k up due to an unbudgeted grant from DIA

YTD Expenses is $64k below budget, key variances are:
- Business Training is up $15k due to increase in workshops (timing)
- Regional Business Partner down $5k due to allocation of staffing hours
- Business Attraction is down $26k due to research and marketing not fully completed
- Visit Waimakariri are down $37k as marketing collateral not produced this period (OVG, Walking & Cycling, District Map) and ChristchurchNZ contribution deferred

The forecast trading result shows a surplus of $19k compared with the budgeted surplus of $6k. This $14k surplus primarily relates to the grant from DIA.

The debtors ledger shows a debit of $287 at 90+ days, and $2,280 at 60-90 days. We are confident in receiving all outstanding debts.

5. **Sponsorship**

ENC is grateful to new and existing sponsors of the business centre
- We secured sponsorship for the two networking functions this period
- We have also secured new and existing sponsors for the 2018 North Canterbury Business Awards

6. **Staff**

- This period Pattie resigned after two and a half years at ENC as communications advisor to take up a role at Oasis Beauty. Amelia has picked up the extra 8 hours per week
- Sarah resigned as district promotion manager after five years at ENC.
- Janine Rogers was contracted in October to investigate cycling and walking trails in the district, sell advertising in the new official visitor guide and to complete various projects.

7. **Governance**

There were 14 applications for the two positions of ENC Trustee. The Mayors interviewed a shortlist of five. Clare Giffard (owner of Flat White Café and Urban Revival) along with Holly Sterne (GM of Patoa Farms) were the successful applicants.
8. **Summary**

Successful Economic Development is about long term partnerships. It involves creating an economic vision and an environment that is conducive to business growth while meeting the needs of local communities.

Business development is more short term, helping individual businesses and achieving relatively quick results.

While the economic development goals of Local Government and Central Government can be different, Economic Development Agencies like ENC can align governmental goals with those of the business community so that each ‘agency’ strengthens the work of the other. None of these agencies could succeed alone.

- Central Government sets the economic environment through legislation, government priorities and macro policies looking at the good of the nation.

- Local Government is the steward of place and sets strategies, frameworks and infrastructure to achieve goals that meet the needs of their residents and communities.

- Economic Development Agencies work with businesses to enable them to achieve their individual and sector goals while increasing the opportunities for them to achieve the goals set by Local and Central Government. EDA’s also provide a ‘front-line’ perspective that assists local and central government to stay informed of what is happening in the business community.

We continue to be confident that ENC capably fulfils the role of a successful Economic Development Agency for North Canterbury.

Nick Harris  
Chairman  
Heather Warwick  
Chief Executive
## Profit & Loss [Budget Analysis]

**Actual July 2017 through to December 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Period Actual</th>
<th>Period Budget</th>
<th>$ Difference</th>
<th>Annual Budget</th>
<th>Revised Annual Forecast</th>
<th>% Age Forecast used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NCAA Awards Income</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biz Training Income</td>
<td>$55,202</td>
<td>$37,704</td>
<td>$17,504</td>
<td>$77,930</td>
<td>$63,300</td>
<td>49.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Business Partner Income</td>
<td>$33,903</td>
<td>$21,903</td>
<td>$11,903</td>
<td>$50,106</td>
<td>$37,106</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biz Attraction Income</td>
<td>$39,500</td>
<td>$23,515</td>
<td>$(14,985)</td>
<td>$74,400</td>
<td>$49,050</td>
<td>69.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Income</td>
<td>$1,050</td>
<td>$1,050</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,050</td>
<td>$1,050</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kahalu' UVC Income</td>
<td>$32,929</td>
<td>$39,147</td>
<td>$(6,218)</td>
<td>$38,936</td>
<td>$41,147</td>
<td>106.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit Wailua Income</td>
<td>$35,252</td>
<td>$19,932</td>
<td>$(15,320)</td>
<td>$74,400</td>
<td>$49,400</td>
<td>66.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthquake Support Income</td>
<td>$22,932</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
<td>$(16,432)</td>
<td>$29,432</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
<td>42.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Centre</td>
<td>$43,720</td>
<td>$46,114</td>
<td>$(2,394)</td>
<td>$46,114</td>
<td>$46,114</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management/Adj. Income</td>
<td>$(13,381)</td>
<td>$(13,366)</td>
<td>$(25)</td>
<td>$(13,366)</td>
<td>$(13,366)</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td>$155,164</td>
<td>$159,220</td>
<td>$(4,056)</td>
<td>$163,216</td>
<td>$163,216</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Cost Of KVC Sales | $2,733 | $2,500 | $(13) | $2,733 | $2,500 | 45.92% |
| KVC Purchases Retail | $18,372 | $24,903 | $(6,531) | $24,903 | $24,903 | 100.00% |
| Total Cost Of Sales | $18,605 | $27,403 | $(8,802) | $27,403 | $27,403 | 100.00% |

| **Net Income** | $165,860 | $131,818 | $(34,042) | $135,818 | $135,818 | 100.00% |

| Expenses | $25,560 | $25,560 | $0 | $25,560 | $25,560 | 100.00% |
| NC Business Awards Expenses | $2,115 | $3,635 | $(1,520) | $3,635 | $3,635 | 100.00% |
| Biz Training Expenses | $95,764 | $44,945 | $50,819 | $44,945 | $44,945 | 100.00% |
| Regional Business Partner Expenses | $45,212 | $50,089 | $(4,877) | $50,089 | $50,089 | 100.00% |
| Other Town Support Expenses | $6,334 | $7,727 | $(1,393) | $7,727 | $7,727 | 100.00% |
| Biz Attraction Expenses | $10,654 | $7,302 | $(3,352) | $7,302 | $7,302 | 100.00% |
| Event Expenses | $96,042 | $59,282 | $(36,760) | $59,282 | $59,282 | 100.00% |
| KVC Expenses | $45,265 | $51,281 | $(6,015) | $51,281 | $51,281 | 100.00% |
| Earthquake Support Expenses | $64,963 | $102,324 | $(37,361) | $102,324 | $102,324 | 100.00% |
| Business Centre | $22,498 | $23,392 | $(894) | $23,392 | $23,392 | 100.00% |
| Management/Adj. Expenses | $55,202 | $57,875 | $(2,673) | $57,875 | $57,875 | 100.00% |
| **Total Expenses** | $257,840 | $351,816 | $(93,976) | $351,816 | $351,816 | 100.00% |

| Operating Profit | $165,860 | $201,604 | $(35,744) | $201,604 | $201,604 | 100.00% |

| Other Income | $6,416 | $3,660 | $2,756 | $3,660 | $3,660 | 100.00% |
| Interest Income | $7,169 | $3,992 | $(3,177) | $3,992 | $3,992 | 100.00% |
| Other Income | $4,292 | $(2,033) | $(6,325) | $(2,033) | $(2,033) | 100.00% |

| **Total Other Expenses** | $6,416 | $3,660 | $2,756 | $3,660 | $3,660 | 100.00% |

| Net Profit (Loss) | $172,254 | $195,864 | $(23,610) | $195,864 | $195,864 | 100.00% |
STATEMENT OF INTENT
For the Financial Year Beginning 1 July 2018

INTRODUCTION

North Canterbury Economic Development Trust trading as Enterprise North Canterbury (ENC) is a Council Controlled Organisation (CCO) established by the Waimakariri District & Hurunui District Councils. This Statement of Intent sets out the overall intentions and objectives for the period of 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2021.

NATURE AND SCOPE OF ACTIVITIES

ENC is an Economic Development Agency with a vision:

“To foster an Exceptional North Canterbury by encouraging the development of exceptional infrastructure, businesses and experiences”

THE OBJECTIVES OF THE TRUST

The objects of the Trust as set out in clause 3.1 of the Deed of Trust are to:

a) “Cultivate economic initiatives and foster growth for the benefit of the North Canterbury Community
b) Promote the economic, environmental, cultural and social well being of the North Canterbury Community
c) Foster, develop and assist in the management of best practices and effective use of the resources of North Canterbury
d) Promote and nurture community-based, sustainable economic growth through projects to benefit the people of North Canterbury Community”

In pursuing these objects ENC will:

- Operate with the utmost integrity and highest of ethics
- Be innovative, proactive and professional in all aspects of its operations
- Work collaboratively in all activities it facilitates or undertakes
- Respect the democratic processes of the sponsoring Councils.

ENC’s modus operandi is to “stimulate/facilitate/liberate” new projects, as initiatives will only lead the regional economy to a higher level if a project is self-sustaining in the hands of the private sector. ENC does not see itself as “owning” projects in the long term. Accordingly when assessing new initiatives ENC will:

- Promote the sustainability of business
- Have an awareness of the needs of the community within which business operates
- Be a leader and facilitator but not an investor in development projects

THE PERFORMANCE MEASURES

In pursuit of its vision ENC has adopted strategic objectives against which its performance will be monitored.
ENC Strategic Objectives
Performance Measures 2018/19

Vision: To foster an Exceptional North Canterbury by encouraging the development of exceptional businesses and experiences

Strategic Objective 1: Exceptional Businesses (including Agriculture)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Objective 1.1 Support existing businesses by the provision of training, coaching, and mentoring services and networking opportunities | Deliver the Regional Business Partner Programme for NZTE  
Provide training of local business owners and managers  
Provide networking opportunities to market, share knowledge, exchange information three times a year  
Support local businesses by referring them to the appropriate support agency  
Expand ENC’s Business Partner Programme to provide increased services to local businesses  
A minimum of 60% net promoter score of services provided by ENC through NZTE’s annual customer survey  
Undertake 52 Capability Assessments and issue a minimum of $80,000 NZTE Vouchers  
A minimum of 24 businesses referred to Business Mentors NZ  
Refer at least 2 businesses undertaking research and development work to Callaghan Innovation  
Run 20 half day business training workshops with 80 business people attending, with attendees expressing a minimum of 80% satisfaction rate  
Run 3 networking functions with a minimum of 60 attending and each event is fully sponsored  
A minimum of 60 businesses referred to external agencies (excluding BMNZ)  
Retain financial commitment of business partners  
A 10% increase in business partners signed up |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 1.1 Communicate with businesses so they are well informed about services and support available to them</th>
<th>A minimum of 10 electronic newsletter distributed Enhance northcanterbury.co.nz website and Facebook and increase number of visitations Grow social media channels and website visitors by 10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 1.2 Celebrate and Recognise Business Leaders in the region</strong></td>
<td>Organise the biennial business awards Gala Dinner and Ceremony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full capacity and attendance at the Gala Awards Ceremony Participating businesses are surveyed with a minimum of 80% satisfaction rate of involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 1.3 Undertake analysis of regional employment opportunities and trends</strong></td>
<td>Have a high level of understanding of local labour market conditions and economic confidence in North Canterbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENC complete 2 business confidence surveys with a minimum of 50 businesses participating and results are picked up by newspapers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 1.4 Assist Hurunui Town Development</strong></td>
<td>ENC and the Council's fully understand the needs of small businesses in rural townships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Survey completed and distributed in nominated township Business initiatives are created following engagement ENC to assist in implementing two activities as a result of their engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 1.5 Manage the ENC Business Centre for local businesses to use</strong></td>
<td>Achieve revenue targets as included in the Business Case justifying the establishment of the Business Centre Partner with private sector to fund the rental and running costs of business centre Grow the use of the Business Centre with new initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business centre is well utilised and external bookings are increased by 10% compared with the prior year Retain the aggregate level of current sponsorship Run quarterly ‘Talk with the Experts’ sessions Two monthly BDO ‘Business Discovery’ sessions Two new business forums</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Strategic Objective 2: Promote the Waimakariri District

Service delivery agreed annually between WDC and ENC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promote the Waimakariri District to businesses and visitors</td>
<td>Overall satisfaction by WDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Business Promotion</td>
<td>b) Track and grow online visitations to the Invest Section of the ENC Website and the Visit Waimakariri Website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) ENC staff to secure at least one new business to the district in conjunction with Council and developers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate online business information with visitor information</td>
<td>b)ENC staff to secure at least one new business to the district in conjunction with Council and developers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement the agreed Investment Strategy for ENC/WDC</td>
<td>b) ENC staff to secure at least one new business to the district in conjunction with Council and developers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write case studies to promote the reasons why businesses choose to set up in the district</td>
<td>b) ENC staff to secure at least one new business to the district in conjunction with Council and developers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with private developers to assist promotion of their developments in the Waimakariri</td>
<td>b) ENC staff to secure at least one new business to the district in conjunction with Council and developers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work alongside WDC on the regeneration areas (red zone) in Kaiapoi with regard to business use land</td>
<td>b) ENC staff to secure at least one new business to the district in conjunction with Council and developers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New start up businesses are supported by the Business Support team</td>
<td>b) ENC staff to secure at least one new business to the district in conjunction with Council and developers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) ENC staff to secure at least one new business to the district in conjunction with Council and developers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Draft SOI 1.7.18
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.2 Enhance the Visitor Experience</th>
<th>Produce district marketing publications Manage online marketing channels (web, Facebook and Instagram) Coordinate joint advertising opportunities with operators Operate the Kaiapoi i-SITE</th>
<th>The number of visitors attracted to the Districts accommodation, attraction and activities is increased as measured by growth in CAM guest nights; visitor spend measured by MBIE; online presence through website page visits and Facebook likes and newsletter uptake, user pay publications are produced. Meet i-SITE criteria standards, increase contacts and sales at the i-SITE by 10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Connect with Residents</td>
<td>Promote and support quality events which reinforce the strengths and brand of the District and are embraced by the community Administer the contestible and non contestible funding</td>
<td>Number of events promoted increase by 10% Events Calendar distribution increases by 10% Event fund is fully distributed Event fund is widely promoted, applications considered and fund fully distributed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Develop new Products</td>
<td>Work with the private sector investors to plan and develop their new visitor attractions</td>
<td>Two new visitor attractions commenced and promoted by ENC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE BOARD’S APPROACH TO GOVERNANCE

The Board of Trustees is responsible for the overall corporate governance of ENC. The Trust Deed sets out the governance responsibilities of the Trustees. The Board guides and monitors management of the business and affairs of the Trust on behalf of the Councils to whom they are accountable. The Mayors of each of the Councils are Trustees, and the two CEO’s are Advisory Trustees. The Board meets two monthly.

THE ACCOUNTING POLICIES

The Trust is a not-for-profit organisation. The Trust has adopted accounting policies that are consistent with the Financial Reporting Act 1993 and Financial Reporting Standards issued by the Institute of Chartered Accountants of New Zealand. The Trust has elected to apply the PBE SFR-A (PS) Public Benefit Entity Simple Format Reporting – Accrual (Public Sector) on the basis that the Trust does not have public accountability and has total annual expenses of less than $2m.

THE RATIO OF CONSOLIDATED SHAREHOLDERS FUNDS TO TOTAL ASSETS

As at 30th June 2017 the Trust’s Equity comprised 67% of total assets and 100% of net assets. Equity is defined as the sum of the amount of retained earnings and accumulated losses. Total assets are defined as the sum of the net book values of current assets and non-current assets as disclosed in the Trust’s annual report.

DISTRIBUTIONS TO SHAREHOLDERS

The Trust’s Equity is not distributed, but is held in reserve to fund the Trust’s future economic development activities and Waimakariri District promotion activities as appropriate.

INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED TO SHAREHOLDERS

Annually the Trust reports to the Councils, with the following matters being covered:

- Trust Directory
- Review of the Year’s Activities
- Report against the Year’s Performance Measures
- Statement of Financial Position
- Statement of Cashflows
- Statement of Financial Performance
- Statement of Movements in Equity
- Notes to the Accounts
- Auditor’s Opinion

Half yearly reports are provided to Councils including a statement of income and expenditure for the period, and a report of achievements against the Trust’s objectives.

Quarterly reports are required by WDC.

The two Mayors and CEO attend Board meetings and receive bi-monthly management and financial reports. The Trust’s Strategic Plan and the Annual Business Plan and Budget are made available to the two Councils following its approval by the ENC Board.
PROCEDURES FOR MEMBERS TO ACQUIRE SHARES

There is no means for Trustees to acquire shares.

COMPENSATION FROM LOCAL AUTHORITIES

The Trust receives seed capital from the two District Councils to enable it to initiate its economic development activities. In addition ENC has a service contact with Waimakariri District for the provision of District Promotion services. The following table sets out the current level of funding and that projected for the next three years (excl. GST).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authority</th>
<th>2018/19</th>
<th>2019/20</th>
<th>2020/21</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri District Council</td>
<td>$TBA</td>
<td>$TBA</td>
<td>$TBA</td>
<td>Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri District Council</td>
<td>$TBA</td>
<td>$TBA</td>
<td>$TBA</td>
<td>District Promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurunui District Council</td>
<td>$TBA</td>
<td>$TBA</td>
<td>$TBA</td>
<td>Economic Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TBA = Councils to determine through their Annual Plan processes

If any other contracts are entered into between the Trust and any territorial or regional authority, payment of the contract price will be required from such contracting authority.

COMMERCIAL VALUE OF THE SHAREHOLDERS’ INVESTMENT

The commercial value of the shareholders’ investment is the Trust’s equity is $450,631 at 30 June 2017 as stated in the annual report.

The Trust Deed requires that “the capital and income of the Trust fund shall be applied only within New Zealand to meet the Objects of the Trust”. On winding up all surplus assets are to be applied by the Councils to similar purposes as the Objects of the Trust. No reassessment of the Trust’s commercial value is therefore proposed.

OTHER MATTERS

The Trust has a contract with Waimakariri District Council for the provision of promotion services until 30 June 2018. The contract has a right for the trust to call for renewal of the contract for a further three years. The contract has a minimum annual level of funding specified ($200,000) but provides for the Council to confirm a final level of funding each year as it approves the annual Promotion Business Plan, prior to the commencement of each year.

--- 0000---
Dear Jim

Promotion of Waimakariri District
Business Plan Report to 31 December 2017

We are very pleased with the results being achieved in promoting Waimakariri District in the first six months of this year.

WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT PROMOTION PLAN OBJECTIVES

To promote the District as an innovative and progressive place to live, work, stay, play, and prosper by:

- Business Promotion – market the district so that more businesses want to set up here
- Enhance the Visitor Experience – collectively market the district to visitors and provide quality information services
- Connect with residents – increase local pride, awareness of events and endorse their own district to friends and family
- Develop new products – grow the districts offering by assisting and promoting new visitor attractions

1. **Goals**

To achieve the Promotion Objectives the 2017/18 Promotion Plan has four key goals with an aim to attract visitors and new businesses through marketing and events, profiling why it is worth visiting/investing in/doing business in/relocating to.

**GOAL 1: BUSINESS PROMOTION (Business Sector)**

ENC are mandated to promote the Waimakariri District as a great place to do business and set up a business. ENC’s role in business investment/promotion – Miles Dalton (20 hours per week) and Amelia Norman (communication and online):

1. **Assisting existing businesses with their growth goals (new staff, expansion)**

Retain existing and expanding businesses:

- Worked with 83 Waimakariri businesses (one on one) in six months to 31 December.
- Ran 7 workshops to upskill existing businesses with 72 attending
- Proactively approached established businesses that are not in the ENC database to offer our services. We have approached 47 businesses over this period
- Welcomed new businesses to the district through social media and our newsletter along with either calling them or visiting them personally to gain their approval to be promoted via our channels.
- One particular business was Misco Joinery. ENC invited them to morning tea and introduced them to many local businesses. Misco have since become an ENC Business Sponsor and have offered to host a networking function at their new premises. They have 40 staff that have relocated to the district.

2. Acting as the first point of contact for all new business enquiries.

ENC worked with 17 business interests, 12 of whom remain interested and 2 who now seem extremely likely to establish businesses in the Waimakariri.

While ENC is not able to name businesses due to strict commercial sensitivity and confidentiality, we can confirm that substantive discussions are occurring with:

- A blackcurrent processing plant looking at relocating from Auckland
- A biotech venture developing probiotics for stock
- A large scale food producer looking at building a factory in the Waimak
- An American chain of weight loss clinics developing a new product and looking at basing production in the Waimak.
- A weight loss clinic (by the same investors as above).
- An indoor produce market
- A counselling/wellbeing centre
- A tourism venture based around a working Meadery (to be built)
- A current Waimak manufacturer who is expanding and was considering Selwyn as a location
- An investor looking at purchasing an existing business in the Waimak.
- A retail co-operative
- An online retailer looking at establishing their offices and storage in the Waimak
- An artists’ co-operative
- An international golf academy
- Four Councils – a two day cycle trail from Christchurch to Waipara with the first night in Waimakariri

The ENC Business Support Manager (BSM) provided business start advice to 35 people in the 6 month period to 31 Dec 2017. These included people scoping an idea, and new businesses just getting started. They approached ENC through word of mouth and our website.

The types of business (sector) included:

- 7 trades and services
- 5 tourism and hospitality
- 9 professional services
- 7 retail
- 1 primary industry
- 4 manufacturing
- 1 wholesale and distribution
- 1 arts and recreation

Of these businesses, 18 were working towards setting up a new business and 17 had already started and needed some help.
3. **Working with existing developers to enable them to achieve tenants for their developments**

This six month period ENC has:

- Worked with Ravenswood, Silverstream (Fred Rahme and Devon Construction), Andrew Wenborn, PLC Developments and Daniel Smith Developments to promote commercial and industrial land.
- Met with Harcourts Commercial Agents to explain our role in business promotion and development. This was very well received.
- Presented (in conjunction with Simon Hart) to a Chinese Business Delegation who were exploring investment opportunities in the area. This led to them requesting we take them on site in Ravenswood and Pegasus which we did.
- Had a stall at the Christchurch A&P Show presenting the district. We got 2 good leads.
- Held their networking function in December 2017 at Urban Revival, sponsored by Silverstream Investments, with over 100 business people attending
- Provided key statistics on the district to interested tenants to all developments. For example Eagle Brewery, and 4 other confidential potential developments
- Provided key statistics to developers such as Andrew Wenborn and H Investments
- Over the past six months ENC interviewed a range of developers, business owners and other stakeholders in the Waimakariri District. This enabled us to develop suggestions on how to take Waimakariri forward in a way that works for both investors and those already invested in the region.
- Been part of the working group developing the plan for the Kaiapoi recovery zone, and advised Council on what is needed to attract appropriate businesses to the zone.

4. **Promote the district as a diverse and dynamic business community**

In this period ENC has promoted the image of a diverse and dynamic business community via our website news articles and social media channels. Some of the stories have included:

- Misco Settles into Kaiapoi
- Urban Revival Café Opens
- Eagle Brewing to Land in Kaiapoi
- Ravenswood Ramps Up
- Trike Brand Set To Boom

For the six months to December 2017, 221 unique visitors viewed our extensive informational Business Start Up Page and 2,126 visits to the Invest Waimakariri section of the website (note: this counts all of the pages in the Live, Invest & Regional Profile sections of the site)

ENC’s website on business investment in the Waimakariri District including lifestyle, job opportunities and education with a link to Visit Waimakariri’s website showcasing the “play” element has been completed. Including material on community assets, employment statistics, spending, social and school

A good level of generic information is now available throughout the website with specific information provided as required. We have provided specific information to developers, potential investors and tourism operators as well as potential new small businesses.

Commercial and industrial zone maps are available from the WDC (linked from our website). Providing an up-to-date record of buildings and land available has proven impractical and we link to the various agents around the district instead.
ENC staff work very closely with Simon Hart (Business and Centre’s Manager). They also attended the series of workshops that Council are running for the regeneration area utilisation for both recreation and business land use. Please see Appendix ONE on the roles of each organisation in business promotion and support.

GOAL 2: ENHANCE THE VISITOR EXPERIENCE (Visitor Industry)
Visit Waimakariri will continue to leverage the Waimakariri District profile widely

2.1 MARKETING
2.1.1 Marketing Promotion

- We were asked by Blackwells to coordinate a feature in The Press on Kaiapoi. We obtained 10 advertisers with the page featuring on Wednesday July 12th.
- In November, staff from Visit Waimakariri and ENC facilitated a Trade Stand promoting the Waimakariri District at the Christchurch A&P Show over three days. All aspects of ENC were provided including, business promotion, support, business centre as well as events and visitor attractions. We ran a competition for sign ups to the events newsletter and had ENC staff on hand to talk about business in the Waimakariri.
- In November, staff from Visit Waimakariri and ENC along with WDC staff and volunteers attended a Trade Stand at the Hui-A-Iwi promoting the Waimakariri District.
- In December ENC coordinated a full page in the Press “Summer in Kaiapoi” with 10 advertisers and listing the Top Summer Things to do in Kaiapoi.

2.1.2 Marketing Publications
- We continue to distribute the North Canterbury Food and Wine Trail Guide and will do so until the supply of guides and/or the funding is depleted.
- Devlin and Harcourts Kaiapoi have confirmed their ongoing sponsorship to cover the costs of the Rangiora and Kaiapoi Street Maps
- We were successful in signing up 30 local operators to produce the 2018 Official Visitor Guide. This guide which is fully funded by operators. It is now with the designer and content writer.
- Received grants for $3,500 from CERT and $3,500 from Southern Trust for the printing and distribution of the new walking and cycling guide to be produced.

2.1.3 Website and online channels
- The website of www.visitwaimakariri.co.nz and social media is constantly updated to promote the district. Total unique visitors 71,323 vs 79,352 for same period last year.
- Social media engagements on Facebook have grown from 2,866 likes to 3,204 and our Instagram followers are 485
- We ran a Facebook campaign promoting “Roast Meals in the Waimakariri” featuring five business partners which reached 19,151 people with 1488 website clicks for a ROI of 0.06c. Two business partners reported a rise in the roast meals purchased and ChristchurchNZ went on to do the same promotion.
- Ran a successful campaign over the Christmas period via Facebook on Waimak Walks which reached 11,794 people with 789 links through to our webpage.

2.2 Coordination
2.2.1 Visit Waimakariri Visitor Industry Partnership
- Visit Waimakariri Business Partner sales were undertaken in July 2017 with 58 partners signing up. We lost ten partners in the last year but gained four. These businesses fund the Visit Waimakariri website.
- After a meeting with the Pegasus Resident Association, we now have a dedicated and branded signage board in their new community meeting rooms which stocks our brochures, events and promotions.
We have been working with the Dept of Conservation on the condition of the Ryde Falls Track, conservation week and the promotion of our forested conservation areas and together we have six walks in the CCC Walking Festival.

We presented to 25 Inbound Tour Operators’ (ITO) at a Trade Event with ChristchurchNZ and other Canterbury organisations. A Waimakariri Trade Manual was produced for this event that featured our Trade Ready Products and why they should include the Waimakariri in their future itineraries. Of the 25 ITO’s, three were already trading in our district and 12 requested 2019 commissionable rates.

2.2.2. Town Centre Promotion and Support
- ENC hosted one Promotion Associations Chairs meetings on the 3rd of November.
- In December, post Carnival and Jordan Luck concert, we met with members from KPA, Martin Pinkham, Dan Gordon, Simon Hart on future events and relationships.
- We assisted KPA to promote the Jordan Luck concert and Carnival. We got a very good rate through Fairfax and North Canterbury News. The advertising totalled $10,694+GST.

2.2.3 Other Stakeholders
Regular liaison has been maintained with local, regional and national stakeholders.
- Visit Waimakariri attended a Tourism Infrastructure Fund Meeting (TIF) with other district councils. TIF is not immediately relevant to us but we will consider future funding rounds.
- Continually working with DOC and TTKT Coastal Park with their open day and guided walks
- Support Rangiora Museum and Ashley Rakahuri River Care by hosting their website as part of the Visit Waimakariri website.

2.3. Operate and grow the Kaiapoi i-SITE
Provide coordinated, consistent and professional district-wide information to residents and visitors.

