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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 4 DECEMBER 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

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 16 October 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 16 October 2018.

4.2 Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on 6 November 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 6 November 2018.
(to be circulated separately)

4.3 Minutes of the public excluded portion of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on 6 November 2018
(refer to Blue agenda papers)
MATTERS ARISING

5. DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

5.1. Michael Bate

Michael Bate will express his concern for indigenous fish and invertebrate species survival in relation to waterway health and herbicide spraying.

5.2. Julia Holcroft

Julia Holcroft will share her views in relation to Item 9.1 on the agenda: Rangiora-Woodend Road, Gressons Road, Boys Road and Northbrook Road Speed Limit Review Consultation

6. NOTICE OF MOTION

Councillor Paul Williams submitted a notice of motion pursuant to Standing Order 26.1 for the 4 December 2018 meeting of the Waimakariri District Council.

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council resolves to:

(a) Approve Council staff investigating the options and legality to ban the sale and use of fireworks in the Waimakariri District.

(b) Approve Council staff, should such a ban be possible, investigating options on how approved operators/individuals could be approved/licenced.

(c) Requests that staff report back to the Council’s March 2019 meeting.

(d) Notes that should the reports indicate that the banning of fireworks is possible the Council would want any such bans in place as soon as it was possible.

(e) Further notes that the Council will be supportive of licensed fireworks displays by approved operators.

7. ADJOUNDED BUSINESS

Nil.
8. REGENERATION REPORTS

8.1. **Request for Funding to be Brought Forward for Raven Quay and Feldwick Stormwater Infrastructure Earthquake Repairs** – Kalley Simpson (3 Waters Manager), Paul Reed (Stormwater Discipline Lead Earthquake Recovery Programme) and Gary Boot (Senior Engineering Advisor)

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 181119135752

(b) Approves $150,000 of the available budget of $276,000 for Town Centre/Raven Quay East Pipework project (100255.000.5124 ) currently set for the 2019/20 year to be brought forward to the current 2018/19 financial year to complete the Town Centre / Raven Quay Stormwater project prior to June 2019.

(c) Approves $50,000 of the available budget of $276,000 for Town Centre/Raven Quay East Pipework project (100255.000.5124 ) currently set for the 2019/20 year to be brought forward to the current 2018/19 financial year and allocated to Project 58 – Pines Beach Stormwater Improvements project.

(d) Notes that $76,000 ($276,000 - $200,000) of the budget for the Town Centre / Raven Quay Stormwater project allocated in 2019/20 will no longer be required, and this will be addressed in the 2019/20 Annual Plan Budget process.

(e) Approves $91,000 of the Feldwick Catchment Reticulation capital works budget currently set for the 2019/20 year to be brought forward to the current 2018/19 financial year.

(f) Notes that this will allow stormwater infrastructure damaged by the 2010/11 earthquake to be reinstated quicker than previously planned in line with both Council and DPMC preferences to have all remaining earthquake recovery work completed as soon as possible.

(g) Circulates this report to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board and the Utilities & Roading Committee for their information.

8.2 **Kaiapoi Reservoir Strengthening – Request for Additional Budget** – Colin Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager)

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 181119135684.

(b) Notes that there is an existing capital budget on the Kaiapoi scheme of $75,000 in 2018/19 and $300,000 in 2019/20 for the strengthening of the Kaiapoi water supply reservoirs at Darnley Square and Peraki Street.

(c) Notes that during detailed design it was confirmed that there is a need for this strengthening work, but that the existing budget is insufficient to complete the works, with a total recommended construction budget of $600,000.

(d) Notes that it was also identified that in order for the works to be completed in the lower demand time of year, physical works will need to commence in April 2019 which will require some construction budget
in the current financial year as well as in the 2019/20 financial year (to allow an overall construction window of April – October 2019 for both sites).

(e) **Allocates** an additional $300,000 of capital budget to the Kaiapoi reservoir strengthening project for the 2018/19 financial year, noting that this will result in a total capital budget for the project of $375,000 in 2018/19 and $300,000 in 2019/20.

(f) **Notes** that this additional budget is forecast to increase the Kaiapoi water rate by approximately $5.7 per connection per year, effective from the 2020/21 financial year (after the project is capitalised).

(g) **Notes** that in order to balance Council’s overall expenditure efforts are being made to offset this increased expenditure by deferring other projects for the 2019/20 financial year where possible, through the 2019/20 Annual Plan. This includes deferral of the $80,000 storage upgrade budget for the Cust water headworks from 2019/20 to 2020/21, and reduction of the 2020/21 Rangiora UV upgrade budget by $100,000 following a more detailed cost estimate being produced.

8.3. **Earthquake-Prone Buildings Legislation, Hearing Panel recommendations identifying Priority Buildings/Routes – Hearing Panel Councillors A Blackie (Chair), W Doody and J Meyer**

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 181120136033

(b) **Adopts** the following as priority routes/buildings, that are then identified so the public can make informed decisions (as identified on the maps):

   (i) Williams Street, Kaiapoi (Old Bank of New Zealand Building)

   (ii) Walker Street, Kaiapoi (Kaiapoi Mill)

   (iii) High Street, Rangiora (approximately nine buildings)

(c) **Acknowledges** that no emergency routes have been identified for prioritisation, either through public consultation or staff recommendation.

(d) **Notes** that affected property owners and tenants will be advised of the outcome of the public consultation and the implications for their property(s).
9. REPORTS

9.1. Rangiora-Woodend Road, Gressons Road, Boys Road and Northbrook Road Speed Limit Review Consultation – Bill Rice (Senior Transport Engineer)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 181121136994.

(b) Approves the following changes to speed limits:

i. Rangiora Woodend Road, from the end of the existing 80km/h speed limit west of Smarts Road to 170m north west of Bob Robertson Drive, reduces to 80km/h;

ii. Rangiora Woodend Road, from 170m north west of Bob Robertson Drive to the existing 50km/h speed limit north west of School Road, reduces to 60km/h;

iii. Gressons Road reduces to 80km/h;

iv. Boys Road, from Rangiora Woodend Road to the existing 50km/h speed limit east of the railway line, reduces to 80km/h;

v. Northbrook Road, from Boys Road to the existing 50km/h speed limit east of Goodwin Street, reduces to 80km/h;

vi. Tuahiwi Road, from Boys Road to the existing 80km/h limit east of Boys Road, reduces to 80km/h;

vii. Harris Road reduces to 80 km/hr

(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 change 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 Woodend–Sefton, Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi, and Rangiora-Ashley Community Boards for their information;

(f) Notes that operating speeds will be surveyed on these road six months after implementation of the new speed limits;

(g) Notes that a copy of this report has been provided to the Runanga Liaison Committee.

(h) Circulates this report to all Community Boards.
9.2. Multi-Use Sports Facility Project Update – Craig Sargison (Manager Special Projects)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 181119135294

(b) **Approved** the site master plan and site master plan Stage 1 (Trim 181123137746 and 181123137750)

(c) **Notes** the updated interior floor layout and that further refinement is still to happen for the reception area which will impact on joinery design.

(d) **Notes** that the cost estimate based on the preliminary design is for a project cost of $27,850,000 for the sports facility.

(e) **Approved** the inclusion of mechanical cooling plant for the court hall for a cost of approximately $200,000 to be funded from the Project Contingency of $1,325,000.

(f) **Notes** that sprinkling of the complex, excluding the indoor courts, will be required for an estimated cost of $400,000 to be funded from the Project Contingency of $1,325,000.

(g) **Notes** that it is planned to have a report to the Council for 7 May 2019 to consider a construction tender award.

9.3 Zone Implementation Programme Addendum (ZIPA) – David Ashby (Chair, CWMS Waimakariri Zone Committee)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 181115135055;

(b) **Adopts** the Waimakariri Water Zone Implementation Programme Addendum (ZIPA) as recommended by the Zone Committee;

(c) **Notes** Implementation of the ZIPA will be subject to later decisions in the light of budgetary considerations and that a report on options in this regard will be made to the Council’s budget meeting in February 2019;

(d) **Thanks** the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee for its efforts over several years to arrive at a comprehensive ZIPA.
9.4. **Adoption of Local Alcohol Policy – Lynley Beckingsale (Policy Analyst) and Malcolm Johnston (Environmental Services Manager)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 181128139713.

(b) **Adopts** the Local Alcohol Policy (Trim No: 180409037871)

(c) **Resolves** to bring the Local Alcohol Policy into force on Monday 17 December 2018.

(d) **Approves** the Public Notice for publication in the Christchurch Press and the Northern Outlook on Wednesday 12 December and Saturday 15 December 2018.

(e) **Notes** that the Licensees will be individually advised, in writing, of the elements of the policy affecting their licences and the date any changes come into effect.

9.5 **Rating for Drinking Water Supply UV Disinfection – Jim Palmer (Chief Executive)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 181126138621

(b) **Either**

   i. **Resolves** to include a rating proposal into the Draft 2019/20 Annual Plan to aggregate the costs of UV disinfection treatment for water supplies into one account; and:

      1. Establishes a new uniform annual charge for each property connected to a Council water supply, or
      2. Incorporates a share of the UV disinfection costs in each water supply account based on a standard per property charge, and.

   ii **Notes** that staff will further refine the estimates for the Council’s consideration when it deliberates on the Draft 2019/20 Annual Plan,

Or.

iii **Retains** the current rating policy in regards to water supply costs.
9.6. Establish Waimakariri-Passchendaele Advisory Group – Mayor David Ayers

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives report No. 180821094427
(b) Revokes the resolution of report no. 100128002501 which went to Council on 3 March 2010, establishing the Waimakariri Passchendaele Trust.
(c) Approves the establishment of a Waimakariri Passchendaele Advisory Group.
(d) Adopts the Terms of Reference (Trim 180821094503.)

9.7 Register of Interests Policy – Sarah Nichols (Governance Manager)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives report No. 181115134591.
(b) Reviews the Register of Interests content, recording any amendments.
(c) Notes a Register of Interests will be republished in the February 2019 agenda and notes the Register of Interests is listed on the Council website.
(d) Notes the Register will be re-published in subsequent agendas and webpage when an amendment has been notified and recorded.

10. HEALTH AND SAFETY

10.1 Health and Safety Report to Council December 2018 – Jim Palmer (Chief Executive)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives report No 181119135719
(b) Notes that there are no significant Health and Safety issues at this time, and that WDC is, so far as is reasonably practicable, compliant with the PCBU duties of the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015.
11. MATTER REFERRED FROM COMMUNITY BOARDS

11.1. Regeneration Steering Group Continuation and Meeting Dates for 2019 – Roxanne Ramsay (Project Administrator – District Regeneration) and Duncan Roxborough (Implementation Project Manager – District Regeneration)

(refer to attached copy of report no. 181024124235 to the Regeneration Steering Group meeting of 3 December 2018):

THAT the Council

(a) Receives report no. 181024124235

(b) Approves the extension of the term of the current Regeneration Steering Group to the end of September 2019, with no other changes to the Terms of Reference.

(c) Approves the meeting schedule for 2019, commencing at 4pm, in the Ruatanwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre of the Kaiapoi Service Centre, with meetings to be held on the first Monday of each month from February to September inclusive: being 4 February, 4 March, 1 April, 6 May, 10 June (2nd Monday, due to Queens Birthday weekend holiday), 1 July, 5 August, 2 September, 30 September (last meeting prior to Council elections).

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

12.1. Minutes of a meeting of the CWMS Waimakariri Water Zone Committee held on 8 October 2018

12.2. Minutes of a meeting of the District Planning and Regulation Committee held on 16 October 2018

12.3. Minutes of a meeting of the Utilities and Roading Committee held on 16 October 2018

12.4. Minutes of a meeting of the Solid and Hazardous Waste Working Party held on 23 October 2018

12.5. Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri Youth Council held on 30 October 2018

12.6. Minutes of a meeting of the Regeneration Steering Group held on 5 November 2018

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the information in items 12.1 to 12.6 be received.
13. COMMUNITY BOARD MINUTES FOR INFORMATION

13.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board held on 8 November 2018
250 - 261

13.2 Minutes of a meeting of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board held on 12 November 2018
262 - 269

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the information in items 13.1 to 13.2 be received.

14. CORRESPONDENCE

15. MAYOR’S DIARY

15.1 Mayor’s Diary 27 October – 26 November 2018
270 - 272

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives report no. 181126138510

16. COUNCIL PORTFOLIO UPDATES

16.1 Iwi Relationships
16.2 Canterbury Water Management Strategy
16.3 International Relationships
16.4 Regeneration (Kaiapoi)

17. QUESTIONS
(under Standing Orders)

18. URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS
(under Standing Orders)

19. 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: General subject of each matter to be considered</th>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in</th>
<th>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</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>
</table>
| 19.1 – 19.3 | Protection of privacy of natural persons  
To carry out commercial activities without prejudice | A2(a)  
A2(b)ii |

**CLOSED MEETING**

*See Public Excluded Agenda (blue papers)*

**OPEN MEETING**

20. **NEXT MEETING**

The next scheduled meeting of the Council is on Tuesday 29 January 2019 commencing at 9.00am.
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA, ON TUESDAY 16 OCTOBER 2018, COMMENCING AT 3.15PM.

PRESENT:
Mayor D Ayers (Chair), Deputy Mayor K Felstead, Councillors N Atkinson, K Barnett, A Blackie, W Doody, D Gordon, S Stewart and P Williams.

IN ATTENDANCE:
J Palmer (Chief Executive), J Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support) and A Smith (Governance Coordinator)

1. APOLOGIES

Moved Councillor Barnett seconded Councillor Atkinson

THAT apology for absence be received and sustained from Councillor J Meyer

CARRIED

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

There were no conflicts of interest noted.

3. REPORT

3.1. Adoption of the Annual Report for the Year Ended 30 June 2018 – Jeff Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support)

Mr J Millward presented this report seeking approval of the Council to adopt the Annual Report for the year ended 30 June 2018. It was noted that overall the year end accounts show that the Council is in a relatively sound position.

Favourable comments were received from the Auditors on the information that has been provided but there is still some issues with the way that the non-financial information is reported to them.

There has been some feedback from Councillors, mainly in the non-financial performance area and there is some notes that need further clarification.

Council loans are currently at $130m, compared with the $149m budgeted. The lower borrowing that was required is primarily lower due to the delayed capital work that was reforecast within the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.

Councillor Williams, asked why the depreciation figure was not included in the assets figure. Mr Millward said this is included in the Annual report, in a separate area identified as “Other Expenditure” which shows a list of all the key expenditure that the Council has to declare under the Act. Depreciation is one of these figures. A figure of $23.1 million is included under depreciation.

Councillor Barnett referring to page 27 of the report, asked how often asset revaluation is done. J Millward advised this is done every three years except there is annual revaluation undertaken for investment assets (property and roading). Revaluation comes in at the end of the year and this is rated for in
the following year. Roading revaluation is causing some concern, with the movements, indexes and petrol rate, it is very difficult to forecast.

Moved Councillor Barnett seconded Deputy Mayor Felstead

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180928112866.
(b) Adopts the Annual Report for the year ended 30 June 2018 (TRIM 180820093881).
(c) Approves the Annual Report Summary for the year ended 30 June 2018 (Trim 180914106558).
(d) Notes the Net Surplus before taxation of $20.5m for the Council includes vested assets of $20.8m transferred to council ownership as a result of subdivisions.
(e) Authorises the Manager Finance and Business Support, in conjunction with the Chief Executive to make necessary minor edits and corrections to the Annual Report prior to printing.

CARRIED

Councillor Barnett applauded the staff for the new look of the summary, noting this is very easy to read and gives a very clear picture of how the Council is performing.

Deputy Mayor Felstead endorses the comments, and added this is a good result. It is always a good indication when the Council gets a clear audit report.

4. NEXT MEETING

The next scheduled meeting of the Council is on Tuesday 6 November 2018 commencing at 1.00pm.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 3.25pm.

CONFIRMED

________________________
Chairperson

________________________
Date
NOTICE OF MOTION

To the Chief Executive
Waimakariri District Council

We submit the following notice of motion pursuant to Standing Order 26.1, for the 4 December 2018 meeting of the Waimakariri District Council.

THE PURPOSE OF THE PROPOSED NOTICE OF MOTION IS TO SEEK A BYLAW TO PROHIBIT THE SALE AND USE OF FIREWORKS IN THE WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT, WITHOUT PRIOR COUNCIL APPROVAL.

We, the undersigned, request that the Council consider investigating the prohibition of the sale of fireworks within the Waimakariri District and ensure that only fireworks for display be by those that have Council approval.

Explanation

There is a growing demand within the Waimakariri District seeking the banning of fireworks, except for controlled displays, due to the damage being caused to property, animal welfare and people’s wellbeing.

Uncontrolled or inappropriately operated fireworks place an increased risk to people’s wellbeing and property. Furthermore the random use of fireworks causes disruption to households which can lead to reduced sleep and increased anxiety.

This also places extra stress on Fire Service volunteers, an increasing risk to properties with a likely resulting increase in the cost of property insurance, pressure on the health system due to an increased number of hospital admissions, and after-hours emergency treatment and care that are related to fireworks incidents and accidents.

There is also ongoing trauma to animals and their wellbeing, and resultant veterinary costs owing to the stress and injuries that can be directly attributed to the effects of uncontrolled fireworks.

Recommendation to the Waimakariri District Council

That the Council resolves to:

(a) Approve Council staff investigating the options and legality to ban the sale and use of fireworks in the Waimakariri District.

(b) Approve Council staff, should such a ban be possible, investigating options on how approved operators/individuals could be approved/licenced.

(c) Requests that staff report back to the Councils March 2019 meeting.

(d) Notes that should the reports indicate that the banning of fireworks is possible the Council would want any such bans in place as soon as it was possible.

(e) Further Notes that the Council will be supportive of licensed fireworks displays by approved operators.
Signed:

Councillor Paul Williams (Mover)  

Councillor Dan Gordon (Seconder)  

Dated: 20 November 2019
1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to request Council’s approval to bring forward budget from the 2019/20 year to complete three Stormwater projects as part of the Earthquake Recovery Programme as follows:

- **Project 7 – Raven Quay / Town Centre Stormwater:** $150,000 of funding for the Stormwater Infrastructure Earthquake Repairs in Raven Quay, Kaiapoi, between Bowler St and the Council Service Centre.

- **Project 58 – Pines Beach Stormwater Improvements:** $50,000 of funding for installing swales to low lying areas in Pines Beach to address current flooding issues. This is an earthquake project that was identified in 2011, but subsequently dropped of the Earthquake Recovery Programme. Recent flooding has drawn attention to this project and it is proposed to fund it from surplus budget available for Project 7 – Raven Quay / Town Centre Stormwater.

- **Project 43 – Feldwick Catchment Reticulation:** $90,960 of funding for the construction of new swales from Feldwick Drive through to Feldwick Drain to replace the damaged stormwater pipes in a similar location.

1.2. It is proposed to complete these projects earlier than expected as a result of good progress being made in the planning and design phases in the first half of this year and in response to a request from the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet (DPMC) to complete all earthquake repair work as quickly as possible.

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 181119135752

(b) Approves $150,000 of the available budget of $276,000 for Town Centre/Raven Quay East Pipework project (100255.000.5124 ) currently set for the 2019/20 year to be brought forward to the current 2018/19 financial year to complete the Town Centre / Raven Quay Stormwater project prior to June 2019.
(c) **Approves** $50,000 of the available budget of $276,000 for Town Centre/Raven Quay East Pipework project (100255.000.5124) currently set for the 2019/20 year to be brought forward to the current 2018/19 financial year and allocated to Project 58 – Pines Beach Stormwater Improvements project.

(d) **Notes** that $76,000 ($276,000 - $200,000) of the budget for the Town Centre / Raven Quay Stormwater project allocated in 2019/20 will no longer be required, and this will be addressed in the 2019/20 Annual Plan Budget process.

(e) **Approves** $91,000 of the Feldwick Catchment Reticulation capital works budget currently set for the 2019/20 year to be brought forward to the current 2018/19 financial year.

(f) **Notes** that this will allow stormwater infrastructure damaged by the 2010/11 earthquake to be reinstated quicker than previously planned in line with both Council and DPMC preferences to have all remaining earthquake recovery work completed as soon as possible.

(g) **Circulates** this report to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board and the Utilities & Roading Committee for their information.

3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

   **Raven Quay / Town Centre Stormwater**

3.1. A project is planned for the 2019/20 financial year to repair stormwater infrastructure damaged during the 2010/11 earthquakes in the regeneration area adjacent to Raven Quay between Bowler St and the Council Service Centre.

3.2. A budget of $276,000 was allocated in 2019/20 for this work, along with $30,000 in the 2018/19 year, bringing the total budget to $306,000. The $30,000 was set aside for the design and the remainder for the physical works.

3.3. The design is now complete and the total budget required, including that already spent, has reduced to $180,000, leaving a surplus of $126,000.

3.4. The damaged pipe consists of 300mm diameter and 450mm diameter pipe. At the western end, the pipe crown is close to the surface. The pipe was previously located in the backyards of private properties but is now located in the middle of the regeneration area. There are many manholes along the pipe.

3.5. There are approximately 12 locations along the full length of the pipe (see pipe highlighted in red on Figure 1) where minor damage that can be attributed to the earthquakes (eg joint cracking etc.). These damaged pipes can be repaired using trenchless repair/patches. A further 40m of pipe (in three locations) is significantly damaged and will need to be replaced. It is estimated to cost $93,000 to replace or repair the damaged pipes.

3.6. There are two stormwater outfalls that need to be abandoned as part of this work. See the pipelines highlighted green on Figure 1. The outfall furthest downstream (or furthest east) once served a block of Elderly Persons Units and is no longer required. Another outfall exists that runs beneath the Cure Boating Club. This outfall serves a single road sump. The outfall is too damaged to be videoed. It is proposed that the outfall will be abandoned and the flow diverted to the regeneration area or to the main pipe, highlighted red on Figure 1. It is estimated to cost $47,000 to abandon the two outfalls and divert the flow from the roadside sump.

3.7. There are various miscellaneous items that will be rectified when the repairs are undertaken on these pipes:
- Manhole covers will be secured over the manholes for safety reasons.
- A fence will be erected over the western end of the pipe to protect it from vehicle damage. The pipe is shallow and was previously in backyards. It can now be driven over during events on held in this area.
- Some large trees that are over top of the pipe that are causing issues for the pipe integrity may be removed.

It is estimated to cost $20,000 to undertake these miscellaneous items.

3.8. Approximately $10K has been spent to date on Engineering with a further $10K to come.

3.9. The total budget is therefore as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pipeline repairs and part replacement</td>
<td>$93K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decommission Outfalls and divert flow</td>
<td>$47K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manholes &amp; Fencing</td>
<td>$20K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>$20K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL BUDGET REQUIRED:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$180K</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The budget available is $306K, with $30K in 2018/19 and $276K in 2019/20, of which it is proposed $150K will be brought forward to 2018/19.

![Figure 1 – Location of Earthquake Repair work on stormwater pipes in Raven Quay](image)

3.10. The programme for this project is as follows:
3.11. Some land subsidence occurred in Pines Beach during the 2010 Earthquake. The need for drainage repairs were identified in 2011, but was a specific project was omitted when the Earthquake Recovery Programme was developed in 2012.

3.12. Recent surface flooding in Pines Beach has highlighted the need to replace two damaged pipelines across Dunns Ave and to replace three pipelines between Dunns Ave and Saltwater Creek with swales, to address the flooding issues. The estimated cost of the works is $50,000, including engineering and contingency.

3.13. The Earthquake Recovery Team have made very good progress on the budgeted projects for 2018/19 and now have capacity to complete this project prior to June 2019, subject to budget being made available.

3.14. As discussed earlier in this report, there is $126,000 surplus budget in the 2019/20 year for the Town Centre / Raven Quay Stormwater project. Subject to approval of Council, it is proposed to reallocate $50,000 of this surplus budget to complete the Pines Beach Stormwater Improvements project this year.

The programme for this project is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Milestone</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investigations Complete</td>
<td>Mid November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed Design Complete</td>
<td>End December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tender Award</td>
<td>End February 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Complete</td>
<td>End April 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As-Builts Submitted / Project Closeout</td>
<td>End May 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Programme for Pines Beach Stormwater Improvements (Note: This project will be coupled with the Town Centre / Raven Quay stormwater project and tendered as a single package)

Feldwick Reticulation

3.15. A project is planned for the 2019/20 financial year to repair stormwater infrastructure damaged during the 2010/11 earthquakes in the Feldwick Catchment of the Kaiapoi East Regeneration Area near Kirk Street.

3.16. A budget of $91,000 was allocated in 2019/20 for this work.

3.17. The damaged pipes consist of 300mm diameter, 450mm diameter and 600mm diameter pipes. The pipes run from Nandina Place through to Kirk Street and then eastward into Feldwick Drain. It is proposed that the pipes are replaced with two swales as shown on Figure 2. This area is likely to be returned to farmland in the near future and replacement of the underground pipes is unnecessary. The swales are more resilient to future earthquakes, are easier to maintain and are less costly to install when compared to underground pipework.

3.18. The construction of these swales was priced as part of Contract 18/34 Kaiapoi East Enabling Works and Beswick SMA. The total price of the swale construction in the Feldwick Catchment, which included a subsoil drain, is $100,982.69.

3.19. It is proposed that surplus budget on the Beswick SMA project is used to cover the shortfall of approximately $10,000 for the construction of the swales.

Figure 2 – Location of Proposed Swales in Feldwick Catchment

3.20. The programme for this project is as follows:
### Project Milestone Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Milestone</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investigations Complete</td>
<td>June 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed Design Complete</td>
<td>End September 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tender Award</td>
<td>End October 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Complete</td>
<td>End March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As-Builts Submitted / Project Closeout</td>
<td>End April 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Programme for Feldwick Stormwater Reticulation (Note: This project is already under construction as part of the Regeneration area enabling works)

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

4. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

4.1. This report relates to the following community outcomes:

- There is a safe environment for all.
- Core utility services are provided in a timely, sustainable, and affordable manner.

4.2. These projects involve the reinstatement of existing services and therefore consultation with the community is not deemed necessary.

5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

5.1. The bringing forward of the proposed budgets to complete the earthquake recovery work as quickly as possible, and will not negatively impact Council financially as the work was budgeted for next financial year, and the total cost host has reduced.

6. **CONTEXT**

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

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

- **Community Outcomes**
  
  This report relates to the following community outcomes:

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

Gary Boot
Senior Engineering Advisor
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1. This purpose of this report is to request additional funding for the Kaiapoi reservoir strengthening project for the 2018/19 financial year.

1.2. It was identified by AECOM in 2015 that the current water supply reservoirs for Kaiapoi at Peraki Street and Darnley Square require strengthening works to mitigate the risk of failure during a potential future seismic event.

1.3. As a result of the work completed by AECOM a budget was set as part of the 2018-28 Long Term Plan of $75,000 in 2018/19 for design and $300,000 in 2019/20 for construction.

1.4. Beca have been awarded the professional services contract for the detailed design works following a tender process for this. As part of their work two changes are required to the budgets:

   1.4.1. Some construction budget is required in 2018/19 so that all works can be completed in periods of lower demand from April – October 2019 (i.e. construction commencing in current financial year).

   1.4.2. The existing construction budget of $300,000 is inadequate, with a total construction budget of $600,000 recommended.

1.5. It is therefore requested that Council allocate an additional $300,000 budget to the Kaiapoi reservoir strengthening project for the 2018/19 financial year to allow sufficient budget to complete the project, as well as to allow the construction works to start during this financial year so that work at both sites is complete before the 2019/20 summer (when demand increases).

** Attachments:**

i. Nil
2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 181119135684.

(b) **Notes** that there is an existing capital budget on the Kaiapoi scheme of $75,000 in 2018/19 and $300,000 in 2019/20 for the strengthening of the Kaiapoi water supply reservoirs at Darnley Square and Peraki Street.

(c) **Notes** that during detailed design it was confirmed that there is a need for this strengthening work, but that the existing budget is insufficient to complete the works, with a total recommended construction budget of $600,000.

(d) **Notes** that it was also identified that in order for the works to be completed in the lower demand time of year, physical works will need to commence in April 2019 which will require some construction budget in the current financial year as well as in the 2019/20 financial year (to allow an overall construction window of April – October 2019 for both sites).

(e) **Allocates** an additional $300,000 of capital budget to the Kaiapoi reservoir strengthening project for the 2018/19 financial year, noting that this will result in a total capital budget for the project of $375,000 in 2018/19 and $300,000 in 2019/20.

(f) **Notes** that this additional budget is forecast to increase the Kaiapoi water rate by approximately $5.7 per connection per year, effective from the 2020/21 financial year (after the project is capitalised).

(g) **Notes** that in order to balance Council’s overall expenditure efforts are being made to offset this increased expenditure by deferring other projects for the 2019/20 financial year where possible, through the 2019/20 Annual Plan. This includes deferral of the $80,000 storage upgrade budget for the Cust water headworks from 2019/20 to 2020/21, and reduction of the 2020/21 Rangiora UV upgrade budget by $100,000 following a more detailed cost estimate being produced.