The i-SITE serves the local community by connecting visitors with residents and businesses. This is six month period:
- Visitor numbers were up 20% for December 2017 with the re-opening of State Highway One, however down 12% for the 6-month on the same period to Dec 2016.
- Gross Bookings YTD are $42,300 (excl GST), overall down 11% - with Transport down 33%, Accommodation up 4%, Activities/Attractions up 26 %. Transport bookings have been impacted by Kaikoura EQ with no Coastal Pacific and Ferry bookings were well down.
- Fish & Game NZ licences were up 42% YTD. A free give away ‘Check, Clean, Dry packs’ was introduced with licence purchases. Supplied free of charge from MPI.
- I-SITE NZ successfully negotiated increased commissions with Great Journeys of New Zealand Partnership Agreement that will give i-SITEs a 15% commission instead of 10%.
- Kaiapoi i-SITE achieved Qualmark quality assurance this period.
- Assisted the community with selling tickets to five local events and/or being a distribution point.
- 45 local tourism operators pay and display generated a revenue of $2,275 per annum

WDC requested that ENC submit background information and economic and community benefits that the Kaiapoi i-SITE provides to the district. This report will form the basis of a workshop to be held by the Audit and Risk Committee in April 2018.

GOAL 3: CONNECT WITH RESIDENTS (Visitor Industry)
Increase local pride, awareness of events and endorse their own district to friends and family

3.1 Event Promotion
We continue to market Waimakariri Events:
- The “Waimakariri Events Guide” is published in The Northern Outlook and The News every month.
A printed events guide is distributed to 115 locations. A monthly Event Newsletter is distributed to our Event Database of 1220 which has grown by 22%

Events are promoted through the online channels – our website and Social Media, BNZ community e-Noticeboards and WDC e-Noticeboards, Christchurch and Rangiora Mum’s feature our main events in their newsletter and through their online social media.

Through the Rangiora Winter Festival organisers, we directed those that entered the Singapore Airlines competition to further check out the Waimakariri by directing them to a “Top Things To Do” landing page.

We coordinated event entry prizes for a WDC Facebook campaign.

Focus this year was on running more competitions and doing more targeted boosted posts to grow our engagement further.

We coordinated a full page of ‘Waimakariri Events’ showcasing six key events in the local papers in September and December in the Northern Outlook and North Canterbury News along with a half page spread in The Press. These pages are funded by the advertisers. This also included a digital campaign which generated a reach of 11,579 with a CPC of .16c

The number of events promoted by Visit Waimakariri Website for the period of this report was 304.

Printing.Com continues as our sponsor for the colour printing of the event calendar.

3.2 Contestable Event Funding
The Waimakariri Events Funding Group reviewed 10 funding applications. Eight met the criteria and were successful in being granted $26,519. Thus, the following events were approved for funding in the August 2017 round:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>When</th>
<th>Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus Bay Art Show</td>
<td>Pegasus Bay School PTA</td>
<td>13 – 15th October</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA Day</td>
<td>American Car Club</td>
<td>5th October</td>
<td>$609.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebration Night</td>
<td>Rangiora Promotions</td>
<td>23 November 2017</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan Luck Concert</td>
<td>Kaiapoi Promotions</td>
<td>7 December 2017</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Street Party</td>
<td>Rangiora Promotions</td>
<td>25th January 2018</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Party</td>
<td>Reflections Community Trust</td>
<td>4 March 2019</td>
<td>$910.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Colour Festival</td>
<td>Karl Howorth</td>
<td>24 March 2018</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eats and Beats</td>
<td>Rangiora Promotions</td>
<td>1 April 2018</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 Non-Contestable Event Funding
There is no change in the non-contestable fund since the last report as all funds were allocated.

A review of the existing event funding programme and promotion has been undertaken by an external contractor, Angela Gordon. This will be considered in March by the independent events panel of three, Dan Gordon, Simon Markham and Heather. A report will be provided back to the WDC Audit and Risk Committee with recommendations.

GOAL 4: DEVELOP NEW PRODUCTS (Visitor Industry)
Grow the districts offering by assisting and promoting new visitor attractions

- Wheels to Wine:
  - The concept for an off-road two day cycle tour from Christchurch to Waipara was well accepted by a meeting of HDC, WDC, ECAN, ENC and Hurunui Tourism senior staff. The key to making the project work is the collective will, intellect and experience of all parties. The next steps are to seek support from all four Councils for joint funding of a project management role to drive the project.
- Cycle Discovery Project
  - Janine Rogers has met with parties including Ground Effects, Waimakariri Women’s Cycling Club, Andy Pope and Gary Cattermole and Martin Pinkham.
Plotted trails onto a district map and met with DOC and WDC. Looking to looping or joining existing trails (this includes private land also).

- The IT/GIS team at WDC are looking to create a map and an 'app' for the district, starting mid January. The app will be more than just cycling eg walkways, parking, playgrounds, dog friendly areas, public toilets, refuse stations, freedom camping areas, beaches, fuel stations and camping grounds.

2. **Financials**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Six Months Actual</th>
<th>Annual Budget</th>
<th>%age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carried forward from previous Year WDC</td>
<td>$22,056</td>
<td>$84,566</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDC 2016/17 Payment</td>
<td>$213,776</td>
<td>$421,140</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>$27,500</td>
<td>$93,651</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC Sales and Commissions</td>
<td>$49,082</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td>$312,414</td>
<td>$704,357</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating</td>
<td>$193,549</td>
<td>$521,688</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Grants</td>
<td>$26,900</td>
<td>$87,853</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC Purchases</td>
<td>$42,875</td>
<td>$94,390</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating</strong></td>
<td>$263,324</td>
<td>$703,931</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surplus/Loss</strong></td>
<td>$49,090</td>
<td>$426</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Other Income is down due to timing of producing publications (OVG, Street Maps). These will all go ahead in the coming six month period.
2. Operating Costs down due to timing of programmes including business attraction and production of publications and ChristchurchNZ contribution
3. Event Grants is down due to timing of pay outs. Most events occur in first quarter of 2018.

3. **Summary**

ENC staff had a very productive and busy time this last six months promoting the Waimakariri District to local residents (events), visitors and business interests.

Attracting more visitors who spend more and stay longer provides economic benefits. Making investment in Waimakariri easy for businesses, entrepreneurs and investors will also enable economic growth.

ENC through Visit Waimakariri provide visitors with a reason to experience this distinctive district. It is our role to promote and assist with the development of new products for the region to remain competitive.

Waimakariri competes with other districts in New Zealand and needs to support creative entrepreneurs from within Waimakariri and further afield to develop and grow our business sectors. To achieve this, ENC must ensure that our efforts reflect the vision and direction provided by WDC’s policy and planners. The valuable relationships we are developing across districts, Councils and with the private sector allow us to investigate and progress new experiences and opportunities.

Heather Warwick, Chief Executive
APPENDIX ONE

What does the ENC Business Support Manager do?

ENC conducts business attraction/promotion activities by promoting the district as a destination for businesses, relationship development and management. ENC also offers a number of business support functions including best practice advice to existing businesses, professional training and development, and networking opportunities.

Miles is ENC’s business support manager and has been in the role 4 years. Taking up business investment/promotion activity is a natural extension to his role. He is also a business analyst and can provide district wide specific statistics to any interested party.

Miles works closely with prospective businesses to help them in all aspects. This includes:

- Independent and honest feedback to potential investors
- Having important conversations with businesses that Council cannot have due to their role as a regulatory authority
- Provision of statistical information and demographics to help with decision-making
- Helping potential investors identify and address risks to the business
- Connecting potential investors to expertise and assistance within the Waimakariri as well as nationally and internationally
- Connecting potential investors with the best land/buildings to address their needs
- Offering moral support and ‘hand-holding’ to investors when needed
- Connections to assistance with investor networks, research and development assistance and owner upskilling
- Providing funding to assist with owner upskilling and/or research & development
- Hosting Promotion Association Chairperson’s meetings quarterly
- Providing essential advocacy and coordination for the business and commercial sectors with regard to provision of information to Council planning and strategies
- Be a safe and confidential sounding board for local businesses. Sometimes this has led to feedback to Council on how to improve service
- Handshaking conversations to Council with local businesses who may be nervous about talking to a regulatory authority
- ENC is also part of various working groups, including the Kaiapoi Regeneration Zone reference group.

Miles works closely with Simon Hart, Business and Town Centres Manager at the Council who also assists business, but has the focus on ensuring a business is able to comply with council requirements.

What does the Business and Centre Manager Do? (as written by WDC)

Simon Hart’s role provides a senior relationship management advice and support for business interaction with Council’s regulatory functions and services to maximise the Councils contribution to business development. It also aims to implement town centre strategies, plans and projects and the Council’s economic development strategy while enhancing its working relationship with business at large and ENC. This includes:

- Being the custodian of the Councils’ Local Economic Development Strategy in terms of development and implementation of relevant strategies and plans
- Actively lead and implement Councils’ Business friendly resources and processes aimed at helping new and expanding businesses to successfully navigate all regulatory and legislative requirements.
• Developing and implementing key plans and strategies aimed at creating an appropriate environment and framework for businesses to operate within (being town centre plans, district development strategies and district plan).
• Lead, guide and support the coordinated development and implementation of its Town Centre strategies and plans
• Coordinate and manage key business and town centre related projects
• Providing ongoing monitoring of resource consents conditions
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1. The purpose of this report is to present the Statement of Intent (SOI) for Te Kōhaka ā Tuhaitara Trust (TKTT) for the year ending 30 June 2019 for consideration by the Audit and Risk Committee.

1.2. The Trust also would like to provide a presentation of the Business Case that documents the way the Trust will achieve its strategic objectives and priorities.

1.3. Under its delegation the Audit and Risk Committee considers the SOI and provides any comments that it wishes the Trustee to consider in the SOI and other information in relation to the CCOs.

1.4. TKTT is required to consider the comments from Shareholders (Council & Ngai Tahu) within two months of the 1 March and deliver the completed SOI to the Shareholders on or before 30 June each year. The SOI was received on the 14 February 2018.

1.5. Catherine McMillan (Trust Chair) & Greg Byrnes (General Manager) will be in attendance at the meeting to provide a presentation & speak to the report.

**Attachments:**

i. Draft Statement of Intent for Te Kōhaka ā Tuhaitara Trust for the year ending 30 June 2019, with track changes (TRIM 180314027464)

ii. Te Kōhaka ā Tuhaitara Trust Business Case that incorporates the newly acquired areas in Kairaki, pines Beach and the Eastern and Western Conservation Management areas (trim 180314027468).

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Audit Committee recommends that the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No 180313026469.

(b) **Receives** the Statement of Intent for Te Kōhaka ā Tuhaitara Trust for the year ending 30 June 2019.

2.1. **Notes** that under the Local Government Act 2002, the Audit and Risk Committee may request Te Kōhaka ā Tuhaitara Trust to make changes to the Statement of Intent. Te
Kāhaka ā Tuhaitara Trust would consider these changes requested and re-present the Statement of Intent prior to the 30 June;

2.2. **Receives** the Business Case for Te Kāhaka ā Tuhaitara Trust and notes that the Council has made provision in the draft 2018-28 for an additional $120,000 per annum to the Trust to assist in its operations.

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 TKTT is a Council Controlled Organisations (CCOs) as determined under the Local Government Act (LGA), as the Council appoints 50% or more of the Trustees.

3.2 Under section 64 of the LGA, the CCO must have a Statement of Intent that complies with clauses 9 and 10 of Schedule 8, provided in section 7.2 of this report.

3.3 One of the principal objectives of a control-controlled organisation is to achieve the objectives of its shareholder Council, as specified in the Statement of Intent.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. The Trust provided the draft SOI for comment and a business case to support the Strategic direction of TKTT that encompasses the newly acquired areas in Kairaki, Pines Beach and the Eastern and Western Conservation Management areas.

4.2. The purpose of a SOI is to:

   (a) state publicly the activities and intentions of a council-controlled organisation for the year and the objectives to which those activities will contribute; and

   (b) provide an opportunity for Council, being a shareholder, to influence the direction of the organisation; and

   (c) provide a basis for the accountability of the directors to their shareholders for the performance of the organisation.

4.3. The purpose of the Business Case is to provide a strategic framework that identifies the way TKTT will meet its strategic objectives and priorities including how it is aligned and contributes to:

   - National Policies; and
   - the customs and customary practices of Ngai Tahu Whanui Values; and
   - the Waimakariri District Councils community outcomes.

4.4. Changes made to the SOI, other than date changes the draft SOI is generally unchanged except for two measures of the newly acquired areas. These inclusions are:

   - Objective 16 (reworded)
     Complete the development of The Pines and Kairaki Beaches Concept Plan and inclusion of this area into the Tuhaitara Coastal Reserves Management Plan.
   - Objective 17 (new)
     Complete the inclusion of the Pegasus Town ECMA and WCMA areas into the Tuhaitara Coastal Reserves Management Plan.

4.5. The Audit and Risk committee have the option to:

   4.5.1. Accept the SOI as presented;
   4.5.2. Request TKTT to consider amending the SOI, in which case TKKT would consider these changes and is required to under the Act to represent the SOI to Council prior to 30 June;
4.5.3. The Council could receive the Business Case and / or provide feedback on areas within the Business Case.

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

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**
Not specifically sought, however the performance measures include reporting requirements to both Ngai Tahu and the Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga.

5.2. **Wider Community**
The objectives and measures are reported within annual plans and the draft LTP to be adopted in June and are reported to within the Annual Report.

6. **IMPLIEDATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

6.2. The Council has budget provision in the 2018/19 year of Draft LTP totalling $243,390 consisting of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>2018/19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Grant, including audit fees</td>
<td>204,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directors insurance</td>
<td>5,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Fees</td>
<td>2,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease Camp</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease Forestry</td>
<td>21,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>243,390</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3. The Council also provides for the accounting, payroll and administrative services for the Trust.

6.4. **Community Implications**

6.5. The Statement of Intent provides the opportunity for Council to participate with setting direction, objectives, and the accountability measures the Trust will use to communicate its activities to Council.

6.6. **Risk Management**
n/a

6.7. **Health and Safety**
n/a

7. **CONTEXT**

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

7.2. **Legislation**
The following are some relevant extracts from Schedule 8 of the Local Government Act 2002:

1. **Purpose of statement of intent**
The purpose of a statement of intent is to—
(a) state publicly the activities and intentions of a council controlled organisation for the year and the objectives to which those activities will contribute; and
(b) provide an opportunity for shareholders to influence the direction of the organisation; and
(c) provide a basis for the accountability of the directors to their shareholders for the performance of the organisation.

2 Statements of intent for council-controlled organisations

The board of a council-controlled organisation must deliver to its shareholders a draft statement of intent on or before 1 March each year.

3 Completion of statements of intent

The board must—
(a) consider any comments on the draft statement of intent that are made to it within 2 months of 1 March by the shareholders or by any of them; and
(b) deliver the completed statement of intent to the shareholders on or before 30 June each year.

4 Modifications of statements of intent by board

The board may, by written notice, modify a statement of intent at any time if the board has first—
(a) given written notice to the shareholders of the proposed modification; and
(b) considered any comments made on the proposed modification by the shareholders or by any of them within—
(i) 1 month after the date on which the notice under paragraph (a) was given; or
(ii) any shorter period that the shareholders may agree.

5 Modifications of statements of intent by resolution of shareholders

(1) Despite any other provision of the Act or of the constitution of any council-controlled organisation, the shareholders of a council-controlled organisation may, by resolution, require the board to modify the statement of intent by including or omitting any provision or provisions of the kind referred to in clause 9(1)(a) to (i), and any board to whom notice of the resolution is given must comply with the resolution.
(2) Before giving notice of the resolution to the board, the shareholders must consult the board concerned as to the matters to be referred to in the notice.

6 Statement of intent required if exemption granted under section 7 revoked

If an exemption granted under section 7 is revoked, the council-controlled organisation must,—
(a) if there is more than 6 months remaining in the financial year, prepare a statement of intent for that financial year; or
(b) if there is not more than 6 months remaining in the financial year, prepare a statement of intent for the following financial year.

7 Obligation to make statements of intent available

A completed statement of intent and each modification that is adopted to a statement of intent must be made available to the public by the board within 1 month after the date on which it is delivered to the shareholders or adopted, as the case may be.

8 Savings of certain transactions

A failure by a council-controlled organisation to comply with any provision of this schedule or with any provision in a statement of intent does not affect the validity or enforceability of any deed, agreement, right, or obligation entered into, obtained, or incurred by that organisation.

9 Contents of statements of intent

A statement of intent must, to the extent that is appropriate given the organisational form of the council-controlled organisation, specify for the group comprising the council-
controlled organisation and its subsidiaries (if any), and in respect of the financial year immediately following the financial year in which it is required by clause 3(b) to be delivered and each of the immediately following 2 financial years, the following information:

(a) the objectives of the group; and
(b) a statement of the board’s approach to governance of the group; and
(c) the nature and scope of the activities to be undertaken by the group; and
(d) the ratio of consolidated shareholders’ funds to total assets, and the definitions of those terms; and
(e) the accounting policies of the group; and
(f) the performance targets and other measures by which the performance of the group may be judged in relation to its objectives; and
(g) an estimate of the amount or proportion of accumulated profits and capital reserves that is intended to be distributed to the shareholders; and
(h) the kind of information to be provided to the shareholders by the group during the course of those financial years, including the information to be included in each half-yearly report (and, in particular, what prospective financial information is required and how it is to be presented); and
(i) the procedures to be followed before any member or the group subscribes for, purchases, or otherwise acquires shares in any company or other organisation; and from any local authority (whether or not the local authority has agreed to provide the compensation); and
(k) the board’s estimate of the commercial value of the shareholders’ investment in the group and the manner in which, and the times at which, that value is to be reassessed; and
(l) any other matters that are agreed by the shareholders and the board.

(2) If a council-controlled organisation has undertaken to obtain or has obtained compensation from its shareholders in respect of any activity, this undertaking or the amount of compensation obtained must be recorded in—

(a) the annual report of the council-controlled organisation; and
(b) the annual report of the local authority.

(3) Any financial information, including (but not limited to) forecast financial information, must be prepared in accordance with generally accepted accounting practice.

7.3. Community Outcomes

The work of Te Kohaka o Tuhaitara Trust contributes to the outcomes that:

- Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality;
- There are wide ranging activities for enjoying the outdoors;
- Public Organisations give effect to the spirit of the Treaty of Waitangi;
- The community’s cultures, arts and heritage are conserved and celebrated;
- People have a wide ranging opportunities for learning and being informed;
- People are friendly and caring, creating a strong sense of community in our district;
- There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision-making by public organisations that affects our District.

7.4. Delegations

The Audit and Risk Committee has the jurisdiction to “review annually draft performance agreements, including Statement of Corporate Intent of the Council-controlled organisations and recommend adoption to Council” (Delegation S-DM 1022).

Jeff Millward
Manager Finance & Business Support
DRAFT STATEMENT OF INTENT
FOR THE YEAR ENDING 30 JUNE 2019

INTRODUCTION
Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust is a creation of Statute under the Ngāi Tahu (Tūtaepatu Lagoon Vesting) Act 1998, that gave effect to certain provisions of the Deed of ‘On Account Settlement’, signed on 14 June 1996 by the Crown and Te Runanga o Ngāi Tahu as representative of Ngāi Tahu, -
(a) By vesting Tūtaepatu Reserve in Te Runanga o Ngāi Tahu; and
(b) By providing for the establishment of a recreation reserve at Woodend.
Tūtaepatu Lagoon is defined in Schedule 1 of the Act; and the recreational lands are defined in schedule 2 of the Act.
The Act required the Waimakariri District Council and Te Runanga o Ngāi Tahu (The Settlors) to establish a Trust to manage and administer the reserves. By a Deed, dated 31 August 1998, the Settlors established a charitable Trust known as Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust, whereby the trustees shall be 3 appointed by the Waimakariri District Council and 3 from Te Runanga o Ngāi Tahu. The Ngāi Tahu (Tūtaepatu Lagoon Vesting) Act 1998 provides the legal mechanism for this to be achieved.
Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust is a Council Controlled Organisation (CCO) under the Local Government Act 2002, because the Council appoints half of the trustees.
Accordingly, the Trust must prepare an annual Statement of Intent and meet certain reporting requirements under the Local Government Act.
The purpose of the Statement of Intent is to specify the purpose, direction and objectives of the Trust and thereby providing an accountability mechanism for the operation of the Trust.

THE OBJECTS OF THE TRUST
The object of the Trust is to manage and administer the Reserve under the management plan prepared in accordance with the Trust Deed for so long as the Reserve is classified as a Recreation Reserve pursuant to the Reserves Act.

NATURE AND SCOPE OF ACTIVITIES
Tūhaitara Coastal Park covers approximately 575ha of land along the coastline from the Waimakariri River mouth to Waikuku Township. Stretching along the coast for 10.5 kilometres it comprises many natural features of local, regional and national importance to the people of New Zealand. As a coastal park it will provide a range of opportunities to preserve Ngāi Tahu values, retain and enhance biodiversity, and provide recreational and educational opportunities for all people.
The Minister of Conservation has appointed the Trust as a local authority for the purpose of the Reserves Act 1977.
The Trust has commenced implementation of the adopted Management Plan.
The Reserves Act does not apply to the Tūtaepatu Lagoon, although the Tūhaitara Coastal Park and Waikuku Beach Reserves Management Plan does. Part B Waikuku Beach Reserve, which is administered by the Waimakariri District Council, is a separate Reserve but is also subject to the Reserve Management Plan as the land is contiguous.

GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS

The Trust’s policies and objectives are detailed in the Tūhaitara Coastal Reserve Management Plan. The Statement of Intent is the Trust’s annual work programme aimed at meeting the vision To create a coastal reserve which is founded on and expresses strong ecological, conservation and cultural values and provides opportunity for compatible recreation and education activities for all people of New Zealand and to uphold the mana of Ngai Tahu Whanui by protecting and enhancing the mahinga kai values of Tūtaepatu lagoon.

The Trust is required to meet at least twice per year to provide governance over the Trust’s activities, and copies of minutes are distributed to the Settlors. The Trust meets monthly to ensure that the expectations required by the management plan are realised.

All staff, volunteer and contractors working in the Tūhaitara Coastal Park are required to comply with the Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust Coastal Park Health and Safety Plan.
OBJECTIVES & PERFORMANCE TARGETS 2017 -2018

All of the listed performance targets will be prioritised and evaluated with consideration to the success in obtaining external funding and the needs of our adjoining communities.

The Trust will:
1. Manage and administer the Reserve in accordance with the approved Reserve Management Plan.
2. Ensure all reporting mechanisms to the Settlors are timely and within their statutory timeframes.
3. Ensure that the health and safety and employment conditions of Trust staff, contractors, and visitors meet relevant legislation.
4. Ensure concessions for events and other activities on Trust land will have Health and Safety Plans and Public Liability Insurance. (Note: Concessions are not just for events, but can be for ice cream vehicles, coffee vehicles, and research activities; they are a mechanism to control all activities.)
5. Ensure that lease agreements are compatible with the Reserve Management Plan and finalised where necessary to maximise the revenue potential for the Trust.
6. Promote the cultural significance and history of the land, and ensure this is reflected in new programmes.
7. Maximise the opportunities for additional partnerships and sustainable funding to continue with the rehabilitation of Tūhaitara Coastal Park.
8. Develop two performing biota nodes to progress the long-term goal of indigenous coastal forest along the length of the Tūhaitara Park.
9. Continue the rehabilitation of Tūtaepatu Lagoon.
10. Continue the rehabilitation of The Pines wetland.
11. Ensure that access and maintenance programmes are in line with strategic plans and priorities and that they are appropriately resourced.
12. Ensure all work programmes and maintenance activities are consistent with the Park’s cultural, biodiversity, ecological, and recreation values.
13. Provide and maintain a minimum 15 kilometres of walking, cycling, and bridle trails within the park for recreational purposes.
14. Establish an animal pest control programme at the Pegasus Town WCMA.
15. Implement Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Education Strategy
16. Complete the development of The Pines and Kairaki Beaches Concept Plan and inclusion of this area into the Tuhaitara Coastal Reserves Management Plan.
17. Complete the inclusion of the Pegasus Town ECMA and WCMA areas into the Tuhaitara Coastal Reserves Management Plan.
INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED TO THE SETTLORS

The Trust shall present:

- A six monthly report on the Trust’s activities shall be provided, in accordance with the Local Government Act 2002, on the financial performance and position and its progress towards the Performance Targets and other Measures contained in the Statement of Intent.
- An Annual Report shall be prepared in accordance with the Local Government Act 2002, and the reporting requirements prescribed from time to time by the Settlors.
- Copies of the minutes of meetings.
- The MOU between the Trust and the WDC sets out the partnership and requirements
- Ngāi Tahu have informed the Trust that it should report directly to Ngāi Tūahuriri Runanga which will be done quarterly

OTHER REQUIREMENTS

Ratio of Trustee Funds to Total Assets
The ratio of Trust Funds to Total Assets shall be maintained at a minimum of least 90%.

Trust Funds means the retained earnings of the trust as at balance date.

Total Assets means all current and non-current assets of the Trust as at balance date.

Profits and Financial Reserves to be Distributed
The Trust will not distribute any profits or financial reserves during the financial year.

Interests in Other Organisations
The Trust will not purchase or accept an ownership interest in any other organisation, without the prior approval of the Settlors.

Commercial Value of the Trust
The Trustees’ estimate of the value of the Trust is the level of retained earnings shown in the latest audited financial statements. The Trustees will consider the Trust’s value annually as part of the preparation of the Annual Report.

Activities the Trust is Seeking Compensation from the Council
The Council provides administrative support and financial management for the Trust and compensates the three Council appointed trustees with meeting allowances.

From time to time the Trust may request the Council to assist the Trust by contributing to various projects on the Trust land. Other than in these circumstances, there are no activities that the Trust is seeking compensation from the Council, other than for any land leased to the Council, which will be on normal commercial terms and conditions.

Accounting Policies
Refer to Appendix 1
Appendix 1

STATEMENT OF ACCOUNTING POLICIES

REPORTING ENTITY AND STATUTORY BASE

Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust is a Trust established to manage and administer the Recreation Reserve contained in the deed of interest of Ngāi Tahu Whānau and other New Zealanders in terms of the Reserves Act 1977.

The financial statements will be prepared in accordance with New Zealand Generally Accepted Accounting Practice.

MEASUREMENT SYSTEM

The accounting principles recognised as appropriate for the measurement and reporting of financial performance and financial position on a historical cost basis are followed by the Trust.

ACCOUNTING POLICIES

The following specific accounting policies that materially affect the measurement of financial performance and financial position are applied:

(a) Fixed Assets

Fixed assets are recorded at valuation deemed appropriate at the time of transfer, by Quotable Value New Zealand. Valuation was based on a fair market value. Depreciation is recognised in the Statement of Financial Performance on a straight line basis over the estimated life of each part of an item of property, plant and equipment. The estimated useful life for the current and comparative periods are as follows:

- Property, plant and equipment 3-40 years.

(b) Goods and Services Tax (GST)

The Trust is registered for GST. The financial statements are prepared exclusive of GST, with the exception of receivables and payables, whose invoices include GST.

(c) Receivables

Receivables are stated at expected realisable value, after a provision (if any) for doubtful balances.

(d) Differential Reporting

The Trust qualifies for Differential Reporting. Full advantage will be taken of all differential reporting exemptions.

CHANGES IN ACCOUNTING POLICIES

There have been no changes in accounting policies.

The Trust changed in June 2015 to report under Public Benefit SFR-A basis replacing New Zealand equivalents to International Financing Reporting Standards (NZIFRS) and differential reporting.
Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust:

Business Case

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prepared by:</th>
<th>Courageous Solutions Limited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepared for:</td>
<td>Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>7 March 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Version:</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
<td>Adopted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To be read in conjunction with:

- Tūhaitara Coastal Reserve and Waikuku Beach Reserves Management Plan: September 2005
- Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust Strategic Plan 2015 - 2025
- Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust Annual Report to 30 June 2017
Disclaimer:

This disclaimer governs the use of this report. By using this report, you accept this disclaimer in full. You must not rely on the information in the report as an alternative to legal or financial advice from an appropriately qualified professional. If you have any specific questions about any matter you should consult an appropriately qualified professional.

Without prejudice to the generality of the foregoing paragraph, we do not represent, warrant, undertake or guarantee that the use of guidance in the report will lead to any particular outcome or result. We will not be liable to you in respect of any business losses, including without limitation loss of or damage to profits, income, revenue, use, production, anticipated savings, business, contracts, commercial opportunities or goodwill.

No liability is accepted on any grounds whatsoever to any party in respect of any errors or omissions, or any action or omission to act taken as a result of the information contained within this report. This report is prepared based on the information supplied by Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust.
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## Business details

<table>
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<tr>
<th><strong>Business name</strong></th>
<th>Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust</th>
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<tbody>
<tr>
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<td>Tūhaitara Coastal Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Charitable Trust; Council Controlled Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date on Charities register</strong></td>
<td>13/07/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Registration number</strong></td>
<td>CC44619</td>
</tr>
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### Contact details

<table>
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<tr>
<th><strong>Contact name</strong></th>
<th>Greg Byrnes</th>
</tr>
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<td><strong>Landline</strong></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mobile</strong></td>
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<tr>
<td><strong>Email</strong></td>
<td><a href="mailto:tkot@farmside.co.nz">tkot@farmside.co.nz</a></td>
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<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WOODEND BEACH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Postal address</strong></td>
<td>C/- K FRIEDAUER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private Bag 1005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RANGIORA 7440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Online/social media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Website</strong></th>
<th><a href="http://www.tuhitarapark.org.nz">www.tuhitarapark.org.nz</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facebook</strong></td>
<td>Friends of Tūhaitara Coastal Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://www.facebook.com/search/top/?q=friends%20of%20t%C5%ABhaitara%20coastal%20park">https://www.facebook.com/search/top/?q=friends%20of%20t%C5%ABhaitara%20coastal%20park</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tēnei mātou ngā tangata o te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara

*This is us the people of the nest of Tūhaitara*

E mihi nui te aroha ki a koutou katoa

*Greetings/acknowledgement of great love to you all*

Mauri ora, mauri tū

*Living essence, standing essence*

Wai ora me Te Wairua Tapu

*Living water and the Holy Spirit*
Executive Summary

Introduction

The purpose of this business case is to document the way the Trust will achieve its strategic objectives and seek approval to pursue the preferred way forward.

Strategic Case

The success of the current rehabilitation and education programmes at the Tūhaitara Coastal Park (the Park), along with awarding of the regeneration areas in Kairaki and The Pines Beach, and the inclusion of the Eastern Conservation Management Area (ECMA) and Western Conservation Management Area (WCMA) into Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust lands are increasing the activities of the Trust such that the current organisational structure is not able to accommodate the increased workload. Even though the Trust is only in the initial stages of this expansion, this increased workload is already visible with the increased usage of the Tūhaitara Coastal Park for educational and recreational areas.

The activities of Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust align with a range of national, regional and district strategies:

**Contribution to national policies**

- Coastal enhancement and protection, with the Trust being acknowledged nationally as a leader in coastal environmental rehabilitation
- Conservation efforts including protection and restoration of waterways, improving water quality and carbon sequestration
- A strong bicultural focus, which underpins all the Trust’s activities

**Contribution to Waimakariri District Council (WDC) community outcomes**

- Public effect is given to the spirit of the Treaty of Waitangi.
- The air and land [is] healthy.
- There are areas of significant indigenous vegetation and habitats for indigenous fauna.
- The community’s cultures, arts and heritage are conserved and celebrated.
- Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality.
- There is sufficient clean water to meet the needs of communities and eco systems.
- People have wide ranging opportunities for learning and being informed.
- People are friendly and caring, creating a strong sense of community in our District.

**Alignment with the Trust’s strategic objectives and priorities**

This business case aligns with the Trust’s current strategic objectives and priorities (TKOT, 2015, p13):

- **Interpretation**: Ensuring our communications and language enables the park stories to be told.
- **Ngāi Tahu Whanui Values**: Maintaining the many customs and customary practices of Ngāi Tahu whanui and acknowledgement of whakapapa of whenua and resources.
- **Effective Reserve Management**: Achieving the directives of the Trust Deed by providing functional governance for effective management.
Commercial: in Confidence

**Natural & Cultural Values**: The on-going rehabilitation of the environment providing the opportunity to utilise natural resources for cultural values.

**Education**: Continuing to engage with others to provide a multi-faceted approach to learning

**Recreation**: Encouraging recreation that is compatible, appropriate and sympathetic to the values and vision of Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust.

**Community**: Encouraging the community to develop a sense of place and foster a living environment.

**Economic Case**

A range of options were considered as possible ways forward.

- Option 1: Retaining the status quo option (retained as a baseline comparator)
- Option 2: Minimal development
- Option 3: Realistic development (the preferred way forward)
- Option 4: Aspirational development

This report evaluates the preferred way forward.

**Commercial Case (preferred way forward)**

The initial assessment is that it will not be difficult to find appropriate people for the additional roles, and the additional equipment is relatively easy to source. It may, however, take longer to up-scale the facilities and premises.

The aim is to match employment agreements and contracts to the term of the funding provided. The preference is for funding to be “permanent” so the additional staffing can be employees with permanent contracts, rather than contractors or fixed term employees.

**Financial Case (preferred way forward)**

A comprehensive review of the financial commitments needed is included within the report. It is proposed that the additional funding required is sought from the settlors and other funders as identified.
Management Case

The General Manager is supervising the project, providing advice and information as required, and will be responsible for implementation of the expansion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed key milestones</th>
<th>Estimated timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project plan and contract</td>
<td>18 October 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collation of background information and concept draft</td>
<td>30 November 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First draft of business plan</td>
<td>31 January 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second draft of business plan, including attachments:</td>
<td>28 February 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Organisation structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Board skills matrix</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Risk classifications and matrix</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Education strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Environmental restoration strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final report</td>
<td>30 March 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next Steps

This business case seeks approval from the Trust to confirm the financial commitments and implement the preferred way forward.
Introduction

Due to the success of the Trust’s existing environmental education and rehabilitation programmes, it has reached capacity with current resources. Additionally, the inclusion of the regeneration areas in Kairaki and The Pines Beach, as well as the inclusion of the approximately 120 hectares of Eastern and Western Conservation Management Areas (ECMA, WCMA) at Pegasus Town into Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust lands are increasing the activities of the Trust such that the current organisational structure is not able to accommodate the increased workload. Even though the Trust is only in the initial stages of this expansion, this increased workload is already visible with the increased usage of the Tūhaitara Coastal Park for educational and recreational areas. Further pressure is being put on the Trust to meet the expectations of its communities and partners.

Planning to meet these increased needs led to the Trust to exploring possible structures and funding options through a comprehensive business plan, so they can be implemented through a sound, sustainable structure.

The purpose of this business case is to document the way the Trust will achieve its strategic objectives and seek approval to pursue the preferred way forward.

The business case process is organised around a five-case structure designed to systematically ascertain that the proposal:

- is supported by a compelling case for change - the 'strategic case’
- optimises value for money - the ‘economic case’
- is commercially viable - the ‘commercial case’
- is financially affordable - the ‘financial case’, and
- is achievable - the ‘management case’.
Strategic Case – Making the Case for Change

Strategic Context

Organisational overview

The key aims of the Trust are to:

- create a coastal reserve which is founded on and expresses strong ecological, conservation and cultural values
- provide opportunity for compatible recreation and education activities for all people of New Zealand
- uphold the mana of Ngāi Tahu whānui by protecting and enhancing the mahinga kai values of Tūtaepatu Lagoon.

The Tūhaitara Coastal Park was established as an outcome of the Ngāi Tahi settlement with the Crown. The lands were gifted to the people of New Zealand and are managed by the Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust. The Trust is run by six trustees; three appointed by Te Runanga o Ngāi Tahu and three by Waimakariri District Council. The Trust employs a full-time General Manager and a part-time Secretary, and has annual expenditure of $220,000 (TKoT, 2017).

Tūhaitara Coastal Park covers approximately 700ha of land along 10.5 kilometres of coastline between the Waimakariri River mouth and the township of Waikuku. The Park comprises many natural features of local, regional and national importance to the people of New Zealand. These include the Tūtaepatu Lagoon, Taranaki Stream and Saltwater Creek freshwater coastal system, and The Pines Wetland. The Park provides a range of opportunities to preserve Ngāi Tahu values, retain and enhance rare indigenous biodiversity, and provide recreational and educational opportunities for all people.

The Trust operates in a range of sectors including environment and conservation, education, training and research, community development and social services, sport and recreation, and promotion of volunteering. The recreation opportunities are diverse and unique, from walking, cycling and bridle trails, to formal picnic and event settings, through to semi wilderness natural sites, all with easy access to some of the most pristine beaches of the Northern Pegasus Bay.

The core activities of the Trust include:

- Management of Tūhaitara Coastal Park
- Environmental rehabilitation, provision of environmental education, protection and enhancement of mahinga kai, restoration and protection of waterways
- Preservation and protection of cultural sites
- Visitor services, provision of walking, cycling and bridle trails and infrastructure
- Ranger and enforcement activities.
Charitable Purpose

The purpose of the Trust is to manage and administer the Tūhaitara Coastal Reserve, classified as a recreation reserve pursuant to the Reserves Act 1977. The Trust operates in a range of sectors including environment and conservation, education, training and research, community development and social services, sport and recreation, and promotion of volunteering. The beneficiaries are the general public (Charities Service, n.d.).
Analysis of the operating environment

Key factors impacting the current and expected operating environments include:

- A range of activities have increased the workload considerably, including:
  - The increasing numbers of schools and other organisations developing and maintaining biota nodes
  - Managing and supporting the volunteer network
  - Increased research and education from tertiary providers, locally and internationally
  - Demand for more information about the part and the stories that need to be told through interpretation
  - The increased recreational usage in the Park over the last year, most noticeably following the Port Hills fires
  - Increased amounts of land being regenerated into native plantings
  - Bringing the ECMA and WCMA in the Pegasus Town area into the Trust
  - Planning for the transfer of the Kairaki and The Pines Beach Regeneration areas into the Trust.

- There is increasing awareness and support for environmental restoration, particularly for wetlands and water ways, locally, nationally and internationally.

- There is an increasing awareness of the cultural significance of the area and a desire to acknowledge that significance by fostering bi-cultural cooperation, locally, nationally and internationally.

- The Waimakariri District is in a period of growth, as outlined through the Waimakariri 2048 District Development Strategy (WDC, 2017b). This is resulting in increased use by the Park of local people as well as also increased tourism generating the need to improved infrastructure.

- The Trust needs to become financially sustainable. This is difficult while it remains dependent on one-off and intermittent resourcing.
Alignment to existing strategies

The activities of Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust align with a range of national and regional strategies.

Contribution to national policies

The activities of the Trust align with a number of government initiatives including:

- Coastal enhancement and protection, with the Trust being acknowledged nationally as a leader in coastal environmental rehabilitation
- Conservation efforts including protection and restoration of waterways, improving water quality and carbon sequestration
- A strong bicultural focus, which underpins all the Trust’s activities

Contribution to WDC community outcomes

The activities of the Trust contribute to a number of the community outcomes identified by the Waimakariri District Council in its Annual Plan (WDC, 2017, p12) including:

- Public effect is given to the spirit of the Treaty of Waitangi.
- The air and land [is] healthy.
- There are areas of significant indigenous vegetation and habitats for indigenous fauna.
- The community’s cultures, arts and heritage are conserved and celebrated.
- Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality.
- There is sufficient clean water to meet the needs of communities and eco systems.
- People have wide ranging opportunities for learning and being informed.
- People are friendly and caring, creating a strong sense of community in our District.

Alignment with the Trust’s strategic objectives and priorities

This business case aligns with the Trust’s current strategic objectives and priorities (TKOT, 2015, p13):

Interpretation: Ensuring our communications and language enables the park stories to be told.

Ngāi Tahu Whanui Values: Maintaining the many customs and customary practices of Ngāi Tahu whanui and acknowledgement of whakapapa of whenua and resources.

Effective Reserve Management: Achieving the directives of the Trust Deed by providing functional governance for effective management.

Natural & Cultural Values: The on-going rehabilitation of the environment providing the opportunity to utilise natural resources for cultural values.

Education: Continuing to engage with others to provide a multi-faceted approach to learning

Recreation: Encouraging recreation that is compatible, appropriate and sympathetic to the values and vision of Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust.

Community: Encouraging the community to develop a sense of place and foster a living environment.
Investment Objectives, Existing Arrangements and Business Needs

Investment Objectives

The objectives are outlined in the Trust’s Action Plan in the Strategic Plan 2015 – 2025 (TKOT, 2015, pp.18-19). They are identified in seven areas …

- Business development
- Culture
- Habitat protection
- Environmental rehabilitation
- Coastal protection
- Education
- Recreation

...across three time-periods (2015, 2020, 2025).

These are further refined and articulated on an annual basis through the Statement of Intent with Waimakariri District Council.

There is an increasing focus within the community for integrated bio-systems that generate healthy water. In addition, the Trust is seeking to become financially independent through the development of income streams that support its operations.

Existing Arrangements and Business Needs

The Trust has met and exceeded the objectives due to date, as outlined in the latest Annual Report (TKOT, 2017). However, it will not be possible to meet the objectives for 2020 and 2025 without considerable additional investment and increasing the personnel capacity of the Trust – the focus of this business case.

Financial sources

The Trust generates income to support the maintenance of the Park and facilitation of its current education programmes. However, it is reliant upon sourcing external funding to support the rehabilitation of the Park. This includes leases, for example, for forestry, camping grounds and farm lands.

The Trust has been fortunate to receive an annual grant from WDC as a Settlor partner. Additionally, it has been supported for specific projects by Te Runanga o Ngāi Tahu, the CWMS Waimakariri Zone Committee, Vodafone Foundation, the World Wildlife Fund for Nature, Walking Access NZ, Te Ngāi Tuahuriri Runanga, Landcare Research, Environment Canterbury and the Department of Conservation.
Economic Case – Exploring the Preferred Way Forward

The purpose of the economic case is to identify the investment option that optimises value for money, by:

- identifying critical success factors
- considering unique constraints
- undertaking an initial options assessment to identify a limited number of short-listed options, and
- identifying a preferred way forward based on the short-listed options.

Critical Success Factors

The following are critical success factors for Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generic Critical Success Factors</th>
<th>Broad Description</th>
<th>Proposal-Specific Critical Success Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic fit and business needs</td>
<td>Meeting the agreed investment objectives, related business needs and service requirements, and integrates with other strategies, programmes and projects.</td>
<td>The Trust will expand in all key areas of environmental restoration, cultural enhancement, education, interpretation and recreation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential value for money</td>
<td>Optimising value for money through the mix of potential benefits, costs and risks.</td>
<td>The activities of the Trust contribute to the national and regional strategies, in an affordable manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer and supplier capacity and capability</td>
<td>The ability of potential volunteers and suppliers to deliver the required services, in a sustainable arrangement.</td>
<td>Roles and responsibilities of volunteers are expanded and documented through position descriptions and the pool of volunteers is expanded and well-managed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential affordability</td>
<td>Likely available funding.</td>
<td>The Trust is starting to generate its own income, so it is not 100% dependent on external funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential achievability</td>
<td>The Trust’s ability to respond to the changes required, and match the level of available skills required for successful delivery.</td>
<td>Appropriate people are employed. Additional capital items, particularly working spaces, are obtained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community acceptance</td>
<td>Acceptance by the community (“customers”) that the option will add value, in excess of its cost.</td>
<td>Positive community response. Increased regional and national focus and profile.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Constraints

There are some constraints that are unique to the nature of the work of the Trust, and its structure:

- There is urgency to restore and maintain dune systems for protection against coastal inundation.
- The dependence on volunteers can provide challenges around finding appropriate people who are willing to give their time freely and remain with an activity on a long-term basis.
- Financial resources are dependent on being successful with funding applications and receiving charitable donations. This can result in variable funding streams which make it difficult to maintain activities in a consistent and sustainable manner.

Options Assessment

A range of options were considered as possible ways forward.

- Option 1: Retaining the status quo option (retained as a baseline comparator)
- Option 2: Minimal development
- Option 3: Realistic development (the preferred way forward)
- Option 4: Aspirational development

This report evaluates Option 3: the preferred way forward. The remaining options are outlined in Appendix A.

Option 3: Realistic development: Preferred Way Forward

Description

This option would expand the organisational structure of one full-time General Manager and part-time secretarial assistance to include an educational/visitor services person, an environmental/operational services person and a part-time funding/sponsorship/partnership development person (see Figure 2 below). The use of volunteers would continue as this meets a number of the aims of the Trust in engaging with its community and extending the intergenerational interest in the Park.

The Trust will also need to increase its assets and expand the size of the physical base of operations. In conjunction with a third party, additional premises would be explored to accommodate teaching and research facilities. These would also provide room for its offices. Improved workshop and garaging facilities would also be explored.

Advantages

The main advantages are:

- This would allow the Trust to meet the demands from the increased land area and use of the Park.
- It furthers the strategic plans of the Trust and contributes to the national policies and WDC community outcomes.
Disadvantages

The main disadvantages are:

- Additional sustainable permanent funding is required to meet increased salary and operational costs
- Capital outlay is required to establish premises and resources required.

Conclusion

This is the most desired option in the medium to long-term.

Organisational Structure

To achieve this, the Trust would develop an organisational structure similar to Figure 2, with the Trustees and General Manager at the core of the organisation, and each area overlapping. For example, there are the educational services assisting with operational aspects of environmental rehabilitation, and vice versa.

Figure 2: Proposed organisational structure
Commercial: in Confidence

**Trustees**
- The skills required by trustees to govern this expanded organisation are identified in Appendix B.

**General Manager**
Lead the following work
- Lead and develop external and internal stakeholder relationships
- Promotional work and advocacy
- Education and interpretation
- Innovation and new initiatives, including integration of new areas into the Park
- Lead regeneration activities towards the 200-year vision
- Promoting and overseeing research

**Education/Visitor services**
- Outward focus, linked to education, recreation, external "customer" stakeholders
  - Responsible for:
    - Managing interactions with schools and University of Canterbury
    - Working with schools to develop appropriate learning activities
    - Preparation and delivery of lesson plans
    - Event bookings; liaising with Park users
    - Initiating and planning events
    - Managing volunteers

**Environmental/Operational services**
- Operational focus:
  - Field operations within the Park, e.g. planting and maintenance of the environment
  - Understand the rehabilitation of the land
  - Competent with managing contractors etc
  - Responsible for:
    - Field operations work within the Park, e.g. planting and maintenance of the environment
    - Keeping trails clear

**Administration**

**Secretarial**
- Manage secretarial assistance provided by WDC to the Trust, General Manager and staff
- Provide additional secretarial assistance required due to the expanded size of the organisation

**Funding**
- Seek external funding sources and prepare and lodge funding applications
- Develop and maintain stakeholder relationships, particularly with funders and potential funders
- Liaising with professional fundraisers
Activities
In addition to the current activities within the Park, the range of activities will expand to include:

- Full management of the camping grounds at Woodend Beach and Kairaki, rather than leasing them to third parties. This would provide ongoing income for the Trust and provide additional buildings that could be adapted for the multi-purpose needs of the Park. There will be requirements for initial capital costs and ongoing operational costs.

- Establish shops, cafes and other retail outlets throughout the Park, at access points where there are currently no retail outlets. These could be provided in conjunction with the camping grounds in some areas.

- Begin a programme of intensive coastal protection planting the length of the Park (Waikuku to Kairaki) to mitigate the effects of events such as storm surges, global warming and climate change and provide improved habitats for flora and fauna. This will provide additional protection to the settlements of Kaiapoi, The Pine Beach, Kairaki and Waikuku.

Strategies have been prepared for each of the following key areas:

- Environmental Restoration (Appendix C)
- Education (Appendix D)
- Recreation (Appendix E)

Assumptions
The assumptions made in determining the initial estimate are outlined in Appendix F.

Estimated costs
Non-funded depreciation, capital charges, interest and other financing costs are excluded from the analysis.

Taxation
All dollar figures are expressed in GST exclusive terms (where applicable).

Estimating monetary benefits
Where possible monetary benefits have been estimated. These do not include potential returns and costs from activities such as operation of cafes and other retail outlets, and direct management of the currently leased areas such as camping grounds.

Non-monetary Benefits and Costs
Some benefits could not be reliably quantified in monetary terms. These include the Trust's contribution to national policies and WDC community outcomes, as well as the general increase in community health and wellbeing due to increased connection with the natural environment, as outlined in the earlier strategic case section.
Risk and Uncertainty

Risk appetite

The Trust has a low risk appetite. It has a responsibility to maintain and develop its assets, ensuring that their long-term security is not compromised.

Risk identification and measurement

Ten key risks for the Trust that might create, enhance, prevent, degrade, accelerate or delay the achievement of the objectives are plotted on this matrix (Figure 3) and listed below. The criteria are outlined in Appendix G.

![Figure 3: Risk matrix](image)

**Key:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Severity</th>
<th>Control Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>Controls are strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Controls being implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Controls are inadequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Control status unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Risk assessment and risk management strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Consequence (H/M/L)</th>
<th>Likelihood (H/M/L)</th>
<th>Comments and Risk Management Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Natural adverse events, e.g. earthquake, storms</td>
<td>Extreme</td>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>There is no practical mitigation. However, the Trust has response plans for such an event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Environmental problems, e.g. biological</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>Some of these could be extreme and increases in likelihood as more land is rehabilitated. They are well mitigated against.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Water quality</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>Water quality on Trust land is dependent on the events occurring upstream. It is also a large land area with easy public access which makes it possible for illegal activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Coastal erosion and sea level rise</td>
<td>Extreme</td>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>Rare because happening over a long-time period. Consequences are extreme but the Trust is attempting to mitigate that by robust coastal protection measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Health &amp; Safety risks, e.g. personal injury</td>
<td>Insignificant to moderate</td>
<td>Almost certain</td>
<td>Mitigated by Health and Safety plans, risk identification for Park users, events, staff and contractors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significant to extreme</td>
<td>Rare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Funding loss</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>Mitigated by extending the range of funders, volunteer network, high-quality service delivery, key outcomes for national and local government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Vandalism, e.g. fire, dumping, inappropriate use of trails</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Almost certain</td>
<td>This occurs frequently and is mitigated by education and enforcement. With more legitimate recreational visitors, more people will be around to observe and discourage this activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Reputational risk, e.g. being unable to meet the expectations of its communities</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>Open transparent organisation that fronts-up to issues and connects with its community and stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Management and succession planning</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>Mitigated by processes and increasing staffing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Governance breakdown</td>
<td>Extreme</td>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>Mitigated by developing excellent relationships with settlor partners and other stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Commercial Case

Strategy for accessing the required additional funding, equipment and staffing

The preferred supply position and approach to the supply market is to:

- develop detailed position descriptions and advertise for appropriate staff
- prepare a detailed list of additional equipment and resources required, sourcing these from the most cost-effective suppliers, while being conscious of quality and “fit” with current equipment
- identify and document the additional facilities, work spaces, vehicles etc required, sourcing these from the most cost-effective suppliers, while being conscious of quality and “fit” with current equipment

The initial assessment is that it will not be difficult to find appropriate people for the additional roles, and the additional equipment is relatively easy to source. It may, however, take longer to up-scale the facilities and premises.

The type of volunteer roles and number of volunteers are both increasing. As a result, it is intended that the volunteer roles will be more clearly defined, with position descriptions being prepared for all roles. This standardisation will increase the clarity of these roles for the volunteers. In addition, it will enable the number and variety of these roles to be scaled up, while still being managed effectively.

Required services

The required goods and/or services in relation to the preferred way forward are:

- Additional staffing
- Office/working space/shed for equipment/ tools/ teaching room
- Equipment

Contract provisions

The aim is to match employment agreements and contracts to the term of the funding provided. The preference is for funding to be “permanent” so the additional staffing can be employees with permanent contracts, rather than contractors or fixed term employees.
Financial Case - Affordability and Funding Requirements

This part of the financial case provides assurance that the preferred way forward is affordable to the Trust, taking into account potential funding sources.

Indicative costs and benefits

Based on current estimates, the anticipated cash flows for the expanded operation are set out in the table below. The assumptions are included in Appendix F: Financial Assumptions.

Funding sources

It is proposed that the additional funding required is sought from Waimakariri District Council, Te Runanga o Ngāi Tahu, and other funders as identified during the next stage. External funding for specific projects will be targeted to relevant organisations, for example, Trees That Count are currently funding 2,000 podocarps per year for five years; the Corrections Department assist with planting and maintenance of trees.

To date, Waimakariri District Council have indicated they will include an additional $150,000 per annum into their Long-Term Plan.
# Preferred Way Forward: Operating Forecast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
<th>2028</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interest</strong></td>
<td>2,520</td>
<td>2,520</td>
<td>2,520</td>
<td>2,520</td>
<td>2,520</td>
<td>2,520</td>
<td>2,520</td>
<td>2,520</td>
<td>2,520</td>
<td>2,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td>413,833</td>
<td>413,833</td>
<td>413,833</td>
<td>413,833</td>
<td>413,833</td>
<td>413,833</td>
<td>413,833</td>
<td>413,833</td>
<td>413,833</td>
<td>413,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment/operations</strong></td>
<td>194,250</td>
<td>199,250</td>
<td>229,250</td>
<td>234,250</td>
<td>254,750</td>
<td>254,750</td>
<td>254,750</td>
<td>254,750</td>
<td>254,750</td>
<td>254,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental works</strong></td>
<td>222,000</td>
<td>151,000</td>
<td>151,000</td>
<td>151,000</td>
<td>151,000</td>
<td>151,000</td>
<td>151,000</td>
<td>151,000</td>
<td>151,000</td>
<td>151,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vehicle</strong></td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>16,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funded depreciation</strong></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marketing, promotions</strong></td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>7,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office</strong></td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sundry</strong></td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trustee</strong></td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td>474,050</td>
<td>408,050</td>
<td>438,050</td>
<td>443,050</td>
<td>463,550</td>
<td>463,550</td>
<td>463,550</td>
<td>463,550</td>
<td>463,550</td>
<td>463,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surplus/(Deficit)</strong></td>
<td>(60,217)</td>
<td>5,783</td>
<td>(24,217)</td>
<td>(29,217)</td>
<td>(49,717)</td>
<td>(49,717)</td>
<td>(49,717)</td>
<td>(49,717)</td>
<td>(49,717)</td>
<td>(49,717)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Management Case: Planning for Successful Delivery

The General Manager is supervising the project and will be responsible for implementation.

Project milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed key milestones</th>
<th>Estimated timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project plan and contract</td>
<td>18 October 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collation of background information and concept draft</td>
<td>30 November 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First draft of business plan</td>
<td>31 January 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second draft of business plan, including attachments:</td>
<td>28 February 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organisation structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Board skills matrix</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Risk classifications and matrix</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Education strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Environmental restoration strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final report</td>
<td>30 March 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due to requirements from potential funders, it is intended to bring the final report date earlier than the 30 March 2018.

Next Steps

This business case seeks approval from the Trust to confirm the financial commitments and implement the preferred way forward.
Appendix A: Options considered

Option 1: The status quo option

Description
This option will retain the current organisational structure of one full-time General Manager, part-time secretarial assistance and ad hoc contracted assistance

Advantages
The main advantages are:

- this is a familiar way of operating.
- short-term, this is a low-cost option, with limited increase in funding levels required.

Disadvantages
The main disadvantages are:

- the education programme will stall
- the capacity to maintain the standard of the Park is at risk, with a risk of failing to deliver planned services
- there is very slow improvement in quality of the environment
- the outcomes of stakeholders such as WDC are at risk
- there is increased dependence on volunteer services
- funding is uncertain and dependent on winning grants, resulting in a variable level of service to the community.