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1. It was identified by AECOM in 2015 that the current water supply reservoirs for Kaiapoi at Peraki Street and Darnley Square require strengthening works to mitigate the risk of failure during a potential future seismic event. Specifically the seismic capability of the reservoirs relative to New Build Standard (NBS) was assessed as per the tables below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural Component</th>
<th>Performance Ratio*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roof Slab</td>
<td>22% NBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columns</td>
<td>44% NBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof Beams</td>
<td>49% NBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perimeter Wall / Base Connection</td>
<td>50% NBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perimeter Wall / Roof Connection</td>
<td>90% NBS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2. As a result of the work completed by AECOM a budget was set as part of the 2018-28 Long Term Plan of $75,000 in 2018/19 for design and $300,000 in 2019/20 for construction.

3.3. In July 2018 a professional services contract was tendered to carry out the detailed design to achieve 100% of the NBS in line with IL3 classifications, and to recommend any works required to ensure weather tightness and water proofing of the reservoirs.

3.4. This professional services contract (18/19) was awarded to Beca who have been carrying out the detailed design. Beca were awarded the contract based on their experience in similar projects, and having the lowest price of those that submitted (refer evaluation report 180711077151).

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

Repair of Existing Reservoirs

4.1. As Beca progressed through the concept to the detailed design, it was identified that the original scope proposed by AECOM was not appropriate to achieve the required outcome.

4.2. Specifically to give an example of the nature of some of the changes, it had been proposed by AECOM that to secure the walls to the base a number of bolts would be required around the perimeter. Alternatively however Beca have assessed that this would be insufficient, and instead a reinforced concrete nib is required. This proposed methodology is more consistent with the remedial works undertaken on the Ayers Street reservoir recently, which had a reinforced concrete nib installed around its perimeter.

4.3. The reasons for the differences in proposed scope between the AECOM concept design in 2015, and the Beca detailed design in 2018 were assessed. It was concluded that while AECOM accurately identified deficiencies with the existing structures, the concept design was not sufficiently progressed or detailed to fully and accurately scope the level of work required to address these deficiencies.

4.4. Based on the upgrades identified, a cost estimate for physical works of $700,000 was recommended by Beca.

4.5. Some scrutiny has been placed on the Beca design and also their cost estimate. The draft design drawings have been assessed by a contractor to provide a budgetary cost estimate to review against that prepared by Beca, as well as commentary provided on the constructability and efficiency of their design from a contractor’s perspective.
4.6. The contractor indicated that the required construction budget could be in the order of $450,000, which is significantly less than the $700,000 figure recommended by Beca. This has indicated that the budget recommended by Beca may be higher than necessary, potentially due to the conservative nature of some assumptions. Alternatively however, there is a chance that the contractor who was preparing their estimate off preliminary design drawings, may have not fully appreciated the nature and therefore cost of the upgrades.

4.7. Based on the advice both from Beca and the contractor’s review of the Beca price, a total construction budget of $600,000 is recommended which is approximately the mid-point of the two estimates.

4.8. It was also identified that the works on the reservoirs may take a number of weeks per site, including the work to decommission and recommission each headworks before and after the works. It is therefore recommended that a total construction window be given to contractors of April – October 2019. This will allow all works to be completed during the lower demand time of year, during which time the Kaiapoi scheme will be required to run off one headworks as opposed to two.

4.9. In order to achieve the recommended construction window, construction budget will be required to be available from April 2019, rather than from the start of the next financial year in July 2019. To achieve this it is recommended that the additional construction budget be allocated to the current financial year, to allow works to commence from April 2019.

Replacement Option

4.10. Advice was requested whether the scope of upgrades warranted consideration of reservoir replacement as opposed to remediation. Beca advised that consideration of this was not warranted at this stage based on the overall condition of the reservoirs.

4.11. To give an understanding of the order of magnitude of the costs of a full replacement option, estimates (including contingency) were provided on a different project for the Oxford reservoirs of replacement of approximately $500,000 for a single 500m³ steel tank or $1.4M for a 500m³ concrete tank.

4.12. Each of the Kaiapoi sites would be expected to be in this approximate order of magnitude but would have additional costs associated with modifications to inlet and outlet pipework which would be significant at each site with 3 separate inlet pipes in addition to the discharge pipework and overflow. This would therefore, very roughly, give a total project budget of greater than $1.0M - $2.8M (depending on steel or concrete tanks) for the two Kaiapoi sites.

Recommended Option

4.13. Based on the above, repair of the existing reservoirs is the recommended option with a total construction budget of $600,000 spread over the 2018/19 and 2019/20 financial years.

4.14. The Management Team have reviewed this report and support the recommendations, subject to approval from the Council’s Asset Management Steering Group (AMSG). This report was presented to the AMSG on Tuesday 27 November which was after the agenda for the Council meeting closing. Therefore, feedback from the AMSG will be presented as part of presenting this report to Council at the time of the meeting.
5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

5.2. No specific groups have been consulted regarding these works.

5.3. Wider Community

5.4. Directly affected residents will be consulted with as part of the physical works contract.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

6.2. The construction budget for this project is $300,000 from 101122.000.5103 Darnley Square and Peraki Street Reservoir Strengthening and Sealing and this is available from the 2019/20 financial year (1 July 2019).

6.3. It has been noted that an additional $300,000 of construction budget is required, and that construction is recommended to commence from April 2019 (the current financial year).

6.4. To achieve the two desired outcomes, it is recommended that the $300,000 of additional budget be allocated to the current financial year.

6.5. It is calculated that the proposed additional capital expenditure will result in an approximate water rate increase of $5.7 per connection per year to the Kaiapoi water supply scheme.

6.6. Community Implications

6.7. This project will contribute to improving the security of water supply and resilience to earthquake damage.

6.8. Risk Management

6.9. The project contributes to a reduction in risk of loss of service from the Kaiapoi water supply if a major earthquake were to occur.

6.10. Beca have advised that there will be some residual risk with the proposed design in that 'sloshing' that can occur during a seismic event could cause damage to the roof structure which cannot be economically addressed through strengthening works. At Peraki Street, where the mode of failure of this type of event could be significant, it is proposed that the reservoir be operated with a lower maximum level (approx. 0.5m lower than currently). At Darnley Square, where the mode of failure will be more minor and the reservoir be able to remain in service, either the site could continue to operate with this risk remaining (noting that this has not been an issue in past seismic events), or this could also be operated at a lower level to eliminate the risk altogether but reduce the storage volume for the scheme.

6.11. Based on the above, it is concluded that while every risk and eventuality cannot be designed out, the proposed solution provides an appropriate balance of risk mitigation and cost.

6.12. It is noted also that the Kaiapoi scheme will be less resilient than it usually would during the construction phase of the project. This is due to the requirement for the respective reservoirs to be offline during construction, so the Kaiapoi scheme will be run off one reservoir rather than two throughout construction. This risk will be mitigated to some extent by the renewal of the generator at the Darnley Square headworks which is taking place at
present. Generally however, for work of this nature, it is necessary to accept a short term reduction in resilience to improve the longer term resilience of the scheme.

6.13. **Health and Safety**

6.14. Health and Safety practices will be a key requirement to be assessed as part of this contract. A Safety in Design workshop has been held with the designers, asset management, and operational staff. Where possible, health and safety risks have been designed out. Where this was not possible, they will be documented and transferred to the successful contractor to manage as part of the construction works.

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 legislation relevant to this work is the Health (Drinking Water) Amendment Act 2007.

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

This report relates to the following community outcomes:

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

7.4. **Delegations**

The Council has the delegated authority to assign the additional budget.
1. SUMMARY

1.1 The Building (Earthquake Prone Buildings) Amendment Act 2016 introduced a new system to ensure the way buildings are managed for future earthquakes is consistent across the country, and provide information for people using buildings. The new system prioritises identification and remediation of earthquake-prone buildings that either pose a high risk to life safety, or are critical to recovery in an emergency. It ensures routes where there is a lot of vehicle or pedestrian traffic are safe and priority buildings are clearly identified.

1.2 Public consultation, in accordance with section 133AF(2)(a) of the Building Act 2004, was undertaken from 20 August to 20 September 2018. No submissions were received.

1.3 The Hearing and Deliberations were undertaken by the Hearing Panel, Councillors A Blackie (Chair), W Doody and J Meyer, on Tuesday 20 November. The Panel met at 9.00am to visit the proposed sites with Greig Wilson, Building Inspector, before commencing their deliberations at 10.45am.

1.4 The Hearing Panel recommends that three roads in the District meet the category of priority routes/buildings that could impact on public thoroughfares. These are:

- Williams Street, Kaiapoi (Old Bank of New Zealand building)
- Walker Street, Kaiapoi (Kaiapoi Mill)
- High Street, Rangiora (approximately nine buildings)

Attachments:

i. Statement of Proposal including Maps of priority routes/buildings (Trim 180619068194)
ii. Hearing Panel Minutes 20 November 2018 (Trim 181105129686)

2. RECOMMENDATION

The Hearing Panel recommends:

THAT the Council

(a) Receives report No. 181120136033
(b) **Adopts** the following as priority routes/buildings, that are then identified so the public can make informed decisions (as identified on the maps):

(i) Williams Street, Kaiapoi (Old Bank of New Zealand Building)

(ii) Walker Street, Kaiapoi (Kaiapoi Mill)

(iii) High Street, Rangiora (approximately nine buildings)

(c) **Acknowledges** that no emergency routes have been identified for prioritisation, either through public consultation or staff recommendation.

(d) **Notes** that affected property owners and tenants will be advised of the outcome of the public consultation and the implications for their property(s).

### 3. BACKGROUND

3.1 The **Building (Earthquake Prone Buildings) Amendment Act 2016** came into force on 1 July 2017. The Act introduced a new system to ensure the way buildings are managed for future earthquakes is consistent across the country, and provides more information for people using buildings.

3.2 The new system prioritises identification and remediation of earthquake-prone buildings (EPB) that either pose a high risk to life or are critical to recovery in an emergency. Certain hospital, emergency and education buildings that are earthquake-prone will be ‘priority buildings’. Other EPB may be priority buildings due to their location and the potential impact of their failure in an earthquake on people. These buildings must be identified with community input.

3.3 Priority buildings must be identified and remediated in half the usual time, to reduce the risks to life safety more promptly.

3.1. The significant amount of earthquake strengthening of buildings undertaken since the Canterbury earthquakes in 2010/11 means there are very few URM buildings in this District that meet the criteria of the Act. Even so, public consultation must be undertaken to ensure all priority buildings are identified and the danger mitigated in accordance with the requirements of the Act.

3.4 Public consultation through the special consultative procedure was undertaken from 20 August to 20 September 2018. No submissions were received. The Hearing Panel met on 20 November, took the opportunity to visit the sites identified in the Statement of Proposal and deliberated on the proposal the same morning.

### 4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. The Waimakariri District is in a high seismic risk area which means Council must identify potentially earthquake-prone priority buildings by 1 January 2020 and owners of these buildings must carry out seismic working within 7.5 years (time from the issue of EPB notice).

4.2. To determine which buildings in the District should be identified as ‘priority buildings’ Council has identified (1) which thoroughfares have sufficient vehicle or pedestrian traffic to warrant prioritisation if part of an unreinforced masonry (URM) building were to fall onto them in an earthquake; and (2) which transport routes of strategic importance would be impeded if buildings collapsed onto them in an earthquake.
4.3. The Hearing Panel confirmed the three routes/buildings as listed in the recommendation above. No other routes/buildings have been identified through public consultation. No transport routes of strategic importance with URM buildings were identified.

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

Building owners will be advised of the implications of the Act on their building(s) through face-to-face meetings and followed up with written communication.

5.2. **Wider Community**

Wider public consultation was undertaken using the special consultative procedure in the *Local Government Act 2012* S83. Consultation opened on 20 August and closed on 20 September 2018.

A communication plan will be developed and further messaging undertaken early in 2019 to contribute towards public awareness of the priority routes/buildings identified.

Specific public messaging regarding the old Bank of New Zealand building in Williams Street, Kaiapoi is being planned.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

This consultation was undertaken using current staff resources and within current budgets.

6.2. **Community Implications**

On completion of this consultation, priority buildings and strategic routes will be identified and danger to life mitigated in accordance with the provisions of the Act.

6.3. **Risk Management**

Building owners will be aware of their responsibilities under the Act and monitoring by Council staff will ensure compliance. Public consultation provided the widest possible identification of unreinforced masonry buildings and strategic paths/roads to ensure the risk to the public is minimised.

If there is a major earthquake in the next 7.5 years, before building owners have time to complete strengthening work, there is a risk to the public. The URM buildings register and signage ensures the public has knowledge of the buildings that are potentially unsafe.

Section 133AS of the Amendment Act provides that if the seismic work on a building or part of a building subject to an EPB notice is not completed by the deadline that applies, or is not proceeding with reasonable speed towards that deadline, Council may apply to a District Court for an order authorising the Territorial Authority to carry out seismic work on the building or the part of the building.

6.4. **Health and Safety**

URM buildings have been identified as part of the public consultation, the register of these buildings will be available to the public. The Act provides that these buildings must be strengthened within 7.5 years to ensure that “people who use buildings can do so safely and without endangering their health” (*Building Act 2004*). Unreinforced masonry facades, parapets etc pose a risk to pedestrians/vehicles passing by as demonstrated through the Canterbury earthquakes.
8.7. CONTEXT

8.1.7.1. Policy

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

8.2.7.2. Legislation

Building (Earthquake prone buildings) Amendment Act 2016, Subpart 6A – Special provisions for earthquake-prone buildings

Local Government Act 2002, S83 Special consultative procedure

8.3.7.3. Community Outcomes

There is a safe environment for all

- Harm to people from natural and man-made hazards is minimised.
- Our district has the capacity and resilience to quickly recover from natural disasters and adapt to the effects of climate change.
Earthquake-Prone Buildings Legislation
Statement of Proposal
1 Introduction

The system for identifying and managing earthquake-prone buildings changed on 1 July 2017, when the Building (Earthquake-prone Buildings) Amendment Act 2016 came into effect. The new system ensures the way buildings are managed for future earthquakes is consistent across the country, and provides more information for people using buildings. There are new requirements, powers and time frames to address earthquake-prone buildings.

More information about the new system can be found at: https://www.building.govt.nz/managing-buildings/managing-earthquake-prone-buildings

2 Managing earthquake-prone buildings

2.1 Earthquake-prone priority buildings

The new system prioritises identification and remediation of earthquake-prone buildings that either pose a high risk to life safety, or are critical to recovery in an emergency. Certain hospital, emergency, and education buildings that are earthquake-prone will be priority buildings. Other earthquake-prone buildings may be identified as priority buildings because of their location, and the potential impact on people if they fail in an earthquake and block access routes important to the community. These buildings must be identified with community input.

Priority buildings must be identified and remediated in half the usual time to reduce the risks to life safety more promptly. This means the Council must identify potentially earthquake-prone priority buildings in this district within 2.5 years, and building owners must strengthen or demolish earthquake-prone priority buildings within 7.5 years.¹

Waimakariri District Council must identify, with community assistance:

(1) which thoroughfares in the District have sufficient vehicle or pedestrian traffic to warrant prioritisation, if part of an Unreinforced Masonry (URM) building² were to fall onto them in an earthquake; and

(2) which transport routes of strategic importance would be impeded if buildings collapsed onto them in an earthquake.

3 Why are we consulting?

Your input is sought to identify whether there are any buildings that may need to be classified as priority buildings.

---

¹ From the date the earthquake-prone building notice is issued
² An unreinforced masonry (URM) building has masonry walls that do not contain steel, timber or fibre reinforcement. URM buildings are older buildings that often have parapets, as well as verandas, balconies, decorative ornaments, chimneys and signs attached to their facades (front walls that face onto a street or open space).
To determine which other buildings may be priority buildings, Waimakariri District Council must identify thoroughfares that have both URM buildings and sufficient vehicle or pedestrian use.

Your views will assist to inform the Council’s decision on which thoroughfares (if any) to prioritise.

This consultation is in accordance with section 133AF(2)(a) of the Building Act 2004, which requires Council to use the special consultative procedure in section 83 of the Local Government Act 2002 to identify these priority buildings.

4 Proposals

4.1 Vehicle and pedestrian roads and accessways with sufficient traffic to warrant prioritisation

Waimakariri District Council has applied the following criteria to identify roads, footpaths or other thoroughfares to be prioritised:

1. **High pedestrian areas (people not in vehicles)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of use</th>
<th>Description of area</th>
<th>Example of application to Waimakariri District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Areas relating to social or utility activities</td>
<td>Areas where shops or other services are located</td>
<td>Town and suburban areas with shops, cafes, restaurants, bars and lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas relating to work</td>
<td>Areas where concentrations of people work and move around</td>
<td>Areas around office buildings or other places of work where there is a concentration of workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas relating to transport</td>
<td>Areas where concentrations of people access transport</td>
<td>Areas around bus stops and car parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key walking routes</td>
<td>Key walking routes that link areas where people are concentrated</td>
<td>Routes from bus stops and car parks to areas where there are shops, other services or work locations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. **Areas with high vehicle traffic (people in motor vehicles/on bikes)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of use</th>
<th>Description of area</th>
<th>Example of application to Waimakariri District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key traffic routes</td>
<td>Key traffic routes regularly used by vehicles including public transport</td>
<td>Central business district streets, arterial routes, bus routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas with concentrations of vehicles</td>
<td>Areas where high concentrations of vehicles build up</td>
<td>Busy intersections, areas where traffic builds up at peak hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and

3. **Potential for part of an unreinforced masonry building to fall onto the identified thoroughfare**

Waimakariri District Council seeks your views on whether the following roads, footpaths and other thoroughfares have sufficient traffic to warrant prioritisation. It also seeks your views on whether there are any other thoroughfares that should be included.

Based on their being sufficient traffic and the potential for part of an unreinforced masonry building to fall, Waimakariri District Council proposes the following thoroughfares to be prioritised:

- **Rangiora CBD** – the boundary is outlined in red on the map in Appendix 1, High Street from Percival Street to East Belt.

- **Kaiapoi CBD** – the boundary is outlined in red on the map in Appendix 2, Williams Street and Charles Street in the vicinity of the Bank of New Zealand building.

- **Kaiapoi, Ranfurly Street** – the boundary is outlined in red on the map in Appendix 3, Ranfurly Street from Smith Street past the old mill building.

**Questions**

1. Do you agree with the routes identified for prioritisation?
2. If not, which routes do you disagree with and why?
3. Are there any other routes that meet the criteria but are not listed?
4.2 Buildings on a transport route of strategic importance

Buildings impeding a strategic transport route in an earthquake could inhibit an emergency response to the detriment of the community, i.e. loss of life, if access to emergency care is not possible.

Waimakariri District Council has applied the following criteria to identify buildings on transport routes of strategic importance in an emergency for prioritisation:

1. **Emergency routes**
   Routes likely to be used by emergency services in:
   (a) transiting from their bases to areas of need in a major emergency, or
   (b) transiting to central services such as hospitals, where there are no alternative routes available.

2. **At least one building located on them that, if it collapsed, would impede the route.**

Waimakariri District Council has not identified any emergency route that should be prioritised.

We seek your views on whether there are any routes that you think should be included, based on the likelihood of use by emergency services in an emergency and the potential for at least one building to impede the route if it collapsed.

Questions

1. Are there any other routes that meet the criteria but are not listed?
5 Have your say

Submissions

Anyone can make a submission on this Statement of Proposal. The Waimakariri District Council wishes to hear from any person, group or business that would like to make a submission on proposed thoroughfares for prioritisation.

This consultation is open from 20 August 2018 to 20 September 2018 and all relevant information is available on the Council’s website www.waimakariri.co.nz. Hard copies are available from the Council’s libraries and service centres.

6 What happens next

Once consultation closes on 20 September, Council will consider and hear submissions on Thursday 11 October. A proposal will be determined in November.

Once priority thoroughfares have been finalised, Council will look at buildings on those thoroughfares to determine whether they are potentially earthquake-prone in accordance with the Earthquake-prone Building methodology\(^3\). Affected building owners will be notified. Owners of potentially earthquake-prone buildings, whether a priority building or not, have 12 months to provide an engineering assessment. Council will then determine whether the building is earthquake-prone, and notify the building owner of remediation requirements.

---

\(^3\) The EPB methodology is a regulatory tool that sets out the types of buildings that [Council] must identify as potentially earthquake-prone.
1. APOLOGIES

There were no apologies.

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

There were no conflicts of interest.

3. EARTHQUAKE PRONE BUILDINGS LEGISLATION

As noted in the agenda, the public consultation period went from 20 August to 20 September 2018 and there were no submissions received.

Prior to the commencement of this deliberation, the Hearing Panel members had been on site visits to the three areas under consideration in the Statement of Proposal relating to Earthquake Prone Buildings Legislation. WDC staff member G Wilson (Building WOFs & Earthquake Prone Buildings) accompanied the Hearing Panel members on the site visit.

At this time L Beckingsale provided an overview of the Statement of Proposal and the matters before the hearing panel for consideration and recommendation to Council.
The Statement of Proposal suggests there are three areas in the district identified as priority routes which have buildings with potential for unreinforced masonry to fall, Rangiora CBD – High Street from Percival Street to East Belt, Kaiapoi corner Williams and Charles Streets in the vicinity of old Bank of New Zealand building, and Ranfurly Street, Kaiapoi, from Smith Street past the old Mill Building. The Hearing Panel did not identify any other buildings or priority routes and following the site visit this morning, the Hearing Panel members were comfortable with the areas identified in the Statement of Proposal.

G Wilson advised that owners of buildings that have unreinforced masonry have been contacted about the routes and have been informed that there will be plaquing of the buildings until the reinforcing is done. G Wilson also intends to have discussion with both the building owners and any tenants to keep them updated.

Moved Councillor Doody seconded Councillor Meyer

THAT The Hearing Panel recommends

THAT the Council

(a) **Adopts** the following as priority routes/buildings, that are then identified so the public can make informed decisions (as identified on the maps):

(i) Williams Street, Kaiapoi (Old Bank of New Zealand Building)

(ii) Walker Street, Kaiapoi (Kaiapoi Mill)

(iii) High Street, Rangiora (approximately nine buildings)

CONFIRMED

**Transport Route of Strategic Importance**

The Hearing Panel then discussed the matter of any buildings collapsing in an earthquake, and subsequently impeding a transport route of strategic importance.

Councillor Meyer asked does there need to be a route marked out in the case of another event happening. Referring to High Street, Rangiora, G Wilson noted that traffic could be reduced to one lane and there would still be public access maintained if there was another event. It would not be necessary to close access.

After some discussion, the Hearing Panel did not identify any emergency route that should be prioritised.
Moved Councillor Meyer seconded Councillor Blackie

THAT The Hearing Panel recommends

THAT the Council

(a) **Acknowledges** that no routes of strategic importance in an emergency have been identified for prioritisation.

CARRIED

L. Beckingsale advised that a report including these recommendations will go to the next Council meeting on December 4.

Members of the Hearing Panel wished to record their appreciation of the support of the staff on this matter and conducting the site visit prior to the hearing today.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 11.00am.

CONFIRMED

________________________________________
Chairperson

________________________________________
Date
1. SUMMARY

1.1. This report is to update Council on the feedback from the speed limit review which was undertaken for the Rangiora-Woodend Road, Gressons Road, Boys Road and Northbrook Road area, and to seek approval to change the speed limits in these areas as outlined below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Woodend Road from end of existing 80km/h east of Smarts Road to 170m north west of Bob Robertson Drive</td>
<td>100km/h</td>
<td>80km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Woodend Road from 170m north west of Bob Robertson Drive to 50km/h speed limit north-west of School Road</td>
<td>100km/h</td>
<td>60km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gressons Road</td>
<td>100km/h</td>
<td>80km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris Road</td>
<td>100km/h</td>
<td>80km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys Road from Rangiora Woodend Road to existing 50km/h east of the railway line</td>
<td>100km/h</td>
<td>80km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuahiwi Road from Boys Road to the existing 80km/h signs east of Boys Road</td>
<td>100km/h</td>
<td>80km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbrook Road from Boys Road to existing 50km/h east of Goodwin Street</td>
<td>100km/h</td>
<td>80km/h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Summary of Proposed Speed Limit Changes

1.2. The safe and appropriate speeds for these roads have been assessed using NZTA’s Speed Management Guide (2016).

1.3. Consultation was held through October regarding reducing speed limits on these roads. 198 responses have been received.

1.4. Feedback was also sought from the following organisations on the proposed speed limit changes:
- Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga
- NZ Police
- NZ Transport Agency
- NZ Automobile Association Inc.
- Road Transport Association NZ
2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 181121136994.

(b) **Approves** the following changes to speed limits:

i. Rangiora Woodend Road, from the end of the existing 80km/h speed limit west of Smarts Road to 170m north west of Bob Robertson Drive, reduces to 80km/h;

ii. Rangiora Woodend Road, from 170m north west of Bob Robertson Drive to the existing 50km/h speed limit north west of School Road, reduces to 60km/h;

iii. Gressons Road reduces to 80km/h;

iv. Boys Road, from Rangiora Woodend Road to the existing 50km/h speed limit east of the railway line, reduces to 80km/h;

v. Northbrook Road, from Boys Road to the existing 50km/h speed limit east of Goodwin Street, reduces to 80km/h;

vi. Tuahiwi Road, from Boys Road to the existing 80km/h limit east of Boys Road, reduces to 80km/h;

vii. Harris Road reduces to 80 km/hr

(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 change 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 Woodend–Sefton, Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi, and Rangiora-Ashley Community Boards for their information;

(f) **Notes** that operating speeds will be surveyed on these road six months after implementation of the new speed limits;

(g) **Notes** that a copy of this report has been provided to the Runanga Liaison Committee.

(h) **Circulates** this report to all Community Boards.

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 Council considered report No. 180706075194 at its meeting on 7th August 2018. This report requested approval to consult on reducing speed limits on Rangiora Woodend Road, Gressons Road, Boys Road, and Northbrook Road. Council resolved to “Refer the report to all Community Boards to seek feedback, and report back to the Council, prior to consultation on proposed speed limits.”
3.2 Following feedback from each of the Community Boards, Council considered report No. 180919108756 at its meeting on 2 October 2018 and approved consultation on the proposed speed limit changes.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. As discussed in section 5, the community was consulted on the proposed speed limit changes.

4.2. The consultation results and issues and options identified for each section of road being considered since the August report are discussed below.

**RANGIORA WOODEND ROAD - Smarts Road to Proposed Ravenswood Roundabout**

**Considerations**

4.3. Rangiora-Woodend Road is an Arterial road between Smarts Road and Chinnerys Road and a Primary collector between Chinnerys Road and School Road. The road consists of an undivided sealed carriageway with narrow shoulders with numerous roadside hazards such as power poles, ditches and vehicle entrances along its length.

4.4. The existing speed limits on Rangiora Woodend Road are:

- 80km/h to the west of Smarts Road (outside area under review)
- 100 km/h from Smarts Road to Chinnerys Road
- 70km/h from Chinnerys Road to School Road
- 50km/h from School Road to SH1 (outside area under review)

4.5. Current land use on both sides of Rangiora Woodend Road is rural between Smarts Road and Chinnerys Road. Beyond Chinnerys Road the land uses are residential on the north eastern side of the road, and rural on the south western side.

4.6. The Ravenswood development will have an impacts on the section of Rangiora Woodend Road to the north west of Chinnerys Road. Stage 1A of the residential portion of Ravenswood is nearly complete and includes properties fronting onto Chinnerys Road, and a new internal road connecting onto Chinnerys Road. It does not include properties with access onto Rangiora Woodend Road.

4.7. Construction of Ravenswood Stage 1B is underway. This stage includes properties with access onto Rangiora Woodend Road, and a roundabout at the intersection of Rangiora Woodend Road and the new road “Bob Robertson Drive”. Bob Robertson Drive will link to Rangiora Woodend Road in the future and through to the commercial area of Ravenswood, by the roundabout on State Highway 1 at Pegasus Boulevard.

4.8. The speed limit assessment has therefore assumed that the land uses adjacent to the section of Rangiora Woodend Road between Chinnerys Road and Bob Robertson Drive will be similar to those in the section between Chinnerys Road and School Road.

4.9. The following table shows the recorded Average Daily Traffic (ADT) volumes on Rangiora Woodend Road:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>ADT (vpd)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08/05/2018</td>
<td>South of Woodend Rd</td>
<td>3,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/09/2017</td>
<td>100m south of Chinnerys Rd</td>
<td>5,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/05/2018</td>
<td>140m east of Boys Road</td>
<td>10,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/05/2018</td>
<td>350m west of Boys Rd</td>
<td>6,680</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2: Rangiora Woodend Road Traffic Counts*

These volumes are expected to increase significantly once the Ravenswood development is complete.
4.10. NZTA has a project underway to provide safer access across and onto State Highway 1 in Woodend. This project is likely to result in improved access onto SH1 in a limited number of locations. This may mean that some routes accessing SH1 become more attractive than others, thereby contributing to changed traffic patterns on Rangiora Woodend Road. As a result changes to intersection, or other, layouts along Rangiora Woodend Road may be required.