Conclusion
This option is not viable in the medium to long-term.

Option 2: Minimal development

Description
This option would retain the current organisational structure of one full-time General Manager and part-time secretarial assistance. It would add more permanent contracted assistance for either educational/visitor services or environmental/operational services.

Advantages
The main advantages are:

- this is a familiar way of operating.
- short-term, this is a low-cost option, with limited increase in funding levels required.
- it relieves some of the pressure off the General Manager
Disadvantages

The main disadvantages are:

- either the education programme will stall, or the capacity to maintain the standard of the Park is at risk, depending on which branch of activity receives the more permanent contracted assistance. Either has the risk of failing to deliver planned services
- there is very slow improvement in quality of the environment
- the outcomes of stakeholders such as WDC are at risk
- there is continuing dependence on volunteer services
- funding is uncertain and dependent on winning grants, resulting in a variable level of service to the community.

Conclusion

This option is not viable in the medium to long-term.

Option 4: Aspirational development

Description

In addition to option 3, this option allows for the employment of additional people in the educational/visitor services (e.g. full-time interpretation) and/or the environmental/operational services (e.g. Park rangers/operational staff) teams.

Advantages

The main advantages are:

- Accelerates the development within the Park
- Cater for much wider groups of users
- Accelerates the provision of education and interpretative services
- Rapid improvement of the natural environment, quality of water, aquatic life, soil, plants, birds, reptiles and insect life.
- Reach the 200-year vision earlier

Disadvantages

The main disadvantages are:

- Larger amount of sustainable funding required.

Conclusion

This option is not being pursued at this stage but is the right direction to aim for.
Appendix B: On-going Board Skills required

The following is an outline of key skills required by Trustees. These will be developed into a skills matrix to assist the on-going development of the Trust.

Competencies required include:

Strategic and governance leadership, including

- Strategic thinking
- Understands the “political” context for the settlors, as well as the national political context
- Contributes to the formation, direction, implementation and oversight of the organisation’s culture based on the vision and strategy
- Understands and has affinity with environmental restoration and the natural environment
- Is bi-culturally competent and embraces co-operation

Decision making based on comprehensive information, including

- Applies critical thinking to analyse and evaluate information
- Applies criteria to decisions and understands the consequences of them
- Can use key performance indicators as part of the decision-making process

Business acumen, including

- Applies business and commercial knowledge to influence business growth and achievement of objectives.
- Focuses on results, monitoring and evaluating strategic performance to achieve outcomes
- Understands the business drivers of the organisation and maintains industry specific knowledge.
- Identifies, assesses and manages risks

Communication skills, including

- Engages with fellow Trustees, management and stakeholders to establish and maintain effective relationships
- Is able to communication effectively, verbally and non-verbally
- Uses relevant communication channels, adhering to associated policies and protocols.

It is also essential that Trustees have appropriate behavioural attributes that foster co-operative, cohesive governance.
Appendix C: Environmental restoration strategy

Background

Tūhaitara Coastal Park is made up of a number of ecosystems including the fore and back dunes, exotic plantation and coastal protection plantings and the coastal freshwater network made up of a series of wetlands, a lagoon and streams which run parallel to the sea and connect the Waimakariri and Ashley-Rakahuri Braided Rivers.

The Trust has a 200-year plan to rehabilitate the lands to an indigenous coastal ecosystem supporting a diverse range of native flora and fauna species and providing sustainable mahinga kai. There are numerous projects underway or in the planning stages involving environmental rehabilitation, trail development, dune restoration, forestry, education and research.

Currently, its keystone projects include the establishment of a biota node network and the rehabilitation of Tūtaepatu Lagoon and The Pines Beach Wetland. In addition, the Trust is actively managing and restoring the coastal dunes.

Biota Nodes

The Trust is establishing a series of ‘biota nodes’ along the 10.5km length of the Trust’s lands at approximately 250m centres.

With ‘biota’ meaning the ecological system (flora and fauna) of a particular environment, and ‘node’ being a point of intersection, these biota nodes are a series of small, localised points of native wildlife, which, as they mature, will extend outwards to form a ‘biodiversity skeleton’ stretching the length of the Park. Each contains a freshwater pond and native plant life that will attract birds, aiding seed transfer for easy and eventual self-maintaining propagation.

Each Node is adopted and maintained by a school, class or community group.

Currently there are 17 established biota nodes. Over 5,000 native plants including manuka, harakeke, tikouka, tarata, ake ake, kahikatea and totara, among others, have been planted.

In October 2015, with the support of the Working Waters Trust, Kowaro/Canterbury Mudfish fry were released into a number of the nodes, to extend the habitat of these threatened species within Tūhaitara. In March 2016, during the first monitoring survey, mudfish were located in each of the nodes ranging in size from 53 - 91mm.

Tūtaepatu Lagoon

The Tūtaepatu Lagoon site includes the largest area of natural open water in the coastal strip between the Waimakariri and Ashley Rakahuri Rivers, and an area of surrounding vegetation, totalling over 54 hectares. It is a spring fed freshwater wildlife sanctuary which is home to many species of native fauna and flora. The overall goal of the proposed restoration of Tūtaepatu Lagoon is “a lagoon with indigenous vegetation that supports mahinga kai and spiritual values”.

Tūtaepatu Lagoon discharges north into the Taranaki Stream which then flows into the Ashley Rakahuri and south into the Saltwater Creek which discharges into the Waimakariri at Kairaki. The Lagoon and its freshwater network support a diverse range of indigenous biota,
e.g. wetland and swamp plants, fish e.g. inaka, tuna (eel), kowaro (mudfish) and birds, e.g. kotuku (white heron) bittern, kotare (kingfisher) kōrimako (bellbird) and ruru (morepork).

Over the past 5 years 30,000 natives have been planted, female grey willow and old man’s beard controlled and over 1,000 animal pests eradicated.

The Pines Beach Wetland

The Pines Beach Wetland is a 36-hectare open reedland, surrounded by dunes. Originally, it was a lagoon open to the sea; however, around 1970, the opening was closed and the area has converted to a freshwater wetland.

The Trust has commenced an extensive weed control programme primarily targeting willow and beggars tick. Additionally, planting has commenced on the periphery with a range of native wetland shrub and tree species.

The work, along with a comprehensive animal pest control programme will result in a rapid transformation of the area.

Carbon Sequestration - Trees that Count

The Trust commenced the planting of a proposed 10,000 podocarp forest in April 2016 with a mix of 2000 kahikatea, matai and totara planted at Woodend Beach on the southern side of Tūtaepatu Lagoon. This coincided with New Zealand and 174 other countries signing the Paris Agreement on Climate Change in New York the previous night. In what is probably the first tree planting to sequester carbon from the atmosphere after the agreement was signed, about 150 volunteers organised by the Student Volunteer Army descended on the Park. The planting was a truly international effort (with lots of international students participating) in a truly bicultural project. For Trees that Count, which provided the trees, this is hopefully the beginning of a much larger nationwide project that combines biodiversity restoration and action on climate change.

On Anzac Day 2017, another 1,000 totara and 1,000 assorted native tree species were added to the Woodend Beach forest including kowhai, ribbonwood, ake ake, tarata and kanuka. There were over 200 volunteers on site from all walks of New Zealand life, small children to great-grandparents, pai rawa atu, excellent.

Coastal Management

Tūhaitara Coastal Park runs for 10.5 kilometres of the Northern Pegasus Bay coastline, between the Waimakariri and Waikuku Beach.

The Park includes all of the back dunes along this stretch and some of the fore dunes and fore shore areas. Tūhaitara Coastal Park is managed under the Tūhaitara Coastal Reserve & Waikuku Beach Reserves, Reserve Management Plan.

The fore dunes and fore shore are managed under the Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016.

The dunes are an ecosystem for many native fauna and flora species, they provide protection from storm surges and sea events including Tsunami, have significant cultural and archaeological values arising from the occupation of Maori and; act as filters for coastal water.
Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust and Environment Canterbury have commenced the restoration of the dunes system, with a number of fore dune trial plots planted with native sand binding plants including Spinifex and Pingao. Additionally, there are numerous back dune native planting sites.

Over time these plantings will be extended so that they reflect the Trusts 200-year vision to restore the lands, protect the coastal communities and provide opportunities for mahinga kai.

**Strategy**

The Trust has an environmental restoration strategy. The update and expansion of this strategy will be the primary initial task for the new Environmental/Operational Services position. The development of the environmental restoration strategy will include:

- A Park wide strategy, e.g. biota nodes spanning the whole park.
- Incremental development, so newly restored and planted areas can be maintained, i.e. high quality sustainable development.
- Reliance on volunteers, with neighbouring communities encouraged to look after the Park areas closest to them
- Links with the braided rivers at each end of the Park. These are managed by ECan as regional parks. The Ashley Rakahuri River Care group actively support the river. The development of these links will provide a connecting corridor and facilitate the release of black stilt kaki because of connection with other neighbouring groups.
- Involvement with national genetics group.

As funding becomes available, the following projects will be undertaken:

- Establish boardwalk areas through the wetlands between Tūtaepatu Lagoon and Pegasus ECMA
- Trail development as forestry project moves through the Park
- Re-naturalising Tūtaepatu Lagoon northern outlet, lagoon to Waikuku Beach
- Riparian planting Tūtaepatu Lagoon northern outlet, lagoon to Waikuku Beach
- Inclusion of Ashley Rakahuri estuary into Tūhaitara Coastal Park
- Foredune planting
- Planting Pegasus carpark surrounds
- Planting Western conservation management area ridge
- Create firebreak and native planted area behind Dunns Ave houses at The Pines Wetland
- Establish bird hides at Tūtaepatu Lagoon and Pegasus ECMA
- Establish Rongoa gardens at Te pa harakeke o Tūhaitara
- Establish basic plant nursery at Woodend Beach
Appendix D: Education strategy

Background

Learning for Life

Te Köhaka o Tūhaitara Trust provides environmental education to many of North Canterbury and Christchurch's primary and secondary schools. These range from regular fortnightly sessions through to a few visits per year.

The modules are based around the biota node development (see the projects page) and provide for a mix of theory and experiential learning.

The Trust has developed its own learning resources and supplements these with visits by topic experts covering subjects including freshwater, invertebrates, microscopy, and animal pest control.

Bruce Banks Environmental Education Award

The Bruce Banks Award is offered annually to any primary or secondary school student who aims to further native biodiversity in the Waimakariri District. The award has been established by the Trust to recognise the important work Bruce did establishing the animal pest control programme at the Park.

Bruce had also recognised the importance of encouraging young people to become involved in caring for the Park and often brought his young grandchildren to work with him, nurturing their interest in biodiversity.

Resources

The Trust also has a range of environmental education lesson plans. The content is available for reuse and redistribution under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 3.0. Please reference Te Köhaka o Tūhaitara Trust, Note © Peter Langlands Wild Capture research & photography all fauna photos.

Hard copies of the Tūhaitara Coastal Park Field Guide are available from the Trust Office or WDC Kaiapoi Service Centre, cost $20. Original oil pencil art is available from Katherine.jacob@xtra.co.nz.

Additionally, the Trust has under graduate and post graduate resources. These can be sourced by contacting the Trust office.

Strategy

The Trust is working on the full development of an education strategy. This will be the primary initial task for the new Education/Visitor Services position. The development of the education strategy will include:

- Consideration of who uses the Park for education purposes, e.g. schools, university, general public, special interest groups, and the varying needs of these groups.

- Review of the pedagogy relating to the style of learning (e.g. learning facilitator compared with teaching for of education) and stages of learning and building of
knowledge at different stages of learning (e.g. basics, advanced knowledge followed by investigations, action research, self-directed learning).

- Consultation with schools regarding the level of involvement they want from the Trust on an on-going basis. The range could be from merely provision of a living laboratory through to total responsibility for teaching and learning that takes place at the biota nodes.

The strategy will include, but not be limited to current users, resources and activities:

- Schools
  - Darfield
  - Enviroschools
  - Hurunui
  - Kaiapoi North
  - Pegasus
  - Rangiora High
  - St Josephs
  - Tuahiwi
  - Woodend

- University of Canterbury
  - Education
  - Engineering
  - Forestry
  - Genetics
  - Geography
  - Management
  - Office of the AVC Māori

- Community

- Biota node booklet and lesson plans

It will also include exploration of involvement from other potential users such as Lincoln University and corporate bodies.
Appendix E: Recreation Strategy

Background

The Tūhaitara Coastal Park contains a variety of walking, cycling and bridle trails with access from all of the adjoining communities. A number of the walking and cycling trails link to the adjoining Waimakariri River and Ashley Rakahuri Regional Parks. There are many natural features to view and enjoy including Tūtaepatu Lagoon.

Tūtaepatu Lagoon

The lagoon is a 49ha spring fed freshwater wildlife sanctuary which is home to many species of native fauna and flora. A viewing platform allows you to see over the raupo beds into the open water to view the many species of waterfowl, wetland and forest bird species.

Tūtaepatu Trail

Tūtaepatu Trail is a 5km all weather walking and cycling trail running between Woodend Beach Road and Kiwi Ave Waikuku. It can also be accessed from Tiritirimoana Drive Pegasus Town. The trail passes Tūtaepatu Lagoon and its viewing platform and a seated area with views north to Maukatere Mt Grey. Dogs may be taken on the trail but are required to be on a leash between Woodend Beach and Pegasus Town. This trail is for all levels of fitness.

Pegasus Walkway

Pegasus Walkway meanders the 10.5km length of the Park between The Pines and Kairaki Beaches and Waikuku Beach. It is a shared trail with walkers, mountainbikers and horses. It is a natural surfaced trail which requires a reasonable level of fitness if mountain biking. The walkway meanders along the back of the dune system and through the coastal protection pine forests. There are numerous sign-posted access points leading to the beach.

Horse riding

Horse Float carparks are located at Kiwi Avenue Waikuku Beach (Key available from Waimakariri District Council) and Ferry Road Woodend Beach. Bridle Trails are clearly marked. Horse are not permitted on the Tūtaepatu Trail or in the Woodend Beach Domain.

Picnics/Events

Woodend Beach Domain provides a great picnic and event area and bookings can be made by contacting the Trust. Vehicles are permitted in the designated picnic area. NOTE: the gate is shut in the evenings and there is a charge to get out if you are locked in. Details are on the signs located at the entrance to the domain.

Beaches

Tūhaitara Coastal Park borders 10.5km of the Northern Pegasus Bay. Surf patrols operate at Waikuku Beach between mid-November and mid-March. Woodend Beach is patrolled during the Christmas New Year period. The beaches bordering Kairaki, The Pines and Pegasus Town are not patrolled. The entire length of beach is covered by the Northern Pegasus Bay bylaw.
Strategy

Recreational activities change over time as communities develop new and different interests and ways to recreate. The Park is available to all people for organised or unorganised activities, formally arranged events or casual use, active or passive pursuits. It is being regenerated to provide for a resource for the community as a place which offers many different things to different people, so they will use it in their own way, contributing to all aspects of their health and well-being.

Alongside the education strategy, the development of the recreation strategy will be one of the primary tasks for the new Education/Visitor Services position.

These are some of the activities that could be developed and enjoyed at the Park:

- Events
- Orienteering
- Picnics
- Horses
- Swimming/beach access
- Biking
- Walking
- Fitness
- Nature study
- Photography
- Reading and writing
Appendix F: Financial Assumptions

The following assumptions have been made in determining the initial estimate:

- While the Trust is a separate legal entity and has no obligation to follow Local Government pay scales, it is assumed that the Local Government Remuneration Report September 2017 categories and remuneration indications will be used to ascertain appropriate salary levels (Strategic Pay Limited, 2017).

- The General Manager will have increased responsibilities and, therefore, potentially move to a different position category. This could be Parks & Recreation Manager CS04 (Strategic Pay Limited, 2017, p90). This is a full-time position.

- The Education /Visitor Services position will be similar to IM43, with a range of $56,734 to $66,274 (Strategic Pay Limited, 2017, p201). The position will initially be 40 hours per fortnight, but may move to full-time over 3-5 years.

- The Environmental/Operational Services position will be a technical, practical person with expertise in botany, fauna and ecology. It is expected they will hold a degree-level qualification in ecology, freshwater or similar areas of study, and demonstrate initiative (i.e. self-directed with guidance from the General Manager). There was no similar position in the Local Government Remuneration Report September 2017. However, it is expected that they will be in the range $50,000 to $65,000. This is a full-time position.

- The Funding Assistant position will be similar to CO10, with a range of $38,406 to $40,671 (Strategic Pay Limited, 2017, p111). It will be a part-time position of 10 to 20 hours per week.

- There will be additional operational and overhead costs associated with the increased structure of twice the current budget.

- There will be capital costs required for:
  - Premises – Additional office space for the Trust and additional operational buildings. These may be able to be attached to a UC research centre. This may be a joint venture, where the Trust provides the land and the university provides the buildings. The Trust may use some parts of the centre for offices or to operate revenue generating activities such as a café - estimated at least $400,000
  - Office and IT equipment, workstations – estimated $10,000
  - Vehicles – at least one additional vehicle (purchase or lease) - $30,000
  - Additional tools and equipment - $5,000.

These will be sought from funding applications and external funders.

- Current leases (e.g. for forestry and camping grounds) will “run their course” at which time they will be reviewed to consider whether it is still in the best interests of the Trust. Some land may be retired for wetland rehabilitation. Some activities may be directly managed by the Trust.
Revenue generating activities will require capital investment, e.g.

- Upgrades to camping grounds
- Temporary residential structures at locations within the Park, e.g. The Pines Beach, Kairaki, next to Pa Harakeke
- Nursery
- Retail outlets – café, ice cream shop

The Trust will keep a "watching brief" on the availability of neighbouring properties. It may be possible to purchase one of these to resolve the premises requirements as well as develop revenue generating activities through leasing of paddocks and/or residential dwellings.

WDC will fund:

- Secretarial services
- Rates for ECMA, WCMA, Pines Kairaki Regeneration Areas
- Audit fees

Previous external funders will continue to support the operations of the Trust.

Funding will continue to be sought for specific projects, such as:

- Maintaining current trails and rehabilitation areas underway
- Mahinga kai, rongoa, freshwater network ($50,000 per annum)
- Tūtaepatu Lagoon ($37,000 per annum)
- Pines beach Wetlands, Dunes, biota nodes
- Pest control throughout the Park.
- Coastal protection – as available. It would take $7 million for the coast line to be cleared and planted so it could become self-sustaining.
- Pegasus ECMA and WCMA – initial planting and ongoing weed and pest control

The Trust will retain at least $100,000 in fixed term investments as an "emergency" fund for prudent financial management, to ensure the long-term sustainability of the Trust so it can respond to variations in cash-flow needs.

Budget shows a deficit which will be covered through additional funding sought by the new funding administrator. The work plan will be subject to the success of these external applications, with the environmental works being scaled up or down to meet funding levels.
# Appendix G: Risk Criteria

## Consequence Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Insignificant</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Significant</th>
<th>Extreme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial impact</strong></td>
<td>Financial loss less than $1,000.</td>
<td>Financial loss or increased costs equivalent to less than 5% of budgeted operational costs</td>
<td>Financial loss or increased costs equivalent to 5-10% of budgeted operational costs</td>
<td>Financial loss or increased costs equivalent to 10-20% of budgeted operational costs</td>
<td>Financial loss or increased costs equivalent to 20% or more of budgeted operational costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operational</strong></td>
<td>Negligible impact on achieving key objectives. No measurable disruption to operational objectives.</td>
<td>Delay in achieving a key objective. Disruption to operational objectives or minor performance degradation.</td>
<td>Inability to achieve a key objective. Disruption up to 1 week and/or temporary degradation in the quality of output delivery.</td>
<td>Inability to achieve a number of key objectives. Disruption up to 1 month resulting in some community/customer dissatisfaction.</td>
<td>Inability to achieve key strategic objectives. Disruption greater than 1 month, resulting in failure to meet community/customer expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management effort</strong></td>
<td>Management effort can be absorbed into routine operations.</td>
<td>Minimal additional management effort required to prevent escalation.</td>
<td>Management effort required to prevent escalation.</td>
<td>Significant Senior Management and Trustee attention and possible diversion of resources to manage issues or prevent crisis.</td>
<td>Extensive Senior Management and Trustee effort or resources diverted to prevent/recover from a crisis event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health &amp; Safety</strong></td>
<td>Insignificant injury, no lost time. No long term effects.</td>
<td>First aid injury, minimal lost time. No long term effects.</td>
<td>Injury requiring medical attention off-site, short term lost time. Medium to long-term effects.</td>
<td>Serious illness/injury resulting in hospitalisation. Some rehabilitation costs.</td>
<td>Serious injury/illness resulting in permanent and critical loss of personnel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholder confidence/reputation</strong></td>
<td>Minor adverse publicity</td>
<td>Significant adverse publicity in particular locations</td>
<td>Adverse publicity causing targeted board scrutiny or investigation</td>
<td>Sustained adverse publicity locally or nationally causing sustained board, settlor and community scrutiny or investigation. Adverse impact with key suppliers and or customers regionally.</td>
<td>Sustained national and international adverse media coverage causing: Loss of confidence in the board and/or management. Loss of key community and/or funding support, customers and/or suppliers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Likelihood Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Frequency (business context)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost certain</td>
<td>The event is expected to occur in most circumstances</td>
<td>Expected to occur twice (or more) each year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>The event will probably occur in most circumstances</td>
<td>Expected to occur every year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>The event should occur at some time</td>
<td>Expected to occur every 1 to 2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>The event could occur at some time</td>
<td>Expected to occur about once every two to three years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>The event may occur only in exceptional circumstances</td>
<td>May occur every three to-five years (or more)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Commercial: in Confidence
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1. SUMMARY

1. This report presents the Risk Management Framework for the Council’s business and proposes that it be recommended to the Council for adoption. The report also contains the Register of Key Risks which outlines management’s assessment of the Council’s key risks as at March 2018.

2. The Risk Management Framework is intended to demonstrate the Council’s approach to managing risk, and provide an outline of what the key risks of the Council’s business are and how we respond to them.

3. The purpose of the Framework is to:
   - Define the Council’s appetite for risk
   - Outline how key risks are managed
   - Document the process for considering and managing risk
   - Provide guidance to the Council staff in considering risks.

4. LGNZ’s Excellence Programme, as part of its review of the Council’s performance, recommended that we could strengthen our approach to risk management with the adoption of a Risk Management Framework or policy.

Attachments:
   i. Risk Management Framework (Trim 180316028262)
   ii. Register of Key Risks (Trim 180321030354)
   iii. Risk rating

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Audit and Risk Committee

(a) Receives report No. 180316028255.
(b) **Recommends** to the Council that it

i. **Adopts** the Risk Management Framework (Trim No. 180316028262)

ii. **Notes** that the Risk Management Framework will be formally reviewed annually, and that the Register of Key Risks will be presented to the Audit and Risk Committee on a six monthly basis.

(c) **Notes** the Register of Key Risks as at March 2018 (Trim 180321030354).

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1. The Risk Management Framework is intended to demonstrate the Council’s approach to managing risk, and provide an outline of what the key risks of the Council’s business are and how we respond to them.

3.2. The purpose of the Framework is to:

- Define the Council’s appetite for risk
- Outline how key risks are managed
- Document the process for considering and managing risk
- Provide guidance to the Council staff in considering risks.

3.3. The risks that the Council should be most concerned about those that, having considered all the control measures and risk mitigation actions, are likely to have the most significant effect on Council. Those effects could be financial, reputational, related to health and safety, or non-performance by the Council.

3.4. LGNZ’s Excellence Programme, as part of its review of the Council’s performance, recommended that:

- “The Council should develop a risk policy, with the risk appetites in relevant areas clearly stated beyond that provided in the Treasury Policy.
- There needs to be clearer and more specific risk reporting, and a focus on strategic risks being reported to the Audit and Risk Committee, especially without an independent chair.”

3.5. The Risk Management Framework document will be formally reviewed every 12 months and the Register of Key Risks will be reported every six months to the Audit and Risk Committee.

**Register of Key Risks**

3.6. Having considered all mitigation actions and other controls to manage risks, the following are assessed as the most significant risk facing the Council:

Natural hazards and environmental events

- Catastrophic natural disaster, especially Alpine Fault rupture or major local source earthquake.
- Flooding in excess of a 1 in 200 event.
- Climate changes, including the effects of inundation from sea level rise, impacts on groundwater levels and flooding
- Decreasing water quality of lowland streams.
Growth
- Growth rates varying significantly from that anticipated
- Unable to meet community expectations to respond to growth or the manner in which it occurs, including implementation of any associated development plans

Financial
Operational
- Not meeting community expectations re mode of service delivery or losing opportunities to be innovative, due to not investing in IT/business improvement, therefore not remaining relevant to community
- Health and Safety - risk of accident or injury crystallises, or Council fails to meet legislative standards, or actions/inaction endangers staff, the public or contractors

Political
- Nationally led change seeking reorganisation of Council structure for service delivery - eg outcome of 3 waters review

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. The Audit and Risk Committee could ask for other risks or matters to be considered and reflected in the Framework or Register of Key Risks, or it could ask that the issues be worked before the Report is considered.

4.2. Management Team has reviewed this report and support the recommendations.

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations
Not Applicable

5.2. Wider Community
Not Applicable

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications
The financial implications of key risk crystallising can be significant for the Council. The risks with the greatest financial exposure relate to a major earthquake. The Council’s Risk Assessment and Financing Strategy has signalled the need for headroom of $84 million in the Council’s borrowing policy limits. The Council resolved to maintain that level of headroom.

6.2. Community Implications
Our intent is to ensure events or issues are managed so that should the risks crystallising the impact on the community and Council’s operation are minimised.

6.3. Risk Management
It is the subject of the report.
6.4. **Health and Safety**

Addressed as a risk within the Register of Key Risks.

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

The Risk Management Framework forms the Council’s Policy on Risk Management and should be adopted by the Council. The Framework is not a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

7.2. **Legislation**

Not Applicable.

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

Directly or indirectly the Council management of its risk affects the Council’s ability to deliver against all its community outcomes.

7.4. **Delegations**

The adoption of the Framework should be referred to the Council.

Jim Palmer
Chief Executive
Risk Management Framework

Waimakariri District Council

Adopted: April 2018
Risk (the effect of uncertainty on objectives) is present in all aspects of our business.

Gaining a clear understanding of the risks associated with a plan, objective, project, decision, or operation can give us confidence in the way we do business. Effectively managing risk reduces uncertainty and increases the likelihood of successful outcomes.

Risk awareness should be an integral part of the way we think, plan and operate, with plans in place to manage key risks, while not stifling opportunities for development, operational efficiency and customer service.

For the Council events and circumstances that give rise to risk are many and varied. Events giving rise to high levels of risk and uncertainty include such things as:

- Natural disasters impacting communities
- Actions resulting in financial loss to the Council
- Contract and project risks crystallising
- Events impacting the Council’s reputation and integrity
- Major legislative or regulatory changes
- World-wide events impacting New Zealand
- Major safety incidents affecting people’s health and wellbeing.

We have a responsibility to assess and manage risk. The better we consider and respond to risks the more effective we will be at lessening the effects should an unfavourable event occur.

The level of risk associated with an event or issue is subject to constant change, as issues develop, or as time passes. Therefore, we need to remain vigilant and alert to our changing environment, and the key issues and events that may impact our risk assessment.

This Risk Management Framework demonstrates how the Council considers and responds to risk. It provides an overview of how we ensure risks are reviewed regularly; mitigation and control measures are put in place; and thereby enabling us to continue to operate effectively and efficiently, maintain public confidence and deliver services for our community.

Jim Palmer
Chief Executive
Risk Management Framework

Risk manifests itself in a number of ways.

The following diagram illustrates well the complexity of risk as it applies to an organisation. It shows that risk exists at an organisation-wide level, and at Department and Unit levels, and it indicates for different events and risk types there are a range of responses as to how we should assess, manage and respond to risk.

Council Purpose

The Local Government Act outlines a council’s purpose is to:

- enable democratic local decision-making and action by, and on behalf of, communities; and
- meet the current and future needs of communities for good-quality local infrastructure, local public services, and performance of regulatory functions in a way that is most cost-effective for households and businesses.

The Council has translated this purpose:

“To make Waimakariri a great place to be, in partnership with our communities”

Council’s Strategic Approach to Managing Key Risks

Risk Philosophy and Appetite

The Council must have due regard to the needs of today’s and tomorrow’s residents and ratepayers.

Essentially, the Council is the steward of the assets and resources that the community has entrusted to it.

The Council’s role embraces both the responsibilities of a steward and those akin to a trustee. Elected members will want to ensure that the Council and community are in a better “place” at the end of their term than it was at the beginning.

Accordingly, discharging responsibilities will tend to reflect prudence and to some extent conservatism.

Principles and practices that underpin the Council’s management of its resources and statutory responsibilities will include:

- Displaying effective governance and leadership principles and disciplines that reflect best practice
- Maintaining assets, resources and service delivery through responsible management
- Planning in a sustainable manner to ensure the community’s current and long-term needs are met, and required services are provided for
- Investing in the replacement and enhancement of assets and to ensure they fit for their long-term intended purposes
- Actively managing activities and assets to make them, and the community, more resilient
- Assessing the most appropriate forms of service delivery and ensuring contracts provide best value and that risk-share principles between Council and contractors are explored
- Planning that supports the community in times of disaster or adversity
- Maintaining financial capacity to withstand the effect of adverse events, including ensuring appropriate insurance and risk sharing/transfer arrangements are in place.
- Maintaining borrowing levels within prudent limits
- Adopting a conservative strategy to managing investments reflected in the Treasury Management Policy, with no involvement in property development unless it is ancillary to a core purpose or activity
Sources of Risk and Council’s Response

Risk affects the community (such as Natural Hazards) and risk also affects the Council (eg impact on infrastructure arising from a natural hazard event).

While Council mitigation responses may reduce community risk, the strategic responses contained in this framework are directed primarily to managing the Council’s risk.

The Council categorises risk into five main themes or sources of risk:

- Natural hazards and environmental events
- Growth
- Financial
- Operational
- Political

The range, nature and extent of events, actions or inactions that give rise to risk crystallising for the Council are extensive. The following list outlines the events or issues that give rise to the more significant risks that the Council is exposed to and what its strategic approach to managing those risks is.

Natural Hazards and Environmental Events

The major natural hazard risk facing the community, and the Council, is the threat of earthquakes with the Alpine Fault having a 30% probability of generating an earthquake of magnitude 8.

Living on a flood plain creates risk for the community, and while a major flood may cause some damage to Council assets and infrastructure, most of the risk the Council faces relates to how well it has anticipated and planned for the effects of flood, how it responds during a flood event and then supports a community to recover.

Other natural hazard events, such as rural fire, snow, wind, and tsunami risk are present and depending on the nature and extent of the issue dictates the response, but these events are likely to be less severe on the Council than the impacts from major earthquakes or floods.

The effect of Climate Change has longer term consequences and while planning at a local level is starting to emerge to ensure the effects are considered in planning decisions, the Council is dependent on national and regional policy settings which have yet to be developed.

The increasing focus on water quality and quantity issues is an emerging risk for the Council as community expectations, standards, and the costs associated with improving water quality and ensuring adequate water management continue to increase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk/ Event</th>
<th>Risk Rating</th>
<th>Strategic Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Major earthquake - (alpine fault or major local fault) | Severe impact on community and Council services | **Policy Response**  
  - All known fault and liquefaction prone areas are mapped and recorded in the District Plan and LIMs advice  
  - Earthquake Zones are reflected in building code requirements  
  - Risk Assessment & Financing Strategy in place that assesses risk and potential damage, as well as the funding strategy and prioritisation of asset replacement  

  **Resilience Response**  
  - All Council-owned properties have been strengthened to, at least, 67% of the building code  
  - All infrastructure is subject to a risk-based renewal replacement programme, with priority focused on vulnerable/high risk parts of the 3 Waters network  
  - Infrastructure installed in liquefaction prone areas is subject to earthquake assessment during design – eg pressurised sewer pump networks in high liquefaction prone areas |
### Operational Response
- Competent Earthquake Operations Centre trained, supported by effective communications
- Knowledgeable, competent Council engineers and Water Unit to lead repair work for critical infrastructure, along with contractors

### Financial Response
- Earthquake insurance cover for all insurable above-ground assets, but limited cover for some reserve assets (e.g., playgrounds)
- For 3 Waters underground assets utilising LAPP insurance along with the Government 60/40 funding arrangement.
- Utilise NZTA funding formula for road repairs, funding the local share by loan
- Providing ‘head-room’ in the Council's borrowing policy to cover Council's share of uninsurable costs, and in the event that earthquake insurance cover is not available

### Flooding (design standards of localised stormwater and flood systems will be exceeded)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Major Policy Response</th>
<th>Moderate – Major (depending on event severity) Policy Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flood mapping developed for inclusion in the District Plan based on flood modelling using LIDAR data identifying high/medium/low hazard areas, and reflecting projected sea level rise giving effect to Regional Policy Statement requirements.</td>
<td>Building regulations specify wind and snow loading and Tsunami modelling developed for inclusion in the District Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme of flood mitigation work following the 2014 flood being designed and implemented over 5-10 years period, valued at about $20 million</td>
<td>Tsunami mapping and building regulations used to advise PIMs and LIMs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major upgrade in sewer network capacity upgrade in Rangiora to address, among other things, stormwater infiltration, costing about $25 million</td>
<td>Tsunami warning sirens in beach communities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Resilience Response
- New stormwater and flood infrastructure design factors in sea level/groundwater rise and climate change projections
- Programme of flood mitigation work following the 2014 flood being designed and implemented over 5-10 years period, valued at about $20 million
- Major upgrade in sewer network capacity upgrade in Rangiora to address, among other things, stormwater infiltration, costing about $25 million

### Operational Response
- Flood mapping data used to advise PIMs and LIMs in terms of building platform heights
- Competent Earthquake Operations Centre trained, supported by effective communications
- Knowledgeable, competent Council engineers and Water Unit to manage effects and lead repair work, along with contractors.
- Drainage systems’ ‘levels of service’ developed and reflected in programmed maintenance
- Rigorous processes and well-trained people preparing LIMs and PIMs information

### Financial Response
- Insurance for damage to insurable assets.
- Professional Indemnity insurance re information distributed and relied on
- Utilise NZTA funding formula for road repairs, funding the local share by loan
- Providing ‘head-room’ in the Council borrowing policy to cover Council's share of uninsurable costs

### Other natural events including Tsunami, Snow, Wind, Fire
- Building regulations specify wind and snow loading
- Tsunami modelling developed for inclusion in the District Plan
- Tsunami mapping and building regulations used to advise PIMs and LIMs
- Tsunami warning sirens in beach communities.
- Competent Earthquake Operations Centre trained, supported by effective communications
- Knowledgeable, competent Council engineers and Water Unit to manage effects and lead repair work, along with contractors
### Climate Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Management Framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Severe, albeit gradual effects</strong> – <em>(Main risks are sea level/groundwater levels rising, more storms events, and potential for higher rural fire risk)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy Response</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Flood mapping developed for inclusion in the District Plan based on flood modelling using LIDAR data identifying high/medium/low hazard areas, and reflecting projected sea level rise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Assessing storm surge, coastal inundation and groundwater rise risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Awaiting national and regional guidance/direction re District Plan provisions, albeit any development near the coast will consider potential effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resilience Response</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- New stormwater and flood infrastructure designs factor in sea level/groundwater rise and climate change projections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operational Response</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rigorous processes and well-trained people preparing LIMs and PIMs information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Response</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No specific modelling undertaken yet as to the effects on infrastructure or community impacts/effects. Will follow national guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Providing ‘head-room’ in the Council borrowing policy to cover Council’s uninsurable costs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Water Quantity and Quality Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Management Framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major-Severe</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy Response</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Contributing to Canterbury Water Management Strategy through Water Zone Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Flood mapping developed for inclusion in the District Plan based on flood modelling using LIDAR data identifying high/medium/low hazard areas, and reflecting climate change projections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Contributing to regional and national water forums to understand and influence policy formulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Working closely with Ngai Tuahuriri to understand, respect and respond to Iwi interests and concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Developing stormwater by-laws and global consents to improve waterway management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resilience Response</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- New stormwater and flood infrastructure designs factor in sea level/groundwater rise and climate change projections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Commissioning investigations to better understand ecology of water environments and best practices improvement options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operational Response</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Trialling solutions to improve lowland stream environments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Considering best management practices adjacent to waterways, such as weed management solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Response</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Financial provision for improving water quality and quantity with $40 million forecast in the next 30 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Budgeted $20 million flood protection works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increased annual provision for consent monitoring and water testing and investigations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Growth

The District is one of the fastest growing districts in the country and the population of 60,000 is projected to grow between 86,000 and 97,000 by 2048.

It is essential that the growth is well planned: ensuring there is sufficient business and residential land zoned; that infrastructure and community services are in place to support the growing population; that settlement patterns are consistent with sustainable development; and that growth occurs in accordance with agreed settlement patterns for Greater Christchurch.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk/ Event</th>
<th>Risk Rating</th>
<th>Strategic Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient or inappropriately zoned land to meet residential and business demand</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Policy Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• District Development Strategy developed to provide direction for growth to 2048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Settlement Pattern Review undertaken to meet the requirements of the NPS on urban development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Co-ordination and collaboration with other Great Christchurch councils to manage the fair allocation of growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• District Plan Review underway to ensure planning provisions are fit for future purposes and to enable development in appropriate locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Development planning provisions are based on robust analysis of natural hazards and other known constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Constant review of population projections and household requirements compared to planned and zoned capacity to respond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Operational Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Customer focused collaborative response to developers seeking to initiate development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Financial Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Financial provision made to enable above Policy initiatives to be delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure (roads, water, sewer, drainage, community facilities) not sized or timed appropriately to cater for reasonably foreseeable growth</td>
<td>Moderate (dependent to some extent on the economic cycle of the country)</td>
<td>Policy Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Infrastructure Strategies and Asset Management Plans are aligned to the District Development Strategy taking account of future development locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Growth planning provides a minimum of a 30 year horizon, with network sizing factored to account for long-term growth and capacity projections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Asset management renewal based on 100 year renewal cycles to ensure long term replacement and capacity for growth is aligned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Long Term Plans provide for growth projections and funding streams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Resilience Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Network configuration and construction material design anticipated future requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Operational Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Customer focused collaborative response to developers seeking to initiate development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Regular updates with developers on the intended development and servicing requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Financial Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Revenue and Financing Policy and Long Term Plan specifically provide for development funding, along with ratepayer funded implications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Development Contributions Policy reflects to growth-related work, with the programme of intended growth-related work and policy settings subject to peer review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Financial

The Council is a ‘net borrower’ and is a high-growth council, therefore subject to higher levels of debt than would otherwise be the case. Ensuring prudent financial management of the Council’s affairs is extremely important along with maintaining debt levels within acceptable policy limits. The Council has maintained its Standard and Poor’s AA credit rating.

Because the Council is a ‘net borrower’ it has relatively few funds to invest and little surplus property or commercial property. Investment practises are governed by the Treasury Management policy and reflect a conservative approach. The Council does not act as developer unless it is co-incidental to a core project it is undertaking.

Ensuring a sound culture is in place, having good budgetary control and robust systems and checks in place is the best defence to managing risk of fraud, corruption or misappropriation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk/Event</th>
<th>Risk Rating</th>
<th>Strategic Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Risks</td>
<td>Low-Moderate (the risk of significant global or national downturn is present)</td>
<td><strong>Policy Response</strong>&lt;br&gt;- Long Term Plans prepared every 3 years with the ability to review every year if change occurs&lt;br&gt;- Prudent financial policy limits set&lt;br&gt;<strong>Operational Response</strong>&lt;br&gt;- Daily monitoring of global and national economic trends&lt;br&gt;<strong>Financial Response</strong>&lt;br&gt;- Standard and Poors’ AA credit rating maintained which provides confidence that prudent financial management is exercised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowing exceeds financial capacity of the Council</td>
<td>Low (if this occurred the impact would be severe, but sufficient controls are in place to reduce the risk rating)</td>
<td><strong>Policy Response</strong>&lt;br&gt;- Prudent debt limits set with policy limits within parameters that lenders consider acceptable&lt;br&gt;- Self-imposed lower limits utilised as ‘head-room’ provided for major natural disasters&lt;br&gt;- Long Term Plan process forecasts debt requirements and affordability parameters&lt;br&gt;- Treasury Management Policy specifies acceptable parameters re counter party risk, credit exposure, interest rate risk management&lt;br&gt;- No speculation is permitted when managing interest rate risk&lt;br&gt;<strong>Operational Response</strong>&lt;br&gt;- Financial performance is subject to regular review by the Audit and Risk Committee&lt;br&gt;- Independent treasury advisor appointed to provide advice&lt;br&gt;- Treasury Management Committee regularly reviews debt position, lending requirements, compliance with policy settings and interest rate hedging strategy&lt;br&gt;- Experienced finance team&lt;br&gt;<strong>Financial Response</strong>&lt;br&gt;- Standard and Poor’s AA credit rating maintained which provides confidence prudent financial management is exercised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment funds lost</td>
<td>Low (as quantum of funds involved is relatively low)</td>
<td><strong>Policy Response</strong>&lt;br&gt;- Treasury Management Policy specifies acceptable parameters re counter party risk, credit exposure, investment strategy management practices&lt;br&gt;<strong>Operational Response</strong>&lt;br&gt;- Financial performance is subject to regular review by the Audit and Risk Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Risk Management Framework

#### Independent treasury advisor appointed to provide treasury advice
- Treasury Management Committee regularly reviews debt position, lending requirements, compliance with policy settings and interest rate hedging strategy
- Experienced finance team

#### Financial Response
- Conservative investment returns budgeted in Long Term Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Failure to secure appropriate insurance cover at reasonable cost</th>
<th>Moderate (insurance cover withdrawal is possible if a major natural disaster occurred, but financial head-room capacity has been retained in borrowing policy)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Policy Response | Policy to fully insure all assets except land, some reserves and park assets, and roads and bridges which are subject to NZTA subsidy
- Assets subject to regular revaluations for insurance purposes

#### Operational Response
- Insurance broker engaged to advise on insurance placement and claim management

#### Financial Response
- Annual market testing of insurance proposals
- Head-room provided in borrowing policy to limit debt exposure in the event of a major natural disaster and insurance withdrawal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budgetary Control</th>
<th>Low (failure to meet budget targets)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Policy Response | Delegations Policy in place limiting spending authority of staff
- Council develops budgets on a break-even basis, including conservative revenue assumptions
- Annual Report and LTP subject to annual audit

#### Operational Response
- Production and review of monthly financial statements against year-to-date budget
- Quarterly meeting of finance staff and budget holders to discuss progress
- Quarterly reporting on financial performance and position to the Audit & Risk Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fraud, corruption, sensitive and inappropriate expenditure</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Policy Response | Fraud and whistle blower policies in place.
- One-up sign-off required for sensitive expenditure and credit card spending
- Gifts policy established with disclosure required
- Employment agreements, Code of Conduct and Values Statement set behaviour expectations

#### Operational Response
- Values promoted and reinforced regularly
- Regular review of transactions by managers
- Internal audit of sensitive expenditure and periodic audit of processes
- Segregation of duties requiring more than one person involved in any financial transaction
- Vigilant Finance Officer review of invoices

#### Financial Response
- Insurance cover in the advent of loss

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-compliance with law</th>
<th>Low (compliance with Tax and Rating Act law closely monitored)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Policy Response | Rating Policy development subject to independent legal review

#### Operational Response
- Tax practices subject to regular tax audit by taxation specialists
- Experience Finance team
Operational Risk

The business of a Council involves more than 30 separate businesses and the nature and range of business risk is entirely different.

The most significant operational risks relate to ensuring the health and safety of the public and staff. This can span from ensuring drinking water safety, food safety, ensuring people remain safe in our aquatic facilities or on our play equipment, or keeping hazardous areas like refuse transfer stations safe, and making sure built structures ensure public safety.

Other operational risks relate to non-delivery of services or capital projects, breaches of legislation or consents (eg sewer treatment discharges), information systems and human resources related risks.

The majority of these key risks are addressed through appropriate policies, systems and procedures being developed, having skilled and well trained staff and ensuring activities are subject to independent review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk / Event</th>
<th>Risk Rating</th>
<th>Strategic Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public safety endangered</td>
<td>Low - Moderate (if this occurred the impact would be severely on Council)</td>
<td><strong>Policy Response</strong>&lt;br&gt;• All activities subject to high public risk (eg drinking water, pool safety, playground equipment, airfield safety, sewage discharges, building control, swimming pool audits, food safety, transfer station movements, road design and maintenance) are all subject to legislation or standards that specify policies and procedures to be adopted&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Operational Response</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Detailed operating procedures developed for each activity&lt;br&gt;• Staff trained to requisite standards&lt;br&gt;• Continuing vigilance and ongoing operational audit and review procedure&lt;br&gt;• Independent audit of compliance – (eg DWS assessors, Ecan review, IIANZ accreditation, CAA reviews, technical and H&amp;S audits)&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Financial Response</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Sufficient budget provided to ensure activities undertaken to, at least, meet minimum standards&lt;br&gt;• Professional Indemnity insurance of up to $200 million if Council found negligent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Safety of staff and public</td>
<td>Major (if a serious harm accident or death occurred it would have a major impact on the Council)</td>
<td><strong>Policy Response</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Health and Safety policies developed for all staff, contractors and members of the public affected by Council activities&lt;br&gt;• Detailed operating policies procedures developed for high risk activities (eg confined spaces).&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Operational Response</strong>&lt;br&gt;• H&amp;S risk register regularly reviewed&lt;br&gt;• Regular site safety audits and process review&lt;br&gt;• Full-time H&amp;S Officer employed&lt;br&gt;• H&amp;S Committee meetings held quarterly.&lt;br&gt;• Appropriate training provided for all staff&lt;br&gt;• Annual external audit of H&amp;S performance&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Financial Response</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Insurance to defend any court case brought (fines uninsurable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-delivery of services or capital programme not delivered</td>
<td>Low - Moderate (processes ensure service delivery continuity.)</td>
<td><strong>Policy Response</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Budget provision ensures specified level of services capable of being delivered.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Operational Response</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Contracts or staff resource set at levels to ensure service delivery&lt;br&gt;• Critical systems (eg water supplies) subject to regular maintenance regimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event / Event Type</td>
<td>Likelihood</td>
<td>Level of Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| but some risk re non-delivery of capital programme | Major | Financial Response | - Capital programme implementation monitored monthly by staff and quarterly by A&R Committee  
- Business Interruption insurance in place |
| Not keeping pace with community expectations re service delivery modes (especially digital service delivery) | Major | Policy Response | - Business Improvement Strategy (reviewed annually with 3-5 year focus for digital/systems investment)  
- Scanning of E business responses nationally and monitoring progress with E-Business noted as an organisational priority  
- Budget provision supports Business Improvement Strategy, and is governed by the rate of change the Council can manage. (There is always a demand – internally and externally to do more)  
- Operational Response | - Building information platforms and business processes to support further digitisation - (eg digitising records through electronic records system, developing an enterprise-wide computer platform, using open source systems, business process mapping exercises, mobility projects)  
- Attending training and seminars to remain alert to emerging technology and trends.  
- E-Business projects focus largely as part of Organisation Development Strategy.  
- Financial Response | - Business Improvement Strategy funded through the LTP. |
| Breach of Legislation, regulation or contract | Low | Policy Response | - Contract management policies and procedures developed |
| | | Operational Response | - Trained staff to deliver services and retain knowledge of legislative provisions and responsibilities  
- Legal advice or review sought when uncertainty  
- Regular reporting of key conditions (re discharge consents)  
- Periodic audit by external bodies (eg CDHB, Ecan, IIANZ,) |
| | | Financial Response | - Professional Indemnity insurance of up to $200 million if Council found negligent. |
| Information Technology failure or breach | Low-Moderate | Policy Response | - Policies and procedures established for operation and use of systems |
| | | Operational Response | - Core IT infrastructure held in secure data warehouse (Infrastructure as a Service)  
- Core systems supported by major vendors  
- Essential controls operating and security walls in place and tested  
- Business Continuity Plans in place |
| | | Financial Response | - Business Interruption insurance in place |
| Human Resource – breach of good employer obligations | Low | Policy Response | - Policies and employment contracts developed to align with legislation and best practice  
- Ta Matou Mauri principles developed to align staff culture  
- Code of conduct and disciplinary procedures in place |
| | | Operational Response | - Trained Managers and HR staff  
- Climate survey undertaken to understand issues  
- Standardised practices and procedures including performance management framework.  
- Legal advice sought when required.  
- Employee Assistance Programme services provided |
Political Risk

Councils are democratically elected and open to public scrutiny. Expectations of certain behaviours and performance of a council, and its willingness to engage with the community, along with its level of transparency impact a view about the competence and capability of a council to function.

Risks can related to flawed decision making due to inadequate advice or processes, poor relationships with key stakeholders and community groups, not engaging meaningfully with communities, including Iwi, allowing conflicts of interest to impact decision making, and poor internal protocols and relationships creating conflict among elected members, and/or elected members and management.

Any of these risks crystallising in a significant manner will undermine public trust and confidence, and therefore the effectiveness of the Council.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk/Event</th>
<th>Risk Rating</th>
<th>Strategic Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision making risks</td>
<td>Low – Moderate</td>
<td><strong>Policy Response</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Clearly prescribed Local Government Act and LGOIMA Act processes&lt;br&gt;• Significance and Engagement Policy specifies processes for engagement&lt;br&gt;• Standing Orders developed and enforced during debates.&lt;br&gt;• Reports prepared for elected members follow a prescribed format and process <strong>Operational Response</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Reports to elected members subject to Management Team review&lt;br&gt;• Clear timetable for discussion of evolving and key issues&lt;br&gt;• Workshopping of key issues prior to Council formally considering a report&lt;br&gt;• Advice provided as part of report about community views and public engagement undertaken&lt;br&gt;• Well chaired meetings enabling structured debate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External relationship risks</td>
<td>Low – Moderate</td>
<td><strong>Policy Response</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Triennial Agreement with other Canterbury Councils clarifying respective expectations and processes.&lt;br&gt;• Memorandum of Understanding in place with Ngai Tuahuriri as the basis for a sound relationship with Iwi&lt;br&gt;• Significance and Engagement Policy specifies processes for community engagement&lt;br&gt;• Councillors have portfolio responsibilities to support engagement <strong>Operational Response</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Effective Council and community board interaction.&lt;br&gt;• Monthly meeting with Ngai Tuahuriri runanga and annual hui&lt;br&gt;• Active participation in regional and national issues.&lt;br&gt;• Membership of LGNZ and SOLGM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Government Policy change or intervention</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td><strong>Policy Response</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Understand Government’s policy agenda and submit and influence through submission and other agencies like LGNZ.&lt;br&gt;• Assessment of effects of proposed or potential changes eg 3 Waters review. <strong>Operational Response</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Responsible leadership of Council lessening risk of intervention&lt;br&gt;• Active participation in regional and national issues.&lt;br&gt;• Membership of LGNZ and SOLGM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict of Interest</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td><strong>Policy Response</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Interest register developed and Gifts Policy/register in place&lt;br&gt;• Meeting agendas specifically consider Conflicts <strong>Operational Response</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Training of elected members at induction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Managing Risks

Management Philosophy

Risk is associated with every activity of the Council’s business.

We cannot eliminate risk. But we can manage risk, which includes minimising, transferring or accepting risk in a planned way. In this way we can pursue opportunities and manage risks that may affect us.

By using risk management tools we can identify some risks we didn’t recognise, or identify others we placed too much importance on.

Managers and staff need to be risk aware, not to be risk averse. Knowledge, analysis and planning are key components of our risk programme. This leads to sound decision making.

This document provides staff the tools and guidance to implement Council’s risk management processes by:

- Introducing tools and internal assistance enabling sections to complete a risk analysis relevant to their operation.
- Ensuring decision making is consistent and demonstrable.
- Developing a ‘risk aware’ culture that encourages everyone to identify risks and associated opportunities.
- Promoting and fostering communication and risk monitoring throughout the organisation.

Risk Review Process

Risk is present in every decision or action undertaken. Having an awareness of potential risks, consequences and mitigation strategies is an important part of judgement that is exercised by all decision makers.

1. Gaining a clear understanding of the risks associated with a plan, objective, project, decision, or operation can give us confidence in the way we do business. Effectively managing risks reduces uncertainty and increases the likelihood of successful outcomes.

2. Risk awareness should be an integral part of the way we think, plan and operate, with plans in place to manage key risks, while not stifling opportunities for development, operational efficiency and customer service

3. We all deal with risks every day and we intuitively manage them as they appear on our radar. In business we need to be able to demonstrate how we consider this intuitive process.

4. Council’s focus is to regularly review risks within the various sections of Council. The Management Team is responsible for overall organisation risk management, although the Chief Executive and Council are ultimately accountable. Department and Unit Managers are responsible for developing a risk profile specific to their operations. These profiles include strategies and action plans to manage or treat risk. Risk profiles are then regularly monitored and reviewed – a formal six monthly review is undertaken as a minimum.

5. The Forms provided as part of this Framework are for guidance and help ensure consistency of profiles across our organisation.
Communication and Reporting

The reporting template for all reports to the Council and Management Team for decision making include a section in the report that allows the author to record and consider the key risks related to the issue, and outline key risks associated with making a decision, and how they will be managed.

Any events and issues that give risk to a risk crystallising and adversely affecting the Council should be escalated to the appropriate level of management and if appropriate included in advice to the Audit & Risk Committee.

The Management Team will formally consider and review the corporate risk register risk on a six monthly basis, referring to risk assessments completed by them and their Unit Managers.

The Audit and Risk Committee will receive a report every six months that outlines the key risks and any new or emerging strategies for risk treatment.

Growing Our Risk Management Leadership

To deeply embed the concepts and practices of risk management in our organisation we need to ensure leaders, including those that are responsible for key areas of our business, are strongly grounded in the principles of good risk management and apply practices and procedures that demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of how risk impacts their business.