4.11. The nature and timing of any changes associated with improving access to SH1 are currently unknown. The speed limit assessment has therefore assumed no changes associated with these measures.

Consultation

4.12. The speed limit proposed in the consultation was 80km/h. The following question was asked regarding this section of road was “Should Rangiora Woodend Road from end of existing 80 km/h west of Smarts Road to proposed Ravenswood roundabout be lowered to 80 km/h?”

Responses to this question are summarised below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCLUDING WOODEND SCHOOL RESPONSE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option</td>
<td>No. of Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes – lower to 80km/h</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No – retain current 100km/h speed limit</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No – change to another speed</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responded</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXCLUDING WOODEND SCHOOL RESPONSE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Options</td>
<td>No. of Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes – lower to 80km/h</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No – retain current 100km/h speed limit</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No – change to another speed</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responded</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Rangiora Woodend Road (Rural) Consultation Response

4.13. Responses from Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga, local police, NZTA, the Automobile Association, and the Road Transport Association, all indicated support for the 80km/h speed limit proposed in the consultation.

Technical Assessment

4.14. The technical assessment for Rangiora Woodend Road – Smarts Road to the proposed Ravenswood roundabout is summarised in below table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Speed Limit</th>
<th>100km/h</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of feedback respondents supporting 80km/h</td>
<td>80% incl. Woodend School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Function</td>
<td>Class 2 (Arterial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72% excl. Woodend School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Collective Risk | Medium
---|---
Personal Risk | Low
Infrastructure Risk Rating | Medium
Assessed Safe and Appropriate Speed | 80km/h
Recorded Mean Speed | 85.3km/h
5 year crash rate (2012 – 2017) total | 26
  Fatal | 0
  Serious | 2
  Minor | 7
  Non Injury | 17

Table 4: Speed Limit Assessment Rangiora Woodend Road - Smarts Road to Proposed Ravenswood Roundabout

**Options - Smarts Road to Proposed Ravenswood Roundabout**

4.15. The assessed safe and appropriate speed is 80km/h. In addition, the Speed Limit Setting Rule recommends that mean operating speeds are no more than 10% above the posted speed limit. The current recorded mean speed (85km/h) meets this recommendation with a posted speed limit of 80km/h.

4.16. Other options considered include:

- **Leave Speed Limit at 100km/h** - This option is not recommended because the roadside features, including power poles, roadside drains, intersections, property accesses, and the cycleway pose significant hazards. The speed survey suggests that this section of road is currently operating as an 80km/h road rather than a 100km/h road.

- **Reduce the speed limit lower than 80km/h** - 70km/h speed limits are not supported by the current Speed Limit Setting rule. A dispensation would be required by NZTA to set a new 70km/h speed limit. An application for a dispensation would need to show how the 70km/h limit would be phased out. It is considered unlikely that NZTA would approve a 70km/h limit. A 60km/h limit is considered too slow for this environment. The roadside environment and road alignment do not suggest a 60km/h speed environment to drivers. This is reflected in the current mean speed. Compliance with a 60km/h limit in this environment is likely to be poor without significant changes to the roadside and / road environment.

4.17. It is therefore recommended that the speed limit on Rangiora Woodend Road from Smarts Road to west of the proposed Ravenswood Roundabout be reduced to 80km/h

**RANGIORA WOODEND ROAD - Proposed Ravenswood Roundabout to School Road**

**Consultation**

4.18. The speed limit proposed in the consultation was 60km/h. The following question was asked regarding the section of road which is currently rural: “Should Rangiora Woodend Road from proposed Ravenswood roundabout to start of existing 70km/h west of Chinnerys Road be lowered to 60km/h?”

4.19. Responses to this question are summarised in Error! Reference source not found..
### Table 5: Rangiora Woodend Road (Ravenswood Roundabout to Chinnerys Road) Consultation Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>Not Responded</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes − lower to 60km/h</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No − retain current 100km/h speed limit</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No − change to another speed</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responded</td>
<td>188</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INCLUDING WOODEND SCHOOL RESPONSE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>Not Responded</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes − lower to 60km/h</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No − retain current 70km/h speed limit</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No − change to another speed</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responded</td>
<td>185</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXCLUDING WOODEND SCHOOL RESPONSE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>Not Responded</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes − lower to 80km/h</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No − retain current 100km/h speed limit</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No − change to another speed</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responded</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.20. The consultation asked the following question regarding the section of this road which is currently urban: "Should Rangiora Woodend Road from start of existing 70km/h west of Chinnerys Road to start of 50km/h north of School Road be lowered to 60km/h?"

4.21. Responses are summarised in the table below.

### Table 6: Rangiora Woodend Road (Chinnerys Rd to School Rd) Consultation Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>Not Responded</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes − lower to 60km/h</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No − retain current 70km/h speed limit</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No − change to another speed</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responded</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.22. The vast majority of those suggesting changing to another speed preferred 50km/h.
4.23. Responses from Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga, local police, the Automobile Association, and the Road Transport Association, all indicated support for the 60km/h speed limit proposed in the consultation. Police, in particular, specifically indicated that they preferred 60km/h rather than 50km/h. However, NZTA has indicated a preference for a 50km/h limit on this section of Rangiora Woodend Road.

**Technical Assessment**

4.24. The assessment for Rangiora Woodend Road – proposed Ravenswood roundabout (Bob Robertson Drive) to School Road is summarised in **Error! Reference source not found.** table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Speed Limit</th>
<th>70 km/h and 100km/h</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of feedback respondents supporting 60 km/h</td>
<td>42/43% incl. Woodend School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60/66% excl. Woodend School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Function</td>
<td>Class 3 (Primary Collector)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Risk</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Risk</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Risk Rating</td>
<td>Low-Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed Safe and Appropriate Speed</td>
<td>50km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded Mean Speed</td>
<td>62.6km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 year crash rate (2012 – 2017) total</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatal</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Injury</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 7: Speed Limit Assessment Rangiora Woodend Road – Bob Robertson Drive to School Road*

**Options – Proposed Ravenswood Roundabout to School Road**

4.25. A number of options were considered for this section of Rangiora Woodend Road including:

- **Reduce Speed Limit to 60km/h** - A speed limit of 60km/h is recommended from a point 170m north-west of Bob Robertson Drive to 20m north-west of School Road for the following reasons:
  - Residential development is expected to extend to the section of road between the proposed roundabout and the current urban edge of Woodend at Chinnerys Road by mid-2019.
  - Although the safe and appropriate speed is assessed at 50km/h, the recorded mean speed suggests that significant engineering works would be required to reduce the operating speed to within 10% of 50km/h. Such works are not recommended prior to confirmation of the SH1 access works being proposed by NZTA.
  - The current mean speed is less than 10% higher than 60km/h;
  - Local road policing staff, who are familiar with driver behaviour on this section of road recommend a speed limit of 60km/h.
Reduce the Speed Limit to 50km/h - The safe and appropriate speed for this section of road is assessed at 50km/h. However, it is considered that the combination of long sections of very wide road and a rural environment on one side is likely to result in poor compliance with a 50km/h speed limit.

The recorded mean speed is 63km/h. A reduction in mean speed of 8km/h is required to meet the target that mean operating speed not exceed the posted speed limit by more than 10%. This is unlikely to be met by merely reducing the speed limit and enforcement. Further engineering measures are likely to be required.

Measures to make the road “feel” more like a 50km/h road, and thereby reduce the operating speed, could include provision cycle lanes, lane narrowing, and road narrowing. These measures are not recommended prior to confirmation of measures that NZTA might be implementing on the State Highway.

This option is NZTA’s preferred option, and has some advantages over the 60km/h option, but there is a need to implement physical measures to achieve compliance. These measures may need to be modified or removed to suit possible changes to SH1. This option is therefore not recommended.

Leave Speed Limits at 100 and 70km/h - This option is not recommended because the roadside features, including, existing and proposed urban development, intersections, and property accesses make a lower speed limit appropriate for this section of road. The speed survey suggests that this section of road is currently operating as a 60km/h road rather than a 70 or 100km/h road.

Lower the Rural Section (proposed roundabout to Chinnerys Road) to 80km/h - The proposed roundabout will perform a significant “gateway” function for Woodend, traffic approaching the town.

The proposed residential development on this section of Rangiora Woodend Road will give the north eastern side of this section of road a much more urban feel than it currently has.

A detailed construction programme for the roundabout and other construction works on Rangiora Woodend Road, including services installation and road and footpath construction, will not be available until a contractor is appointed for the construction of Ravenswood Stage 1B. However, the developer’s programme is for construction to start in October 2018, and continue until May 2019. It is likely that this section of Rangiora Woodend Road will be under some form of temporary traffic management for much of this period.

There is a small risk that stage 1B of the Ravenswood development does not proceed within the proposed timeframe. However, it is considered unlikely that the roundabout and development on this section of Rangiora Woodend Road will not proceed at some stage. It is considered appropriate to change speed limits to suit a likely well defined development. This option is therefore not recommended.

Delay Speed Limit changes until Future NZTA Projects are confirmed - NZTA’s projects to improve access across and to SH1 may have an effect on the layout and nature of Rangiora Woodend Road, and other roads in Woodend. It may also affect the location and nature of the future extension of the cycleway into the Woodend urban area.

Both of these factors are likely to influence the safe and appropriate speeds on Rangiora Woodend Road within Woodend. It is therefore possible that a further review of speed limits on this section of Rangiora Woodend Road may be required once there is clarity about the nature and timing of NZTA’s proposals for access to SH1, including
pedestrian and cycle connections to and across the highway. Delaying speed limit changes, minimises the likelihood of needing to review the speed limits again. However, it does not address the likely changes to the road environment associated with the Ravenswood stage 1B development.

Not adjusting the speed limit to suit these developments has some potentially significant safety effects. This option is therefore not recommended.

- A variation of this option is to extend the 70km/h limit to include the section between Chinnerys Road and the proposed Ravenswood roundabout, and delay changes to the extended 70km/h section until there is clarity around the nature and timing of NZTA’s proposals.

An extension of the 70km/h limit will require a special dispensation from NZTA. An argument could be made that the 70km/h limit would be reviewed once there was clarity about the wider Woodend access proposals, and that it was therefore comparatively short term. This is considered a reasonably strong argument, but there is still some uncertainty over how NZTA would view it.

This option has some advantages over the preferred option, but its inability to address the speed on the existing urban section of Rangiora Woodend Road and the uncertainty over NZTA’s response mean that it is not recommended.

**Gressons Road**

*Considerations*

4.26. Gressons Road is a primary collector linking Rangiora-Woodend Road with SH1. The road is an undivided sealed carriageway with multiple hazards such as power poles, ditches and Vehicle entrances along its length, with a speed limit of 100 km/hr. The Average Daily Traffic (ADT) is 2,313 Vehicles per day.

4.27. Current land use on both sides of Gressons Road is rural.

*Consultation*

4.28. The speed limit proposed in the consultation was 80km/h. The following question was asked regarding this section of road: “Should Gressons Road be lowered to 80km/h?”

4.29. Responses to this question are summarised in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCLUDING WOODEND SCHOOL RESPONSE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option</strong></td>
<td><strong>No. of Responses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes – lower to 80km/h</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No – retain current 100km/h speed limit</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No – change to another speed</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Responded</strong></td>
<td><strong>186</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXCLUDING WOODEND SCHOOL RESPONSE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option</strong></td>
<td><strong>No. of Responses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes – lower to 80km/h</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8: Gressons Road Consultation Response

4.30. Responses from Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga, local police, NZTA, and the Automobile Association, all indicated support for the 80km/h speed limit proposed in the consultation, however, the Road Transport Association suggested maintaining the existing 100km/h speed limit, and implementing engineering improvements to improve safety on Gressons Road.

Technical Assessment

4.31. The technical assessment for Gressons Road is summarised in Error! Reference source not found. table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Speed Limit</th>
<th>100km/h</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of feedback respondents supporting 80km/h</td>
<td>75% incl. Woodend School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66% excl. Woodend School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Function</td>
<td>Class 2 (Arterial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Risk</td>
<td>Medium High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Risk</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Risk Rating</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed Safe and Appropriate Speed</td>
<td>80km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded Mean Speed</td>
<td>93.0km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 year crash rate (2012 – 2017) total</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatal</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Injury</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Speed Limit Assessment Gressons Road

Options – Gressons Road

- **Reduce Limit to 80km/h** - The assessed safe and appropriate speed is 80km/h. In addition, the Speed Limit Setting Rule recommends that mean operating speeds are no more than 10% above the posted speed limit. The current recorded mean speed (93km/h) does not meet this recommendation with a posted speed limit of 80km/h. A mean speed reduction of 5km/h is required to meet this target. A reduction of this magnitude is considered achievable with a speed limit change and enforcement.

It is therefore recommended that the speed limit be reduced to 80km/h on Gressons Road. Other options considered include:

- **Leave Speed Limit at 100km/h** - This, with engineering improvements, is the Road Transport Association’s preferred option.
The roadside features, including power poles, roadside drains, intersections, property accesses, and the cycleway pose significant hazards on this road. Significant expenditure would be required to eliminate or mitigate these hazards, such that 100km/h would be a safe and appropriate speed on this road.

The speed limit on SH1 at the intersection with Gressons Road is 80km/h. If the limit on Rangiora Woodend Road reduces to 80km/h and Gressons Road stays at 100km/h then Gressons Road would be inconsistent with both the adjacent roads. This option is therefore not recommended.

**BOYS ROAD – Rangiora Woodend Road to 50km/h Limit East of Railway Line**

**Considerations**

4.32. Boys Road is a primary collector linking Rangiora-Woodend Road with the urban area of Rangiora at South Belt. The road is an undivided sealed carriageway with multiple hazards such as power poles, ditches and Vehicle entrances along its length with a speed limit of 100 km/hr. The Average Daily Traffic (ADT) is 1,638 Vehicles per day.

4.33. Current land use on both sides of Boys Road is rural.

**Consultation**

4.34. The speed limit proposed in the consultation was 80km/h. The following question was asked regarding this section of road: “Should Boys Road from Rangiora Woodend Road to existing 50km/h at railway line be lowered to 80km/h?”

4.35. Responses to this question are summarised in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Including Woodend School Response</th>
<th>Excluding Woodend School Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes – lower to 80km/h</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No – retain current 100km/h speed</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No – change to another speed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responded</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2: Boys Road Consultation Responses*

4.36. Responses from Te Ngāi Tūhuriri Rūnanga, local police, NZTA, and the Automobile Association, all indicated support for the 80km/h speed limit proposed in the consultation, however, the Road Transport Association suggested maintaining the existing 100km/h
speed limit, and implementing engineering improvements to improve safety on Gressons Road.

**Technical Assessment**

4.37. The technical assessment for Boys Road is summarised in table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Speed Limit</th>
<th>100km/h</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of feedback respondents supporting 80km/h</td>
<td>78% incl. Woodend School, 69% excl. Woodend School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Function</td>
<td>Class 3 (Primary Collector)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Risk</td>
<td>Medium High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Risk</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Risk Rating</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed Safe and Appropriate Speed</td>
<td>80km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded Mean Speed</td>
<td>88.5km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 year crash rate (2012 – 2017) total</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Injury</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3 Speed Limit Assessment Boys Road*

4.38. **Options – Boys Road**

- Reduce Speed Limit to 80km/h - The assessed safe and appropriate speed is 80km/h. In addition, the Speed Limit Setting Rule recommends that mean operating speeds are no more than 10% above the posted speed limit. The current recorded mean speed (89km/h) is extremely close to meeting this recommendation with a posted speed limit of 80km/h. A reduction in mean speed of 1km/h is required to meet this target. A reduction of this magnitude is considered to be readily achievable with a speed limit change and enforcement.

It is therefore recommended that the speed limit be reduced to 80km/h on Boys Road. Other options considered include:

- Leave Speed Limit at 100km/h - This, with engineering improvements, is the Road Transport Association’s preferred option.

The roadside features, including power poles, roadside drains, intersections, property accesses, and the cycleway pose significant hazards. Significant expenditure would be required to eliminate or mitigate these hazards, such that 100km/h would be a safe and appropriate speed on this road.

The speed survey suggests that this section of road is currently operating more as an 80km/h road rather than a 100km/h road. If the limit on Rangiora Woodend Road reduces to 80km/h and Boys Road stays at 100km/h then Boys Road would be inconsistent with adjacent roads. This option is therefore not recommended.
NORTHBROOK ROAD – Boys Road to 50km/h Limit East of Goodwin Street

Considerations

4.39. Northbrook Road is primary collector to the south-west of Rangiora-Woodend Road. It connects Boys Road to the eastern part of the Rangiora urban area. The road is a narrow, undivided sealed carriageway with multiple hazards such as power poles, ditches and vehicle entrances along its length with a speed limit of 100 km/hr. The Average Daily Traffic (ADT) is 4,795 Vehicles per day.

4.40. Land uses on the section of Northbrook Road being reviewed are rural.

Consultation

4.41. The speed limit proposed in the consultation was 80km/h. The following question was asked regarding this section of road: “Should Northbrook Road from Boys Road to existing 50km/h east of Goodwin Street be lowered to 80km/h?”

4.42. Responses to this question are summarised in table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>INCLUDING WOODEND SCHOOL RESPONSE</th>
<th>EXCLUDING WOODEND SCHOOL RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Responses</td>
<td>Not Responded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes – lower to 80km/h</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No – retain current 100km/h speed limit</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No – change to another speed</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responded</td>
<td>186</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 Northbrook Road Consultation Responses

4.43. Responses from Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga, local police, NZTA, the Automobile Association, and the Road Transport Association, all indicated support for the 80km/h speed limit proposed in the consultation.

Technical Assessment

4.44. The assessment for Northbrook Road is summarised in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Speed Limit</th>
<th>100km/h</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of feedback respondents supporting 80km/h</td>
<td>82% incl. Woodend School 75% excl. Woodend School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Function</td>
<td>Class 3 (Primary Collector)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Risk</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Risk</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Risk Rating</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed Safe and Appropriate Speed</td>
<td>80km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded Mean Speed</td>
<td>82.6km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 year crash rate (2012 – 2017) total</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatal</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Injury</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: Speed Limit Assessment Northbrook Road

Options – Northbrook Road

- **Reduce Speed Limit to 80km/h** - The assessed safe and appropriate speed is 80km/h. In addition, the Speed Limit Setting Rule recommends that mean operating speeds are no more than 10% above the posted speed limit. The current recorded mean speed (83km/h) meets this target with a posted speed limit of 80km/h.

It is therefore recommended that the speed limit be reduced to 80km/h on Boys Road. Other options considered include:

- **Leave Speed Limit at 100km/h** - The roadside features, including power poles, roadside drains, intersections, property accesses, and the cycleway pose significant hazards. Significant expenditure would be required to eliminate or mitigate these hazards, such that 100km/h would be a safe and appropriate speed on this road.

The speed survey suggests that this section of road is currently operating more as an 80km/h road rather than a 100km/h road. If the limit on Rangiora Woodend and Boys Roads reduce to 80km/h and Boys Road stays at 100km/h then Boys Road would be inconsistent with adjacent roads. This option is therefore not recommended.

TUAHIWI ROAD from Rangiora Woodend Road to Existing 80km/h Limit

Considerations

4.45. The Police consultation response noted that this 80m section of road is currently 100km/h, and had been omitted from the consultation. They recommended that it be reduced to 80km/h to be consistent with the existing limit on Tuahiwi Road, and the proposed limits on Boys Road and Rangiora Woodend Road. It is therefore recommended that the speed limit on the section of Tuahiwi Road from Rangiora Woodend Road to the existing 80km/h limit be reduced to 80km/h.

HARRIS ROAD

Considerations

4.46. The Police response also recommended that the speed limit on Harris Road be reduced to 80km/h to be consistent with the proposed limits on Gressons and Rangiora Woodend.
Roads at either end of Harris Road. It is therefore recommended that the speed limit on Harris Road be reduced to 80km/h.

4.47. The Management Team have reviewed this report and support the recommendations.

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

Groups and Organisations

5.1. The following groups and organisations were consulted with:

- Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga
- The Commissioner of Police
- The Chief Executive Officer of NZ Transport Agency
- The Chief Executive Officer of the NZ Automobile Association Inc.
- The Chief Executive Officer of the Road Transport Association NZ

5.2. Their opinions were sought on the following proposals:

- Reducing the speed limit on Rangiora Woodend Road between the end of the existing 80km/h limit west of Smarts Road and the proposed Ravenswood Roundabout to 80km/h;
- Reducing the speed limit on Rangiora Woodend Road between the proposed Ravenswood roundabout and the existing 50km/h limit north of School Road to 60km/h;
- Reducing the speed limit on Gressons Road to 80km/h;
- Reducing the speed limit on Boys Road between Rangiora Woodend Road and the existing 50km/h limit east of the railway line to 80km/h;
- Reducing the speed limit on Northbrook Road between Boys Road and the existing 50km/h limit east of Goodwin Street to 80km/h;

5.3. Responses have been received from each of the organisations approached. They generally supported the proposals with the following exceptions:

- NZTA recommended reducing the speed limit on the more urban section of Rangiora Woodend Road to 50km/h.
- The Road Transport Association suggested maintaining a speed limit of 100km/h on Gressons and Boys Roads, and implementing engineering improvements to improve road safety.

5.4. The Automobile Association also recommended that after implementation of this speed reduction, the mean speeds be reassessed and the results made available. This recommendation is supported, and it is proposed to survey operating speeds on these roads six months following implementation of the new speed limits. Their responses are included in Attachments ii to vi.

Wider Community

5.5. The wider community has been consulted over a four week period in October 2018. The consultation included a drop in session at the Woodend Community Centre, social media posts, newspaper advertisements, and fliers delivered to affected properties along the routes.
5.6. Hard copy and electronic (via Survey Monkey) responses were able to be provided. A total of 192 responses were received, including 57 from staff and pupils at Woodend School. 124 hardcopy, and 68 survey monkey responses were received. The responses were collated in Attachment i

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

**Financial Implications**

6.1. The total cost is expected to be less than $5,000, and will be able to be met through existing budgets.

**Community Implications**

6.2. The views of the community have been sought.

**Risk Management**

6.3. The adverse risks associated with changing these speed limits are considered low. These speed limit changes are expected to reduce the risk of fatal and serious injury crashes on these roads.

**Health and Safety**

6.4. Reduction of speed limits is expected to have positive health and safety effects from a reduced rate of fatal and serious crashes on these roads.

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**

Section 145 of the Local Government Act 2002 empowers the Council to make a bylaw for its district to protect, promote and maintain public health and safety.

The Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits Rule (2017) requires that permanent speed limits be set by bylaw.

The Speed Limits Bylaw 2009 enables the Council to set speed limits by Council resolution.

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

**Governance**

There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision making that effects our District:

- The Council makes information about its plans and activities readily available.  
- The Council takes account of the views across the community including mana whenua.  
- The Council makes known its views on significant proposals by others affecting the District’s wellbeing.  
- Opportunities for collaboration and partnerships are actively pursued.

7.4. **Delegations**

The Speed Limits Bylaw 2009 enables the Council to set speed limits by Council resolution.
Should Range Road be lowered to 80 km/hr between Rangiora Woodend Road and railway line?

- **Yes** - Lower to 80 km/hr
- **No** - Retain current 100 km/hr speed limit
- **No** - Change to another speed
- **No** - Change to another road

No comments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Should Gressons Road be lowered to 80 km/hr?</th>
<th>Should Rangiora Woodend Road be lowered to 60 km/hr between Chinnerys Road and School Road</th>
<th>Should Gressons Road be lowered to 80 km/hr?</th>
<th>Should Rangiora Woodend Road be lowered to 60 km/hr between SH1 and Bypass for Rangiora</th>
<th>Should Bypass Road be lowered to 60 km/hr between Gressons Road and Rangiora</th>
<th>Should Gressons Road be lowered to 80 km/hr?</th>
<th>Should Rangiora Woodend Road be lowered to 60 km/hr between SH1 and Bypass for Rangiora</th>
<th>Should Bypass Road be lowered to 60 km/hr between Gressons Road and Rangiora</th>
<th>Should Rangiora Woodend Road be lowered to 60 km/hr between SH1 and Bypass for Rangiora</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>Yes - lower to 80 km/hr</td>
<td>No - retain current 100 km/hr speed limit</td>
<td>No - Change to another speed</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>Yes - lower to 80 km/hr</td>
<td>No - retain current 100 km/hr speed limit</td>
<td>No - Change to another speed</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>Yes - lower to 80 km/hr</td>
<td>No - retain current 100 km/hr speed limit</td>
<td>No - Change to another speed</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>Yes - lower to 80 km/hr</td>
<td>No - retain current 100 km/hr speed limit</td>
<td>No - Change to another speed</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>Yes - lower to 80 km/hr</td>
<td>No - retain current 100 km/hr speed limit</td>
<td>No - Change to another speed</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - No comments</td>
<td>Yes - lower to 80 km/hr</td>
<td>No - retain current 100 km/hr speed limit</td>
<td>No - Change to another speed</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - No comments</td>
<td>Yes - lower to 80 km/hr</td>
<td>No - retain current 100 km/hr speed limit</td>
<td>No - Change to another speed</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - No comments</td>
<td>Yes - lower to 80 km/hr</td>
<td>No - retain current 100 km/hr speed limit</td>
<td>No - Change to another speed</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - No comments</td>
<td>Yes - lower to 80 km/hr</td>
<td>No - retain current 100 km/hr speed limit</td>
<td>No - Change to another speed</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - No comments</td>
<td>Yes - lower to 80 km/hr</td>
<td>No - retain current 100 km/hr speed limit</td>
<td>No - Change to another speed</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - No comments</td>
<td>Yes - lower to 80 km/hr</td>
<td>No - retain current 100 km/hr speed limit</td>
<td>No - Change to another speed</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - No comments</td>
<td>Yes - lower to 80 km/hr</td>
<td>No - retain current 100 km/hr speed limit</td>
<td>No - Change to another speed</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - No comments</td>
<td>Yes - lower to 80 km/hr</td>
<td>No - retain current 100 km/hr speed limit</td>
<td>No - Change to another speed</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - No comments</td>
<td>Yes - lower to 80 km/hr</td>
<td>No - retain current 100 km/hr speed limit</td>
<td>No - Change to another speed</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - No comments</td>
<td>Yes - lower to 80 km/hr</td>
<td>No - retain current 100 km/hr speed limit</td>
<td>No - Change to another speed</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - No comments</td>
<td>Yes - lower to 80 km/hr</td>
<td>No - retain current 100 km/hr speed limit</td>
<td>No - Change to another speed</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - No comments</td>
<td>Yes - lower to 80 km/hr</td>
<td>No - retain current 100 km/hr speed limit</td>
<td>No - Change to another speed</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - No comments</td>
<td>Yes - lower to 80 km/hr</td>
<td>No - retain current 100 km/hr speed limit</td>
<td>No - Change to another speed</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - No comments</td>
<td>Yes - lower to 80 km/hr</td>
<td>No - retain current 100 km/hr speed limit</td>
<td>No - Change to another speed</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - No comments</td>
<td>Yes - lower to 80 km/hr</td>
<td>No - retain current 100 km/hr speed limit</td>
<td>No - Change to another speed</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - No comments</td>
<td>Yes - lower to 80 km/hr</td>
<td>No - retain current 100 km/hr speed limit</td>
<td>No - Change to another speed</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - No comments</td>
<td>Yes - lower to 80 km/hr</td>
<td>No - retain current 100 km/hr speed limit</td>
<td>No - Change to another speed</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - No comments</td>
<td>Yes - lower to 80 km/hr</td>
<td>No - retain current 100 km/hr speed limit</td>
<td>No - Change to another speed</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - No comments</td>
<td>Yes - lower to 80 km/hr</td>
<td>No - retain current 100 km/hr speed limit</td>
<td>No - Change to another speed</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - No comments</td>
<td>Yes - lower to 80 km/hr</td>
<td>No - retain current 100 km/hr speed limit</td>
<td>No - Change to another speed</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
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<td>Yes - No comments</td>
<td>Yes - lower to 80 km/hr</td>
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<td>No - Change to another speed</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - No comments</td>
<td>Yes - lower to 80 km/hr</td>
<td>No - retain current 100 km/hr speed limit</td>
<td>No - Change to another speed</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - No comments</td>
<td>Yes - lower to 80 km/hr</td>
<td>No - retain current 100 km/hr speed limit</td>
<td>No - Change to another speed</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - No comments</td>
<td>Yes - lower to 80 km/hr</td>
<td>No - retain current 100 km/hr speed limit</td>
<td>No - Change to another speed</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - No comments</td>
<td>Yes - lower to 80 km/hr</td>
<td>No - retain current 100 km/hr speed limit</td>
<td>No - Change to another speed</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - No comments</td>
<td>Yes - lower to 80 km/hr</td>
<td>No - retain current 100 km/hr speed limit</td>
<td>No - Change to another speed</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
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<td>Yes - No comments</td>
<td>Yes - lower to 80 km/hr</td>
<td>No - retain current 100 km/hr speed limit</td>
<td>No - Change to another speed</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>编号</td>
<td>道路名称</td>
<td>是否降低限速</td>
<td>限速调整前</td>
<td>限速调整后</td>
<td>评论</td>
<td>编号</td>
<td>道路名称</td>
<td>是否降低限速</td>
<td>限速调整前</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rangiora Woodend Road</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>80 km/hr</td>
<td>100 km/hr</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rangiora Woodend Road</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>80 km/hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Smarts Road to proposed Revenswood Roundabout</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>80 km/hr</td>
<td>100 km/hr</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Smarts Road to proposed Revenswood Roundabout</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>80 km/hr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

注：表格中“Y”表示同意降低限速，“N”表示不同意降低限速。
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Should Gressons Road be lowered to 80 km/hr?</th>
<th>Should Ravenswood Road be lowered to 80 km/hr?</th>
<th>Should Darnley Road be lowered to 80 km/hr?</th>
<th>Should Road to proposed Ravenswood Roundabout and Chinnerys Road be lowered to 80 km/hr?</th>
<th>Should Woodend Road to proposed Ravenswood Roundabout and Chinnerys Road be lowered to 80 km/hr?</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>Y</td>
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<td>Comments</td>
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Rangiora Woodend Road, Gressons Road, Boys Road, Northbrook Road
Speed Limit Review
Consultation Response from Key Stakeholders.