To ensure we have effective leadership it requires:

- Effective championing from the Chief Executive and Senior Management Team
- Expectations to be clearly set about what we require leaders to be doing in respect of risk management.
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- Training and development focused on the principles and best practices approaches to Risk Management
- Inquisitive and inquiring minds that think about the environmental context within which we operate, opportunities, and “what could go wrong” to test the adequacy of our risk assessments and proposed responses.
- A willingness to implement and review the success of mitigation strategies.
- Effective reporting and accountability surrounding Risk Management

The Council will develop a programme that supports the implementation of the Risk Management Framework that helps leaders to be more effective in this regard.
## Likelihood and Consequences

Risk assessment involves considering the likelihood and consequences of an event occurring and therefore the risk crystallizing. It also notes the mitigation strategies that are put in place to mitigate or minimize the risk.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIKELIHOOD RATINGS</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost Certain</td>
<td>The event is expected to occur in most circumstances or a very low level of confidence/information</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>The event will probably occur in most circumstances or an average level of confidence/information</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>The event should occur at some time with a moderate level of confidence/information</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>The event could occur at some time with a high level of confidence/information</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>The event may occur only in exceptional circumstances with a very high level of confidence/information</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSEQUENCE RATINGS</th>
<th>Health and Safety</th>
<th>$</th>
<th>Project Delays</th>
<th>Design/Project robustness</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Image</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>Fatality, or permanent total disability</td>
<td>&gt;$20m</td>
<td>Years</td>
<td>Significant performance deficiencies</td>
<td>Permanent widespread ecological damage</td>
<td>International media, public enquiry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Significant injury resulting in permanent partial disability, Serious Harm</td>
<td>$2m-20m</td>
<td>6-12 months</td>
<td>Fails to meet design criteria</td>
<td>Heavy ecological damage, costly restoration</td>
<td>National media, ministerial questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Serious injury or illness, with &gt;10 days lost time</td>
<td>$200K-$2m</td>
<td>0-6 months</td>
<td>Unable to meet some design criteria</td>
<td>Significant but recoverable damage</td>
<td>Regional media, official information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Injury or illness requiring medical treatment, with &lt;10 days lost time</td>
<td>$20K-$200K</td>
<td>Weeks</td>
<td>Meets design criteria most of the time</td>
<td>Limited but medium term effects</td>
<td>Local media, minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine</td>
<td>Slight injuries</td>
<td>&lt;$20K</td>
<td>Days</td>
<td>Routine operational niggles</td>
<td>Minor short term effects</td>
<td>Internal questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Combined factor ratings**

- **Low risk**: 0 - 149
- **Medium risk**: 150 - 199
- **High risk**: 200 +

---
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Definitions
Definitions below are reproduced in whole or part summary from the Australian/New Zealand Standard® Risk Management Principles and Guidelines, pp 1-7 [AS/NZS ISO 31000:2009]

Not all definitions contained in the Standard are shown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>The effect of uncertainty on objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Note 1:</strong> An effect is a deviation from the expected - positive and/or negative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Note 2:</strong> Objectives can have different aspects (such as financial, health and safety, and environmental goals) and can apply at different levels (such as strategic, organisation-wide, project, product and process).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Note 3:</strong> Risk is often characterised by reference to potential events and consequences, or a combination of these.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Note 4:</strong> Risk is often expressed in terms of a combination of the consequences of an event (including changes in circumstances) and the associated likelihood of occurrence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Note 5:</strong> Uncertainty is the state, even partial, of deficiency of information related to, understanding or knowledge of an event, its consequences, or likelihood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Identification</td>
<td>Process of finding, recognizing and describing risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Note 1:</strong> Risk identification involves the identification of risk sources, events, their causes and their potential consequences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Note 2:</strong> Risk identification can involve historical data, theoretical analysis, informed and expert opinions, and stakeholder’s needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Source</td>
<td>Element which alone or in combination has the intrinsic potential to give rise to risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Note 1:</strong> A risk source can be tangible or intangible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Occurrence or change of a particular set of circumstances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Note 1:</strong> An event can be one or more circumstances, and can have several causes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Note 2:</strong> An event can consist of something not happening.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Note 3:</strong> An event can sometimes be referred to as an “incident” or “accident”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Note 4:</strong> An event without consequences can also be referred to as a “near miss”, “incident”, “near hit” or “close call”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequence</td>
<td>Outcome of an event affecting objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Note 1:</strong> An event can lead to a range of consequences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Note 2:</strong> A consequence can be certain or uncertain and can have positive or negative effects on objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Note 3:</strong></td>
<td>Consequences can be expressed qualitatively or quantitatively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Note 4:</strong></td>
<td>Initial consequences can escalate through knock-on effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Term</strong></td>
<td><strong>Definition</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Note 3:</strong></td>
<td>Consequences can be expressed qualitatively or quantitatively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Note 4:</strong></td>
<td>Initial consequences can escalate through knock-on effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Likelihood</strong></td>
<td>Chance of something happening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Note 1:</strong></td>
<td>In risk management terminology, the word ‘likelihood’ is used to refer to the chance of something happening, whether defined, measured or determined objectively or subjectively, qualitatively or quantitatively, and described using general terms or mathematically (such as a probability or a frequency over a given time period).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Note 2:</strong></td>
<td>The English term “likelihood” does not have a direct equivalent in some languages; instead, the equivalent of the term “probability” is often used. However, in English, “probability” is often narrowly interpreted as a mathematical term. Therefore, in risk management terminology, “likelihood” is used with the intent that it should have the same broad interpretation as the term “probability” has in many languages other than English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Risk Profile</strong></td>
<td>Description of any set of risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Note 1:</strong></td>
<td>The set of risks can contain those that relate to the whole organisation, part of the organisation, or as otherwise defined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Risk Analysis</strong></td>
<td>Process to comprehend the nature or risk and to determine the level of risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Note 1:</strong></td>
<td>Risk analysis provides the basis for risk evaluation and risk treatment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Note 2:</strong></td>
<td>Risk analysis includes risk estimation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Risk Criteria</strong></td>
<td>Terms of reference against which the significance of a risk is evaluated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Note 1:</strong></td>
<td>Risk criteria are based on organizational objectives, and external and internal context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Note 2:</strong></td>
<td>Risk criteria can be derived from standards, laws, policies and other requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of Risk</strong></td>
<td>Magnitude of a risk or combination of risks, expressed in terms of the combination of consequences and their likelihood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Risk Treatment</strong></td>
<td>Process to modify risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Note 1:</strong></td>
<td>Risk treatment can involve:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Avoiding the risk by deciding not to start or continue with the activity that gives rise to the risk;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Taking or increasing risk in order to pursue an opportunity;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Removing the risk source;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Changing the likelihood;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Changing the consequences;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Sharing the risk with another party or parties (including contracts and risk financing); and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Retaining the risk by informed decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note 2:</td>
<td><strong>Risk treatments</strong> that deal with negative consequences are sometimes referred to as &quot;risk mitigation&quot;, &quot;risk elimination&quot;, &quot;risk prevention&quot; and &quot;risk reduction&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note 3:</td>
<td><strong>Risk treatment</strong> can create new risks or modify existing risks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control(s)</th>
<th>Measure(s) that is modifying risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Note 1: <strong>Controls</strong> include any process, policy, device, practice, or other actions which modify risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Note 2: <strong>Controls</strong> may not always produce the intended or assumed modifying effect.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residual Risk</th>
<th>Risk remaining after risk treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Note 1: <strong>Residual risk</strong> can contain unidentified risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Note 2: <strong>Residual risk</strong> can also be known as &quot;retained risk&quot;.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Audit & Risk Committee           | • Consider and agree key risks facing the Council  
<pre><code>                             | • Monitor the Council’s risk profile and be assured residual risk mitigation actions are being actioned                                          |
</code></pre>
<p>| Chief Executive                  | • Responsibility for risk management Council wide and ownership of the Risk Register.                                                              |
| Management Team                  | • Continuously improve and develop our risk programme as best practice evolves.                                                                      |
|                                  | • Continue to commit budget and resources to ensure the risk programme continues and is implemented effectively.                                      |
|                                  | • Management oversight of risk management in relation to strategic and operational risks relative to their areas of responsibility.                    |
|                                  | • Determination of the levels of acceptable risk and treatments within their departments.                                                             |
|                                  | • Ensure their managers implement treatments and manage controls as agreed.                                                                          |
|                                  | • Monitoring of risk register and annual reporting to Council on risk management issues.                                                              |
|                                  | • Approval of risk management policy.                                                                                                               |
| Manager, Finance and Business Support | • Management responsibility for creating, implementing and disseminating risk management policy within Council.                                      |
|                                  | • Assist sections to develop and review Risk Profiles.                                                                                               |
|                                  | • Maintenance of Central Risk Register (master copies of Risk Profiles).                                                                                |
|                                  | • Provision of regular updates for managers/staff to promote a positive risk aware culture.                                                           |
|                                  | • Operational group profile development and periodic review. He is also there to assist with project specific profiling if needed. The ownership and management of profiles rests with individual department managers and their staff with oversight from unit managers. |
| Unit Managers                    | • Assessment, management, monitoring and reporting of risks relative to their operational and project responsibilities.                                 |
|                                  | • Use Risk Profiles as an effective tool for management of operations and staff.                                                                     |
|                                  | • Amend/annotate Risk Profiles between formal reviews to maintain relevance/capture changes.                                                           |
|                                  | • Request a formal review where significant changes occur.                                                                                             |
|                                  | • Direct implementation of treatments and maintenance of controls.                                                                                     |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Staff</td>
<td>- Awareness of operational and business risks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Identify and advise supervisor of change in any risks in a timely way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Implement treatments and maintain controls as directed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- While the third tier managers are accountable for risk management in their particular sections, responsibility ultimately rests with us all.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 1: Risk Management Process

Step 1 - Establish the Context and Criteria

We need to understand the context and criteria before starting a risk review. The context refers to the strategic context, organisational context, and risk management context. We also need to understand the criteria or areas of impact and the organisational environment. The decisions on ‘what to do’ about the risk depends on the context in which that risk occurs. We must also understand the areas of impact. This means where the consequences could happen.
(a) Strategic Context

The strategic plans, operational plans and reports of Council which look at areas such as the legal requirements and the financial, regulatory, political, social and cultural obligations;

The physical environment of the area we operate within;

Identification of the stakeholders, e.g. the community, employees, elected representatives and local iwi.

(b) Organisational Context

The goals and objectives of our organisation and department/unit. Also the organisational structure e.g. staffing, elected representatives, work areas, locations, sites, IT systems etc.

(c) Risk Management Context

The activities of the Council and the scope of these activities should be defined.

Step 2 - Identify Risks

Keep in mind that risk is the effect of uncertainty on objectives, therefore initial clarity around the organisational or departmental objectives is critical to the process, as we are most interested in "risk that matters".

(a) Identify the function or activity to be reviewed, fill this information in on Form 1- Risk Register.

(b) List these risks on Form 1- Risk Register.

Step 3 - Analyse the Risks

(a) Use Consequence and Likelihood Table to assess and quantify the likelihood and consequence.

(b) What are the existing controls.

(c) Are the existing controls adequate.

(d) Record your findings in a Risk Register – Form 1.

Step 4 - Evaluate Risks

(a) Use the Consequence x Likelihood process to determine the level of each risk. This tool will help you to establish the risk ranking.

(b) Fill out risk priority from highest to lowest.

(c) Record your findings on the Risk Register - Form 1.
Step 5 - Treat Risks

Treatment - This is how you respond to or modify the risk. Accepting a risk is a valid response. Any response will take factors such as risk appetite, budgets, other resources and technical limitations into account. The key is clear analysis, evaluation against policy and sound decision making. Options for treatment can include:

(a) Avoiding the risk by deciding not to start or continue with the activity that gives rise to the risk;
(b) Taking or increasing risk in order to pursue an opportunity;
(c) Removing or modifying the risk source;
(d) Changing the likelihood;
(e) Changing the consequences;
(f) Sharing the risk (or consequences should the risk eventuate) with another party or parties (including contracts and risk financing); and
(g) Retaining the risk unmodified by informed decision.

The outcome of this risk evaluation will represent the risk profile for the Unit or activity. It will have prioritised risks with controls and treatments.

(h) Complete Form 2 - Risk Treatment Plan by listing in priority the risks you have identified in highest to lowest ranking.
(i) Assess options for treatment.
(j) Detail the treatment options.
(k) Use Form 3 as an action plan for treatments as required.
(l) This should identify responsibilities and schedules and may include the expected outcome of treatments, budgeting, and performance measures and the review process to be set in place. Responsibility for implementing the plans should be agreed at the earliest possible time.

Step 6 - Risk Monitoring & Review and Communicate & Consult

(a) Use Form 3 - Action Plan to monitor and review the risks. The form should be updated whenever the review is conducted. The period of the review will depend on the risk and will be decided when the action plan is formulated.
(b) Once the Risk Profile has been established, Unit Managers must lead the monitoring process. The quality of monitoring is a section management responsibility, and must cover all relevant indicators.
(c) Communicate and Consult with all relevant stakeholders throughout the process.
(d) Form 4 - Risk Monitoring and Review Form is available to help summarise your Unit's risk monitoring and reviews.
(e) The monitoring and review process should also lead to a re-evaluation of the residual risk rating.
## Form 1 - Risk Register

Date of Risk Review ........................................

Compiled by:…………………………………… Date:……………………………………

Function/Activity/Process or Area………………………………………………………………

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Category:</th>
<th>Specific assessment of the risk – what can happen and how it can happen</th>
<th>Possible effects</th>
<th>What are the existing controls</th>
<th>Consequences</th>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Risk Rating</th>
<th>Are the existing controls adequate/ Comments</th>
<th>Action Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural hazards and environmental events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reviewed by:…………………………………… Date:……………………………………
Form 2 - Risk Treatment Schedule and Plan

Date of Risk Review

Compiled by: Date:

Reviewed by: Date:

Function/Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The risk in priority order from Risk Register</th>
<th>Possible treatment options</th>
<th>Risk rating after treatment</th>
<th>Result of cost/benefit analysis</th>
<th>Preferred option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Ref</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary - Recommended response and impact**

**Action plan**

**Proposed actions**

**Resource requirements**

**Responsibilities**

**Timing**

**Reporting and monitoring required**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compiler</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reviewer</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Form 3 - Risk Action Plan
### Form 4 - Risk Monitoring and Review Record

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk to be reviewed</th>
<th>How this will be reviewed</th>
<th>The outcome</th>
<th>The frequency of future reviews</th>
<th>Other monitoring procedures</th>
<th>Confirm a new Form 2 &amp; 3 (Treatment Plan &amp; Action Plan) has been completed</th>
<th>Who will implement the plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compiler………………… Date……………….. Reviewer…………………. Date………………..
### REGISTER OF KEY RISKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk categories</th>
<th>Specific Risks Identified</th>
<th>Possible Effects</th>
<th>Existing Controls and Mitigation Measures in place</th>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Consequence Rating</th>
<th>Risk Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Hazards &amp; Environmental Events</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural events and disasters</td>
<td>Catastrophic natural disaster, especially Alpine Fault rupture or major local source earthquake.</td>
<td>Potential for injury and death; Major service disruptions with critical infrastructure damaged; Extended periods with low levels of service; Financial capacity challenged</td>
<td>Civil Defence and Emergency Management team prepared for a range of disasters; all staff have first aid training; Business continuity (including criticality assessment) in place; Insurance arrangements in place, with Borrowing headroom; Buildings strengthened</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flooding</td>
<td>Property damage; Infrastructure damage; Damage to reputation if not taken into account in decision making; Financial loss</td>
<td>EOC capacity and capability, 16% contingency added to HIRDS2 rainfall data. Flood plans have been developed to assess flooding on the latest modelling. $20million flood mitigation project being implemented. Allowing for sea level rise in flood modeling and plans</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fires (including rural fires), Snow, Tsunami</td>
<td>Financial loss; Injury/death; wild fire spreading &amp; out of control</td>
<td>EOC capacity and capability responsive, tsunami sirens &amp; signs, weather warning alerts, In Council buildings - fire evacuation practices; fire hoses and extinguishers; insurance arrangements. Other buildings - fire risk taken into account in building codes. Rural fire - function transferred to FENZ</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pandemic</td>
<td>Infection/death; Difficulties in maintaining levels of service</td>
<td>Pandemic planning has been developed and tested with the pandemic flu in the winter of 2009.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>Over-abstraction of Waimakariri water resource</td>
<td>Difficulties in maintaining drinking water or stockwater availability; Loss of amenity value; Potential impact on economic development</td>
<td>Work quality and quantity key focus of water zone committee and in management of the water ways. Council acts responsibility by restrictor checks for restricted supplies; prompt repairs to water faults, &amp; I investigations and leak reduction programmes, education re wise water use.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change</td>
<td>Floods, rising water table, coastal inundation</td>
<td>Property damage; Damage to reputation if not taken into account in decision making; Financial loss</td>
<td>16% contingency added to HIRDS2 rainfall data. Flood mapping includes effect of 1 metre of sea level rise. $20million flood mitigation project being implemented.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change</td>
<td>Floods, rising water table, coastal inundation</td>
<td>Property damage; Damage to reputation if not taken into account in decision making; Financial loss</td>
<td>16% contingency added to HIRDS2 rainfall data. Flood mapping includes effect of 1 metre of sea level rise. $20million flood mitigation project being implemented.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Combined factor ratings**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk categories</th>
<th>Specific Risks Identified</th>
<th>Possible Effects</th>
<th>Existing Controls and Mitigation Measures in place</th>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Consequence Rating</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(worst case) (after controls)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>Water quality - Natural waterways</td>
<td>Health of water and waterways and impact of health of humans and environment</td>
<td>Investigation, monitoring and trials underway. Resource consent for waste water and stormwater discharge</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>280</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Growth risks associated with development</td>
<td>Development contributions too high/low with corresponding impacts on ratepayers; Infrastructure not suited to need; Difficulties in meeting specified levels of service</td>
<td>Forecasts have been reviewed for growth estimates in LTP which will better reflect expected growth; Potential growth considered in depth as part of the development of the DDS. Independent probity audit undertaken on development contribution policy underlying methodology and charging schedules.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unable to meet community expectations about rate growth or the manner in which it occurs</td>
<td>Loss of amenity value; Overloading of services; Reactive service provision; Excessive costs for future ratepayers; Ecological damage</td>
<td>District Plan in place; research and consultation carried out prior to rezoning land; NPS on Urban Development (Settlement Pattern Review and Future Demand Strategy); GCP and DDS to manage the way in which growth occurs, sequencing current development growth areas; DDS and DP review underway.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development contributions set at levels that make development less viable.</td>
<td>Limited ratepayer base from which to meet costs funding/holding costs. Development less attractive than adjacent districts</td>
<td>District Plan specifies requirements relating to staging. Regular meetings with Developers. Monitoring development activity monthly and regular demand reassessments.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Risk that long term assets may not meet future needs, e.g. obsolescence, changing demand patterns, changing legislation, unexpected growth rates</td>
<td>Inability to meet expected level of service without incurring additional cost</td>
<td>Activity management plans extend over one asset cycle, and network demand performance modelling undertaken</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vested assets being below necessary standards</td>
<td>Difficulties in maintaining levels of service; Financial loss</td>
<td>Consent conditions; Engineering approvals; Auditing of consent conditions; Engineering code of practice</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The 4ha rule or MR 873 zoning could contribute to a demand for infrastructure which may not be possible to meet in a timely and economic manner</td>
<td>Inability to meet expected level of service without incurring additional cost</td>
<td>GCUDS provides for smaller rural residential lots; DP review will consider 4ha development options; Development contributions policy seeks to recover equitable share of costs.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not appropriately assessing flood risks</td>
<td>People could build in inappropriate places and suffer loss; Council infrastructure doesn't operate in accordance with expectations (strategic risk, new builds now managed)</td>
<td>LIDAR database; surveying when constructing infrastructure; District Plan rules re floor heights; Activity management planning. Ashley break-out modelling effects on existing and new developments. Each LIM notes draft flood modelling and any BC in flood hazard area has flood effects specifically considered.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Financial**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk categories</th>
<th>Specific Risks Identified</th>
<th>Possible Effects</th>
<th>Existing Controls and Mitigation Measures in place</th>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Consequence Rating</th>
<th>Risk Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>worst case (after controls)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordability of Council Services.</td>
<td>Ratepayer distress; Increased political risk; Media interest; Trying to do more with less leading to errors/burnout; Reduction in levels of service; increased difficulties collecting rates.</td>
<td>Review of budgets by management, community plans committee and council; Financial analysis included with proposals to council; Consultation on LTP and annual plans and levels of service completed; Full insurance cover over assets including govt subsidies.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad debts by multiple debtors (possible causes include downturn in economy, ratepayer revolt, unemployment or ageing population).</td>
<td>Financial loss</td>
<td>Reviews of applications for credit; Monitoring of outstanding debts; Early contact re overdue debts; Enforcement mechanisms.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant cost escalation, e.g. with major projects such as LTP programme, rapidly increasing fuel costs, water upgrades are relevant.</td>
<td>Financial loss; Possible impacts on ability to provide expected levels of service</td>
<td>Budgets calculated with provision for escalation; Experienced staff/consultants involved in estimating costs for major projects; Specified procedures where budgets likely to be exceeded; Financial proposals indicate degree of robustness of forecasts.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest rate movements</td>
<td>Financial loss or exposure</td>
<td>Treasury management policy specifies hedging strategy; regular monitoring by Treasury Committee (including independent advisor) and A &amp; R Committee oversight.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft/misappropriation of assets</td>
<td>Financial loss; loss of reputation</td>
<td>Values and culture reinforced, systems reviews and independent audits, and fidelity insurance cover in place</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operational</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>worst case (after controls)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal/Compliance Risk</td>
<td>Failure to comply with Reserves Act processes</td>
<td>Prosecution; Financial loss; Loss of amenity value; Loss of reputation</td>
<td>Green space team adequately resourced, skilled and experience is being maintained; Legal advice sought as required</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not taking sufficient steps to meet resource consent conditions related to Council activities</td>
<td>Prosecution; Financial loss; Loss of amenity value</td>
<td>Monitoring conditions regularly and reported to A &amp; R Committee</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not effectively discharging environmental &amp; legislative monitoring and compliance role, or not being timely in responses</td>
<td>Reputation risk, Legislative provisions not given effect to (eg RMA/BA provisions being monitored effectively)</td>
<td>Staff resources and after-hours service available, legal review of challenging issues</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council liability flowing from not meeting Building Act requirements - leaky building or flooding issues</td>
<td>Financial loss; Loss of reputation</td>
<td>Internal Review of processes, Insurance protection via JLT.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tender/contracting errors expose Council to legal action or financial loss</td>
<td>Civil action; Financial loss; contract works may not be carried out in accordance with expectations.</td>
<td>Project Development Unit involved in preparing contract documents; Contractual documents were reviewed; Tender secretary and deputy trained; Sometimes seek external technical tender evaluations; Legal assistance sought as required. Insurance policies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff mistakes or staff providing incorrect advice, e.g. Advice re RMA planning, LIMs, PIMS, building consents, or miscommunication between staff and customers regarding advice given</td>
<td>Legal challenge; Financial loss; Damage to Council reputation</td>
<td>Staff training; internal review; electronic filing systems capturing all data; legal advice where relevant; professional indemnity insurance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk categories</td>
<td>Specific Risks Identified</td>
<td>Possible Effects</td>
<td>Existing Controls and Mitigation Measures in place</td>
<td>Likelihood</td>
<td>Consequence Rating</td>
<td>Risk Changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changes in legislation/regulations not reflected in practices impacting the way functions are carried out, or compliance requirements etc.</td>
<td>Additional costs of compliance and/or risks of non-compliance; Ability to provide some services; Delays in delivery in some services</td>
<td>The Council submits on proposed legislation or regulations, and receives bulletins re proposed changes in legislation; training and system redesign when changes are known.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operational performance</td>
<td>Not meeting community expectations re mode of service delivery or losing opportunities to be innovative, due to not investing in IT/business improvement, not remaining relevant to community</td>
<td>Could affect Council's relevance to community and customers, and impact future financial outcomes and service provision</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operational performance</td>
<td>Poor performance because of lack of information as to how the Council is performing</td>
<td>The Council may not be performing in line with its own expectations or those of the community</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>Loss of key staff.</td>
<td>Difficulties in achieving performance targets; Loss of &quot;institutional memory&quot;; Recruitment costs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>Risk of poor performance</td>
<td>Difficulties in providing expected levels of service; Could have implications for finances and reputation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health and Safety</td>
<td>Risk of accident or injury crystallises: Council fails to meet legislative standards, or actions/inaction endangers staff, the public or contractors</td>
<td>A number of affects ranging Injury/Death; Damage to reputation; prosecution and personal liability.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Health and Safety</td>
<td>Swimming pool health and safety not being correctly monitored</td>
<td>Sickness; injury; drowning; damage to reputation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Health and Safety</td>
<td>Earthquake prone building policy not being implemented</td>
<td>Injury or death; Prosecution and damage to Council reputation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk categories</td>
<td>Specific Risks Identified</td>
<td>Possible Effects</td>
<td>Existing Controls and Mitigation Measures in place</td>
<td>Likelihood</td>
<td>Consequence Rating</td>
<td>Risk Changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxidation pond health and safety. Other public facilities operated by contractors, including Refuse, Camping grounds and other Council premises on rental or lease arrangements</td>
<td>Oxidation pond health and safety. Other public facilities operated by contractors, including Refuse, Camping grounds and other Council premises on rental or lease arrangements</td>
<td>Sickness; injury; drowning</td>
<td>Restricted access - lock gates after hours, Sign in book at Marsh Road. Reviews of Health and Safety plans at all sites. Inspections of facilities. Water Unit staff inoculated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cars crashing in or into reserves</td>
<td>Cars crashing in or into reserves</td>
<td>Injury; Death; Damage to Council reputation</td>
<td>In reserve: Carriageways in reserves appropriately maintained; speed limits signposted; car park separated from field</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falls in council buildings, e.g. library</td>
<td>Falls in council buildings, e.g. library</td>
<td>Injury; Damage to Council reputation</td>
<td>Regular hazard reviews; Tradesmen use signs to signal hazards. Maintenance is kept at a high standard through mtc programme.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contamination of public water supplies (accidental/deliberate)</td>
<td>Contamination of public water supplies (accidental/deliberate)</td>
<td>Illness; Death; Damage to Council reputation</td>
<td>Adherence to WINZ testing programme; Procedures in the event of failed tests; Staff appropriately qualified; Locks on Water Supply buildings and wells. Approved Water safety plans for all schemes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cars crashing in or into reserves</td>
<td>Cars crashing in or into reserves</td>
<td>Injury; Death; Damage to Council reputation</td>
<td>In reserve: Carriageways in reserves appropriately maintained; speed limits signposted; car park separated from field</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falls in council buildings, e.g. library</td>
<td>Falls in council buildings, e.g. library</td>
<td>Injury; Damage to Council reputation</td>
<td>Regular hazard reviews; Tradesmen use signs to signal hazards. Maintenance is kept at a high standard through mtc programme.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contamination of public water supplies (accidental/deliberate)</td>
<td>Contamination of public water supplies (accidental/deliberate)</td>
<td>Illness; Death; Damage to Council reputation</td>
<td>Adherence to WINZ testing programme; Procedures in the event of failed tests; Staff appropriately qualified; Locks on Water Supply buildings and wells. Approved Water safety plans for all schemes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer overflows</td>
<td>Sewer overflows</td>
<td>Illness; Death; Prosecution; Damage to Council reputation; Loss of amenity value</td>
<td>Appropriately qualified staff; regular maintenance programme; Telemetry for monitoring systems; After hours call out system to mitigate effects of any overflows; Sewer Modeling and upgrades occurring</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Treatment Plant performance deteriorates resulting in non-compliant/insanitary effluent</td>
<td>Sewer Treatment Plant performance deteriorates resulting in non-compliant/insanitary effluent</td>
<td>Illness; Death; Prosecution; Damage to Council reputation; Loss of amenity value</td>
<td>Appropriately qualified staff; regular maintenance programme; After hours call out system to mitigate effects of any overflows; Sewer Modeling and upgrades occurring</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Swimming Pools not complying with Act resulting in drowning</td>
<td>Private Swimming Pools not complying with Act resulting in drowning</td>
<td>Death; Prosecution; Council reputation</td>
<td>A service level agreement has been developed. The Water unit have well developed quality procedure manuals in place</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public health risks are inherent in supply. Detection and response.</td>
<td>Public health risks are inherent in supply. Detection and response.</td>
<td>Injury; Death; Prosecution; Damage to Council reputation</td>
<td>Added financial cost</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic accidents due to poorly designed or maintained roads</td>
<td>Traffic accidents due to poorly designed or maintained roads</td>
<td>Injury; Illness; Death; Prosecution; Damage to Council reputation</td>
<td>For new roads or modifications - Staff appropriately qualified; internal review of designs; use of external expertise in some instances. For existing roads, programmed maintenance programme</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council assets</td>
<td>Council assets</td>
<td>Infrastructure failure (lots of possible causes, including wear and tear, inappropriate design for use or vice versa, poor construction)</td>
<td>Difficulties in maintaining levels of service; Financial loss in restoring service; loss of reputation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer mains underneath buildings</td>
<td>Sewer mains underneath buildings</td>
<td>Added maintenance costs; Damage to buildings; May need to demolish a building</td>
<td>Buildings no longer allowed to be built on top of sewer mains</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism at multiple locations or severe in nature</td>
<td>Vandalism at multiple locations or severe in nature</td>
<td>Financial loss; loss of amenity value</td>
<td>Support security camera operation in selected locations; repair vandalism promptly to reduce subsequent damage</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to Provide Expected Service</td>
<td>Ability to Provide Expected Service</td>
<td>If failures could affect ability to carry out some functions, e.g. library, LIMS/PIMS, rates.</td>
<td>Difficulties in maintaining levels of service; Financial loss</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk categories</td>
<td>Specific Risks Identified</td>
<td>Possible Effects</td>
<td>Existing Controls and Mitigation Measures in place</td>
<td>Likelihood</td>
<td>Consequence Rating</td>
<td>Risk Changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power failure (more than minor)</td>
<td>Difficulties in maintaining levels of service; Financial loss</td>
<td>Stock of generators; Battery power for SCADA system; Criticality plan prepared; UPS for critical IT equipment; Storage arrangements (e.g. water, stormwater); Generator strategy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal of community funding</td>
<td>Difficulties in maintaining levels of service; Financial loss</td>
<td>Discussions, securing agreements, advocating the need and representation to decision makers.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post earthquake Regeneration process unaffordable or does not meet community expectations</td>
<td>Reputation with community and Central government. Financial, budget and costs</td>
<td>Regeneration plan approved, with regular community consultation and government engagement re Plan implementation. LTP provisions consulted on</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in regional composition of council - 2019 Ecan return to full democracy with representation review in 2018</td>
<td>Regional - risk re nature of representation arrangements, and focus of Ecan council/relationships with WDC</td>
<td>Manage conflict processes well. Engage regularly with Ecan councillors and through Canterbury Mayoral and CE forum.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME COUNCIL DECISIONS AND ACTIVITIES ARE INHERENTLY LIKELY TO BE UNPOPULAR WITH SOME PARTS OF THE COMMUNITY, E.G. TOWN CENTRE DEVELOPMENT, PARKING ARRANGEMENTS, RESOURCE CONSENTS, LEVEL AND PRIORITISATION OF SEAL EXTENSIONS</td>
<td>Damage to reputation; Added political risk</td>
<td>Transparent decision making processes; specified objection processes; publicity about rules and bylaws and any changes in enforcement arrangements; Council values support customer focus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECISION MAKING RISKS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel could leak confidential information (e.g. details of tenders). One particular instance would be espionage</td>
<td>Damage to reputation; Financial loss; Added political risk</td>
<td>Employment agreements specify that information is confidential; Confidential council/committee papers not stored in main drive and have limited circulation; Council/committee papers clearly specify which information is in committee;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk categories</th>
<th>Specific Risks Identified</th>
<th>Possible Effects</th>
<th>Existing Controls and Mitigation Measures in place</th>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Consequence Rating</th>
<th>Risk Rating</th>
<th>Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>Nationally led change seeking reorganisation of Council structure for service delivery - eg outcome of 3 waters review</td>
<td>Affect ability to carry out Council business; Council reputation; staff morale/turnover; Staff experience difficulty in meeting some council/invitation expectations</td>
<td>Contribute to national reviews and ensure our voice is heard. Remain alert to the local impacts and ensure community awareness. Ensure local service delivery is to a high standard.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>(worst case) (after controls)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional collaboration support requiring significant investment/commitment from the Council</td>
<td>Impact on Council operations/diversion of resources/divergent community expectations</td>
<td>Engage constructively through the Cant Mayoral Forum. Remain alert to the local impacts and ensure community awareness. Ensure local service delivery is to a high standard.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central government changes may impose further changes on council, e.g. reviews, rates caps, changing functions, appointment of commissioners.</td>
<td>Affect ability to carry out Council business; Council reputation; staff morale/turnover</td>
<td>Endeavour to operate Council affairs with regard for due process, legal obligations and ratepayer expectations; Monitor central government initiatives; Participation in central government reviews, e.g. submissions. Mayoral forum</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk categories</td>
<td>Specific Risks Identified</td>
<td>Possible Effects</td>
<td>Existing Measures in place</td>
<td>Likelihood</td>
<td>Consequence</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Risk Changes (worst case)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Risk Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIKELIHOOD RATINGS</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost Certain</td>
<td>The event is expected to occur in most circumstances or A very low level of confidence/information</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>The event will probably occur in most circumstances or A low level of confidence/information</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>The event should occur at some time A moderate level of confidence/information</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>The event could occur at some time A high level of confidence/information</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>The event may occur only in exceptional circumstances A very high level of confidence/information</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSEQUENCE RATINGS</th>
<th>Health and Safety</th>
<th>$</th>
<th>Project Delays</th>
<th>Design/Project robustness</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Image</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>Fatality, or permanent total disability</td>
<td>&gt;$20m</td>
<td>Years</td>
<td>Significant performance deficiencies</td>
<td>Permanent widespread ecological damage</td>
<td>International media, public enquiry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Significant injury resulting in permanent partial disability. Serious Harm</td>
<td>$2m-20m</td>
<td>6-12 months</td>
<td>Fails to meet design criteria</td>
<td>Heavy ecological damage, costly restoration</td>
<td>National media, ministerial questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Serious injury or illness, with &gt;10 days lost time</td>
<td>$200K-$2m</td>
<td>0-6 months</td>
<td>Unable to meet some design criteria</td>
<td>Significant but recoverable damage</td>
<td>Regional media, official information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Injury or illness requiring medical treatment, with &lt; 10 days lost time.</td>
<td>$20K-$200K</td>
<td>Weeks</td>
<td>Meets design criteria most of the time</td>
<td>Limited but medium term effects</td>
<td>Local media, minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine</td>
<td>Slight injuries</td>
<td>&lt;$20K</td>
<td>Days</td>
<td>Routine operational niggles</td>
<td>Minor short term effects</td>
<td>Internal questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combined factor ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High risk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to update the Council on Health and Safety matters for the month of March.

Attachment

1. Discharging Officer Health and Safety Duties
2. March 2018 Health and Safety Dashboard Report

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No 180326032221.

3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. There are only two work-related accidents in this report, the four further incidents recorded (as shown in the bar chart) but not reflected on here were reported in the last report submitted to Council.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Occurrence</th>
<th>Event description</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24 February</td>
<td>Accident</td>
<td>Staff member was walking to staff room and slipped over. This resulted in a scrap to the torso. First aid was administered by another lifeguard.</td>
<td>Accident was handled correctly. No corrective actions required. CLOSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 February</td>
<td>Accident</td>
<td>Staff member received a dog bite on hand which resulted in a puncture wound (first aid treatment was applied). The dog approached the staff member and sniffed his hand, then decided to bite his hand, causing several puncture wounds. The staff member cleaned the wound and applied antiseptic cream and the hand healed and the swelling</td>
<td>There were no contributing factors. The only thing that come to mind is to recommend the owner of the dog to have it tied up whilst there are others on the property. The incident has been reported and investigated to Dog Control. Dog Control spoke to all parties involved and found that the owner should have put the dog away ad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2. The dashboard review shows:

- Waimakariri District Council Health and Safety Risk Register was reviewed on Monday 12 March by Management Team. The updated register will be issued to all staff once changes are finalised.

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. Not applicable.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1 Not applicable

6. CONTEXT

6.1. Policy

Not applicable

6.2. Legislation

Key extracts from the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015, especially as it relates to Officers, were provided to the first meeting of this term of Council on 25 October 2016.

Jim Palmer
Chief Executive
## Discharging Officer Health and Safety Duties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OFFICER DUTIES</th>
<th>EXAMPLES OF ACTIVITIES TO SUPPORT DISCHARGE OF DUTIES</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>KNOW</strong></td>
<td>• Updates on new activities/major contracts</td>
<td>Various Committee reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Council reports to include Health and Safety advice as relevant</td>
<td>Monthly, as required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Audit Committee to receive minutes of Health and Safety Committee meetings</td>
<td>Two-monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Update on legislation and best practice changes to Audit Committee</td>
<td>As required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNDERSTAND</strong></td>
<td>• Induction of new Council through tour of District and ongoing site visits.</td>
<td>Start of each new term and as required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• H&amp;S Risk register to Audit Committee</td>
<td>Six monthly, or where major change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Training on H&amp;S legislation and best practices updates</td>
<td>At least annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CCO activities reported to the Audit Committee</td>
<td>At least annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESOURCES</strong></td>
<td>• LTP or Annual Plan to have a specific report on H&amp;S resources</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reports to Committees will outline H&amp;S issues and resourcing, as appropriate</td>
<td>As required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MONITOR</strong></td>
<td>• Report to every Council meeting – standing agenda item to include Dashboard Update and any major developments</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Risk register review by Audit Committee</td>
<td>Six monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMPLY</strong></td>
<td>• Programme of H&amp;S internal work received by Audit Committee</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Internal Audit reports to Audit Committee</td>
<td>As completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Incident Investigations reported Audit Committee</td>
<td>As required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Worksafe review of incidents/accidents reported to Audit Committee</td>
<td>As required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VERIFY</strong></td>
<td>• Receive ACC WSMP audit results and remedial actions (if any) reported to Audit Committee</td>
<td>Two yearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Worksafe audits, if undertaken</td>
<td>As completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Self-assessment against Canterbury Safety Charter reported to the Audit Committee</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Progress against 2017/18 Workplan - March 2018 (**as at Tuesday 13th March 2018**)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 1: Improve Health and Safety data management, and encourage all staff to report incidents and hazards.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action 1:</strong> Safety Management System investigation and procurement project (includes carry-over of ‘Reporting Improvement’ project from 2016/17).</td>
<td>No change to prior month</td>
<td>Meeting was held with 4 other Councils in the region during to investigate the potential to embark on a shared services’ procurement project, as each of those Councils are in varying stages either procuring, reviewing or replacing their Safety Management System software. However this shared services project has now been placed on hold due to differing priorities and workload levels across the Councils. In the meantime, WDC is pursuing the following potential option for improving Safety Management:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Incident management in Technology One (with mobility interface, and bespoke reporting developed by Technology One team)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Risk Management via Promapp (yet to be implemented)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Training Management via Promapp (yet to be trialed and approved)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Auditing schedule as per SafePlus requirements (see below), and continue with current inspection schedules for regular site audits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Documentation management via TRM and new intranet portal (see below)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Procedure management via Promapp (yet to be implemented) and linked to new intranet portal (see below)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 2: Maintain a fit-for-purpose internal health and safety auditing system to ensure that WDC is compliant with health and safety policies, procedures and legal requirements.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action 2:</strong> Implementation of Tech1/Mobile Hazard, Incident and Take-5 systems (carry-over project).</td>
<td>No change to prior month</td>
<td>Hazards and Incidents: Both hazard forms and incident forms have ‘gone live’ online. All staff can lodge hazards or incidents via intranet link or mobile device. Link has been established to Technology 1, which is now the database for hazard and incident data. If staff are developing workflows for any actions to be assigned to relevant staff. Completion of the workflows in Technology 1 is imminent, with IT currently working to finalise. Take-5 Forms: Take-5 forms have been developed for mobile devices, and are in use in the Water Unit. The forms have been demonstrated to Audit &amp; Risk Committee, Health and Safety Committee, and key users throughout the organisation. Trial for Utilities and Roading team has been completed, and feedback will be incorporated into Take-5 prior to roll-out to remainder of organisation (early 2018).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 3: Ensure that all contractors are managed according to health and safety procedural requirements, and improve staff knowledge of those requirements.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action 3:</strong> Review and re-develop internal health and safety auditing system, aligned with best practice.</td>
<td>No change to prior month</td>
<td>Initial investigation has led to reviewing WorkSafe’s proposed “SafePlus” as a model. SafePlus has not been designed to replace WSMI. It has a different approach from a purely compliance audit. SafePlus is a business improvement tool that uses a behaviour-based assessment approach, and also offers independent guidance and advice on how to improve health and safety performance in a business. The toolkit will be available as three separate products:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Resources and guidance from WorkSafe website (available September 2017).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- An independent onsite assessment (available September 2017).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A free online self-assessment (available mid 2018).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report to Management Team has been submitted to seek approval to align WDC H&amp;S systems with SafePlus, and in turn, create an internal auditing programme to suit. Intranet portal is currently in development which aligns with SafePlus structure, where all documentation and procedures will be accessed by staff. This is due for finalisation by end of March.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 4: Improve the Health and Wellbeing of staff, and create measures to ensure success.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action 4:</strong> Wellbeing strategy development and implementation project.</td>
<td>No change to prior month</td>
<td>A Wellbeing Survey was distributed in mid-September. Report to Management Team to present the findings of the Survey was submitted and approved in November. Decision has been made to create a ‘Wellbeing Committee/Workgroup’ which will include members of HR/H&amp;S, MAD Committee, Social Club, and other interested staff. Strategy development is now currently in progress, with a goal of creating an inclusive, diverse and easily accessed range of wellbeing offerings. Strategy due for completion at end of March 2018.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 5: Improve traceability and of staff working alone outside of hours, and appropriate response in the event of an incident.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action 8:</strong> Lone working equipment procurement project.</td>
<td>COMPLETE</td>
<td>Work is complete on this project. SmartTrak devices have been procured for the Water Unit on-call team, which are satellite capable and externally monitored by ADT. They act as panic alarms and communication devices, even when the staff are out of cell-phone coverage range. A panic alarm has been assessed in the Environmental Services Unit, and the trial was successful, therefore they will be going ahead with purchase.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEGEND**

- **COMPLETE** Work is complete on this project.
- **On track** Work is on track.
- **Slightly behind schedule (less than one month)** Work is slightly behind schedule (less than one month).
- **Behind schedule (greater than one month)** Work is behind schedule (greater than one month).
Mar 2017 to Current: Worker Incident Reporting
Incidents/Accidents - March 2018 (**as at Tuesday 13th March 2018)

Accident, 41, 57%

Incident, 12, 17%

Near Miss, 12, 17%

Notifiable Injury/Illness/Incident, 1, 1%

Property Damage, 6, 8%

Fatality, 0, 0%

Mar 2017 to Current: Worker Incident Reporting

Mar 2017 to Current: Worker - Cause of Incident

Fall, trip or slip, 12, 23%

Body stressing, 8, 16%

Heat, radiation or energy, 4, 8%

Biological factors, 5, 10%

Chemicals or other substances, 2, 4%

Mental stress, 2, 4%

Hitting objects with part of body incl. cuts, 10, 19%

Being hit by moving objects, 12, 23%

Sound or pressure, 0, 0%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Description</th>
<th>Rating (out of 25)</th>
<th>Current actions</th>
<th>Action Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Contractor Health and Safety Management              | 15                 | *Train all contract managers in H&S processes/requirements at time of induction.  
*Develop comprehensive contract administration/contract management training package to deliver to all staff managing contractors.  
*Identify volunteer groups and leaseholders that engage contractors on behalf of WDC and train in contract H&S management processes.  
*Complete development of Safety in Design procedures and embed in design processes. | Charlotte Browne   |
| Vehicle Use & Driver Safety                          | 15                 | *Deliver driver training as per training strategy (Driver Safety / 4WD)  
*Identify any drivers that require further progressive driver training on an as-needs basis and provide relevant training.  
*Provide information and training regarding use of safety equipment such as fire extinguishers in staff pool vehicles to all drivers. | Charlotte Browne   |
| Volunteers                                           | 15                 | *Undertake a review of operations to ensure that all activity and training is being carried out as per internal H&S processes.  | Liz Ashton          |
| *Conducting hazardous activities  
*Injury/death                                        |                    |                                                                                                                                                                                                                |                    |
| Adverse Weather                                      | 15                 | *Develop protocols for response to adverse weather events (especially at night), and include in Safe Working in the Field Manual  
*Include in Emergency Management Plan out-of-hours deployment in adverse weather. | Charlotte Browne   |
| Airfield Operations                                  | 15                 | *Develop of Airfield Safety Committee and appointment of Airfield Safety Coordinator to administer all actions from safety review.  
*Develop of Airfield Operations Manual, and adoption of the manual by Council as the key safety document for the Airfield operations.  
*Provide regular Airfield Operations report to Council | Craig Sargison     |
MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE REGENERATION STEERING GROUP HELD IN THE RUATANIWHA KAIAPOI CIVIC CENTRE ON MONDAY 5 MARCH 2018 AT 4.00PM

PRESENT:

A Blackie (Chair), J Watson, P Redmond, S Stewart, C Greengrass, R Blair, J Meyer, M Pinkham, N Atkinson.

Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust (Chair) representative C McMillian; Environment Canterbury representative C McKay; D Ayers (Mayor); J Palmer (Chief Executive); C Sargison (Manager Community and Recreation); D Roxborough (Implementation Project Manager - District Regeneration).

IN ATTENDANCE:

M Flanagan, WDC
K Dwyer, WDC

1. APOLOGIES

An apology was received and sustained from H Crombie, and J Barr for absence.

An apology was received and sustained from J Watson, C McMillan and D Ayers for lateness.

CARRIED

2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Moved: J Meyer  Seconded: P Redmond

THAT the Regeneration Steering Group:

Confirms as a true and correct record the minutes of a meeting held on Monday 29 January 2018.

CARRIED

3. MATTERS ARISING

The Kakaunui Reserve location map has been received from MKT and this will be circulated to the Regeneration Steering Group.

4. DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

Brent and Shirley Cairns – Kaiapoi Food Forest Update

B Cairns gave an update of the Kaiapoi Food Forest timeline. On the 29 and 30 August 2017, Treetech were engaged to move some trees into the food forest. The Council provided $7.5K of funding for this. Treetech moved a total of 17 trees over the two days.

There was an Open Planting Day in which B and S Cairns donated 150 trees, another 27 trees were donated by Heritage Fruit Trees along with an additional 80 trees that were donated on the open planting day.

The first school visit by Clarkville School had 55 students and 82 strawberry plants. They are coming back to the food forest tonight with their parents for a picnic.

B Cairns advised that he has spent some time with G Byrnes from the Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust to get some advice on how they have been able to make such a success of the Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust.
B Cairns noted that W Cook from the Corrections Department has been instrumental in moving almost 500 cubic metres of mulch, and currently they have spent just over 800 man hours in the Kaiapoi Food Forest. The Corrections Team are now specifically asking to come and work in the food forest.

There are 17 types of trees, over 50 types of plants and for the next planting day there will be more plants purchased that will be infill plants. These plants will be purchased from Woodend Nursery who are giving a very special deal. Some events are starting to be held in the food forest with the first one being held by You, Me, We, Us, the Amazing Race which was organised by C Greengrass and was a very successful event. The Leithfield Pre-school have also been to visit the food forest.

B Cairns noted that the community are noticing the work that is being done by the Corrections Department and a member of the community recently brought down some morning tea for the workers.

B Cairns advised that the wharf timber that has been donated from the Council is being used for planting borders and looks amazing.

B Cairns advised that the Corrections Department are now using the food forest as part of an education programme that has been set up to teach about landscape gardening.

S Cairns noted that during the school visits, they have been teaching children how to graft and the Rangi Ruru students learnt about sustainable food.

B Cairns advised that nearly every week there are plants and trees that are being dropped off. There have also been some cranberries delivered yesterday from Waimate. A couple from the Solomon Islands came to visit to see what they could do in terms of replicating a food forest in their island. We had Hannah and Len last week from the rubbish trip came to visit the food forest and were most impressed from a zero waste point of view, they loved the concept of a food forest has people can come in instead of buying the food in packaging, they can pick it off the tree.

B Cairns advised they have been approached by North Loburn as they would like to set up a community food forest in the North Loburn area. They had a visit from R Wallace representing the local Rūnanga. She came to visit the food forest and commented on how the food forest had a lovely feel about it. B Cairns said they would like to get the local Rūnanga involved in the food forest in terms of telling stories about Kaiapoi.

C Adams is looking at sourcing more funding from other sources in relation to co-ordinator fees and some more seating. N Leary who is also a Food Forest has a connection with the local Rūnanga.

B Cairns advised that he has met with Glen Foley who works for an international business who provide a lot of equipment for disability associations. We are going to look at setting up areas in the food forest that will allow for better access for disabled and the elderly.

B Cairns advised that the food forest is going to be used as a testing ground for growing mushrooms.

The next open day is scheduled for the 24 March – 10am – 12pm. There will be planting days and education days over the next few months.

B and S Cairns will provide a further greater detailed report in June.

5. LINZ UPDATE

C Sargison noted that the Draft Divestment Agreement is going before Council on Tuesday 6 March.

6. TE KŌHAKA O TŪHAITARA TRUST UPDATE

C McMillan gave an update and advised they have started talking with the residents in The Pines Beach and Kairaki about their areas.

C McMillan advised that a concept plan has been sent out for consultation and anyone is welcome to submit.
C McMillan noted they have been talking with LINZ in regard to their Divestment Land Agreement.

7. **KAIAPOI TOWN CENTRE 2028 PLAN UPDATE**

C Sargison noted that there will be a workshop next month by Simon Hart.

8. **REPORTS**

8.1 **Kaiapoi East Regeneration Area – outstanding roading repairs – Michelle Flanagan, Landscape Planner – District Regeneration, Ken Stevenson, Roading Manager, Duncan Roxborough, Implementation Project Manager – District Regeneration**

D Roxborough advised that the purpose of this report is to cover the retained roads within the Kaiapoi East regeneration area. There are a number of roads that will be retained and will still play an integral part in accessing the existing land uses and activities in the Kaiapoi East regeneration area. The road that this report covers are the likes of Charles and Jollie Street. There are also the ongoing driveways and private access ways. Jones Street is another road that is yet to be attended to through the Infrastructure Recovery Programme, and is the last roading project left in the Infrastructure Recovery Plan.

The reason that these roads are not in the Infrastructure Recovery Programme is because at the time of establishing that programme the red zoning had just happened and there was some uncertainty around what was going to remain in the red zones.

For the work to be undertaken on the likes of Charles, Jollie and Cass Street, these are included within the regeneration programme and have been budgeted for. There is a budget of $1.8M included. That is the gross cost as these roads attract an NZTA subsidy.

Staff are seeking approval to progress to the next stage which will be developing the concept designs for those road based on the purpose that is summarised in the report. Staff will come back to workshop the designs.

Moved: A Blackie  
Seconded: C Greengrass

**THAT** the Regeneration Steering Group recommends:

**THAT** the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180222019119(v02).

(b) Approves staff progressing the concept design of permanent repairs Charles Street with a primary purpose of providing vehicle access to Jollie Street and adjacent reserve and land uses and on-street parking.

(c) Approves staff progressing with the concept design of permanent repairs to Jollie Street with a primary purpose of providing vehicle access reserve and rural land uses and on-street parking.

(d) Approves staff progressing with the concept design of permanent repairs to Cass Street (from Jones Street to the Kaiapoi East sport and recreation reserve) with a primary purpose of providing vehicle access to the sport and recreation reserve.

(e) Approves staff progressing with the concept design of permanent repairs to Cass Street (from Jollie Street to Hall Street) with a primary purpose of providing vehicle access to the boat ramp in Askeaton Park.

(f) Notes that the preliminary concept designs and refined cost estimates for Charles Street, Jollie Street, Cass Street (from Jones Street to the Kaiapoi East sport and recreation reserve), and Cass Street (from Jollie Street to Hall Street) will be presented at a staff briefing to the Regeneration Steering Group later this year for feedback.

(g) Notes that there is currently a budget of $1,810,000 allocated for the repairs to Charles Street, Jollie Street and Cass Street.
(h) Notes that the repair options for Jones Street will be presented in a separate workshop session; and subsequently a separate report will be presented.

CARRIED

9. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT


D Roxborough noted that the purpose of this report is to provide the regular Comm’s update.

Clause 3.1.1. in regard to the consultation that has been undertaken around the street trees for the new Kaiapoi East Link road and also the rebuild of Courtenay Drive, there was only one submission received that was positive and favourable on the tree selection. The consultation closed last week.

In regard to the projects in the wharf and marine precinct area, staff issued an “Information Notice” late last week for the next projects that are due to commence. Environment Canterbury will be temporarily shifting the stop bank to make access to be able to start on the upgrades to the river wall which will be followed by the Riverview Terraces.

Moved: A Blackie  Seconded: C McKay

THAT the Regeneration Steering Group:

(a) Receives report No 180214014896

CARRIED

10. MINUTES FROM PCG MEETINGS

10.1 Kaiapoi River Marine Precinct Project Control Group (PCG) Meeting Minutes – Thursday 8 February 2018

Received for information.

M Pinkham asked if the problems with the preferred contractor have been resolved.

C Sargison advised that this has been resolved.

M Pinkham asked if the contractor working on the private development site has the appropriate Health and Safety accreditation now.

D Roxborough advised that the contractor is now Site Wise approved.

10.2 Regeneration Project Control Group (PCG) Meeting Minutes – Wednesday 14 February 2018

Received for information.

11. CORRESPONDENCE

There was no correspondence.

12. GENERAL

There was no general business.
13. **MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED**

*Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987*

Moved: A Blackie  Seconded: N Atkinson

**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>13.1</td>
<td>Minutes of the public excluded portion of the Regeneration Steering Group meeting Monday 29 January 2018</td>
<td>Confirmation of minutes</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>Report by Duncan Roxborough (Implementation Project Manager – District Regeneration) and Roxanne Ramsay (Project Administrator – District Regeneration)</td>
<td>Licence to Occupy Agreements and Fencing at The Pines Beach</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>13.1</td>
<td>Protection of privacy of natural persons</td>
<td>A2(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>Protection of privacy of natural persons</td>
<td>A2(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CARRIED**

**CLOSED MEETING**

The public were excluded from the meeting from 4.30pm.

**Resolution to Resume Open meeting**

Moved: N Atkinson  Seconded: P Redmond

**THAT** the open meeting resumes and the resolution for item 13.2 be made public, but the discussion and report contents remain public excluded.

**CARRIED**
OPEN MEETING

13.2 Licence to Occupy Agreements and Fencing at The Pines Beach – Duncan Roxborough, Implementation Project Manager – District Regeneration and Roxanne Ramsay, Project Administrator – District Regeneration

Moved: N Atkinson                          Seconded: S Stewart

THAT the Regeneration Steering Group recommends:

(i) Receives report No.171208133657.

(j) Approves staff to defer entering into new Licences to Occupy for the new private lease land in the regeneration areas, and continue with existing vegetation control and maintenance in the interim due to uncertainties about the viability of on-going leasing on the adjacent Rinaldi Reserve.

(k) Notes that a further report will be prepared which reviews options for a potential wetland area development in part of Rinaldi Reserve, which may have implications for allocation of new licences to occupy on WDC land in the wider Pines Beach area.

(l) Circulates a copy of this report to the Community and Recreation Committee.

CARRIED

14. NEXT MEETING

The next scheduled meeting of the Regeneration Steering Group commences at 4.00pm on Monday 9 April 2018 at the Ruataniwha Centre, Kaiapoi.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS THE MEETING CLOSED AT 5.04PM.
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE KAIAPOI-TUAHIWI COMMUNITY BOARD
HELD IN MEETING ROOM 1 (UPSTAIRS), RUATANIWHA KAIAPOI CIVIC CENTRE,
176 WILLIAMS STREET, KAIAPOI ON MONDAY 19 FEBRUARY 2018
COMMENCING AT 4.05PM.

PRESENT
J Watson (Chair), C Greengrass (Deputy Chair), R Blair, M Pinkham, P Redmond and
S Stewart.

IN ATTENDANCE
Councillors J Meyer and A Blackie,
J Palmer (Chief Executive), Mayor D Ayers, G Cleary (Manager Utilities and Roading),
O Davies (Drainage Asset Manager), J Fraser (Utilities Planner), D Haussman (Media and
Visual Communications Coordinator) and M McIlraith (Communications and Engagement
Manager), E Cordwell (Governance Advisor) and A Smith (Committee Advisor)

1 APOLOGIES
Moved J Watson, seconded P Redmond
THAT the Board receive and sustain an apology from N Atkinson.
CARRIED

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
There were no conflicts of interest.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board – 18 December 2017
Moved J Watson seconded C Greengrass
THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:
(a) Confirms the circulated minutes of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community
Board meeting, held 18 December 2017, as a true and accurate
record.
CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
There were no matters arising.