The following key stakeholders were consulted with regarding changes to the speed limits on Rangiora Woodend Road, Gressons Road, Boys Road, and Northbrook Road:

- Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga
- NZ Police
- NZ Transport Agency
- NZ Automobile Association
- Road Transport Association NZ

The responses from Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga, NZ Transport Agency, NZ Automobile Association, and Road Transport Association were in the form of emails. The texts of the emails are collated below.

Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga

Kia ora Joanne,

Below is the following feedback received from the Kaitiaki in regards to the WDC speed limit review for Rangiora Woodend Road, Gressons Road, Boys Road and Northbrook Road.

- The Kaitiaki have no concerns to raise in regards to the proposed speed limit changes.
- The Kaitiaki stated that speed limit along Old North Road also needs to be reviewed as the current speed limit (80km) is too fast. The intersection of Old North Road and Williams was identified as an area of particular concern.

Please let me know if you have any questions.
Thanks Bill. The mean speed will drop 4-7km/h if you go from 70 to 50, so if mean speed is 63 now it will likely drop to mid to 55-59, which is what I think you are getting in the existing 50 now, and will be a better result than if you just drop to 60.

With the rural approach dropping to 80 from 100, and advance warning signs and a good threshold, I’d still run with the permanent 50 now - that will provide a safer result and in line with the environment in my view.

The decision is of course yours. Just don’t contemplate temporary speed limits any further!

Cheers, Glenn

---

From: Bill Rice <bill.rice@wmk.govt.nz>
Sent: Thursday, 22 November 2018 11:53 AM
To: >
Subject: RE: Rangiora Woodend and adjacent roads Speed Limit Review

Thanks for the response Glenn,

A couple of comments:

- Council’s speed limit schedule records the 70km/h section as “from a point generally 20m north west of School Road to a point generally 20m north west of Chinnerys Road.”
- A speed survey we’ve done shows a mean speed of 63km/h in the current 70km/h section.
- The section north west of Chinnereys Road is currently being urbanised on the north eastern side, and a new roundabout will be constructed 400m from Chinnereys Road.
- The total length of 60km/h we’re proposing is 1250m
- NZTA currently have a project looking at improving access across and onto SH1 through Woodend. This may change hierarchy in Woodend, with some changes to the layout on Rangiora Woodend. I’m reluctant to recommend any permanent physical works to reduce the speed environment when these may need to be modified or removed.
- Local police have indicated a preference for 60km/h over 50km/h unless there are some physical measures to reduce operating speeds.

Cheers,

Bill
1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report is to update the Council on progress with the Multi-Use Sports Centre project.

1.2 Preliminary design is completed and work is progressing on developed design which will be completed before Christmas and then a further cost estimate will be completed. This report outlines the levels of service for lighting and ventilation and recommends mechanical cooling be included for the main sports hall (indoor courts).

1.3 The report also has details on the site master plan at Coldstream Road including providing for future development of a further artificial hockey turf and the potential for expanding the sports facility.

1.4 It is planned to have a report to 7 May 2019 Council meeting for Council to consider awarding a construction contract for the complex.

Attachments:

(i) Site master plan (Trim 181123137746)
(ii) Site master plan Stage 1 (Trim 181123137750)
(iii) Site master plan future expansion of facility (Trim 181123137796)
(iv) Site master plan cross section (Trim 181123137757)
(v) Interior floor plan (Trim 181127139130)
(vi) Programme (Trim 181122137266)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 181119135294

(b) Approves the site master plan and site master plan Stage 1 (Trim 181123137746 and 181123137750)

(c) Notes the updated interior floor layout and that further refinement is still to happen for the reception area which will impact on joinery design.
(d) **Notes** that the cost estimate based on the preliminary design is for a project cost of $27,850,000 for the sports facility.

(e) **Approves** the inclusion of mechanical cooling plant for the court hall for a cost of approximately $200,000 to be funded from the Project Contingency of $1,325,000.

(f) **Notes** that sprinkling of the complex, excluding the indoor courts, will be required for an estimated cost of $400,000 to be funded from the Project Contingency of $1,325,000.

(g) **Notes** that it is planned to have a report to the Council for 7 May 2019 to consider a construction tender award.

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 In July 2018 Council approved the project structure and engagement of consultants for the detailed design and contractor procurement for the multi-use indoor sports facility at Coldstream Road, Rangiora.

3.2 As part of the project structure a Project Steering Group (PSG) was established with the Mayor, Councillors Doody and Felstead and the CE included in the membership. Councillor Gordon has also attended the two meetings of the Steering Group that have been held.

3.3 This report provides an update on progress to November 2018 and highlights recommendations from the Project Steering Group on site layout and levels of service decisions around cooling in the main court hall.

3.4 It is intended that regular monthly progress reports will be prepared for Council.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1 Site layout

4.1.1 The development of the initial concept layout plan was done based on measurements from Google earth.

4.1.2 A site survey has been undertaken by Woods Surveying and that data has been used as the basis for the site layout and for the detailed design of the building.

4.1.3 There are two critical elements to ensure that the site is laid out suitably for the future to accommodate provision for a potential 2nd artificial hockey turf and also future provision of a tennis facility.

4.1.4 Discussions were held with the PSG on the site layout and the PSG supported the attached site layout plan.

4.1.5 If a second turf is developed there would be a 7 metre gap between the exterior fences of the turfs and a 12 metre gap between the side of the turf and the sports facility building.

4.1.6 The 12 metre gap will allow still 7 metres for bleacher type seating and retaining a 5metre separation from the building.

4.1.7 To accommodate the second turf the current bund at the side of the existing turf will need to be removed.

4.1.8 Attached are the site layout plan, the layout plan for Stage 1 (what is currently being designed) and a cross section which shows potential layout for spectator seating for hockey if a second turf is built. There is also a site detail plan which shows provision for the potential to add 2 additional courts to the facility.
4.2. Preliminary Design

4.2.1. The Design Team completed preliminary design by Friday 19 October and the preliminary design folios were submitted to the QS to complete the next cost estimate.

4.2.2. The cost estimate was tabled at the PSG meeting on Thursday 1 November and Ross Davidson guided the PSG through the various elements of the Cost Estimate.

4.2.3. The Cost Estimate confirmed that the project is still within the approved budget and this is further discussed in Section 6.1 of this report.

4.2.4. The Geotechnical report by Tonkin and Taylor has also been received and it confirms that the land is very sound and the report has been used as the preparation for the preliminary structural design of the complex.

4.2.5. Note that to prepare the cost estimate some decisions had to be made about key levels of service relating to lighting, heating/ventilation and fire protection.

4.2.6. The cost estimate has been prepared on the basis of the “base level” described in this report but the PSG has recommended to Council that a higher level of service be provided for cooling in the main court area which is discussed below in Section 4.4.

4.3. Plan refinements

4.3.1. Since the last PSG, the Architects have met with representatives from the North Canterbury Sport and Recreation Trust (the Trust) and have made some refinements to the floor plan.

4.3.2. These have not affected the overall floor area of the complex and are still in accord with the functional design brief but the effect of progressing them will make the building more suitable for end users.

4.3.3. The refinements principally relate to the sports hall, multi-use rooms and the allied health area and the layout of the changing rooms. The refinements are all minor in terms of cost implications and is usual practice during the preliminary design and the developed designed phases.

4.3.4. The expected final layout plan, as at 3 December is attached and there are still refinements to be undertaken in the customer service/reception area but those changes will relate to joinery design so are not critical to other developed design work.

4.4. Levels of service – electrical and lighting

4.4.1. The electrical demand of the new facility shall require an upgrade of the existing Mainpower network.

4.4.2. The Mainpower electrical upgrade will accommodate:
   - the facility as currently designed (including 3-phase power for catering, the exact location to be agreed during developed design)
   - future sports court expansion for two additional courts
   - senior and junior outdoor sports fields
   - tennis courts and pavilion.

4.4.3. Alternative energy sources – photovoltaic (PV) will be investigated during the developed design phase of the project.
4.4.4. To enable the facility to function as a Welfare Centre during an emergency the electrical system will be configured to enable the connection of a portable standby generator. (The electrical configuration will be configured as essential and non-essential so the facility can remain operational).

4.4.5. Lighting: internal lighting will be energy efficient LED luminaires, control gear and control systems.

4.4.6. The lighting throughout the facility shall achieve the following lighting compliant light levels:
- Offices 320 lux at desk level
- Meeting rooms 320 lux at desk level
- Fitness centre 500 lux at floor level (adjustable)
- Amenity/lobby 150 -200 llix at floor level
- Sports courts 200 lux at floor level for training and 500 lux at floor level for national competition. (In accordance with CIBSE Lighting Guide for mid-level competition events.)

4.4.7. Note that if there is ever a nationally televised game in the Sports Courts there will need to be an upgrade to the lighting. Cabling will be included and lights installed as required for the event – this is fairly standard practice for such facilities.

4.5. Levels of service – mechanical services

4.5.1. Mechanical services systems relate to the heating, cooling and ventilation of all occupied spaces.

4.5.2. Systems are commonly sized for the 2.5% NIWA design conditions. These are conditions that will not be exceeded more than 2.5% of the time during 0800-1800 hours local time. The design temperatures for Rangiora are:
- Summer outdoor: 26.9C
- Winter outdoor: -1.9C

4.5.3. Following experience with other buildings Council staff asked for a design to consider more extreme outdoor summer conditions. “More extreme” design criteria are based on a 1% NIWA conditions:
- Summer outdoor: 28.9C
- Winter outdoor: -3.4C

4.5.4. Designing for temperatures exceeding 1% conditions typically becomes uneconomic and rarely done unless there are other factors other than occupant comfort.

4.5.5. The Mechanical Services report discusses the levels of service in other similar facilities as well as various options for the Multi Use Sport Facility.

4.5.6. The main court area is the most challenging from a ventilation perspective and the current systems proposed for the main court include electric radiant heating, with motorised openings, high and low level mechanical extract from high level. This system provides a passive cooling system with assisted mechanical ventilation to provide air movement and is on the basis that no mechanical cooling is provided.

4.5.7. With no mechanical cooling it is likely that the ambient temperature in the court area would equate to the outside temperature. If there is a period of continual hot
weather, temperatures in the court area could be in the order of 2-3 degrees higher than the outside temperature.

4.5.8. The PSG had a presentation from the Mechanical Services Engineer, Reece Bennet and recommended that some mechanical cooling system be incorporated into the design.

4.5.9. For an estimated outlay of $200,000 it would be possible to install some mechanical cooling plant to provide partial cooling in the court space. It is estimated that this would keep the building around 3 degrees less than ambient with around 300 people in the court space. So on a 28 degree day the system should be able to maintain a temperature of 25 degrees in the main court area.

4.5.10. The PSC agreed that this would be a good level of service and recommended that mechanical cooling system be included in the design.

4.6. Levels of service – fire control

4.6.1. A fire strategy for the facility needs to address both evacuation of the occupants as well as firefighting operations.

4.6.2. Evacuation is addressed by the supply of smoke detectors and several egress doors around the perimeter.

4.6.3. The firefighting operations are more complex and are also being addressed to in relation to the potential future expansion of the facility.

4.6.4. The water supply at Coldstream Road is consistent with a standard residential development and it is not uncommon for large scale buildings in a residential area to require some on site water storage. The necessity for this and the scale of storage have yet to be addressed with the Fire Service.

4.6.5. Holmes consultants and Staff have met with the relevant Fire Service personnel to discuss the complex and potential solutions.

4.6.6. There are three principal options to address the firefighting requirements:

- Option 1: Sprinkler system for the building
- Option 2: A partial sprinkler system for the building
- Option 3: No sprinklers and no fire cells and provide vehicle access to two sides (extent decided by FENZ)

4.6.7. The Fire Service supports a partial sprinkler system for the building. This would mean that effectively all of the building has a sprinkler system with the exception of the indoor court space.

4.6.8. This is a practical risk based assessment as there is little risk of a fire starting in the indoor court space compared with the rest of the building and there will be a fire rating between the indoor court space and the rest of the building of around 60 minutes. The exact duration of the fire rating is presently being modelled by the fire engineers.

4.6.9. The high level cost estimate for the partial sprinkler system is $400,000 and the funding for this is discussed in 6.1 of this report.

4.7. Programme

4.7.1. The Design Team are working to have the construction procurement process completed by 22nd April with a recommendation for Council to consider awarding a construction contract at the 6 May meeting.
4.7.2. There is also the potential to award a separate contract for some preliminary site works. Undertaking a site scrape in good weather would be advantageous as the silt soil that needs to be moved is difficult to work with when it is wet.

4.7.3. This will be further progressed with the PSG at its December meeting.

4.8. Road traffic and pedestrian linkages

4.8.1. Ableys have been commissioned to report on any traffic safety improvements needed for Coldstream Road and also on providing safe pedestrian and cycle access to the facility as well as adjoining sporting facilities.

4.8.2. Ableys are also looking at the car park layout to minimise the potential for pedestrian and vehicle conflict.

4.9. The Management Team have reviewed this report and support the recommendations.

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

5.1.1. The North Canterbury Sport and Recreation staff are involved in the detailed design refinement process.

5.2. Wider Community

5.2.1. There was widespread consultation on the proposed complex and it is not planned to undertake any further consultation on the detailed design.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

6.1.1. The Council has budgeted $27.85 million for the project which includes an allowance for construction cost escalation.

6.1.2. A new QS estimate for the project, based on the completed preliminary design documentation has confirmed that the project is still on budget.

6.1.3. The following is an extract from the AECOM report, prepared by Ross Davidson:

2.1 Main Works

Our preliminary assessment of likely cost is $27,850,000 (Twenty seven million eight hundred and fifty thousand dollars) broken down as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Works</td>
<td>10,454,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Services</td>
<td>1,313,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Works</td>
<td>881,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escalation Provision (4%)</td>
<td>21,648,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Contingency (5%)</td>
<td>22,514,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Fees</td>
<td>1,126,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Consent Fees + Development Contributions</td>
<td>25,640,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Contingency + Fire Sprinklers ($400k)</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27,850,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Refer to Appendix A for full elemental estimate breakdown.

2.2 Fittings, Fixtures and Equipment

Our preliminary assessment of likely cost is $1,000,000 (One million dollars) broken down as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fittings, Fixtures and Equipment</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Refer to Appendix B for full elemental estimate breakdown.
6.1.4. The additional mechanical cooling estimate of $200,000 and provision of fire sprinkling system of $400,000 will be funded from the Project Contingency of $1,325,000.

6.1.5. Once those items are accounted for there will be $725,000 remaining in the Project Contingency provision.

6.2. Community Implications

6.2.1. The submissions received from the Community, during the LTP process, in support of the facility include a range of comments about the need for such a complex to cater for the increasing range of sports and exercise activities for all age ranges.

6.3. Risk Management

The following key risks have been identified for this project:

i. Cost overrun – This will be minimised by working closely with the Quantity Surveyor through the Project Steering Group and also minimising variations to the contract and avoiding scope creep. Note that all of the Community Facilities Capital Projects have been completed within budget.

ii. Project delays – This is a risk to any project and the contract is most likely to include penalty payments and/or extensions of time for weather related delays. Such claims will be monitored through the Project Steering Group and administered by the Project Steering Group.

iii. Design not suitable – This risk has been minimised by the engagement of the Trust in the concept design and the detailed design will be peer reviewed.

iv. Staged development of site – the development of the concept plan for the site will minimise the risk of developments occurring in the wrong space and a site layout will be surveyed prior to any development to ensure that developments take place in the appropriate location. The site will be managed by one Council appointed Project Manager.

v. Future proofing for growth - This has been mitigated by providing for the potential expansion of two additional indoor courts to be added to the western side of the facility.

6.4. Health and Safety

6.4.1. The tender documentation for construction will have appropriate requirements for Health and Safety during construction and this will be monitored by the Project Steering Group.

6.4.2. Operational health and safety will be a factor considered by the Design Team during the development of the detailed design.

6.4.3. Once the building is operational, Health and Safety will be the responsibility of the operator: North Canterbury Sport and Recreation Trust.

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**
- Reserves Act 1977
- Resource Management Act 1991 (Note a Resource Consent will be required)
- Building Act 2004

7.3. **Community Outcomes**
The accessibility of community and recreation facilities meets the changing needs of our community.

7.4. **Delegations**
The Council is the decision making body for the Multi Use Sports Facility with Governance support provided by the Project Steering Group established by Council.
## WAIKAKARIKI MULTI-USE INDOOR SPORTS FACILITY

Revised: 22/11/2018

### DATE (WEEK COMMENCING)

- 03 10 17 24 01 08 15 22 29 05 12 19 26 33 40
- 06 13 20 27 34 41 48

### MONTHS

- SEPTEMBER
- OCTOBER
- NOVEMBER
- DECEMBER
- JANUARY
- FEBRUARY
- MARCH
- APRIL
- MAY
- JUNE

## Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-4 April</td>
<td>PRELIMINARY DESIGN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 April</td>
<td>DEVELOPED DESIGN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-9 April</td>
<td>DETAILED DESIGN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-13 April</td>
<td>CONSTRUCTION (Mobilisation) START 27 May 2018, FINISH August 2020 (56w)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-17 April</td>
<td>PROCUREMENT (4wk TENDER)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-21 April</td>
<td>CONSTRUCTION (4wk TENDER)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-25 April</td>
<td>CONSTRUCTION (4wk TENDER)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-29 April</td>
<td>CONSTRUCTION (4wk TENDER)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 May</td>
<td>RESOURCE CONSENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4 June</td>
<td>BUILDING CONSENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 June</td>
<td>DESIGN TEAM MEETINGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 June</td>
<td>PCG MEETINGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 May</td>
<td>WDC COUNCIL MEETING (APPROVAL TO PROCEED - TUES 7 MAY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 May</td>
<td>TENDER REVIEW (WDC REVIEW &amp; PREPARE REPORT TO COUNCIL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 May</td>
<td>TENDER EOI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 May</td>
<td>WDC COUNCIL MEETING (APPROVAL TO PROCEED - TUES 7 MAY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 May</td>
<td>WDC ESTIMATE APPROVAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 May</td>
<td>WDC ESTIMATE APPROVAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 May</td>
<td>WDC ESTIMATE APPROVAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 May</td>
<td>WDC ESTIMATE APPROVAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 May</td>
<td>WDC ESTIMATE APPROVAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 May</td>
<td>WDC ESTIMATE APPROVAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 May</td>
<td>WDC ESTIMATE APPROVAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 May</td>
<td>WDC ESTIMATE APPROVAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 May</td>
<td>WDC ESTIMATE APPROVAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 May</td>
<td>WDC ESTIMATE APPROVAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 May</td>
<td>WDC ESTIMATE APPROVAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 May</td>
<td>WDC ESTIMATE APPROVAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 May</td>
<td>WDC ESTIMATE APPROVAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 May</td>
<td>WDC ESTIMATE APPROVAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 May</td>
<td>WDC ESTIMATE APPROVAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 May</td>
<td>WDC ESTIMATE APPROVAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 May</td>
<td>CONSTRUCTION (4wk TENDER)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 May</td>
<td>CONSTRUCTION (4wk TENDER)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 May</td>
<td>CONSTRUCTION (4wk TENDER)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 May</td>
<td>CONSTRUCTION (4wk TENDER)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 May</td>
<td>RESOURCE CONSENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 June</td>
<td>BUILDING CONSENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 June</td>
<td>DESIGN TEAM MEETINGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 June</td>
<td>PCG MEETINGS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1/ INDICATIVE TIMING ONLY, SUBJECT TO STUDIO RESOURCING AND CLIENT APPROVAL
2/ NOTE CHRISTMAS HOLIDAY BREAK DEC 24 - JAN 14
3/ WAIKAKARIKI DISTRICT COUNCIL RESOURCE AND BUILDING CONSENTS ASSUMED AT 6 WEEKS INCLUDING RFIS
4/ CONSTRUCTION DURATION ANTICIPATED AT 15 MONTHS (60 WEEKS) (9m 12 - 18 MONTHS est)
1. SUMMARY

1.1 The purpose of this report is to present the Waimakariri Zone Committee’s ZIPA – the Zone Implementation Programme Addendum - which has incorporated feedback from community consultations in September and October 2018.

Attachments:

i. Waimakariri Water Zone Committee Zone Implementation Programme Addendum (November 2018) (TRIM No. 181123137853).

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 181115135055;

(b) Adopts the Waimakariri Water Zone Implementation Programme Addendum (ZIPA) as recommended by the Zone Committee;

(c) Notes Implementation of the ZIPA will be subject to later decisions in the light of budgetary considerations and that a report on options in this regard will be made to the Council’s budget meeting in February 2019;

(d) Thanks the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee for its efforts over several years to arrive at a comprehensive ZIPA.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 The Canterbury Water Management Strategy (CWMS) Waimakariri Zone Committee developed a Zone Implementation Programme in 2011, and has now, after both extensive consideration of the best available science and extensive consultation with the public, developed an addendum (ZIPA). This ZIPA, or alternatively named the Waimakariri Land and Water Solutions Package, with both statutory and non-statutory recommendations for action, is aimed at setting water quantity and water quality limits to improve the condition of fresh water resources in the Zone.

3.2 The Waimakariri Zone Committee approved the final ZIPA on Monday 19 November 2018,
3.3 The ZIPA recommendations are divided into 5 chapters vis:
- Improving Stream Health;
- Protecting and Enhancing Indigenous Biodiversity;
- Reducing Nitrates;
- Managing Surface water – Flows and Allocations;
- Managing Groundwater – Allocations.

4. DISCUSSION

4.1 Since the Zone Implementation Programme was published in 2011, the Zone Committee have considered a wide range of reports on the current state of water resources in the Zone, culminating in 10 “Current State” reports at the end of 2016 vis:
- Groundwater Quality (TRIM No.160920097030);
- Te Akaaka Ecology and Water Quality (TRIM No.160920097031);
- Groundwater Quantity (TRIM No.160920097033);
- Recreation (TRIM No.160920097035);
- Socio-economic Profile (TRIM No. also 160920097035);
- Economic Profile (TRIM No.160920097037)
- Surface Water Quality and Ecology (TRIM No.180926111529)
- Hydrology (TRIM No.181119135388)
- Biodiversity (TRIM No.181119135391)
- Cultural Opportunities and Monitoring Assessment (TRIM No.180807088654)

4.2 A dot point summary of each of the above Current State reports is attached (TRIM No.170602056521). Note all these reports are publically available and have been provided to councilors through Diligent.

4.3 The chapters on Improving Stream Health, Protecting and Enhancing Biodiversity, and Reducing Nitrates all include recommendations for consideration by Waimakariri District Council, as well as Environment Canterbury. The chapters on Managing Surface Water and Ground Water recommend changes to the Regional Land and Water Plan, and are directed to Environment Canterbury.

4.4 Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga supports the zone committee’s intent and overall direction as presented in the Waimakariri ZIP Addendum 2018. However, it does not support the ZIP Addendum in its entirety. In some areas covered by the ZIP Addendum the Rūnanga seeks faster progress to achieve improved outcomes than the zone committee has proposed.

5. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

5.1. The final ZIPA that was approved by the Zone Committee on 19 November 2018 has not been formatted through the “in-design” software; rather the changes made as a result of feedback have been incorporated into a word version attached, and the final “in-design” version will be formatted during the month of December 2018.

5.2. The ZIPA version that was released for public feedback in September 2018 has been amended by the Zone Committee in relation to a range of matters raised in feedback from the public including minimum flows, target dates for achieving reduction in nitrates to groundwater, and improving stream health.
5.3. Recommendations concerning proposed statutory changes to the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan are scheduled to be notified for a public process before June 2019.

5.4. Council have opportunity to reflect on the recommendations over December/January before deliberating on a response to the ZIPA in the course of preparation of the 2019/20 Annual Plan consultation.

5.5. The Management Team have reviewed this report and support the recommendations.

6. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

6.1. **Groups and Organisations**


6.2. **Wider Community**

   6.2.1. Community engagement meetings at West Eyreton (28/4/15), Oxford (29/4/15, 19/7/18, 3/10/18), Clarkeville (30/4/15), Waikuku Beach (5/5/15, 17/10/16, 21/11/16), Loburn (6/5/18), Cust (7/5/15, 7/10/16, 20/3/17), Taahiwi (25/5/15), Rangiora (26/5/15, 12/10/16, 16/11/16, 15/3/17, 25/7/18, 1/10/18, 11/10/18), Kaiapoi (22/3/17, 27/5/18,18/7/18) and Ohoka (5/10/18).

   Engagement with consent holders at Fernside (6/11/17), Woodend (8/11/17, 16/4/18), Pegasus (22/11/17), Loburn (22/11/17, 17/4/18), and West Eyreton (2/5/18).

7. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

7.1. **Financial Implications**

   7.1.1. To be considered further as part of 2019/20 Annual Plan deliberations. Note: $100,000 for three years in 2018/28 LTP budget.

7.2. **Community Implications**

   7.2.1. Moving towards reducing nitrates to groundwater will have a significant economic impact on the District.

7.3. **Risk Management**

   7.3.1. There is a risk that some dairy farmers will not be able to meet the targets set by changes to the Regional Land and Water Plan, and will go out of business.

7.4. **Health and Safety**

   7.4.1. No workplace health and safety issues.

8. **CONTEXT**

8.1. **Policy**

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

*Local Government Act 2002 Section 41 (3)*

8.3. Community Outcomes

*There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision making that affects our District*

- The Council makes information about its plans and activities readily available. 1,3
- The Council takes account of the views across the community including mana whenua. 1,3
- The Council makes known its views on significant proposals by others affecting the District’s wellbeing. 3
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Waimakariri Zone Committee
The Waimakariri Water Zone Committee is a joint committee of the Waimakariri District Council and Environment Canterbury. The Committee is made up of local residents – the members in 2018 are:
David Ashby
Grant Edge
Carolyne Latham
Gary Walton
Judith Roper-Lindsay
Cameron Henderson
Michael Blackwell
Cherie Williams – Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga representative
Arapata Reuben – Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga representative
Sandra Stewart – Councillor, Waimakariri District Council
Claire McKay – Councillor, Environment Canterbury

With support from:
Technical support has been led by the strategy, planning and science sections of Environment Canterbury, with support from Waimakariri District Council staff and specialist advisers.

Mō tātou, ā, mō kā uri ā muri ake nei
For us and our children after us
CONTENTS

FOREWORD

PART A – INTRODUCTION
1. The Canterbury Water Management Strategy
2. Implementation of Recommendations

PART B – OVERVIEW OF THE WAIMAKARIRI WATER ZONE
1. Catchment and Community Profile – an overview
2. Ngāi Tūāhuriri Values
3. The Zone Committee’s Vision, Key Principles and Role
4. Community Outcomes

PART C – SOLUTIONS PROGRAMME
1. Scope of the Land and Water Solutions Programme
2. Current State and Future Pathways – Technical Overview

PART D – DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS
1. Improving Stream Health
2. Protecting and Enhancing Indigenous Biodiversity
3. Reducing Nitrates
4. Managing Surface Water – flows and allocations
5. Managing Groundwater – allocations

APPENDIX 1 – MAPS
X1. Waimakariri Nutrient Allocation Zones
X2. Surface Water Allocation Zones – 1
X3. Surface Water Allocation Zones – 2
X4. Groundwater Allocation Zones
X5. Private water supply well recharge areas
X6. Interzone Transfer Source Area
X7. Stream Recharge Zones

APPENDIX 2 – CANTERBURY REGIONAL BIODIVERSITY STRATEGY – SUMMARY

APPENDIX 3 – GLOSSARY
Foreword

A foreword from the zone committee Chair, David Ashby, will be added for the final public version of this ZIP Addendum.