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS
5.1 Julia Holcroft – was to speak to the Board regarding the Tuahiwi Road/Boys
Road/Rangiora-Woodend Road intersection (Five Crossroads). Ms Holcroft
was unable to attend the meeting but written comments on behalf of herself
and her husband were tabled at the meeting, in relation to safety hazards at
the Five Crossroads. Copies were circulated to all Board members and also
passed to staff.
5.2 Kaiapoi River Update – Environment Canterbury and Waimakariri District Council staff.

G Cleary (Manager Utilities and Roading) and A Arps (Waimakariri Water Zone Manager, ECan) provided updates to the Board.

G Cleary with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, provided a summary of projects underway for the Kaiapoi River rehabilitation, and proposed future planting and dredging projects. The types of plants that will be used are those that had the best results from the trial plantings. Projects underway and up to June 2018 include continuing linear wetland establishment (WDC); enhance Courtenay confluence downstream into Kaiapoi Island (ECan); and terrestrial planting centre Kaiapoi (ECan). The dredging consent applications are being progressed at the moment as well. It is hoped to coordinate the dredging with the wharf development.

Future projects are the dredging bed "high points", 1.5m minimum channel at low tide, establishing a gravel beach at the 90 degree bend, to lower/realign inner bend and in 2021/22 major sediment trap and slow water channel.

A Arps spoke on the work protecting the riverbanks, which includes the removal of diseased plants. Planting is to enhance indigenous biodiversity. Indigenous plants are the best selection of species, with lower ones that will not impact on the views. The planting will be made up of 85% shorter, riparian shrub categories and 15% taller, longer term trees. There could be a walkway on the inside of the bank on the north side of the river, although this has not been included in the plan at this stage. River engineers will need to consider to ensure that there is no impact on the river. S Stewart believed it would be good to have direct access to the river via walkways and mentioned a plan that had been in place back in 2010 which included this. G Cleary said this is not included in any funding at the moment but there is no reason by it couldn’t be included in the future. A Arps added that this could be discussed with the ECan river engineers and parks staff.

C Greengrass noted that if access was made available for fishing, to be aware of possible use by residents on mobility scooters – and suggested that paths would need to be made either not accessible for scooters, or made safe enough for scooter use.

S Stewart questioned the maintenance programme that would be planned for this area, suggesting that six monthly maintenance cycle is not sufficient. A Arps said there has already been some work undertaken along the river, noting that there hasn’t been a specified level of service to date. ECan are considering work on the river for the extended reaches, not just the areas through the town. A Arps commented on the good interaction that has been observed by members of the community using the river area.

G Cleary advised that the immediate dredging programme is around the wharf area, and the remainder of the work is to take out the high points to improve navigation. With the dredging consent process, J Fraser said it is being drafted for ongoing dredging, in three stages whatever the term of the consent would be granted. The purpose is for a minimum channel for the coastguard primarily. This is on the north side of the river. S Stewart asked why this dredging wouldn’t include the south side as well. Mr Palmer responded that funding would be included for dredging the north side but not south side. A substantial amount of funding would be required for further dredging on the south side and a report will be going to future Council meeting to look at possible funding options for this dredging.
6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS
Nil.

7 REPORTS

7.1 Property Lease/Licence Renewals 01 January 2018 to 31 December 2018 – Monese Ball (Property Officer)
Mr Palmer spoke to this report, which advised the Board members of leases/licences that are due for renewal over 2018 and to also provide information on what leases/licences are held within this area.

Mr Palmer provided an explanation of "landscape encroachment", which is referred to in the report attachment, under “Land Use” for some of the lease agreements. This covers situations where residents have expanded their gardens into an adjoining reserve space or in some cases, road reserve and this has been formalised with an agreement.

Moved J Watson seconded R Blair

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:
(a) Receives attached report number 180119004337, with spreadsheet 180119004352.
(b) Notes the upcoming renewals, status and nature of the lease/licence agreements.

CARRIED

7.2 Adoption of Community Board Standing Orders – Edwina Cordwell (Governance Advisor)
E Cordwell presented this report seeking the approval of the Board to adopt the amended Standing Orders for Community Boards. Noted that this document is based on the Standing Orders adopted by the Council on 5 December 2017, except for any Council specific matters. The amended items were highlighted, including the length of meeting – Council has chosen to extend the overall meeting time to 10 hours, rather than six. The current six hour limit has been retained in the proposed Community Board Standing Orders. The time period for a quorum to be present has been extended from 10 minutes to 15 minutes from the advertised meeting start time, before a meeting lapses. The Board may wish to retain the current 10 minute period. Use of electronic devices has also been included in the Standing Orders.

P Redmond noted some corrections:
4.5(e) remove the word dep
23.1 first para, delete words council, subordinate body, local or
23.2 second para, delete words local board
25.2 (f) correct spelling of words
26.7 second para, amend communities board to community board
26.8 replace the words local authority with community board
27.1 replace the words Council minute book with Community Board minute book
THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:
(a) Receives report No. 180207011818.
(b) Adopts the Draft Waimakariri District Council Community Boards’ Standing Orders (Trim 180124006310) effective from 20 March 2018.
(c) Delegates the Chairperson of the Kaiapoi Tuahiwi Community Board to grant a member leave of absence pursuant to Standing Orders Rule12.3.

CARRIED

8 MATTERS REFERRED FROM COUNCIL AND COMMITTEES

Item 8.1 is referred from the Regeneration Steering Group meeting of 4 December 2017. A copy of report 1711141123505 is attached.

8.1 Licence to Occupy, Waimakariri Sailing and Power Boat Club, Kairaki–Roxanne Ramsay (Project Administrator – District Regeneration)

Mr Palmer was available for any questions in relation to this report, taken as read. There were no questions.

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:
(a) Receives report No.171114123505.
(b) Approves staff issuing a Licence to Occupy with the Waimakariri Sailing and Power Boat Club on the basis of the attached Draft Licence to Occupy for the use of a section of Red Zone land adjacent to the Kairaki Beach Car Park Reserve for the purpose of boat rigging and storage.
(c) Notes that the lease fee would be set at an amount of $1.00 per annum with the lease term initially being 1 year from December 2017.

CARRIED

9 CORRESPONDENCE

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:
Draft Stormwater Drainage Bylaw
(a) Notes the letter of support from the Board to the Draft Stormwater Drainage Bylaw 2018 (Trim 171207133332).
(b) Receives the acknowledgement of letter of support to the Draft Stormwater Drainage Bylaw 2018 (Trim 180122004941).

CARRIED
10 CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT
10.1 Chair’s Diary for January - February 2018

Moved J Watson seconded C Greengrass

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(c) Receives report No. 180209013099.

CARRIED

11 MATTERS REFERRED FOR INFORMATION

11.1 Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting minutes – 7 December 2017
(Trim No. 171129129618)

11.2 Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting minutes – 11 December 2017
(Trim No. 171205131874).

11.3 Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting minutes – 13 December 2017
(Trim No. 171127128450).

11.4 Utilities and Roading Activity Management Plans 2018 – Report to Utilities
and Roading Committee 12 December 2017 (Trim No. 171122126970).

Moved R Blair seconded P Redmond

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board receives the information in items
11.1-11.4.

CARRIED

Note: Items were circulated to Board members separately.

12 MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE

The purpose of this exchange is to provide a short update to other members in
relation to activities/meetings that have been attended or to provide general
Board related information.

P Redmond

Attended the Community Board Christmas party and extended thanks to the Chair
for hosting.

Attended the Regeneration Steering Group Meeting on 29 January 2018.

Attended the Waimakariri Health Advisory Group – met Sam Redman, the recently
appointed Youth Development Advisor, and L Beckingsale was present and sought
any comments relating to the review of the Local Alcohol Policy.

Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan Review meeting on 8 February 2018.

Acknowledged the recent passing of Murray Binnie, and his work during his time
employed at the Council and with taking Te Reo classes at the Council and the
Waiata group.
M Pinkham
No specific items to report

S Stewart
Council’s Stormwater Bylaw review – 10 submissions have been received, four submitters wish to be heard. Hearing to be held on Tuesday 27 February.
Excellent Waitangi Day celebration in Trousselot Park – noted the international flavor.
Attended Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan Review meeting.
Water Zone workshop attended on February 12, working towards the completion of the ZIPPA, Zone Implementation Plan Addendum.
DP&R Retreat was held on February 13. At this retreat Council staff acknowledged that there are many Plans of both the Council and ECan which are aligned.
Ohoka Rural Drainage meeting on Thursday 15 February. S Stewart noted these Drainage areas are historical, which presents challenges for the landowners and council staff.
Koura Creek – visited with Council staff to look at the planting along the creek. This is a tributary stream of the Northbrook and Cam River and is a good start to improving water qualities.

A Blackie
A Blackie had been invited to attend meeting of residents of Moodys Road and Butchers Road, regarding a proposed trailer park. A resource consent application is currently being considered and there will be traffic and sewerage matters to take into account. Although the proposed trailer park is outside the KTBC ward boundaries, the residents in Moody’s and Butcher’s Roads are inside our boundary and stand to be most affected by it. Some of these residents have formed a group who oppose this proposal.

C Greengrass
Pines Beach monthly committee meeting – AGM is on Monday 26 February. Is unable to attend this AGM, but hoped that other Board members may be able to attend.
Attended Kaiapoi Museum meeting, noted there is concern with light bulbs in the museum requiring frequent replacement and had a question regarding the wiring. C Greengrass said she will contact Council staff regarding this.
You, Me, We Us, - there have been many favourable comments regarding the Waitangi Day celebrations. Compliments to Jackie and Linda Dunbar for organizing.
River Carnival – no date has been set yet for this for 2019.
Re the Christmas Carnival – possible option for future carnivals could be for 2019 event to be a Christmas Carnival in the morning, and the River Carnival in the afternoon. There will be discussions had between You Me We Us and Kaiapoi Promotions on this.

R Blair
Darnley Club – enjoying the extension, a positive result and thanks to C Sargison and the team for what has been provided.

Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan Review meeting – highlighted the discussion on the ParkNRide, quite a lot of thought put into that, but believes there is a lot of time before this would be happening.

Neighbourhood Support meeting held recently – $34,000 has been applied for funding from the Rata Foundation. There was discussion on the structure of Neighbourhood Support and working together with Civil Defence. The workloads for the roles of Coordinator and Treasurer are increasing considerably, intending to advertise a position of 7 hours a week.

J Watson

J Watson noted that she is unable to attend the Pines Beach AGM, but it was indicated that there will be Board presence at the meeting.

Pegasus Bay Advisory Group – J Watson noted that she is happy to remain on this group

13 CONSULTATION PROJECTS

There are no current consultation projects.

14 REGENERATION PROJECTS

14.1 Town Centre, Kaiapoi

Updates on the Kaiapoi Town Centre projects are emailed regularly to Board members. These updates can be accessed using the link below:


14.2 Kaiapoi Regeneration Steering Group

The next meeting of the Kaiapoi Regeneration Steering Group will be held in Meeting Room 1, Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre, 4pm on Monday 5 March 2018. This meeting is open to the public.

15 BOARD FUNDING UPDATE

15.1 Board Discretionary Grant

Balance as at 19 February 2018: $2,400.

15.2 General Landscaping Budget

Balance as at 19 February 2018: $60,080.

16 MEDIA ITEMS

There were no media items.

17 QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

P Redmond questioned a matter in the Standing Orders, and asked if the Chairperson was consulted on any matters that are going to be on the agenda. Mr
Palmer noted that the Chairperson is advised on any staff reports which are going to be on an agenda. The Chairperson is also able to ask for a report to come from staff on any matter through the usual process. Some matters are also workshopped with the Boards prior to them being presented in the formal meeting process.

18 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

There was no urgent general business.

NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board is scheduled for 4pm, Monday 19 March 2018 at the Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 5.20pm.

CONFIRMATION

__________________________  ______________________
Chairperson                  Date

Workshop

At the conclusion of the meeting, a workshop was conducted to discuss speed limits on Rangiora-Woodend Road and adjacent roads particularly Boys and Tuahiwi Roads.
MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF THE OXFORD-OHOKA COMMUNITY BOARD
HELD IN THE OHOKA COMMUNITY HALL, MILL ROAD, OHOKA ON THURSDAY
8 MARCH 2018 AT 7.00PM.

PRESENT
D Nicholl (Chair), W Doody, J Ensor, S Farrell, K Felstead, J Lynn and T Robson.

IN ATTENDANCE
S Nichols (Governance Manager), C Brown (Community and Greenspace Manager),
Mayor D Ayers and E Stubbs (Minute Secretary).

Three members of the public were in attendance for the meeting.

The meeting adjourned for a workshop from 7.06pm to 7.54pm.

1 APOLOGIES
Moved W Doody     Seconded K Felstead
An apology was received and sustained from M Brown for absence.  CARRIED

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
Nil.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board – 8 February 2018
Moved S Farrell     seconded T Robson
THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:
   (a) Confirms the circulated minutes of the Oxford-Ohoka Community
       Board meeting, held 8 February 2018, as a true and accurate record.
CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
J Lynn sought an update on the ReadyMix Quarry Operation in Browns Road,
particularly in relation to consenting matters.  S Nichols advised a memo would be
sent to the Board.

S Farrell referred to Item 7.3 of the February meeting, where Mandeville Sports Club
was approved $5000 subject to the provision of a cost breakdown to be approved by
the Greenspace Manager and the Chair, and asked if this had occurred.  C Brown
advised that information had been received and discussed with the Chair.

S Farrell noted that at the previous meeting S Markham had advised that he would
update the Board on who was responsible for Christmas decorations.  C Brown
advised that it was under his responsibility and that he could cover questions in the
workshop.  S Nichols commented that the Board could consider decorations as part
of their LTP submission.

The meeting adjourned for a workshop from 7.06pm to 7.54pm.
5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS
Nil.

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS
Nil.

7 REPORTS
7.1 Adoption of Community Board Standing Orders – E Cordwell
(Governance Adviser)

S Nichols spoke to the report, noting Standing Orders were required by
legislation. She advised that 18 months ago Local Government New Zealand
(LGNZ) had undertaken a review of Standing Orders as legislative changes
meant Standing Orders were out of kilter with legislative requirements. She
noted that the main changes had been to wording with an emphasis on plain
English and an improved flow to the document. The general concept had not
changed. A thorough assessment had been completed in-house and cross-
referenced between the LGNZ and WDC Standing Orders. The Mayor, CE
and Councillors had all been involved in the process. S Nichols noted that the
Standing Orders for the Council and the proposed Community Board were the
same except for the removal of several sections directly related to the Council.
Council Standing Orders would also apply to all Committees and Hearing
Panels.

S Nichols advised that the resultant Standing Orders were adopted by the
Council at its December meeting. Two changes had been made.

- Page 17, Section 42 – Council had changed the maximum duration of
  a meeting to 10 hours. Six hours had been retained in the proposed
  Community Board Standing Orders.
- Page 29, Section 10.5 – to extend the time period for a Quorum to be
  present from 10 minutes to 15 minutes. This has been reflected in
  the Community Board Standing Orders.

In addition, Page 40, Section 19.11 was a new addition regarding the use of
electronic devices. Devices could be used to access pertinent information
relevant to the meeting however non-meeting related contact was not
acceptable.

S Nichols noted that there would a training session/refresher on Standing
Orders for elected members on the 21 March 2018.

S Farrell sought clarification on members speaking once to a motion with
S Nichols advising that in the rules of debate members could ask as many
questions as practical to ensure they had sufficient information to assist their
decision making; it was after the motion had been moved and seconded that
restrictions applied.

Moved W Doody seconded J Lynn

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180220017403.
(b) Adopts the Draft Waimakariri District Council Community Boards’
Standing Orders (Trim 180124006310) effective from 20 March 2018.

CARRIED
W Doody thanked the staff for their effort in producing the updated Standing Orders on behalf of the Community Board.

J Lynn noted that it was great to have consistency.

### 7.2 Application to the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board’s Discretionary Grant Fund 2017-2018 – E Cordwell (Governance Adviser)

S Nichols spoke briefly to the report commenting that the event received many visitors.

W Doody noted that advertising in the Oxford Bulletin and the Observer was unlikely to total $500 and suggested that this should be acknowledged and that any remainder be used for promotional advertising in any other publication at the Trust’s discretion.

Moved J Lynn seconded T Robson

**THAT** the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180220017473.

(b) **Approves** a grant of $500 to Waimakariri Arts Trust - Kaiapoi Art Expo towards the running costs of the Kaiapoi Art Expo and Schools’ Art Expo to be spent on promotional advertising in the Oxford Observer and Oxford Bulletin, with any residual funds to be used for promotional advertising in any other publication at the Waimakariri Arts Trust’s discretion.

CARRIED

J Lynn noted the attendance from the wider community.

J Ensor commented he had been impressed with the event the previous year.

### 8 CORRESPONDENCE

W Doody advised that the pest control traps had caught 38 possums in three weeks.

T Robson, on behalf of the Community Board and Ashley Gorge Advisory Group (AGAG), thanked J Ensor his assistance to the AGAG including providing shingle for the tracks.

Moved W Doody seconded J Lynn

**THAT** the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) **Receives** the letter of thanks from the Ashley Gorge Advisory Group for assistance with their pest control programme (Trim 180221018495).

CARRIED

### 9 CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT

D Nicholl advised that he had attended the Ohoka Rural Drainage Committee meeting rather than the Oxford Rural Drainage Committee as recorded. He commented that he believed the submission to Environment Canterbury regarding the Canterbury Landscapes resource consent had been very effective.
Chairperson’s Report for February 2018

Moved W Doody  seconded J Lynn

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No 180227020456 with alteration.

CARRIED

10 MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

10.1 Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting minutes – 12 February 2018
(Trim No. 180208012087).

10.2 Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting minutes –14 February 2018
(Trim No. 180208012097).

10.3 Youth Council meeting minutes – 28 November 2017 (Trim No.
180115002480).

10.4 Risk Assessment and Financing Strategy relating to Major Natural
Disasters Report to Council 30 January 2018 (Trim No. 180112002169).

10.5 Multi Use Sports Facility Report to Council 30 January 2018 (Trim No.
180118003759).

10.6 Herbicide, Glyphosate use for Waimakariri District Council weed control
operations Report to Council 30 January 2018 (Trim No. 180111001840).

10.7 Additional Business and Centres Unit Resource Report to Council 30
January 2018 (Trim No. 180109001129).

10.8 Community Facilities Provision Report to Council 30 January 2018 (Trim
No. 171026115830).

10.9 China Sister City Visit to Enshi & Establishment of an Advisory Group
Report to Council 7 February 2018 (Trim No. 180117003619).

10.10 Capital Projects Report for the period ended 31 December 2017 Report to
Audit and Risk Committee 13 February 2018 (Trim No. 180117003619).

10.11 Library Update Report to Community and Recreation Committee 13 February
2018 (Trim No. 180201010087).

Moved J Ensor  seconded S Farrell

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board receives the information in items
10.1-10.11.

CARRIED

S Farrell noted the negativity expressed by some members of the public to the Enshi
visit. She suggested that the Council consider taking a representative of a travel
agency with them on the visit in order to look at tourism opportunities for private New
Zealanders going to China. K Felstead advised that Enterprise North Canterbury
had attended the last trip and would be attending again and commented he could
raise the travel agent suggestion.

W Doody advised that she had withdrawn from the visit for family reasons. S Nichols
advised that the Mayor, Councilor Felstead and Councilor Barnett would travel to
Enshi in mid-May.
11 MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE

11.1 J Ensor
- Advised he had repaired a large water leak at Mandeville Sports Centre.
- Attended the All Boards Briefing and that it had been very informative.

11.2 J Lynn
- Gatekeepers Lodge was progressing steadily. Fulton Hogan had been contracted for the move, which was scheduled for 18/19 April.
- Presented with D Nicholl at the Ecan resource consent hearing against Canterbury Landscape Supplies (CLS). He commented that the independent planner engaged by the Board had been beneficial to the cause.

11.3 S Farrell
- Attended the CLS consent hearing and believed the Community Board had been well represented.
- Attended Pearson Park Advisory Group meeting and expressed disappointment at the lack of answers to questions. C Brown advised he was following up on matters raised.
- Had received complaints about speeds on Main Street and interest in potential for 40km/hr zones in urban areas in the future. She had spoken to K Graham (Road Safety Co-ordinator) regarding moving the flashing 40km/hr sign, however that would be at a cost of $2,3000.

J Lynn asked if there had been any comments regarding the removal of the carparks and S Farrell advised she had not received any negative comments.

11.4 T Robson
- Attended Youth Council meeting where he had stepped down as co-chair. Arabella Jarman had taken on the role.
- Attended AGAG meeting and noted that the Heritage Pavilion was in its final stage of design.
- Attended All Boards Briefing and found it informative.
- Attended Pearson Park Advisory Group meeting, which had been a challenging meeting with issues raised.
- Was receiving complaints regarding the standard of roading in the area. Highlighted the repairs outside the Police Station, and Oxford Road.
- Attended Oxford Rural No1 Scheme meeting and suggested that it would be useful for the Board to understand delays and challenges with the scheme.

11.5 K Felstead

Council
- Judge John Brandts-Giesen had been presented with his Community Service Award.
- Report on Dudley Drain Regeneration and request to bring $176,000 into this year’s budget approved.
- The Rangiora-Woodend Cycleway had been formally named the Rangiora-Woodend Path.
- Approved the speed limit change on Lees Road and Barkers Road, Kaiapoi to 50km/hr.
- Renewed District Promotions contract with Enterprise North Canterbury.
- Received this Board’s re-classification of the Woodstock Road Reserve.

With regard to the Rural No.1 Scheme, K Felstead advised that the Council had taken the priority approach to water schemes looking at the
main centres and then working down. The single contamination result was unfortunate in the light of the Havelock North incident and advice had been to retain the boil water notice. While they had drilled a well with good flow now, there had been previous attempts, which had failed and slowed the process. The new well is currently going through a consent process with Ecan.

11.6 **W Doody**
- Tabled her Councillor’s Report for March 2018 (Trim 180312025816).
- Which included information on
  - Multi Use Sports Facility
  - Oxford Swimming Pool
  - Stepping Up digital literacy training
  - Oxford Cenotaph
  - Pearson Park Oval
  - Violence Free North Canterbury
  - West Eyneswell Backup well
  - Passchendaele Memorial Path opening.

12 **CONSULTATION PROJECTS**

Moved S Farrell seconded T Robson

*THAT* the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives the submission of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board in the matter of Resource Consent Applications CRC175344 and CRC175345 by Canterbury Landscape Supplies (Trim 180226019936).

*CARRIED*

K Felstead asked if D Nicholl and J Lynn had a Section 42A report for that area which would set out all the background. D Nicholl advised that it had been referred to in the submission. They had presented a summary version at the hearing. S Nichols advised the Section 42A report would be circulated.

Staff advised matters were still being worked through regarding CLS application through the Council. K Felstead commented that he believed there should have been a joint hearing and S Nichols advised that had been raised by the applicants at the hearing. ECan had argued that there were enough matters to consider on the Ecan side.

13 **REGENERATION PROJECTS**

13.1 **Town Centre, Oxford**

Updates on the Oxford Town Centre projects are emailed regularly to Board members. These updates can be located using the link below:


14 **BOARD FUNDING UPDATE**

14.1 **Board Discretionary Grant**

Balance as at 8 March 2018: $3,276.19

14.2 **General Landscaping Fund**

Balance as at 8 March 2018 $10,790.
It was noted that C Brown would bring a report on the items discussed in the workshop to the April meeting.

K Felstead referred to the General Landscaping Fund 'wish list' exceeding the $10,790 in budget and asked if funds remaining in the Discretionary Grant could be transferred. S Nichols advised that in April-May, if there were funds left over then it could be allocated to another group providing they met criteria, or the Board could look back to allocations during the year.

15 MEDIA ITEMS
The promotion around the LTP was discussed. It was noted the Council would have a presence at the Oxford A&P show with the Community Board members attending and assisting.

16 QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

17 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 8.57pm.

CONFIRMED

________________
Chairperson

________________
Date

Workshop – 7.06pm – 7.54pm.
1. General Landscaping Fund Workshop: C Brown (Community and Greenspace Manager)
   - A number of potential General Landscaping projects raised.
   - Report requested on Gatekeepers Lodge and Swannanoa Cricket Club.
   - Report requested on possible future options for Christmas Decorations, picnic furniture adjacent to Mandeville Commercial area, and Oaks Reserve.
   - General Community and Greenspace update and questions
## WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

**REPORT**

**FILE NO:** GOV-18 / 180223019426  
**REPORT TO:** Council  
**DATE OF MEETING:** 3 April 2018  
**FROM:** David Ayers, Mayor  
**SUBJECT:** Mayor's Diary 24 February to 26 March 2018

### 1. SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday 26 February</td>
<td>Governance and Strategy Advisory Group (GSAG) in Wellington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Councillor Al Blackie attended the Pines- Kairaki AGM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 27 February</td>
<td>Interview with Compass FM Radio Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting with Mike Hart – Oxford School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting with Bruce Kearney – Kaiapoi High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 28 February</td>
<td>Living &amp; Giving Expo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rangiora Promotions Last Wednesday Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 1 March</td>
<td>Meeting with Karen Stewart – Rangiora High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Transport Committee meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury Mayoral Forum working dinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 2 March</td>
<td>Canterbury Mayoral Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury Civil Defence &amp; Emergency Management Group Joint Committee meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Labour Party Back to Work Function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 3 March</td>
<td>Opening of Passchendaele Memorial Path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 4 March</td>
<td>Lions Ashley River Ramble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children’s Day at Trousselot Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deputy Mayor Kevin Felstead attended Japan Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 5 March</td>
<td>Regeneration Steering Group Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 6 March</td>
<td>Interview with Compass FM Radio Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Long Term Plan regarding Indoor Courts Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 7 March</td>
<td>Waimakiriri-Passchendaele Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Boards Briefing (LTP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Airfield Meeting with Affected Residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation of Kaiapoi Garden Certificates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 8 March</td>
<td>Aroha Reriti-Crofts meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting with Bill Wasley and Simon Markham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Airfield Meeting with General Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 9 March</td>
<td>Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee - formal meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with David Hill (North Canterbury News)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury Sports Awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 10 March</td>
<td>Waimakiriri Sailing and Power Boat Club 90th Anniversary Dinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 12 March</td>
<td>Canterbury Museum Trust Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waimakiriri Water Zone Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 13 March</td>
<td>Interview with Compass FM Radio Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 14 March</td>
<td>Meeting with Matt Doocey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ballance Farm Environment Awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 15 March</td>
<td>Minister Meeting with Hon Megan Woods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indoor Sports Facility Discussion with Daniel Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CE Review Committee meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 16 March</td>
<td>Interview with David Hill (North Canterbury News)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Long Term Plan Engagement Rangiora High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 17 March</td>
<td>Riverside Community Church - Grand opening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 18 March</td>
<td>Pride Picnic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 19 March</td>
<td>Cat Hannah meeting regarding Neighbourhood Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WDC/ Te Ngāi Tūahuriri Rūnanga relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ashley Lodge Site - Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 20 March</td>
<td>Bunnings Opening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with Compass FM Radio Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Garrymere Water Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 21 March</td>
<td>Interview candidates for the Council representative for the Waimakariri Irrigation Limited Director role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workshop Risk &amp; Resilience: presented by Bruce Glavovic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Airfield Meeting with Users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 23 March</td>
<td>Interview with David Hill (North Canterbury News)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enshi Exhibition Opening and Chinese Community Night at the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 451.

David Ayers
MAYOR