FOR MORE INFORMATION VISIT: www.ecan.govt.nz/waimakariri-water
PART A – INTRODUCTION

A1. THE CANTERBURY WATER MANAGEMENT STRATEGY (CWMS)

The Canterbury Water Management Strategy (CWMS) was developed by the Canterbury Mayoral Forum in 2008 as a collaboration between Canterbury’s 10 territorial authorities and Environment Canterbury.

The aim of the strategy is: “To enable present and future generations to gain the greatest social, economic, recreational and cultural benefits from our water resources within an environmentally sustainable framework.”

Canterbury Water Management Strategy – Targets

A set of 10 targets provides the strategy with a direction and balance, while ensuring all aspects are advanced in parallel. The strategy also establishes first and second order priorities, as below:

- First order priorities: environment, customary use, community supplies and stock water.
- Second order priorities: irrigation, renewable electricity generation, recreation and amenity

Achieving continued economic production and environmental quality are also key to the strategy, as it is for the Resource Management Act (RMA) and the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2017 (NPS-FM).

The CWMS established 10 zone committees across Canterbury, largely defined by territorial authority boundaries. The zone committees implement the strategy through collaboration, assessment, and decision making. Each zone committee has developed a detailed ‘Zone Implementation Programme’ and works closely with their local community. Although Zone Implementation Programmes are not statutory documents there is a very clear expectation and commitment for the programmes to be implemented, resourced, and given effect to through both regulation and on the ground actions.

The Zone Implementation Programme ‘Addendum’ (ZIP Addendum) builds on the original Zone Implementation Programme and provides recommendations to guide plan changes to section 8 (Waimakariri) of the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan (LWRP) and the Waimakariri River Regional Plan (WRRP), and also actions to be advanced within the Waimakariri Water Zone and the Waimakariri District Plan. These recommendations, the plan changes, and the programme of actions are collectively referred to as the Waimakariri Land and Water Solutions Programme.

For more information on the CWMS go to: https://www.ecan.govt.nz/your-region/plans-strategies-and-bylaws/canterbury-water-management-strategy/

The National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management

The NPS-FM sets out the direction for freshwater quality and quantity management in New Zealand. Regional councils must give effect to the requirements of the NPS-FM when developing statutory plans and plan changes. The NPS-FM requires freshwater quality to be maintained (where it is of good quality), or improved over time (where it does not meet the requirements of the NPS-FM), and includes a national objectives framework for achieving this. The NPS-FM also requires engagement with iwi, hapū, and the community in setting freshwater outcomes, and enables different methods and timeframes to be set. This document has provided the basis for the committee’s recommendations in terms of the freshwater outcomes and timeframes.

For more information on the NPS-FM go to: http://www.mfe.govt.nz/freshwater/national-policy-statement/about-nps

A2. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations will be implemented through plan changes to section 8 of the LWRP and to the WRRP, and importantly through practical actions in priority areas and catchments. The zone committee wants actions delivered in a coordinated way through non-statutory catchment management plans. The development of these plans and the practical actions that follow require funding from a variety of sources.

The LWRP sets out the planning framework for the management of land and water resources in Canterbury and is one method for implementing the CWMS.
Plan Change 5 (PC5) to the LWRP addresses water quality issues throughout the Canterbury region. When made operative it will introduce new definitions, policies, rules, limits and schedules which require farming activities to operate at “Good Management Practice”. PC5 provides both the foundation and starting point for managing nutrient losses from farming within the Waimakariri Water Zone.

The Waimakariri River Regional Plan (WRRP) also has legal effect in part of the Waimakariri Water Zone, and manages water quantity, water quality and works in river and lake beds. Having two regional plans managing freshwater in the same zone adds unnecessary complexity for the regulator and plan user. This process provides an opportunity to create a simpler framework by incorporating the part of the WRRP that applies to the Waimakariri sub-region into section 8 of the LWRP. Achieving this is likely to also require a change to the WRRP.

The Waimakariri District Council will also consider the zone committee’s recommendations when developing work programmes, budgets and reviewing their district plan.

PART B. OVERVIEW OF THE WAIMAKARIRI WATER ZONE

B1. CATCHMENT & COMMUNITY PROFILE – AN OVERVIEW

The Waimakariri Water Zone (Maps B1 & B2) encompasses

• The Ashley River/Rakahuri catchment and Ashley Estuary (Te Aka Aka);
• The catchments of the northern tributaries of the Waimakariri River;
• The Loburn Fan;
• The Ashley-Waimakariri Plain and associated groundwater zones (Ashley, Eyre, and Cust);
• A network of spring-fed streams and lagoons near the coast and
• Hill and high country in the north-western portion.

The Waimakariri Water Zone boundaries are similar to those of the Waimakariri District Council. The zone lies north of the Waimakariri River and extends from Pegasus Bay in the east to the Puketeraki Range in the west. Much of the land in the eastern part of the water zone is subject to poor drainage and occasional flooding. The rivers, streams, lagoons and wetlands have always been important places and a food basket for Ngāi Tūāhuriri. The water zone is part of the Rūnanga’s takiwā.
MAP B1. WAIMAKARIRI WATER ZONE BOUNDARIES
MAP B2. ASHLEY RIVER/RAKAHURI TRIBUTARIES AND NORTHERN WAIMAKARIRI TRIBUTARIES CATCHMENTS
Topography
The topography of the zone ranges from hills and mountains, as high as 1800m in the northwest to flat coastal plains in the southeast. Alluvial sand and gravel deposits dominate the plains with finer-grained estuarine deposits along the coast. Light and very light soils are found between the Eyre River and Waimakariri River. The Loburn Fan, areas along the Cust River and the coastal plain are characterised by heavier soils. Hardpan soils which promote run-off to surface water are found to the north of the Ashley River/Rakahuri, the Mairaki Downs and the hill-country near Oxford.

Water Quality
Surface water quality and aquatic ecosystems are generally degraded due to sediment and high nitrate concentrations (e.g. Silverstream at Island Road and Harpers Road). However, many areas still support important ecological values, particularly the upper catchments of spring-fed streams like Silverstream and Cust Main Drain. Te Aka Aka is a sensitive environment at the bottom of the Ashley River/Rakahuri catchment and has high cultural, social and environmental values. There has been historical habitat loss around the margins of the estuary and high concentrations of sediment and nitrogen promote macroalgae growth with potential for eutrophication.

Water Quantity
The Waimakariri – Ashley Plain is prone to extended dry periods with high evapotranspiration, especially during north-westerly winds. Irrigation demand is high in the summer months when evapotranspiration is well above the average rainfall and there is a large soil moisture deficit. Flow in the rivers and streams fluctuates seasonally. Flow has also changed over the years with an increase in base flow (no rainfall input) in some lowland streams since the start of the WIL scheme in 2000 and long-term declines in the Ashley River/Rakahuri flow measured at the gorge, probably due to drier climatic conditions. There is a complex pattern of flow gain and loss across the plains east of the foothills in the Ashley River/Rakahuri and Cust River/Cust Main Drain. These water bodies, together with the Eyre River, lose water to permeable alluvial gravels as they leave the foothills. These losses recharge the groundwater system and resurface as lowland stream flow.

Water Allocation
Water allocation is currently governed by two regional plans; the LWRP and WRRP. One of the key differences between these plans is the method for calculating the effects of pumping groundwater on nearby streams. The LWRP method quantifies the cumulative effect of abstraction on river flow over an irrigation season (pumping an average rate for 150 days and a maximum rate for 7 days) and is applied throughout most of Canterbury. The WRRP method estimates the effect of shallow groundwater takes if pumped at an average rate over 30 days. The LWRP method is a more defensible calculation of the depletion effect on rivers and generally provides a higher level of protection for aquatic habitats. But transition to the LWRP method will mean that more groundwater takes in the area covered by the WRRP will be classified as stream depleting. Any newly identified stream depleting takes may reduce in reliability of supply, as they will have a minimum flow imposed at times of low flow, whereas previously the abstraction would have been unrestricted.

The Waimakariri Water Zone has been divided into Surface Water Allocation Zones (SWAZs) which provide a water management regime using minimum flow and allocation limits. There are some SWAZs that are above, at or near their allocation limit and several where the current minimum flow does not provide adequate protection for some aquatic species.

There are five Groundwater Allocation Zones (GAZ) – Ashley, Cust, Eyre River, Loburn and Kowai. The Kowai GAZ straddles the boundary with the Hurunui CWMS Water Zone. Although groundwater allocation has increased significantly in the last decade, allocated volume in the Ashley, Cust, Loburn and Kowai GAZs is currently under the allocation limit. The Eyre River GAZ is fully allocated.

Approximately 70% of the allocated groundwater is used for agriculture with 25% used for community water supply. Long-term groundwater trends are steady or increasing in some areas, likely due to leaking water races and irrigation on the plains and declining in others (e.g. the Ashley GAZ), probably due to drier climate conditions and increased groundwater abstraction.

Groundwater quality is generally good and mostly meets drinking water standards without treatment. There are notable exceptions to this; high nitrate concentrations are found in shallow private water supply wells near Cust, Ashley and Eyreton. Also, groundwater provides the transport pathway for nitrate to spring-fed streams.

Biodiversity
Waimakariri District/Zone has diverse terrestrial and aquatic habitats supporting a number of indigenous animal and plant species, including some threatened species.

The upper Ashley River/Rakahuri, including Lees Valley, supports:

- intact indigenous forest;
- remnant patches of beech and mixed podocarp forest;
- shrubland and grassland/herbfield vegetation;
- open rocky habitats at higher altitudes and in river gorges;
- springs and streams which are the source of the Ashley River/Rakahuri;
- springs and streams which are the source of some northern Waimakariri tributaries;
• wetlands.
The dry plains (roughly west of State Highway 1) support:
• three larger remnants of dry shrubland/grassland and scattered dry shrubland remnants;
• spring fed lowland streams;
• the braided reaches of the Ashley River/Rakahuri.
The coastal plains (roughly east of State Highway 1) support:
• coastal dune and wetlands remnants;
• spring-fed lowland streams;
• Ashley Estuary / Te Aka Aka - an extensive estuarine area.
The rivers, streams, lagoons and the wetlands of the Waimakariri have always been an important place and food basket for Ngāi Tahu and Ngāi Tūāhuriri.
The Ashley River/Rakahuri and Saltwater Creek estuarine areas are listed as meeting the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) criteria for a wetland of "international importance".

Social
The current estimated population for the Waimakariri District is 59,300. Approximately 77% of the District’s population lives in the south-east, south of the Ashley River/Rakahuri and east of Two Chain Road area. The Oxford township provides the focal point for social activity for the rural community to the south-west and west of the District. There are smaller social “hubs”, often based around schools and sports facilities, throughout the District that provide the basis for maintenance of community cohesion at a local level.
The age distribution for the District differs significantly from that of Canterbury, with few younger adults living in the area, and a higher percentage of residents aged 40 years and over. There has been an increase in percentage of non-European children (from 11% in 2000 to 19% in 2017).
There has been a strong increase in local employment between 2000 and 2017 with a proportionally lower increase in agricultural employment. Approximately 40% of the workforce travels to Christchurch to work.

Dairy farming has been a feature of farming in the District since the 1890s with a significant increase occurring with the irrigation provided by the Waimakariri Irrigation Limited scheme since it’s opening in 2000.

While the community as a whole has an interest in the measures proposed in this ZIP Addendum, it is the landowners and people involved with the management of the farms who will have to comply with the proposed changes. This will require financial, regulatory and capability responses which some may find challenging.

Recreation
There are many recreational opportunities in the Waimakariri Water Zone including large areas of public land such as Tūhaitara Coastal Park, Waimakariri and Ashley Regional Parks and the Department of Conservation’s estate to the west of the zone. The Waimakariri District Council’s Ashley Gorge and Silverstream Reserves, Northbrook Ponds and Kaiapoi Lakes are also important recreation areas.

Ashley Gorge and the upper Okuku River are valued for white water kayaking. The Waimakariri and Kaiapoi rivers and Pegasus Lake are used extensively for rowing, dragon boating and mana-waka paddling. The Waimakariri Yacht and Power Boat Club is based at Kairaki, and there are opportunities for small boat sailing on Pegasus Lake.

Fishing is another significant activity from the Waimakariri River to the Ashley River/Rakahuri. The Kaiapoi River is an important waterway for whitebait, trout and salmon fishing, with some salmon raised at the Silverstream hatchery finding their way back into the Kaiapoi River.

Economy
The largest sectors in the Waimakariri Water Zone economy are construction and retail trade, and these are proportionately larger than both the Canterbury and national averages. Agriculture, forestry and fishing are also an important part of the economy in the zone.

Growth has been strong since the Canterbury earthquake sequence, driven by construction and population growth.

Land use
Approximately 103,490 ha (40% of the land area) is used to farm sheep, deer, horticulture and beef. Dairy and dairy support account for 38,000 ha (16% of land area). There are also many small block holdings (lifestyle blocks) encompassing approximately 29,000 ha (12% of land area). In total, there are approximately 37,000 ha of irrigated land in the Waimakariri zone with three irrigation schemes: Waimakariri Irrigation Limited (WIL), Loburn Irrigation Company and the Moy Flat scheme.
B2. NGĀI TŪĀHURIRI VALUES

Mihi

Ko o matou whakaaro ki te whenua
Nga roto, nga awa, te moana
Hei here I a tātou
O nga tupu tupunga
o Te Aka O Tu Whenua Hei whakato
whakatipu
I nga mahinga kai a te iwi

Ko matou Tūmanako
Te tatau o te Mātauranga
o nga whakaaro
Hei here ai a iwi,
a mana
Kawhakapuakina

Kia marino ai te wai
O te whakaaro kotahi
Kia tau ki uta
Tēnei waka tūmanako
Tēnei waka aroha
Kia tau te rangimarie

Tēnei te tangi
O nga whakatupuranga
O Ngāi Tahu Whānui

Kia koutou, nga tangata
O nga marae maha

Kia ora tātou e tu nei

Ngāi Tūāhuriri contend that the Crown’s right to govern, as gifted in Article the First, is totally dependent on the honouring of Article the Second. That is, the recognition and protection of the Tribe’s resource ownership authority rights, including the rights to use and have access to those resources. Ngāi Tūāhuriri maintain that they did not alienate their resources or taonga by signing the Treaty of Waitangi. As the Crown had not acquired the ownership of the Tribe’s water, fisheries, and mahinga kai-food and other resources, Ngāi Tūāhuriri maintain that these taonga still belong to them.

This Ngāi Tūāhuriri position has been reinforced by Te Rūnanga o Ngai Tahu who have taken it to be the Ngai Tahu position on Freshwater, that position is;
• Ngāi Tahu have rights, interests, obligations and responsibilities in the flow and quality of water in our takiwā.
• Ngāi Tahu has ownership over freshwater and will continue to exercise tino rangatiratanga in our takiwā.
• Ngāi Tahu shall accept a Governing Body which reflects the Treaty Partnership.
• That Governing Body shall lead policy and regulatory development to achieve Freshwater aspirations.
• Freshwater royalties or taxes (or similar) shall be used to meet that Governing Body’s obligations, responsibilities and aspirations in Freshwater.

Ngāi Tūāhuriri Recommendation

That Environment Canterbury and the Waimakariri District Council, along with Local Government NZ, work together with Ngāi Tūāhuriri and Ngāi Tahu to lobby central government (the Crown) to prioritise the resolution of iwi rights and interests in freshwater.

Acknowledgement

The Waimakariri Zone Committee acknowledges that the rights and interests of iwi have not been resolved and that this creates considerable uncertainty in New Zealand’s freshwater management system. The Waimakariri Zone Committee is of a view that leaving iwi rights and interests unresolved will create considerable risks to the long-term durability of any freshwater management framework.

The Waimakariri Zone Committee urges the Crown to prioritise work with iwi to reach agreement on how to resolve the rights and interests of iwi in freshwater.

B3. ZONE COMMITTEE VISION, PRINCIPLES AND ROLE

Zone Committee Vision

Mō tātou, ā, mō kā uri ā muri ake nei
For us and our children after us

The Waimakariri Water Zone Committee has had this Ngāi Tahu whakatoki as an expression of commitment since it was formed in 2010. Along with Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga, and many others in our community, the zone committee is committed to achieving improved water management outcomes for the Waimakariri Water Zone within a generation.

Zone Committee Principles

A ‘whole of waterway’ approach is taken to integrate management from the mountains to the sea – Ki Uta Ki Tai.

The zone committee wish to see activities integrated across agencies and groups working together using an outcome-based approach.

Kaitiakitanga is integrated into each pathway with actions to address water quality and quantity concerns and provisions for improved customary use and the involvement of Rūnanga in water management weaved through this document.

The pathways and recommendations in this ZIP Addendum represent an integrated approach to water management and should not be considered in isolation. The zone committee recognises the need for an integrated approach to water quality, quantity, and land management.

The collaborative approach used in the development of the Canterbury Water Management Strategy and by the zone committee in developing this Solutions Programme must be carried through to the implementation of the recommendations.

The Role of the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee

The Waimakariri Water Zone Committee was formed in 2010 as a joint committee of Waimakariri District Council and Environment Canterbury. The zone committee has representatives from the two councils, Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga, and the wider community.

The zone committee’s role is to develop and facilitate enduring water management solutions that give effect to the Canterbury Water Management Strategy’s vision, principles and targets. The zone committee’s initial priority was to complete the Waimakariri Zone Implementation Programme (ZIP), which it completed in 2012. This draft ZIP Addendum (2018) builds upon the original ZIP, including the community outcomes, which provide a sustained focus for the Waimakariri Water Zone and community.

The zone committee’s role is to facilitate community-based solutions, while balancing cultural, economic, environmental & social values for the water zone. The zone committee, like the Canterbury Water Management Strategy, is focused on collaboration and seeks to reach decisions by consensus. In developing these recommendations, the zone committee focused on reaching consensus. This involved considerable debate at times with agreement not always being reached. Nevertheless, the committee endorses the final ZIP Addendum as the way forward for achieving the community outcomes desired in the Waimakariri Zone.

What Does Success Look Like?

The zone committee’s measure of success is based on improvements measured against the community outcomes of this Zone Implementation Programme Addendum (see section B5) and achieving the Canterbury Water Management Strategy targets.

The zone committee appreciates time will be an important factor in achieving these targets and outcomes. The initial steps need to focus on halting declining trends in water quality where they have been identified in the water zone. The zone committee is committed to what can be achieved in a generation, given change in behaviour, systems and infrastructure will take time. The following graphic illustrates
what success can look like, relative to the targets of the Canterbury Water Management Strategy.

Figure B.1 The Canterbury Water Management Strategy – What Success Looks Like

B4. WAIMAKARIKI WATER ZONE – COMMUNITY OUTCOMES

These community outcomes were affirmed by the zone committee, based on community feedback gathered from a series of community meetings held in 2014/15 and 2016.

They provide a primary focus for this Solutions Programme and align with the original priority outcomes of the Zone Implementation Programme developed with the community in 2011.

The narratives for each outcome represent the zone committee’s vision and ‘measures of success’.

Outcome 1 – The water quality and quantity of spring-fed streams maintains or improves mahinga kai gathering and diverse aquatic life

Narrative: The habitat, flow and water quality in the spring fed streams supports abundant and diverse aquatic life (including native flora and fauna). Spring fed streams contain safe and plentiful kai for gathering. The flow and visual appearance of the spring fed streams meet aesthetic values and promotes customary use. Plant and animal pest species are managed or eliminated.

Outcome 2 – The Ashley River/Rakahuri is safe for contact recreation, has improved river habitat, fish passage, and customary use; and has flows that support natural coastal processes

Narrative: The river meets national standards for swimmable contact recreation. The habitat and fish passage along the river are improved to encourage more customary use and mahinga kai gathering. Braided river bird populations are protected, and numbers improved. The river mouth and estuary are healthy and functioning.

Outcome 3 – The Waimakariri River as a receiving environment is a healthy habitat for freshwater and coastal species, and is protected and managed as an outstanding natural landscape and recreation resource

Narrative: Flow and water quality are maintained to support and enhance aquatic life. The river mouth is healthy and functioning. The natural braided characteristics of this alpine river are recognised for aesthetic and amenity values. Recreational opportunities, along and on the river, are sustained.
Outcome 4 – The zone has safe and reliable drinking water, preferably from secure sources
Narrative: Community drinking and domestic supplies meet New Zealand drinking water standards.

Outcome 5 – Indigenous biodiversity in the zone is protected and improved
Narrative: Protect and improve the indigenous biodiversity, habitat or ecosystems. Plant and animal pest species are managed or eliminated.

Outcome 6 – Highly reliable irrigation water, to a target of 95%, is available in the zone
Narrative: Irrigation water (from both surface and groundwater) reliably supplies water to meet demand when operating within flow and allocation regimes. 100% of the irrigated area can be irrigated 95% of the time. The effects of climate change are considered in the planning and effective long-term management of water and land. Opportunities for water storage are considered.

Outcome 7 – Optimal water and nutrient management is common practice
Narrative: All land and water users’ practise management that maximises water use efficiency and minimises inputs of nutrients and pollutants to water. Industry agreed Good Management Practices and Farm Environment Plans are adopted as everyday farm management tools.

Outcome 8 – There is improved contribution to the regional economy from the zone
Narrative: The zone has thriving, and vibrant communities supported by a sustainable local economy based on diverse and productive land and water use. Integrated and sustainable management of the effects of flooding, earthquakes and climate change protects assets and amenities and builds resilience in communities and ecosystems.

Interzone Groundwater Outcome

Outcome 9 – Land and freshwater management in the Waimakariri Water Zone will, over time, support the maintenance of current high-quality drinking water from Christchurch’s aquifers
Narrative: Nutrient discharges to groundwater in the Waimakariri zone are managed to maintain the high-quality groundwater resource beneath Christchurch, recognising that nitrate concentrations may increase in the medium term due to the nitrogen load already moving through the system, before reducing in the longer term. This Priority Outcome is in response to recent science investigations which have concluded that a proportion of the Christchurch aquifer system recharge is likely to be derived from north of the Waimakariri River, within the Waimakariri Zone.

PART C. LAND AND WATER SOLUTIONS PROGRAMME

C1. WHAT IS THE WAIMAKARIRI LAND AND WATER SOLUTIONS PROGRAMME?

The Waimakariri Land and Water Solutions Programme is a first step in setting a direction for water management in the Waimakariri Water Zone. This solutions programme:

• Provides focus and direction for achieving community outcomes for water management in the Waimakariri Water Zone for the next 50 years.
• Sets out a staged approach to achieving community outcomes for water management over time with regular 10-year plan reviews to incorporate new information, refine the modelling, and allow adoption of new practices.
• Establishes a monitoring framework to review progress as part of this staged approach.
• Provides recommendations to inform the planning provisions of the Waimakariri chapter of the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan.
• Provides a programme of actions to 2032.
C2. CURRENT STATE AND FUTURE PATHWAYS – TECHNICAL OVERVIEW

Current State Assessment – overview
Environment Canterbury undertook a technical assessment programme from 2015 to 2017 to better understand key biophysical elements (water quality, water quantity, biodiversity and instream ecosystems) and their corresponding influence on cultural, social, recreational and economic values within the Waimakariri Water Zone. These ‘current state’ assessments focussed on taking a ‘snapshot’ of these key elements and associated values. The assessments also looked for any historical trends.

As part of the current state assessment two scenarios, ‘current pathways’ and ‘alternative pathways’ were also assessed. The ‘current pathways’ scenario considered likely outcomes assuming no changes to current land-use management. The alternative pathways scenario looked at how changing land-use management may impact on environmental, cultural, social, recreational and economic outcomes. Understanding these interactions has informed the Waimakariri land and water solutions programme’s development and supported the zone committee to develop the draft ZIP Addendum recommendations.

Current State Assessment – Reports
To view these reports and more information on the current state assessment for the Waimakariri Water Zone, go to: www.waimakariri-water.nz

- Groundwater quality and quantity
- Water quality and ecology
- Hydrology
- Biodiversity
- Cultural health and water management
- Ashley Estuary (Te Aka Aka) ecology and water quality
- Socio-economic profile
- Recreation
- Economic

Current state key findings
The key findings of the current state technical reports are provided below and discussed in detail in the rest of this overview.

Ngāi Tūāhuriri values
- Many streams and rivers no longer sustain mana whenua values
- Mana whenua are particularly concerned about Cam River/Ruatanuiwa, Ashley River/Rakahuri, Little Ashley Creek, and Taranaki Creek

Social / Recreational / Economic
- The zone has a unique mix of land uses
- Water supplies for agriculture (irrigation and stockwater) are important for the local economy
- There are close links between Waimakariri and Christchurch City

Environmental
- Changes in land cover since human settlement
- Some areas could be described as water short, normally
- Vulnerable to drought, particularly multi-year dry periods
- Most wetlands have been drained
- Ashley Estuary (Te Aka Aka) is a significant and sensitive environment at the bottom of the catchment
- High sediment loads in many streams and rivers
- Nitrogen concentrations are high in some streams
- Drinking water quality is generally good, but nitrate concentrations are elevated in some wells
- Flows in the Ashley River/Rakahuri have declined over the last few decades. Water levels in wells and flows in spring-fed streams near the Ashley River/Rakahuri have also declined
- Groundwater levels in the Silverstream area and flows in the Silverstream are declining
- Groundwater recharge from Waimakariri Irrigation Limited and stockwater race network water losses and inefficient irrigation have offset a large increase in groundwater abstraction

Current Pathways Scenario Assessments – Key Findings
The second stage of the current state assessment was to explore scenarios based on what might happen if the current state (2016/17) was projected into the future, assuming current land management rules and practices are unchanged. This scenario has been referred to as the Current Pathways scenario. Key findings included:

Ngāi Tūāhuriri values
- Many streams and rivers will fail to sustain Ngāi Tūāhuriri values

Ecology – stream health
- Sea level rise resulting in saltwater intrusion in lowland tidal waterways, coastal retreat and loss of coastal habitat
• Continued overland flow of contaminants (phosphorus, sediment and E. coli)
• Increase in stormwater contaminants
• Continued habitat loss in freshwater and coastal waterbodies

Biodiversity
• Continued decline in extent of high biodiversity value habitats, especially for indigenous forest, broadleaved indigenous hardwood scrub, kanuka and herbaceous freshwater wetland vegetation.
• Projected increase of low biodiversity value habitats such as high producing grassland, orchards and urban areas.

Nitrates
• A groundwater model was used to evaluate the possible range of future nitrate concentrations in water supply wells and surface water bodies. The model was developed collaboratively between Environment Canterbury staff and a panel of external experts and was reviewed by expert panel members on completion. A thorough analysis of the uncertainty around modelled nitrate projections was undertaken, in recognition of the fact that modelled estimates of future water quality outcomes are uncertain.
• Current Pathways modelling results have highlighted the potential for significant nitrate concentration increases in surface water and groundwater in some areas within the Waimakariri Water Zone (e.g. Silverstream and some deep-water supply wells) because of the time it takes for groundwater to travel from the source area (i.e. nitrates already “in the post”)
• Groundwater modelling and other investigations undertaken in 2016-2017 concluded that groundwater in the Waimakariri Water Zone is likely to flow under the Waimakariri River and into the Christchurch aquifer system. The Waimakariri Water Zone Committee has made recommendations for nutrient management in their zone, to “play their part” in maintaining the high quality of water in the Christchurch aquifers.
• Permitted activity rules in Plan Change 5 of the LWRP could offset any nitrate reduction gains from Good Management Practice (GMP) and cause significant increases in nitrogen discharges to some sensitive water bodies e.g. Ashley Estuary (Te Aka Aka).

Stream flows
• Reduction in flows, especially Silverstream, Ohoka Stream and Cust Main Drain due to improved irrigation efficiency and potentially increased groundwater abstraction within current allocation limits

Groundwater quantity
• Decrease in water supply well reliability and spring-fed stream flows due to potential increases in groundwater abstraction and improved irrigation efficiency

Possible climate change effects
• Increase in the frequency, duration and severity of droughts causing increased stress on water resources and impacts on stream health
• An increase in evapotranspiration with associated increase in groundwater abstraction, depending on rainfall
• Further flow decreases in the Ashley River/Rakahuri, increasing length and duration of dry reaches in the river and causing reduced flows in the spring-fed streams sustained by losses from the river
• Less snowfall (affects flows in alpine rivers such as the Waimakariri River)
• The potential for less winter rainfall with more rainfall in summer and autumn.

Economic assessment
• Population is expected to increase from current (59,300) to an estimated 97,000 in 2048
• There is potential for a small increase in agricultural productivity associated with growth in irrigated area. This economic gain is offset by the loss of productive land into lower producing small-block holdings and, to a lesser extent, by lowering reliability and the costs of providing clean drinking water.

C3. PROGRAMME EVALUATION AND MONITORING

The Waimakariri Water Zone Committee is committed to evaluating progress made in implementing the Land and Water Solutions Programme. Various recommendations in this document focus on monitoring and building collective knowledge of the issues, and possible solutions, to improving water management in the Waimakariri Water Zone.

The Water Zone Committee will also develop a 5-year work programme to oversee and evaluate progress in implementing these recommendations. To align with the Land and Water Solutions Programme over the next decade the following approach is proposed:

2019-2021 Solutions Programme – Establishment stage
This will include:
• Initial catchment management plans underway
• Identified actions which can be implemented immediately underway
• Engagement and, where possible, establishment of Water User Groups
• Funding plan for implementation of the programme prepared.

2021-2025 Solutions Programme – 5-year priorities stage 1
• A set of priorities to be achieved by 2025 will be prepared and monitored over a five-year period, to 2025.

2026-2030 Solutions Programme – 5-year priorities stage 2
• Based on a review of progress made to 2025, a revised set of priorities will be prepared to direct progress over the following 5 years, to 2030.
PART D. RECOMMENDATIONS

KEY RECOMMENDATION AREAS – DRIVERS OF CHANGE

The following key recommendation areas provide the structure for the solutions programme ZIP Addendum. They are the drivers of change required to achieve community outcomes and address water management issues for the Waimakariri Water Zone.

The zone committee developed the following key recommendation areas in response to issues identified by the current state and future pathways assessments, and overarching community outcomes. This solutions programme is focused on:

1. Improving Stream Health
2. Protecting and Enhancing Indigenous Biodiversity
3. Reducing Nitrates
4. Managing Surface Water Quantity
5. Managing Groundwater Quantity

D1. RECOMMENDATIONS – IMPROVING STREAM HEALTH

D1.1 Key Issues

The key issues for improving stream health within the zone are:

- There is a need for adequate habitat protection for waterways and riparian habitats that contribute to stream health.
- There is a need for improved data on ecological health in waterways, the influence of specific land uses, and an improved monitoring regime to set priorities and management targets.
- The lowland /plains reach of waterways in the zone are generally in poor ecological health due to a variety of factors.
- Poor ecological health results in low cultural and recreational values.
- The ecological health of hill country waterways needs to be protected from adverse effects of natural and induced bank erosion, and potential effects of forestry operations.
- There is a need to protect and establish healthy populations and habitats of indigenous plant and animal species across the zone.

D1.2 Rationale

The zone committee proposes a wide range of tools for protecting and improving stream water quality and ecological health. These include practical actions, planning mechanisms, education and support, engagement with industry bodies and extra monitoring effort. Nitrates and stream flows are clearly relevant to stream health and are addressed separately in later sections of this document.

Catchment Management Plans

The zone committee views non-statutory catchment management plans as a critical tool to assist in delivering outcomes on the ground and taking a holistic view of management. The committee will prioritise two catchments to be addressed in the first year following ratification of the ZIP Addendum, and develop plans with support from Environment Canterbury, landowners, Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga, Waimakariri District Council, farming industry and other organisations. Plans will build on existing initiatives to set out visions for the waterways and identify new actions, lead partners, and funding.

Supporting Good Management Practice

PCS to the LWRP introduces Good Management Practices (GMP) on-farm into the planning framework through policies, rules and targets in Farm Environment Plans for consented farming activities. It also introduces management plans and targets for farms that do not need resource consent. The zone committee sees Farm Environment Plans and Management Plans as the cornerstone for managing contaminant losses to land and waterways and for improving biodiversity, stream ecology and mahinga kai through education and support to farmers and landowners.

There are over 3,500 small block properties in the zone, most of which are classified as permitted activities in the Land and Water Regional Plan because of their small size. These properties can have localised impacts on water quality and stream health if not managed well. Issues also include non-compliance with plan rules for on-site wastewater treatment plants such as septic tanks. Though large in number, on-site sewage effluent discharges are a very small contributor to overall nitrate losses within the zone (estimated at around 1%). The zone committee wants to extend a pilot education programme targeted at small block holders and promote the uptake of good management practices.
Stock exclusion

The Zone Committee wishes to strengthen the region wide stock exclusion provisions in the LWRP to additionally exclude “intensively farmed stock” from springs, all open drains and other artificial watercourses. The Committee also wishes for “non-intensively farmed” cattle and deer to be excluded from all waterways, springs, open drains and artificial watercourses on the plains. The purpose of excluding stock is to stop them exacerbating stream bank erosion, causing pugging, sedimentation and reduce inputs of phosphorus and microbiological contaminants to waterbodies.

Improving environmental monitoring

State of the environment (SOE) monitoring is key to understanding the state and trends of water quality and ecosystem health in the Waimakariri Water Zone. A successful monitoring programme will include the establishment of a robust and representative network of monitoring sites across a variety of catchment types and areas.

Protecting aquatic biodiversity

The Waimakariri Water Zone contains numerous aquatic species of high ecological, cultural and recreational value. However, many years of land development has resulted in many species or populations becoming lost or threatened. At risk species include the threatened Canterbury mudfish, lamprey, freshwater mussels, longfin eel and kōura. A key factor contributing to the loss of these species has been habitat loss or degradation.

Stream surveys and investigations have identified numerous barriers to migratory fish passage throughout the zone. These include flood and tide gates, weirs, and culverts. The remediation of such barriers is important to ensuring that the recruitment of individuals into the middle and upper reaches of catchments is allowed.

Protecting natural waterbody character and ecosystem function

Many urban and rural waterways in the Waimakariri Water Zone have been extensively modified. Spring-fed plains streams have been affected by stream realignments, channel straightening, bank modifications and more. Protecting the natural character of streams can have multiple long-term aesthetic and ecosystem benefits.

Coastal waterbodies

Coastal waterbodies are highly valued ecosystems. They are culturally important and serve as nursery, feeding areas and resting grounds for a variety of fish species and birds. Located at the bottom of river catchments, they act as basins which capture upstream contaminant inputs. The Ashley Estuary (Te Aka Aka) and tidal reaches of spring-fed plains streams have been particularly affected by habitat degradation associated with excessive sediment deposition. Managing upstream contaminant losses to protect coastal waterbodies downstream is a critical component of any good catchment management plan. Developing a robust monitoring programme for tidal-freshwater and estuarine waterbodies will improve the current poor understanding of ecosystem state and trends. The extent and characteristics of tidally influenced waterbodies are expected to shift with climate change and rising sea levels.

Ashley River/Rakahuri and Saltwater Creek catchment

The zone committee identifies the Ashley River/Rakahuri as an important natural landscape feature. As such, the committee believes the upper-catchment, above the gorge, should be safeguarded from further land use intensification relative to downstream. The Ashley River/Rakahuri (and to a lesser extent the Okuku River) affords many characteristics of an alpine braided river, as defined under the Land and Water Regional Plan. The zone committee wishes its braided river values to be protected.

The braided nature of the Ashley River/Rakahuri becomes constrained by terrestrial weed (e.g. gorse, willows, and broom) growth in the mid-catchment. Extensive weed control is required to protect the river’s braided character and bird nesting habitat. The effects of forestry practices in the upper hill-fed catchments of the Okuku and Makerikeri Rivers have caused concern amongst community members, but limited monitoring makes determining the real effects of such practices downstream difficult.

Spring-fed tributaries of the lower Ashley River/Rakahuri catchment are highly valued by both Ngāi Tūāhuriri and the local community. The degradation of these streams is typical of that displayed by most spring-fed waterways in the Waimakariri Water Zone with excessive deposited sediment and poor habitat quality. Water quality in these streams has flow-on effects to downstream aquatic environments, especially the Ashley Estuary (Te Aka Aka).

Northern Waimakariri Tributaries area

Many issues in the Waimakariri Water Zone are centred around the spring-fed tributaries that flow into the Kaiapoi River and eventually the main stem of the Waimakariri River. Unlike other catchments in the zone, the Cam River/Ruataniwha and Kaiapoi River flow through substantial urban populations. For this reason, these waterways receive stormwater inputs that can greatly affect instream water quality. One significant change was the Rangiora sewer ponds ceasing to discharge into the Southbrook, and thus into the Cam River/Ruataniwha, in 2006. Urban subdivision has been a...
significant contributor to the sediment deposited in spring-fed waterways in the south-east of the zone over many years.

Streams in the Northern Waimakariri Tributaries area are highly valued for their amenity and recreation values, and there is significant scope to rehabilitate degraded reaches of streams. This work has already begun in places such as the Cam River/Ruataniwha catchment. With a growing urban population, community education and environmental awareness programmes will also create positive changes in these streams.

**Aligned with Community Outcomes**

The following recommendations for improving stream health align with the following community outcomes:

- The water quality and quantity of spring-fed streams maintains or improves mahinga kai gathering and diverse aquatic life
- The Ashley River/Rakahuri is safe for contact recreation, has improved river habitat, fish passage, and customary use; and has flows that support natural coastal processes
- The Waimakariri River as a receiving environment is a healthy habitat for freshwater and coastal species, and is protected and managed as an outstanding natural landscape and recreation resource
- Indigenous biodiversity in the zone is protected and improved
- Optimal water and nutrient management is common practice

**D1.3 Recommendations – Improving stream health**

**Cross-outcome recommendations**

Rec 1.1

That Environment Canterbury and the Waimakariri District Council support the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee to prioritise catchments and develop at least two Catchment Management Plans per year. These plans will provide specific catchment management goals and actions, priorities and monitoring programmes to support the implementation of ZIP Addendum recommendations.

Rec 1.2

That Environment Canterbury and the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee support industry groups to provide sector, and catchment-specific support to landowners implementing Good Management Practice (GMP), including:

- sub-catchment groups working to reduce contaminant losses.
- increasing education and awareness of the Farm Environment Plan audit and accreditation process amongst wider community.
- educating and supporting landowners to protect catchment-specific ecological, biodiversity and Ngāi Tūāhuriri values by:
  - Preparing catchment management plans to implement on-the-ground waterway remediation projects at sites identified as priorities.
  - Providing workshops in vulnerable hotspots (i.e. high value or high contaminant loss) areas.

Rec 1.3

That Environment Canterbury engages with small block owners to increase awareness and uptake of good management practices.

**Monitoring and Research**

Rec 1.4

That Environment Canterbury implement a comprehensive waterway monitoring plan for the Waimakariri Water Zone, including:

- Monitoring water quality and ecological health of waterways.
- State of the Takiwā monitoring, including the health and wellbeing of mahinga kai species including but not necessarily limited to:
  - Tuna (freshwater eels)
  - Īnanga (whitebait species)
  - Kākahi (freshwater mussels)
  - Kanakana (lamprey)
  - Kōura (freshwater crayfish)
  - Tuangi (cockles)
  - Pātiki (flounder)
- Measuring diversity and distributions of freshwater fish, invertebrates and aquatic vegetation throughout the zone.
- Identifying critical sources areas and measuring deposited sediment extent and character, particularly in spring-fed plains streams.
- Including important bathing sites in Schedule 6 of the Land and Water Regional Plan and assessing primary recreational water quality at:
  - Ashley River/Rakahuri at Gorge
  - Ashley River/Rakahuri at Rangiora-Loburn Bridge
  - Ashley River/Rakahuri at State Highway 1
  - Kaiapoi River at Kaiapoi township
  - Pegasus Lake at Motu Quay
Cam River at Bramleys Rd

f. Continuing to share information and integrating monitoring programmes between organisations, and promoting community-based monitoring of waterways (citizen science) and education initiatives

g. Investigating the ecosystem health of hill country waterways to identify issues and catchment-specific management options as required.

h. Supporting ongoing research into emerging contaminants, including endocrine disruptors, in the Waimakariri Water Zone.

i. Investigating tidal waterbodies related to:
   I. Sediment deposition and salt water intrusion in:
      – Ashley River/Rakahuri – Saltwater Creek Estuary
      – Tidal reaches of Kaiapoi River, Saltwater Creek and Taranaki Creek
   II. Aquatic habitat shifts associated with climate change and sea level rise, including changes in īnanga spawning areas.

j. Monitoring water quality and ecological health in urban streams and rivers in conjunction with Waimakariri District Council

Rec 1.5
That Environment Canterbury and Waimakariri District Council investigate the impact of commercial forestry practices and wilding pines on downstream freshwater ecosystems.

Rec 1.6
That Environment Canterbury and the Waimakariri District Council support further research into factors that influence and/or control toxic cyanobacteria growth in the Ashley River/Rakahuri.

Protecting and enhancing aquatic biodiversity

Rec 1.7
That Environment Canterbury, Waimakariri District Council, and Ngāi Tūāhuriri review the waterway management and maintenance methods used in the Zone. The review which should be publicly reported, would include:

a. Preparation of an inventory of the main methods, including chemicals and mechanical methods, used by public and private land and water managers in the Zone;

b. The findings of recent work by EPA, MfE or other relevant New Zealand organisations reviewing the potential effects of the listed chemicals on waterway ecosystem health and of other methods;

c. An assessment of the risk to soil biodiversity and waterway ecosystem health in the Zone from use of chemicals or other methods.

Rec 1.8
That Environment Canterbury, Waimakariri District Council, Department of Conservation, Fish and Game, and Ngāi Tūāhuriri review the presence and effects of barriers to indigenous and introduced fish migration on waterways in the Zone in consultation with stakeholders and land owners. The review should:

a. Identify locations where there are barriers to migrating indigenous fish and salmonids

b. Consider the purpose of specific barriers (e.g. tidal control, flood management, drainage)

c. Determine and prioritise options for removing or retrofitting barriers appropriate to different species at specific sites.

Rec 1.9
That Environment Canterbury work with Ngāi Tūāhuriri and Department of Conservation to identify the types of activities and controls needed to protect the aquatic habitat of the threatened Canterbury mudfish and amend plan provisions to ensure protection at key sites in waterbodies including the following:

- Tutaepatu Lagoon
- Taranaki Creek
- Eyre River tributaries
- Coopers Creek tributaries
- Mounseys Stream tributaries

Rec 1.10
That Environment Canterbury work with Ngāi Tūāhuriri and Department of Conservation to identify the locations and types of activities and controls needed to protect the habitat of important indigenous species including but not limited to:

- Freshwater crayfish/kōura
- Freshwater mussels/kākahi
- Lamprey/kanakana

Protecting and enhancing aquatic ecosystem health

Rec 1.11
That Environment Canterbury support catchment management plans that implement on the ground projects targeted at rehabilitating the wetland, freshwater or estuarine habitats of threatened species or species of high value to Ngāi Tūāhuriri.
Rec 1.12
That Environment Canterbury support further assessment of the issue of lost ecological and cultural values resulting from waterway realignments for consented and permitted activities.

Rec 1.13
That Environment Canterbury promotes actions that improve bank stabilisation and reduce sediment inputs to spring-fed plains waterways.

Rec 1.14
That Environment Canterbury and Waimakariri District Council ensure waterway management and maintenance activities minimise contaminants losses to downstream waterbodies and loss of aquatic life, while maintaining flood carrying capacity.

Rec 1.15
That Environment Canterbury strengthen the LWRP rules on stock exclusion to exclude intensively farmed stock from:
- All springheads that permanently or intermittently contain water; and
- All open drains and other artificial watercourses, (including but not restricted to irrigation canals and water races) with surface water in them that discharge into a stream, river or lake.

Rec 1.16
That Environment Canterbury strengthen the LWRP rules on stock exclusion to exclude non-intensively farmed cattle and deer on the plains from:
- All waterways and their tributaries,
- All springheads that permanently or intermittently contain water; and
- All open drains and other artificial watercourses, (including but not restricted to irrigation canals and water races) with surface water in them that discharge into a stream, river or lake.

Rec 1.17
That Environment Canterbury educate horse owners to exclude grazing horses from access to waterways.

Rec 1.18
That Environment Canterbury and the Waimakariri District Council support landowners with education and guidance on appropriate riparian set back distances and plantings for different situations.

Rec 1.19
That Environment Canterbury and Waimakariri District Council work with the forestry sector and MPI to:
- Identify high risk periods over the next 5 years when earthworks and harvesting will take place within the Waimakariri Water Zone, so resources can be targeted to ensure potential environmental effects are mitigated or avoided.
- Ensure that implementation of the NES is effective within the zone.

Ngāi Tūāhuriri values and aquatic ecosystems
Rec 1.20
That Ngāi Tūāhuriri, Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu, Environment Canterbury, and Waimakariri District Council work together to identify areas and waterways of high cultural value and options for protecting those values including providing for mahinga kai and the protection of wāhi tapu and wāhi taonga within the Waimakariri Water Zone.

Rec 1.21
That Environment Canterbury prioritise on the ground projects for Taranaki Creek, given its significant value to Ngāi Tūāhuriri and proximity to Kaiapoi Pā, particularly those related to:
- reducing and removing sources and legacies of deposited fine sediment
- improving the quality of habitat for mahinga kai species
- removing barriers to native fish passage
- removal of invasive fish species

Ashley River/Rakahuri and Saltwater Creek catchment
Rec 1.22
That Environment Canterbury and the Waimakariri District Council recognise the Ashley River/Rakahuri for its important natural landscape values, braided river characteristics, and braided river bird (nesting and feeding) habitat.

Rec 1.23
That Environment Canterbury investigate funding for projects to address key environmental issues in consultation with LINZ and Department of Conservation for the Ashley River/Rakahuri, particularly the removal of woody weeds above the confluence with the Okuku River.

Rec 1.24
That Environment Canterbury and the Waimakariri District Council recognise the Upper Ashley River/Rakahuri catchment, including Lees Valley, for its high natural landscape and ecosystem values, and protect its waterways from degradation by:
- avoiding increased contaminant losses to waterways.
• preventing the removal or degradation of any existing wetlands.
• preventing the expansion of wilding pines.

Urban waterways
Rec 1.25
That Environment Canterbury and the Waimakariri District Council initiate public education and awareness campaigns aimed at improving the water quality and health of urban waterways.

Project support
Rec 1.26
That Environment Canterbury and the Waimakariri District Council support projects that have enduring benefits for improved stream health, Ngāi Tūāhuriri values, and improved recreational amenity in the North Waimakariri River tributaries.

Rec 1.27
That Environment Canterbury and the Waimakariri District Council prioritise on-the-ground projects in the Cam River/Ruatanuiha and Kaiapoi/Silverstream, including but not limited to:
• Reducing and removing sources and legacies of deposited fine sediment.
• Improving the quality of habitat for mahinga kai.
• Removing barriers to native fish passage.

Rec 1.28
That Environment Canterbury and Waimakariri District Council investigate options to fund plants for riparian or wetland planting on land managed in accordance with an FEP or a Management Plan. (see also Rec 2.9)

D2. RECOMMENDATIONS – PROTECTING AND ENHANCING INDIGENOUS BIODIVERSITY

D2.1 Issues
• Indigenous habitats and ecosystems across the zone have been highly modified by rural and urban land and water uses; this includes terrestrial, freshwater and estuarine environments. Modification continues, but through a lack of base-line information there is little data on rates of change at a catchment or site level.
• Various nationally and locally rare plant and animal species occur in the zone, but there is no comprehensive information about abundance or distribution.
• There is increasing awareness about protection of significant indigenous vegetation and habitats. However, many species occur in isolated remnants which require an integrated approach to indigenous biodiversity management (for example, through a catchment or landscape plan)
• Plant and animal pests threaten indigenous biodiversity values in many parts of the zone.
• Indigenous plants are used for planting in riparian areas and on other areas of private land. Landowners carrying out indigenous biodiversity protection and enhancement work on riparian (and terrestrial habitats) often work in isolation. Better biodiversity outcomes could be achieved if:
  – ecological connections with riparian reaches up and downstream have already been described, and biodiversity and critical source management targets set
  (for example, through a catchment or landscape plan)
  – landowners could access good biodiversity information, support, advice and plant material.
• The links between cultural, landscape and amenity values are not well documented in this zone, which makes integrated management difficult to achieve.
• The effects of the earthquakes and of climate change create uncertainty about biodiversity change.

D2.2 Rationale
The Current State assessment highlighted the need for short and longer-term actions to protect and enhance indigenous terrestrial, freshwater and estuarine biodiversity in the zone. The zone committee’s recommendations seek to:
• Protect significant biodiversity values.
• Integrate indigenous biodiversity management into wider aspects of land and water management by all land owners and managers.
• Integrate indigenous biodiversity values and management within the proposed catchment management plans.
• Create a “vision” for indigenous biodiversity which integrates investigations and actions.
• Develop a strong regulatory and voluntary framework for indigenous biodiversity management in the zone.
• Engage and support private landowners to work with
• Ngāi Tūāhuriri, Environment Canterbury, Waimakariri District Council, Department of Conservation and stakeholders on indigenous biodiversity action.
• Gather data and information to help prioritise actions and set regulation.

**Aligned Community Outcome**

The following recommendations for protecting and enhancing indigenous biodiversity align with the following community outcome:

• Indigenous biodiversity in the zone is protected and improved

**D2.3 Recommendations – Protecting and enhancing Indigenous Biodiversity**

**Cross-outcome recommendations**

**Rec 2.1**

The zone committee recommends that Environment Canterbury and the Waimakariri District Council work with Ngāi Tūāhuriri, landowners, agencies and stakeholders to integrate indigenous biodiversity in a whole of waterway, Ki Uta Ki Tai, approach to managing catchments in the Waimakariri Water Zone.

**Rec 2.2**

The Waimakariri Water Zone Committee endorses and supports the implementation of the Canterbury Regional Biodiversity Strategy as it applies in the Waimakariri Water Zone. In particular:

a. The zone committee endorses the vision, goals, targets, and actions of Canterbury Regional Biodiversity Strategy:

b. The zone committee recommends that Environment Canterbury support the appointment of a regional co-ordinator for the Canterbury Regional Biodiversity Strategy

c. The zone committee recommends that Waimakariri District Council increase its biodiversity capability and capacity

**Rec 2.3**

The zone committee recommends implementing the Canterbury Biodiversity Strategy, at the water zone level, with a Waimakariri Biodiversity Action Plan to enable the following actions:

• Developing and illustrating a vision for indigenous biodiversity (and related values) across the zone

• Mapping indigenous habitats, vegetation and, as appropriate, threatened plant and animal species in the zone

• Identifying actions for protection and enhancement of indigenous habitats, vegetation types and plant and animal species

• Identifying priority sites, waterways, springheads, wetlands, reaches or locations for protection

• Identifying priority habitats and vegetation for management actions

• Setting targets for biodiversity protection and enhancement in the zone

• Working with willing landowners to action indigenous biodiversity protection and enhancement projects

• Developing strategies and actions that incentivise indigenous biodiversity protection and enhancement on private land.

**Rec 2.4**

That Environment Canterbury and the Waimakariri District Council consider climate change and sea level rise impacts on indigenous biodiversity in the Waimakariri Water Zone.

**Protecting and enhancing ecosystem health**

**Rec 2.5**

That Environment Canterbury and the Waimakariri District Council integrate indigenous biodiversity and instream ecological values into councils’ planning and operational activities, including in work carried out by consultants or contractors.

**Rec 2.6**

That Environment Canterbury and Waimakariri District Council investigate further ways to protect braided river-bed breeding bird habitat and bird populations from the impacts of vehicles.

**Ngāi Tūāhuriri values and indigenous biodiversity**

**Rec 2.7**

That Environment Canterbury, Waimakariri District Council and the Department of Conservation work with, and support, Ngāi Tūāhuriri Fenton Reserve Trustees in the Land and Water Solutions Programme project to reconnect coastal ecosystems between the Lower Ashley River/Rakahuri, the estuary and Te Aka Aka Fenton Reserve to provide for mahinga kai benefits for Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga.

**Protecting and enhancing terrestrial and aquatic indigenous biodiversity**

**Rec 2.8**

That Environment Canterbury and the Waimakariri District Council work with community groups to address indigenous biodiversity protection and enhancement by means such as:
• Provision of administrative support;
• Provision of financial assistance;
• Identification of funding sources;
• Provision of technical advice; and
• Endorsement of projects.

Rec 2.9
That Environment Canterbury and the Waimakariri District Council work with Ngāi Tūāhuriri, Department of Conservation and other agencies to assist landowners/land managers by:

• Establishing a biodiversity advisory service (e.g. advice on appropriate plant sources or riparian planting)
• Advising on indigenous biodiversity management as part of farm management planning within catchment plans
• Publicising positive biodiversity actions, events and news
• Promoting and raising awareness of biodiversity values and protection or enhancement opportunities
• Investigating the development of a system to ensure appropriate sources of plant material for revegetation and enhancement projects
• Promoting and advising on appropriate wetland habitat and waterway protection

Rec 2.10
That Environment Canterbury and the Waimakariri District Council explore consenting options to enable landowners to undertake indigenous biodiversity initiatives including, but not restricted to:

• habitat protection and enhancement
• wetland creation or restoration
• predator control of high values sites
• revegetation projects

Coastal habitats and ecosystems

Rec 2.11
The zone committee recognises the importance of the tidal reaches of waterways as inanga habitat and recommends that Environment Canterbury and the Waimakariri District Council support the development of habitat at inanga spawning sites and riparian planting.

Rec 2.12
The Waimakariri Water Zone Committee acknowledges the Ashley Estuary (Te Aka Aka) as a taonga within the Waimakariri Water Zone; and acknowledges the current project in relation to the Fenton Reserves (see Rec 2.7); and recommends the establishment of a working group comprising representatives of Ngāi Tūāhuriri, Environment Canterbury, Waimakariri District Council, Department of Conservation, Fish and Game and other agencies to develop a strategy and programme to protect and enhance Ngāi Tūāhuriri, biodiversity and recreational values in the face of current pressures, climate change and rising sea levels.

Rec 2.13
That Environment Canterbury undertake a programme of investigations and monitoring in the Ashley Estuary (Te Aka Aka) to provide information for the deliberations of the working group identified in Rec 2.12 and the group implementing Rec 2.7. The programme should include:

• Determination of eutrophication susceptibility. This requires determining the flushing potential, the dilution potential, nutrient inputs and nutrient load susceptibility
• Development and implementation of a programme to assess current trophic state and to monitor trophic state over time (important considerations are location of sites, parameters to be measured, frequency of sampling, seasonality of sampling)
• Annual mid-summer broad-scale monitoring to assess the occurrence of macro-algae.
• Monthly water quality monitoring for ecosystem health at the site near the estuary mouth.
• Five-yearly monitoring of sediment quality at two sites – present site adjacent to Saltwater Creek and downstream from SH1 and a site in proximity to where Taranaki Creek flows into the Ashley Estuary (Te Aka Aka).
• Monitoring of cockles and pipis from sites in the estuary to assess contaminant levels in shellfish flesh.
• Establish stations at various locations in the estuary and begin to monitor sedimentation.
• Annual monitoring of the sediments and macrobiota at one site within the estuary.
• Baseline surveys of the fish and bird populations of this estuary.

D3. RECOMMENDATIONS – REDUCING NITRATES

D3.1 Key Issues
Nitrates are one of the key contaminants that affect the quality of groundwater and surface water. They have been identified as a key issue for the Waimakariri Water Zone, most significantly in the Kaiapoi River catchment.
Nitrates are currently likely to exceed the nitrate drinking water standard in an estimated 75 private drinking water wells in the water zone (see Map X5). If current land use and management continues as is, then modelling suggests:

- the number of private wells exceeding the drinking water standard may rise to 100; and
- some community water supply wells may need to be treated, or alternative sources found.

**Groundwater Investigations – Northern Waimakariri Catchment**

Modelling indicates nitrates in groundwater sourced from a portion of the North Waimakariri catchment may travel under the Waimakariri River towards Christchurch aquifers (See Map X6).

This groundwater travel may result in nitrate levels in deep groundwater in the Christchurch aquifer slowly increasing over 50 to 100 years. Any increase in nitrates is likely to be to levels below the maximum acceptable value defined in the New Zealand Drinking Water Standards.

**Waimakariri River northern tributaries**

Of greatest concern for the water zone committee are the high and upward trends in nitrate concentrations in the Silverstream.

Elevated but declining trends have been assessed in the Cust Main Drain and Ohoka Stream, with moderate and low nitrate concentrations assessed for Courtenay Stream and Cam River/Ruataniwha, respectively (See Map X7).

Nitrate concentrations in streams and groundwater could increase in the future due to increased irrigation efficiency, particularly if the additional water made available by more efficient irrigation is used to irrigate more land.

**Ashley River/Rakahuri Catchment**

Ashley River/Rakahuri currently experiences cyanobacteria and algal blooms. Increased nitrate losses could intensify nuisance growths through this highly valued habitat and recreational area.

Ashley Estuary (Te Aka Aka) is rated as highly to very highly susceptible to macroalgal eutrophication based on modelling of current nitrogen loads. This places significant stress on the aquatic ecosystem.

**National Limits for Nitrate**

The following table (3.1) provides an overview of the nitrate limits the water zone committee, Environment Canterbury and the Waimakariri District Council must address.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drinking Water Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>½ Maximum Allowable Value (MAV) – 5.65 mg/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Allowable Value (MAV) – 11.3 mg/L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biodiversity and Ecosystem Health – Nitrate Toxicity Limits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.9 mg/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8 mg/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 mg/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 mg/L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ngāi Tūāhuriri Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0 mg/L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1 New Zealand Nitrate Limits
D3.2 Rationale

Approach to managing nitrates in groundwater and surface water

The committee considers that management of land and water use is the main mechanism by which nitrates targets in groundwater and surface water should be achieved. Although other measures such as stream augmentation and managed aquifer recharge may play a part in the future, the feasibility of these measures have not yet been proven to the point at which they can be “banked upon” as part of the nitrate solution for the Waimakariri Water Zone.

Science information

Measured nitrate concentrations in some surface and groundwater bodies within the zone currently exceed the plan limits recommended by the committee. Furthermore, modelling results indicate that in future, for some streams and aquifers, nitrate concentrations currently below the zone committee’s recommended limits for those waterbodies are likely to increase above the plan limits at least for a time (lag effect).

The zone committee has based its recommendations on the best scientific and economic information currently available. The committee recognises that the nitrate contamination of both surface and groundwater operates within a complex system and that information and understanding needs to continue to evolve. The committee, however, acknowledges there is enough information on which to act now. Inaction is not an option and could ultimately come at a significant cost to current and future generations.

The zone committee recognises that model-based projections of future water quality are often associated with a high degree of uncertainty. This uncertainty has been evaluated and carefully considered by the committee when making recommendations about nitrate management in the zone. The committee has generally chosen to use the median nitrate concentration from the modelled range to determine the nitrate loss reductions required to meet their recommended limits. Use of the median value recognises that the likelihood of the true value being greater than this value is the same as the likelihood of the true value being less than this median value. By using the median value, the committee considers that the likelihood of excessive economic impacts on farming (where the true future concentration proves to be less than the modelled value) is balanced against the likelihood of excessive environmental impacts (where the true future concentration proves to be greater than the modelled value). In the case of community water supply wells, the committee recommends that the 95th percentile model results should be used to determine the nitrate loss reductions required to meet their recommended limits for these wells. Use of the 95th percentile provides a greater level of certainty that the nitrate limits will be achieved.

Nitrate limits

The zone committee considered a range of possible nitrate plan limits from 1.0 mg/L to 6.9 mg/L nitrate-N for most rivers and streams, with lower limits in the Ashley River/Rakahuri and Waimakariri River. The effects of different limits on stream health and associated Ngai Tūhuriri values were considered. Economic and social impacts were also considered, particularly when the zone committee looked at how quickly limits could be achieved.

For community drinking water supplies and private wells, the committee considered the New Zealand Drinking Water Standards and ½ MAV threshold that alerts operators to a possible emerging problem. A precautionary limit of 3.8 mg/L was also considered and eventually recommended as the limit guiding nitrate reductions for the source area potentially associated with the Christchurch aquifer (See Map X6).

Statistical analysis indicates that if 50% of all samples collected within a given year are less than 5.65 mg/L, around 10% of samples are likely to exceed the drinking water limit of 11.3 mg/L. The zone committee's future goal is that all private drinking water supply wells meet the Nitrate Drinking water standards at all times. The committee recognises that it may take some time to achieve this.

The zone committee acknowledges that the Christchurch West Melton Zone Committee has requested that nitrate limits in the Christchurch aquifer provide for 95% aquatic species protection from toxicity effect in rivers and a groundwater nitrate concentration limit of 2.4 mg/L. The committee elected to retain the limit of 3.8 mg/L, which provides protection for 90% of aquatic species. The reason for this is that if concentrations in the deep aquifer are maintained at 3.8 mg/L, a significant increase in nitrate concentrations in Christchurch spring-fed streams is unlikely. This is because groundwater sourced from north of the Waimakariri River is likely to represent only a small proportion of the flow in Christchurch’s streams.

Previous studies have shown that Waimakariri River-sourced water, containing very low nitrate concentrations, makes up a significant proportion of flows in most of the Christchurch spring-fed streams. If the relatively small north-of-river stream flow component is maintained at 3.8 mg/L or less, the potential for significant changes related to Waimakariri zone land use will be limited. Furthermore, a proportion of the nitrogen load which travels into the deep Christchurch groundwater system is likely to be attenuated as it travels upwards through the organic-rich sediments which occur within the aquifers beneath.
the spring-fed streams. This provides a further limitation on the potential for deep groundwater nitrate concentrations of 3.8 mg/L or less to cause a deterioration in Christchurch spring-fed stream water quality.

Plan limits
The zone committee has recommended plan limits that are challenging but achievable, given current knowledge and tools available. The limits also meet requirements in the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management.

Some of the recommended plan limits represent a compromise and do not go as far as the zone committee might ideally prefer. So, for some waterbodies, the zone committee has identified future goals. These are nitrate concentrations that are not recommended as plan limits for this Waimakariri sub-region plan change (due to uncertainty about a feasible pathway) but which could eventually be achievable. The zone committee expects the future goals listed in this ZIP Addendum to be revisited by Environment Canterbury during the 10-year plan review, and where possible, included in a future plan change as plan limits.

Specific timeframes for achieving plan limits are needed for this Waimakariri sub-region plan change. The zone committee wants to see the limits achieved as quickly as possible, but it wants to avoid over-promising and under-delivering. For this reason, the timeframes should be based on the number of stages of on-farm nitrate loss reductions necessary to achieve the limits.

This should not be read as an endorsement of long timeframes for achieving limits. The zone committee is looking for investigations of potential mitigations to allow nitrate plan limits to be achieved faster. The Committee is also keen to see the acknowledgement and rewarding of leading farmers who reduce nitrates quicker than the statutory timeframes. It also expects to see faster improvements across a broad range of water quality, habitat and mahinga kai indicators through implementation of on-farm GMPs, and through practical actions under catchment management plans.

Priority management areas
The zone committee understands that whilst elevated nitrate concentrations are influencing stream health and Ngāi Tūāhuriri values across much of the zone, sediment, phosphorus and E. coli are having a more significant adverse impact in some waterways. These three contaminants can be transported into surface water bodies by runoff from farm land, small/lifestyle blocks and in urban stormwater. Careful runoff management is required to address them. The committee has therefore defined an indicative Nitrate Priority Management Area (Map 3.1), which identifies land where special measures are required to manage nitrate as the first priority, and an indicative Runoff Management Area (Map 3.1), where sediment, phosphorus or microbiological contaminants such as E. coli are likely to be having a greater overall adverse impact than nitrate and hence careful management of runoff is a top priority.

The boundary of the Nitrate Priority Management Area has been defined primarily by aggregating:
- the groundwater recharge zones for the main community supply wells;
- recharge zones for streams with high nitrate concentrations and where nitrate toxicity is a critical stream health factor; and
- the source area contributing groundwater flow to Christchurch aquifers.

The boundary extends to the edge of the Waimakariri River Regional Park and takes in part of the Central Canterbury Alpine Rivers (Section 12) of the Land and Water Regional Plan (presently classified as a “green” nutrient allocation zone) because of the potential for farming in this area to impact Christchurch aquifers and/or contribute to the observed elevated nitrate concentrations in the Waimakariri River itself.

Being adaptive is important. The spatial extent of the Nitrate Priority Management Area is likely to be re-defined in subsequent plan changes if monitoring and modelling indicates that rivers and drinking water supply wells are meeting or are likely to meet their nitrate concentration limits without the need for further reductions.

The Runoff Priority Management Area encompasses the remainder of the Zone and captures the area where the current concentrations of runoff contaminants such as sediment, phosphorus and microbiological contaminants are having a greater effect on stream health than nitrate.

For clarity, all farmers are expected to farm to the GMP principles described in Plan Change 5 in both the Nitrate and Runoff Priority Management Areas, as a minimum.

Runoff priority management area
The Zone Committee has recommended farmers in the Runoff Priority Management Area (see Map 3.1) are not required to go beyond Baseline GMP reductions. Actions required to improve stream health through runoff management in this area are discussed in Section D1.
Map 3.1 Proposed Nitrate and Runoff Priority Management Areas
Direction of travel for the Nitrate Priority Management Area

The zone committee recognises that nitrate concentrations will increase in some water bodies if we continue current land management practices within the Nitrate Priority Management Area. The zone committee has heard the community and Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga voice their desire to improve water quality to levels that sustain ecosystem health and customary values and practices (i.e. collection of abundant and safe mahinga kai) as quickly as possible.

The zone committee has tried to find a balance between moving as fast as possible toward ecosystem health and Ngāi Tūāhuriri values while at the same time providing for a future that supports the communities and lifestyles of Waimakariri and giving due consideration to the uncertainty around modelled projections of future nitrate concentrations.

The zone committee has also considered how best to avoid unreasonable impacts on low nitrate loss farming activities. The zone committee consulted on the idea of a nitrate loss rate “floor” below which further reductions beyond baseline GMP are not required, which received general support. The Committee recommends investigating a “floor” of 20 kg/ha/annum using a simple approach that is easy to implement by Council and minimises issues with OVERSEER® version changes.

A staged approach to setting and achieving limits in the Nitrate Priority Management Area

The committee recommends an approach that sets out nitrate reductions to be achieved in stages over time that will ultimately achieve nitrate concentrations that support ecosystem health, and that restore Ngāi Tūāhuriri values. The committee is very conscious of the significant changes to land and water management being signalled in these recommendations and acknowledge that landowners will need time to make necessary adjustments to their farm practices and, in many instances also to their on-farm capital investments. To provide certainty, the Baseline GMP (as calculated by farm portal accessed at www.farmportal.ecan.govt.nz) operative at the notification of this plan change is a fixed starting point for the recommended first stage and any future reductions. If GMP in Plan Change 5 is updated through a subsequent plan change, then Environment Canterbury would need to review the nitrate reduction calculations within the Nitrate Priority Management Area.

The committee is also aware that nitrates are already in the system and hence concentrations may increase for the next decade or two, despite actions being taken by current landowners now.

The committee recognises that for some waterbodies, compliance with planning provisions alone will not achieve ecosystem health and Ngāi Tūāhuriri objectives within a generation. Other actions (e.g. riparian fencing and planting) need to begin immediately and new tools and techniques need to be developed and trialled to see whether they are effective in the Waimakariri Water Zone. These include techniques developed by the University of Canterbury CAREX research programme, managed aquifer recharge and research on soil nitrate attenuation. The committee has therefore recommended a package of regulatory and nonregulatory actions to achieve the required water quality and mahinga kai outcomes.

The committee has set out a series of steps that coincide with anticipated review periods of the Waimakariri section of the Land and Water Regional Plan as well as land use consent renewals in the zone. This approach provides an opportunity to adapt the steps in response to new information, tools and management practices. This could apply to all or some catchments only.

The committee believes that it has set challenging but achievable steps.

Some water bodies such as Silverstream are likely to require up to four stages of reductions over several decades [as per figure 3.2] as there is a substantial gap between projected nitrate concentrations and the recommended plan limit.

The zone committee would like to see the limits it is recommending achieved sooner than the multi-decadal dates likely to be set in the plan for some waterbodies and will be actively working with others to make this happen.

The zone committee supports land use consents with common expiry dates and durations that shortly follow the anticipated date when the next plan review will be made operative. This will facilitate better management of nitrate losses within the zone and allow for new information to inform the setting of future stages of nitrogen reductions.

Figure 3.2 illustrates the staged approach concept within the Nitrate Priority Management Area.
What does Baseline Good Management Practice (Baseline GMP) look like?


The Baseline Good Management Practice Loss Rate is the average nitrogen loss rate below the root zone, as estimated by the Farm Portal, for farming activity carried out during the nitrogen baseline period (2009-2013) as if it were operated at good management practice.

Under Plan Change 5, farms which require resource consent are generally required to adhere to their “Baseline GMP” nitrogen loss limit from 2020. In orange nutrient zones, farms can apply for resource consent to exceed their Baseline GMP Loss Rate.

Nutrient allocation zones

The Waimakariri Water Zone is already subject to “nutrient allocation zones” established during the development of the original Land and Water Regional Plan:

- A narrow area adjacent to the Waimakariri River is classified “green” (least restrictive nutrient management rules, allows for some intensification)
- Much of the Northern Waimakariri Tributaries area is classified “red” (most restrictive), including most of the source area modelled as contributing groundwater flow below the Waimakariri River towards Christchurch
- The Ashley/Rakahuri catchment is “orange” (similar to red but slightly less restrictive).

The zone committee received very detailed localised technical information that was not available when the nutrient allocation zones were set during the development of the Land and Water Regional Plan. In response to that information, the zone committee recommends a precautionary approach by managing risks associated with green and orange zone rules.

Using Plan Change 5 red nutrient zone rules as a foundation for the whole zone would better manage the risks from permitted and consented increases in nitrate loss and better protect the ecological health of rivers and the Ashley Estuary (Te Aka Aka), which is susceptible to even small increases in nitrogen load. For instance, red zone rules limit the area of a property able to be irrigated as a permitted activity to 10 ha above that which was irrigated at February 2016 (provided that doesn’t exceed 50 ha of irrigation). In comparison, in orange and green zones up to 50 ha of the property can be irrigated as a permitted activity without requiring land use consent.
The zone committee’s recommendations would essentially use the region-wide “red” zone rules as a basis for nutrient management throughout the Waimakariri zone. Building on that rule framework, additional reductions in nitrate loss below Baseline GMP for consented farming activities would be required in the Nitrate Priority Management Area. The Zone Committee also recommends the implementation of a nitrate “floor” in the Nitrate Priority Management Area, so that low-emitting farmers do not need to make additional reductions below Baseline GMP.

The zone committee also recommends adjusting the Waimakariri sub-region boundary in the Land and Water Regional Plan to take in part of the green nutrient zone bordering the Waimakariri River that is currently within the Central Canterbury Alpine Rivers section of the plan (See Map B2). This is because the area has the potential to contribute groundwater flow and nitrates to Christchurch aquifers and contribute to the observed upward trend in Waimakariri River nitrate concentrations. This additional area would then be subject to the restrictions recommended for the Nitrate Priority Management Area.

Permitted Activity Thresholds

Plan Change 5 defines an area threshold of 10 ha below which properties are not subject to the farming nutrient management rules. It also set area thresholds for irrigation and winter grazing below which land use consent is not needed (known as permitted activities). The Zone Committee is particularly concerned about nitrates in the zone and has recommended lowering the area threshold for properties subject to the farming rules to 5 ha and lowering the permitted winter grazing thresholds in Plan Change 5. This is because modelling suggests that 50% uptake of the permitted thresholds for winter grazing could cumulatively contribute to a significant amount of nitrate to groundwater, rivers and the Ashley Estuary (Te Aka Aka), which is particularly sensitive to any further increase in nitrate levels.

The committee recommends applying the reduced property size and winter grazing thresholds across the entire zone to assist in achieving its recommended nitrate limits. Also, some properties in the Nitrate Priority Management Area will be required to make greater reductions in nitrate loss and the Committee wants to avoid a situation where winter grazing operations (and associated nitrate losses) are simply transferred from one part of the zone to another or to smaller properties (less than 10 ha) that are not currently regulated under the Land and Water Regional Plan farming rules.

Aligned with Community Outcomes

The following recommendations for reducing nitrates align with the following community outcomes:

- The water quality and quantity of spring-fed streams maintains or improves mahinga kai gathering and diverse aquatic life.
- The Ashley River/Rakahuri is safe for contact recreation, has improved river habitat, fish passage, and customary use; and has flows that support natural coastal processes.
- The Waimakariri River as a receiving environment is a healthy habitat for freshwater and coastal species and is protected and managed as an outstanding natural landscape and recreation resource.
- Indigenous biodiversity in the zone is protected and improved.
- Optimal water and nutrient management is common practice.
- There is improved contribution to the regional economy from the zone.

D3.3 Recommendations – Reducing nitrates

Direction of Travel

Rec 3.1
That Environment Canterbury reflect in the Waimakariri section of the Land and Water Regional Plan a staged approach to reduce nitrate losses over time in the Waimakariri Water Zone.

Rec 3.2
Two water quality management areas are proposed; a Nitrate Priority Management Area and a Runoff Priority Management Area.

Rec 3.3
The zone committee recommend that farmers in the Runoff Priority Management Area are not required to achieve beyond Baseline GMP reductions. The expectation is that landowners in this area will focus on minimizing overland flow of contaminants such as sediment, phosphate, nitrate and pathogens.

Rec 3.4
The Waimakariri Water Zone Committee proposes Baseline GMP as the starting point for nitrate reductions from 1 July 2020 (at the onset of expiry of land use consents). Baseline GMP is the average nitrogen loss rate, estimated by the Farm Portal, for the farming
activity carried out during the baseline period of 2009-2013, if operated at good management practice.

Rec 3.5
Dairy in the Nitrate Priority Management Area should achieve a 15% beyond Baseline GMP reduction by 2030.

Rec 3.6
All other consented farming activities in the Nutrient Priority Management Area should achieve a 5% beyond Baseline GMP reduction by 2030.

Rec 3.7
The zone committee encourage industry and local authorities to provide incentives to achieve nutrient reductions greater than the recommended reductions in this draft ZIP Addendum.

Rec 3.8
Unless amended in a Waimakariri plan review process, the nitrate loss reductions in recs 3.5 and 3.6 above should be repeated until:

a. the nitrate reductions necessary to achieve the plan limits have been met, or
b. the science information available shows the plan limit is likely to be met in the future without the need for further reductions.

Rec 3.9
The zone committee recommends the plan change includes policy criteria that allow for and guides consideration of extensions to the 2030 target date for beyond baseline GMP reductions in exceptional circumstances.

Low Nitrate Emitters
Rec 3.10
Investigate and implement a nitrate “floor” to exclude low nitrogen emitters from having to make further reductions in nitrogen loss beyond Baseline GMP within the Nitrate Priority Management Area.

Permitted Activity Threshold
Rec 3.11
The Waimakariri Water Zone Permitted Activity winter grazing allowances should be reduced across the whole Waimakariri Water Zone to minimise the potential for further nitrate increases in streams and groundwater. The following winter grazing PA property size thresholds should be implemented:

- less than 5 ha do not require consent for winter grazing;
- Between 5 ha and 100ha can use up to 5ha of property for winter grazing without triggering a consent requirement; and
- Between 101ha and 1,000 ha can use up to 5% of property size for winter grazing without triggering a consent requirement; and
- greater than 1,000 ha can use up to 50 ha for winter grazing without triggering a consent requirement.

Rec 3.12
That Environment Canterbury runs an education campaign (including workshops) promoting good management practice, and proactively checks progress.

Waimakariri Sub-Region Boundary
Rec 3.13
The zone committee recommends that the Waimakariri sub-region plan boundary in Section 8 of Land and Water Regional Plan is amended to incorporate land bordering the Waimakariri River.

Nutrient Allocation Zone Rules
Rec 3.14
That Plan Change 5 nutrient allocation zone rules for “red zones” are used as a foundation for managing nutrients across the whole Waimakariri Water Zone, combined with amendments to the permitted activity winter grazing consent thresholds, and additional nitrate loss reductions in the Nitrate Priority Management Area described in other recommendations.

Nitrate Limits for Community Drinking Water Supplies
Rec 3.15
That Environment Canterbury reflect in the Waimakariri section of the Land and Water Regional Plan the nitrate limits in the drinking water supply wells of Waimakariri Water Zone as set out in the table below 1. Private water supply well areas are shown in Map X5, appended.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drinking Water Source</th>
<th>Current concentration (mg/L)</th>
<th>Current Pathways concentration (mg/L)</th>
<th>Recommended Plan Limit (mg/L)</th>
<th>Future goal (mg/L)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual Waimakariri District Council community water supply wells</td>
<td>0.02 – 9.0</td>
<td>1.9 (Waikuku) to 8.1 (Mandeville)</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td></td>
<td>Limit applies to all water samples collected from community water supply wells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private water supply wells</td>
<td>0.05 – 26.0 (individual wells)</td>
<td>1.3 (Waikuku) to 8.4 (Swannanoa)</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td></td>
<td>At least 50% of all samples collected from each private water supply well area in any year should be less than the limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch community supply wells (deep) – long term 50 to 100 years</td>
<td>0.05 – 2.6 (individual wells &gt;80 m deep)</td>
<td>4.7 (deep aquifer, central Christchurch)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Average nitrate concentration in all samples collected from wells &gt; 80 m deep should be less than the limit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3.2 Community Drinking Water Supplies – Nitrate-N Limits**

**Nitrate Limits for Private Well supplies**

Rec 3.16

That Environment Canterbury, Waimakariri District Council and Canterbury District Health Board work together to:

a. develop a programme for testing and reporting of water quality in private drinking water supply wells, and

b. raise awareness of health impacts from high nitrates in drinking water

Rec 3.17

Environment Canterbury and Waimakariri District Council should consider provision of guidance and information regarding a minimum depth for new drinking water supply wells and well head security, to provide better water quality protection.

**Nitrate Limits for Streams and Rivers**

Rec 3.18

That Environment Canterbury reflect in the Waimakariri section of the Land and Water Regional Plan the nitrate limits in the streams and rivers of the Waimakariri Water Zone as set out in the tables below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Ashley / Rakahuri catchment – Stream/River</strong></th>
<th><strong>Current concentration (mg/L)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Current Pathways concentration (mg/L)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Recommended Plan Limit (mg/L)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saltwater Creek</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikuku Stream</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taranaki Creek</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Ashley Creek</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley River/Rakahuri at Gorge</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley River/Rakahuri at SH1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3.3 Ashley/Rakahuri Catchment – Nitrate-N Limits*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>North Waimakariri catchment – Stream/River</strong></th>
<th><strong>Current concentration (mg/L)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Current Pathways concentration (mg/L)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Recommended Plan Limit (mg/L)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Future goal (mg/L)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Silverstream at Harpers Rd</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverstream at Island Rd</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtenay Stream</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka Stream</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cust Main Drain</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cam River/Ruataniwha</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri River at SH1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3.4 Northern Waimakariri Tributaries – Nitrate-N Limits*
Monitoring
Rec 3.19
That Environment Canterbury makes sufficient resources available to enable significant improvements to continue to be made in the understanding of the Waimakariri Water Zone groundwater system and its connection with the Christchurch aquifer and spring-fed streams. The outcome of this work should be an updated assessment of the direction of travel and likely future nitrate concentrations provided to the committee, partners and stakeholders in 2025. The key areas for improvement of understanding include:

a. Lag times between land use change and nitrate concentration changes in wells and spring-fed streams
b. Past and present rates of nitrate discharge to ground within the zone and trends in nitrate concentrations
c. Transport pathways between land and key receptors such as spring-fed streams, community water supply wells and the Christchurch aquifer system, so that recharge zones can be defined with more certainty
d. Nitrate attenuation
e. The effectiveness of actions (regulatory and non-regulatory) being taken.
f. Nitrate discharges to Ashley Estuary (Te Aka Aka)
g. Nitrate concentrations in private water supply wells

Waimakariri sub-region review in 2032
Rec 3.20
That Environment Canterbury commences a review of the Waimakariri section of the Land and Water Regional Plan in 2030 to incorporate new information and understanding of:

- how social, cultural, economic and environmental systems have responded and
- whether we are on track to meet the plan nitrate limits.

Rec 3.21
That farming land use consents are granted to have common expiry dates to align with plan review stages.

Adapt
Rec 3.22
That Environment Canterbury works with the Waimakariri community and Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga, to respond accordingly to new information, emerging opportunities and technology, and review the Waimakariri section of the Land and Water Regional Plan at least once every 10 years.

Innovation
Rec 3.23
That Environment Canterbury continues to work with sector and research groups to encourage the further development and implementation of tools and techniques to reduce nitrate leaching.

Rec 3.24
That the Zone Committee support the investigation and assessment of on-the-ground actions to address nitrate issues (for example, Managed Aquifer Recharge, targeted stream augmentation, woodchip bioreactors, wetland creation, and water storage), including:

a. That Environment Canterbury undertake a zone-wide study to assess the feasibility, costs and measures required to implement appropriate actions (to be completed by the end of 2019) to inform the development of sub-catchment management plans.
b. That the Waimakariri section of the Land and Water Regional Plan should be assessed to ensure that these activities are enabled where appropriate in the Waimakariri Zone.

Rec 3.25
The Environment Canterbury and Waimakariri District Council explore a funding stream and management structure to deliver the significant improvements in stream health and biodiversity, and mahi kai diversity and abundance for the Waimakariri Water Zone over the next 5-10 years. The option of Targeted Rating Districts should be explored by Environment Canterbury. Industry and government funding partners should also be sought.

D4. RECOMMENDATIONS – MANAGING SURFACE WATER QUANTITY

D4.1 Key Issues
The surface water resource of the Waimakariri Water Zone is a diverse mixture of small spring-fed streams near the coast, and larger hill-fed rivers which drain the front ranges adjacent to the Ashley-Waimakariri Plains. This diversity of resource gives rise to a wide range of issues to be managed.

In addition, there are two regional plans which address the management of different parts of the zone. Currently the requirements of these plans do not align, and this adds a layer of complexity to the current issues.
Notwithstanding these complexities, there are four key issues which need to be considered.

**Environmental Flow Regime requirements in a diverse Zone**

In setting environmental flow regimes for the Waimakariri Water Zone, the committee’s recommendations for minimum flows and allocation limits must balance the available technical information on effects with the needs of water users. In recommending new minimum flows and allocation limits, the committee has taken into consideration flows for – cultural, indigenous and introduced ecology, recreation, reliability for abstractors, other (e.g. amenity dilution, non-consumptive takes). The way in which these contributing factors is accounted for differs depending on whether the water way is spring-fed, or hill-fed.

**Spring-fed streams**

The water resource in catchments which rely on spring-fed streams is a product of groundwater levels in the surrounding area. Flow in these spring-fed streams tends to decline as groundwater levels decline during summer, hence water users tend to experience declining reliability as the summer progresses. Relatively large rainfall events are required to increase flows for a sustained period.

Naturally such streams have high base flows, but limited flow variability. Minimum flows are important to ensure that sufficient water remains in the waterway during the summer months, to provide a refuge for fish, and to moderate the increase in water temperature caused by shallow flow in summer months.

**Hill-fed streams**

The water resource in catchments which rely on hill-fed streams is a product of rainfall and runoff from the surrounding hills. The hill catchments for rivers such as Ashley River/Rakahuri and Cust River sit east of the Southern Alps/Kā Tiritiri o te Moana. They therefore receive less rainfall than rivers such as the Waimakariri River, both in terms of total amount and frequency of storms. As such these rivers tend to be flashy, with flows increasing quickly after rainfall and decreasing quickly once the rainfall has stopped. A lack of storage in lakes and wetlands adds to the flashy nature of the catchment.

These rivers can be challenging for water users needing reliable irrigation water, although storage may be an option where consents allow water to be taken at high flows.

**Stream depleting groundwater abstractions**

Groundwater abstraction can influence flows in nearby streams, an effect referred to as stream depletion. The magnitude of this effect is dependent on the rate of pumping from the groundwater, the distance from the waterbody and characteristics of the aquifer being pumped. If groundwater is closely linked to surface water, the effect can be mitigated at times of low flow by ceasing abstraction. This means that low flows in streams can receive some protection by turning off stream depleting groundwater abstractions.

To quantify the stream depletion effect, the Land and Water Regional Plan sets a methodology which calculates the depletion effect based on the take being pumped at its average rate for 150 days (and maximum rate for 7 days). This calculation quantifies the cumulative effect of a season’s worth of abstraction and is applied throughout most of Canterbury.

The Waimakariri River Regional Plan has an older methodology to calculate stream depletion effect calculated over 30 days of pumping. Both methodologies indicate how connected a groundwater take is to river or stream and are used to define whether a groundwater take requires a minimum flow and should be treated in the same way as surface water abstractions.

The 150-day stream depletion test is a more accurate estimate of the stream depletion effect and consequently provides a higher level of protection to rivers and streams. It also means that more groundwater abstractions in the part of the zone currently managed by the WRRP, are counted as being stream depleting. These newly identified stream depleting groundwater abstractions will have a reduction in reliability of supply as they will have minimum flows imposed on them at times of low flow. Previously these abstractions would have been unrestricted even when nearby streams were experiencing low flows.

The Zone Committee supports the Land and Water Regional Plan stream depletion regime applying to the whole Waimakariri Water Zone, and for the Land and Water Regional rules to replace the Waimakariri River Regional Plan rules in the zone.

**Over allocation**

Six Surface Water Allocation Zones are overallocated, against current plan limits, which means that consents have been issued which equate to more than the allocation limit set for the catchment (Table 4.1).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stream/River</th>
<th>Allocation limit</th>
<th>Total water allocated</th>
<th>Over-allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashley River/Rakahuri (A block)</td>
<td>700 L/s</td>
<td>1,095 L/s</td>
<td>395 L/s 56 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saltwater Creek*</td>
<td>408 L/s</td>
<td>505 L/s</td>
<td>97 L/s 24 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikuku Stream*</td>
<td>460 L/s</td>
<td>983 L/s</td>
<td>523 L/s 114 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taranaki Creek*</td>
<td>61 L/s</td>
<td>275 L/s</td>
<td>214 L/s 351 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cust River</td>
<td>290 L/s</td>
<td>366 L/s</td>
<td>76 L/s 26 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cust Main Drain</td>
<td>690 L/s</td>
<td>804 L/s</td>
<td>114 L/s 17 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - The allocation limit for these waterways has been incorrectly calculated. See D4.2 for further details

Table 4.1 – Overallocation against current plan limits

The issue of over-allocation has occurred for several reasons which include ongoing development of limits which are applied to existing water rights and the improving understanding of how stream-depleting groundwater takes are connected to surface waterways.

Over-allocation increases the potential effects of water abstraction and to prevent these effects it should be recovered. This is backed-up by the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management, which requires overallocation be addressed.

Due to a lack of site specific testing across the zone, a desktop analysis is undertaken to estimate the potential stream depletion effect under the Land and Water Regional Plan regime. The stream depletion model uses a number of assumptions that are considered the worst case for surface water bodies. One consequence of the assessment is that some rivers (including those in Table 4.1) may become more allocated than they are under the Waimakariri River Regional Plan regime and the estimate of over-allocation may increase.

It is acknowledged that the actual stream depletion effect and therefore the true extent of over-allocation can only be determined through site specific bore testing that is required on replacement of consents as part of the application.

The Zone Committee supports reducing over-allocation. In addition, it does not wish to see new consents granted if estimates of the total allocation are proven incorrect due to (more accurate) site-specific assessments of stream depletion.

**Water users dependant on spring-fed streams**

In total, water users hold consent to take 4,600 L/s from spring-fed streams. The greatest number of these users is located towards the east, where other sources of water are limited and therefore users are dependant on spring-fed streams for their water.

The flow in these streams comes from groundwater, and in turn groundwater is fed from four main sources: (1) recharge from the Ashley River/Rakahuri and the Waimakariri River, (2) recharge from rain falling on the plains (3) irrigation water which is applied but is not taken up by plants, and (4) leakage from the water race infrastructure which is used to convey water to users. Any changes to the amount of water coming from these four sources can have an impact on the amount of water available in spring-fed streams.

Groundwater modelling has been used to assess how reductions in these four main water sources would change flows in spring-fed streams. This work focussed on reductions in irrigation water recharge, because this is likely to occur as farmers implement Plan Change 5, and reductions in water race leakage, because it is possible that this may be undertaken in the future, as pressure increases on the available water resource.
Spring-fed streams close to the Ashley or Waimakariri Rivers were found to be relatively insensitive to these changes, as much of their flow comes from losses out of these major rivers and not from irrigation recharge or water race leakage. The spring-fed streams further away from the main rivers were found to be more sensitive to these changes, with modelled reduction in flow of up to 16%. The Custom Main Drain is particularly sensitive to this effect.

For users of water taken from spring-fed streams it is important that they consider how they would manage their operations if the modelled reductions in flow were to occur. Similarly, the zone committee needs to consider what management recommendations are required to manage the effect on water reliability and to protect the wider values associated with the spring-fed watercourses in a future with reduced flows in spring-fed streams.

**D4.2 Rationale**

**Setting the Environmental Flow Regime**

The environment flow regime used to manage water use in the Waimakariri Water Zone at present is relatively simple. It has three main components which are applied to each of the 16 Surface Water Allocation Zones (SWAZ), these components being:

1. A minimum flow – This is the river flow (in litres per second) below which all abstractions must cease
2. An allocation limit – The total amount of water (in litres per second) that is available to be taken from a river, and
3. Partial restrictions – These reduce water takes as the river approaches its minimum flow, to prevent the minimum flow from being breached because of abstraction

The zone committee has determined that this type of regime be continued, but each of the component parts be reconsidered to make sure they contribute towards the committee’s community outcomes.

There are currently areas of the zone which are not covered by SWAZ, and therefore not covered by a published environmental flow regime. At present any application to take water in these areas is dealt with on a case by case basis with the applicant required to demonstrate how the take will avoid effects on the environment.

The zone committee has determined that these gaps need to be infilled, either by extending existing SWAZ, or by creating new SWAZ.

**Minimum flows**

The zone committee have examined each of the existing minimum flows in terms of how they contribute towards meeting the values held for each SWAZ. Where this was found to be deficient, options for a new minimum flow were considered. To assist the zone committee in choosing a new minimum flow, studies were provided which detail the ecological and cultural minimum flows. These documents define, in isolation from all other factors, the most appropriate minimum flow for ecological or cultural purposes. The zone committee then considered other information sources, such as economic assessments and water-user feedback, before making its minimum flow recommendations.

**Allocation limits**

As with minimum flows, the zone committee has examined each of the existing allocation limits in terms of how they contribute towards meeting the values held for each SWAZ. There are less robust metrics by which to judge appropriate allocation levels than there are for minimum flows. Notwithstanding this, the zone committee has reviewed available ecological estimates and weighed these against the current amount of water allocated, the potential for future demand, and the economic effects of removing water from the allocation system.

The zone committee were also asked, via the cultural assessment (COMAR), to consider opportunities to provide an allocation for mahinga kai purposes in catchments where water was unallocated within the existing limits. The zone committee have recommended such an allocation be provided for the Cam River/Ruatanewha, and from the Ashley River/Rakahuri B and C blocks.

In setting allocation limits the zone committee were mindful of the community outcomes, in particular for the improvement of water quality and quantity in spring-fed streams to maintain or improve mahinga kai gathering and diverse aquatic life, and to have highly reliable irrigation water, to a target of 95%.

Without a source of new water these outcomes are potentially conflicting, and the committee have tried to balance the needs of both outcomes.

To this end two general approaches have been adopted. Where catchments are overallocated the committee have decided to maintain the current plan allocation limits and focus efforts on recovering overallocation. Recovering the overallocation has benefits to water quality and quantity. It will improve reliability for users, by reducing the amount of water being taken. The second approach applies to catchments which are under allocated against current
plan limits. In this case the committee propose to reduce the allocation limit to the level of current allocation. This approach does not necessarily improve water quality and quantity, but because these streams are deemed to be degraded at the current level of abstraction it will prevent further degradation by uptake of the remaining allocation. Similarly, the effect on reliability is to prevent reliability for existing users dropping away from the 95% target, by preventing new users taking water.

**Partial restrictions**

Partial restrictions require the gradual or stepped reduction of water use, as the river approaches its minimum flow. This prevents the river from being drawn below its minimum flow by consent holders taking their full entitlement. Such restrictions are common place in modern environmental management regimes, but were often missing in older consents, some of which are still active today. The zone committee want to ensure that these are implemented across the Waimakariri Water Zone.

**Resource Consent Reviews**

The RMA sets out circumstances when conditions in resource consents can be reviewed prior to the expiry date. These include (amongst other things) when a regional plan has been made operative which sets rules relating to flows or use of water.

The Zone Committee supports the review of conditions in water permits to align with its proposed flow and allocation limits where this will provide an environmental benefit and would like provision made for this in Canterbury Regional Council’s Long-Term Plan. The committee has recommended undertaking a review of consents in the Ashley River/ Rakahuri catchment between 2026 and 2027 and in the Northern Waimakariri Tributaries between 2028 and 2029. However, it would consider supporting an earlier review if sufficient advance notice was given to consent holders.

The decision whether to undertake a review of some or all consents ultimately rests with Council and will take into consideration factors such as the environmental benefits that will result, legal compliance, cost implications and support from consent holders.

**Preventing and Phasing Out Over-allocation**

As part of developing this Solutions Programme several catchments with overallocation issues have been identified. These are Ashley River/Rakahuri (A block), Saltwater Creek, Waikuku Stream, Taranaki Creek, Cust River and Cust Main Drain.

The NPSFM requires regional councils to avoid future overallocation and phase out existing over-allocation within a defined timeframe. The zone committee’s first step towards addressing over-allocation is to cap allocation limits and prevent further allocation from occurring. The committee wants to prioritise approaches that reduce paper over-allocation, that is, water that is allocated but not actually used.

Earlier in 2018, the zone committee discussed several approaches to addressing over-allocation with consent holders to get their feedback. This has informed the zone committee’s recommendations on phasing out overallocation which are set out below.

- **Prohibit water takes which exceed the plan allocation limit**

This approach is consistent with the position in the Land and Water Regional Plan which in most circumstances prohibit new applications to take water above an allocation limit (exceptions include takes for community water supplies).

- **Switches from surface water and shallow groundwater to deep groundwater**

This would allow river takes and stream depleting groundwater takes in over-allocated catchments to substitute surface water and stream depleting groundwater takes for deep groundwater. This would help address over allocation by reducing abstraction pressure on rivers. It is difficult to predict how much over-allocation will be reduced by because feasibility depends on the availability of deep groundwater in the area. Additional costs associated with pumping may also limit uptake.

A condition of access would be the surrender of the river take or stream depleting groundwater take and there being no increase in the consented rate of take or annual volume. A portion of the remaining groundwater allocation would be ring-fenced for this purpose only. A timeframe by which this option “closes” could be added to spur action sooner rather than later.

- **Percentage reduction in allocation on replacement of consents**

The Land and Water Regional Plan provides a region-wide default position if methods to reduce over-allocation are not specified in the Waimakariri sub-region section of the Land and Water Regional Plan. Replacement consents receive no more than 90% of the previously consented rate of take and annual or seasonal volume, but the reduction can be moderated depending on the efficiency of existing water use. This
approach could continue to apply or a modified version of it.

- **Prohibiting or restricting site to site water permit transfers**

  The Land and Water Regional Plan already contains policy for the Ashley River/Rakahuri catchment that there shall be no transfers of river water takes in the catchment above SH1. This option could extend this to transfers of river water takes anywhere in the catchment and prohibit all transfers entirely or require that a proportion of any transferred water is surrendered back to the environment. An economic downside of prohibiting transfers entirely is that it does not support the most efficient use of water.

  Additionally, prohibiting the transfer of any unexercised water permit, or of any unused water based on actual use records for the last five years would reduce the risk of further abstraction from over-allocated rivers.

- **Voluntary surrender of water permits**

  This approach would ask consent holders if there are any active consents that are not being exercised they are willing to surrender prior to their expiry. Any surrendered water would not be reallocated.

- **Not re-allocating lapsed, surrendered or expired consents**

  Reducing over-allocation would be assisted by not reallocating water attached to consents that lapse (are not given effect to within 3 years), are surrendered or expire and are not renewed.

- **Allocation of water for irrigation considers records of actual water use**

  Several studies generally agree that on average 40-60% of consented allocation gets used on a volumetric basis. However, water use is not straightforward. It is influenced by several factors including the total consented allocation, climate, on-farm practices, farm systems and availability of water. In periods of restriction, water use will be reduced even at times when demand is high.

  When new consents for irrigation are assessed or existing consents replaced, Schedule 10 to the Land and Water Regional Plan (Reasonable Use Test) requires that annual volumes are based on efficient irrigation (application efficiency 80%) and volumes sufficient to meet demand conditions in nine out of 10 years.

  Schedule 10 provides three methods for determining the seasonal irrigation demand: records of past use or; a field validated model that predicts the annual irrigation volume within an accuracy of 15% or; a methodology set out in the schedule itself.

  Given studies indicate that on average only 40-60% of water is used, allocating water based on records of actual use appears attractive. This may be a long-term option. However, at present we have a relatively short record of actual use and there have been issues with the quality of metered data received so far.

  As a first step, the zone committee recommends that actual water use data is taken into account when determining an allocation for replacement consents. It also recommends that Environment Canterbury investigates and reports on how metered use compares to consented allocation within the zone.

- **Water User Groups (share water when availability restricted)**

  The zone committee supports the establishment of surface water user groups in over-allocated catchments. These groups can be effective at enabling permit holders to share water allocations when takes are operating under partial restrictions (required by the Land and Water Regional Plan) and users are unable to take their full consented allocation.

- **Offset mitigations in short term**

  It may take some years to reduce over-allocation. Offset mitigations such as riparian plantings for shade and reducing water temperature could be fast forwarded within highly allocated catchments as part of the zone committee’s programme of developing Catchment Management Plans.

- **River flow augmentation**

  The zone committee supports the introduction of augmentation water that could offset the effects of over allocation and assist with addressing elevated nitrate concentrations in some rivers. For example, the Waimakariri River Regional Plan includes provisions that enable the augmentation of the Cust River with water from the Waimakariri River to protect and enhance stream values. Environment Canterbury is investigating whether the water allocated for this purpose remains available for use. The Land and Water Regional Plan does not contain specific provisions that enable augmentation.

- **Consent Review**

  There is an expectation that regional plans will be implemented, and reviews of resource consent conditions are, in some situations, an appropriate tool to do this. This could include reviewing water permits to align with new flow and allocation regimes and to address overallocation. The alternative is to
implement new conditions upon application for replacement water permits.

**Rationale specific to the Ashley River/Rakahuri and tributaries**

Because of the diversity of surface water quantity issues the zone committee was required to assess issues on a SWAZ by SWAZ basis and develop environmental flow regimes which contribute towards addressing these issues.

**Rationale for allocation limit methodology correction**

Environment Canterbury are taking the opportunity created by this planning process to correct an historical error associated with the allocation limits stated in the Land and Water Regional Plan for Saltwater Creek, Waikuku Stream, Little Ashley Creek and Taranaki Creek.

During the writing of the Land and Water Regional Plan, and its predecessor the Natural Resources Regional Plan, surface water allocations were generally set by summing the maximum rate of take for each consent granted. The sum was then used as the allocation limit.

However, at the time of writing those plans an alternate method for calculating allocation limits was also being considered, and in the case of the rivers listed above this alternative method was used in error.

The alternative method was to sum the average rate of take for each consent, not the maximum rate. This was because in general consent holders rarely use all their consented maximum rate and therefore the actual water being used at any one time could be more accurately assessed as the average rate of take, rather than the maximum as stated on the consent document. Average rate was calculated by dividing the consented volume by the period in which the consent allows the volume to be used. For instance, a consent may state a volume of 10,000 m³ can be used every 14 days. In this example the average rate would be 8 L/s.

The justification for the maximum rate method being the ‘correct’ methodology was that although it was typical that consent holders would not use all their maximum rate, because they have consent to do so, there is nothing that could be done to stop them and therefore the sum of the maximum rates of take was the actual water allowed to be taken.

Across Canterbury the maximum rate method was adopted to determine allocation limits. This was not the case for the spring-fed tributaries of the Ashley River/Rakahuri; the allocation limits for these rivers were developed based on the average take methodology.

This process provides an opportunity to bring these waterways into line with the rest of the region by adopting allocation limits based on the sum of the maximum rate of takes. To provide limits which are equitable with limits set elsewhere, it is proposed that the sum of the maximum rate of takes at 1st January 2002 be used to set the limits. This is the date used to set the current Land and Water Regional Plan limits.

Table 4.2 shows the allocation limits for each SWAZ, based on the average and maximum rate of take at 1st January 2002.

It is accepted that there are a range of further methods which could be used to set alternative allocation limits, such as taking an approach to determine ecological or culturally appropriate limits. The maximum rate approach has been adopted in this case because of the significant over-allocation present in the affected catchments which makes reduction to lower limits challenging. The fixing of previous errors, and the positioning of these catchments on a similar basis with the rest of the zone is seen as a positive step in the journey of improving management of these catchments.
Allocation limit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waterway</th>
<th>Average rate methodology</th>
<th>Maximum rate Methodology (Recommended)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saltwater Creek</td>
<td>408 L/s</td>
<td>417 L/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikuku Stream</td>
<td>460 L/s</td>
<td>831 L/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Ashley Creek</td>
<td>172 L/s</td>
<td>344 L/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taranaki Creek</td>
<td>61 L/s</td>
<td>149 L/s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 – Allocation limits by method

Regardless of the numbers used for allocation limits (table 4.2) the intent of the proposed management regime is that no further water be allocated, and that the over allocation be recovered.

Table 4.2 shows that the revised allocation limits are higher than the current Land and Water Regional Plan limits. Except for Little Ashley Creek, these waterways are over-allocated against both the current and revised allocation limits. The effect of correcting the plan limits is that no further water can be allocated. It does, however, reduce the size of the overallocation which is to be recovered.

Little Ashley Creek is currently under-allocated and as such there is the risk that the revised allocation limit could allow more water to be allocated. To prevent this the zone committee is seeking to adopt a ‘cap at current allocated water’ approach, rather than adopting the revised limit (see D4.3).

General rationale

The rationale for the zone committee’s other recommendations for the Ashley River/Rakahuri and tributaries is provided in Table 4.3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Surface Water Allocation Zone (SWAZ)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Proposed Environmental Flow Regime</strong></th>
<th><strong>Rationale</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ashley River/Rakahuri (A Block)</strong></td>
<td>Current minimum flow not changed:</td>
<td>Current minimum flow was set to prevent abstractions from exacerbating the natural occurrence of dry reaches and this remains the key driver. Allocation block is over-allocated, and focus is the recovery of over-allocation. Many old consents have lower minimum flows, and do not have partial restrictions and just moving to the current plan rules will have a large impact on their operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan – Jul 2,500 L/s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aug – Nov 4,000 L/s Dec 3,000 L/s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current allocation limit of 700 L/s to be kept. SWAZ is over-allocated Phase out over-allocation by 2032.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ashley River/Rakahuri (B Block)</strong></td>
<td>Current minimum flow not changed:</td>
<td>Any increase to the minimum flow would have significant impacts upon the already poor reliability of takes. The allocation size is being reduced to minimise the risk to flow variability in the future. An allocation for mahinga kai enhancement is proposed. While anyone could seek consent to take this water, it would need to be for mahinga kai enhancement, and co-managed by Environment Canterbury and Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan – Jul 3,200 L/s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aug – Nov 4,700 L/s Dec 3,700 L/s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current allocation limit of 500 L/s to be reduced to the current allocation at date of plan notification + an allocation for mahinga kai enhancement. An allocation for mahinga kai enhancement shall be available equal to 50 % of the available allocation at plan notification.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ashley River/Rakahuri (C Block)</strong></td>
<td>Current minimum flow of 6,000 L/s not changed</td>
<td>Any increase to the minimum flow would have significant impacts upon the already poor reliability of takes. The reduction in the B block allocation limit provides a gap between the B and C blocks. It is being reduced to minimise the risk to flow variability in the future. An allocation for mahinga kai enhancement is proposed. While anyone could seek consent to take this water, it would need to be for mahinga kai enhancement, and co-managed by Environment Canterbury and Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current allocation limit of 3,000 L/s to be reduced to the current allocation at date of plan notification (294 L/s at Nov 2017) + an allocation for mahinga kai enhancement. An allocation for mahinga kai enhancement shall be available equal to 50 % of the available allocation at plan notification.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 – Rationale for the Ashley River/Rakahuri and tributaries
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface Water Allocation Zone (SWAZ)</th>
<th>Proposed Environmental Flow Regime</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Saltwater Creek</strong></td>
<td>Current minimum flow of 100 L/s to be maintained and increased to 148 L/s in 2032. Current allocation limit of 408 L/s to be maintained but adjusted to reflect the correct methodology. It is now 417 L/s. SWAZ is over-allocated. Phase out over-allocation by 2032. Partial restrictions are required for all surface water takes. No B block is currently available, and this is to be maintained.</td>
<td>There is a lack of partial restrictions on consents in this catchment. The requirement to adopt these will have a large impact and it was felt that the cumulative effect of this and a higher minimum flow would impact users too much. A higher minimum flow is proposed for 2032 to give users time to prepare. The partial restrictions will keep more water in the river and prevent it from being drawn below the minimum flow. Allocation limit was not reduced given the significant work required to recover over-allocation. If any gains can be made in removing allocation from the system then this will not be reallocated, maximising the benefits to the stream, and to the Ashley Estuary (Te Aka Aka) B blocks which allow the taking of high flow water are generally not suitable for spring-fed streams and are not supported here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waikuku Stream</strong></td>
<td>Current minimum flow of 100 L/s (Mon-Fri) and 150 L/s (Sat-Sun) to be increased to 150 L/s at all times. Current allocation limit of 460 L/s to be maintained but adjusted to reflect the correct methodology. It is now 831 L/s. SWAZ is over-allocated. Phase out over-allocation by 2032. No B block is currently available, and this is to be maintained.</td>
<td>Waikuku Stream is an important contributor to Ashley Estuary (Te Aka Aka) and a fish refuge in times of low flow in the Ashley River/Rakahuri. The minimum flow has been increased to reflect this. Subject to monitoring, the Zone Committee would like consideration given to increasing the minimum flow to 250 L/s as a future goal for the next plan change. Allocation limit was not reduced given significant work to recover over-allocation. If any gains can be made in removing allocation from the system then this will not be reallocated, maximising the benefits to the stream, and to the Ashley Estuary (Te Aka Aka). B blocks which allow the taking of high flow water are generally not suitable for spring-fed streams and are not supported here.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 – Rationale for the Ashley River/Rakahuri and tributaries
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface Water Allocation Zone (SWAZ)</th>
<th>Proposed Environmental Flow Regime</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Little Ashley Creek</td>
<td>Current minimum flow of 50 L/s and 30 L/s (4 days per month) to be increased to 50 L/s at all times. Current allocation limit of 172 L/s to be reduced to the current allocation at date of plan notification (42 L/s at Nov 2017) No B block is currently available, and this is to be maintained</td>
<td>The variable minimum flow allowed flood irrigation to occur. This outdated irrigation technique is no longer practiced in the catchment and so the rule is not required. Significant water remains available in the allocation block, yet no areas of land are available to irrigate. The creek is a contributor of flow to Waikuku Stream and Ashley Estuary (Te Aka Aka) and hence the Committee have capped the allocation to avoid adverse effects from future use. B blocks which allow the taking of high flow water are generally not suitable for spring-fed streams and are not supported here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taranaki Creek</td>
<td>Current minimum flow of 120 L/s is to be kept Current allocation limit of 61 L/s to be maintained but adjusted to reflect the correct methodology. It is now 149 L/s Phase out over-allocation by 2032. SWAZ is over-allocated. Partial restrictions are required for all surface water takes. No B block is currently available, and this is to be maintained.</td>
<td>Ecological and cultural recommendations were for the minimum flow to stay at 120 L/s. Allocation limit was not reduced given significant work to recover over-allocation. If any gains can be made in removing allocation from the system then this will not be reallotted, maximising the benefits to the stream, and to the Ashley Estuary (Te Aka Aka). B blocks which allow the taking of high flow water are generally not suitable for spring-fed streams and are not supported here.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 – Rationale for the Ashley River/Rakahuri and tributaries

Rationale specific to the Northern Waimakariri Tributaries

The zone committee assessed issues on a Surface Water Allocation Zone basis and developed environmental flow regimes which contribute towards addressing these issues. Provided below (Table 4.4) is a brief summary of the zone committee’s rationale for each SWAZ.

Rationale specific to the Kaiapoi River through the town of Kaiapoi.

The Kaiapoi River is the ultimate receiving environment of the northern Waimakariri Tributaries but differs from them in acting as an estuary or hāpua with long water and sediment residence times. The issues within the Kaiapoi River are therefore more complex and demanding than simply treating individual contributing catchments on an individual SWAZ by SWAZ basis and developing environmental flow regimes for each of them. This may require consideration of further measures to halt or reverse the degraded features that detract from the development of Kaiapoi as a notable river town.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface Water Allocation Zone (SWAZ)</th>
<th>Proposed Environmental Flow Regime</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cam River/Ruataniwha</td>
<td>Current minimum flow of 1,000 L/s to be kept, with a future goal of 1,200 L/s.</td>
<td>The minimum flow was originally set to dilute sewage from Rangiora. It is higher than a ‘typical’ ecological flow recommendation. That said there are significant issues with the river which would be made worse by lowering the minimum flow. The Committee have recommended to keep it as its current level but would like to see it increased in the long term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current allocation limit of 700 L/s to be reduced to the current allocation at date of plan notification (278 L/s at Nov 2017) + an allocation for mahinga kai enhancement.</td>
<td>The allocation block is to be reduced to current allocation levels, to prevent further degradation of the river, without impacting current water users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An allocation for mahinga kai enhancement shall be available equal to 50 % of the available allocation at date of plan notification.</td>
<td>An allocation for mahinga kai enhancement is proposed. While anyone could seek consent to take this water, it would need to be for mahinga kai enhancement, and co-managed by Environment Canterbury and Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The current B block is to be removed meaning no B block water will be available unless investigations show that a sustainable B block can be provided.</td>
<td>B blocks which allow the taking of high flow water are generally not suitable for spring-fed streams and are not supported unless strong evidence demonstrates a sustainable B Block can be provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Brook</td>
<td>Current minimum flow of 530 L/s to be increased to 560 L/s, with a future goal of 590 L/s.</td>
<td>Minimum flow increased to the ecological recommendation to improve the habitats available in the river during low flows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current allocation limit of 200 L/s to be reduced to the current allocation at date of plan notification (190 L/s at Nov 2017).</td>
<td>The allocation size is being reduced to minimise the risk to flow variability in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The current B block is to be removed meaning no B block water will be available unless investigations show that a sustainable B block can be provided.</td>
<td>B blocks which allow the taking of high flow water are not suitable for spring-fed streams and are not supported unless strong evidence demonstrates that a sustainable B Block can be provided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 – Rationale for the Northern Waimakariri Tributaries
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface Water Allocation Zone (SWAZ)</th>
<th>Proposed Environmental Flow Regime</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Middle Brook</strong></td>
<td>Current minimum flow of 60 L/s to kept Current allocation limit of 30 L/s to be kept. The current B block is to be removed meaning no B block water will be available unless investigations show that a sustainable B block can be provided.</td>
<td>The flow regime is not being changed for this SWAZ and changes would have a large impact on the viability of take. B blocks which allow the taking of high flow water are not suitable for spring-fed streams and are not supported unless strong evidence demonstrates a sustainable B Block can be provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Brook</strong></td>
<td>Current minimum flow of 140 L/s is to be increased to 155 L/s, with a future goal of 170 L/s. Current allocation limit of 100 L/s to be reduced to the current allocation at date of plan notification (24 L/s at Nov 2017). The current B block is to be removed meaning no B block water will be available unless investigations show that a sustainable B block can be provided.</td>
<td>Minimum flow increased to a high level of habitat protection to improve the habitats available in the river during low flows. The allocation size is being reduced to minimise the risk to flow variability in the future. B blocks which allow the taking of high flow water are not suitable for spring-fed streams and are not supported unless strong evidence demonstrates a sustainable B Block can be provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cust River</strong></td>
<td>Current A block minimum flow of 20 L/s is to be increased to 60 L/s. Current allocation limit of 290 L/s to be kept SWAZ is over-allocated Phase out over-allocation by 2032 Current B block minimum flow of 310 L/s is to be kept B Block allocation limit is currently ‘unlimited’. Environment Canterbury will investigate a sustainable B allocation limit prior to plan notification.</td>
<td>The A block allocation is over-allocated and so efforts are to be focused on reducing the over-allocation. If these efforts result in reductions of allocation below the limit, then no new consents will be issued. This keeps the returned water in the river. The Cust River is hill-fed and hence a B Block can be supported. The zone committee propose that a suitable limit for the B block be investigated and included in the notified plan change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Cust Main Drain

Current minimum flow of 230 L/s is to be kept  
Current allocation limit of 690 L/s to be kept  
SWAZ is over-allocated  
Phase out over-allocation by 2032  
The current B block is to be removed meaning no B block water will be available unless investigations show that a sustainable B block can be provided.

Minimum flow and allocation are to be kept the same as the current regime.  
Takes from the river are well managed, but the river is over-allocated.  
The A block allocation is over-allocated and so efforts are to be focused on reducing the over-allocation. If these efforts result in reductions of allocation below the limit, then no new consents will be issued. This keeps the returned water in the river  
B blocks which allow the taking of high flow water are not suitable for spring-fed streams and are not supported here unless strong evidence demonstrates a sustainable B Block can be provided.

### Table 4.4 – Rationale for the Northern Waimakariri Tributaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface Water Allocation Zone (SWAZ)</th>
<th>Proposed Environmental Flow Regime</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **No.7 Drain**                      | Current minimum flow of 60 L/s is to be kept.  
Current allocation limit of 130 L/s to be reduced to the current allocation at plan notification (85 L/s at Nov 2017).  
The current B block is to be removed meaning no B block water will be available unless investigations show that a sustainable B block can be provided. | Minimum flow is to be kept the same as the current regime.  
The allocation size is being reduced to minimise the risk to flow variability in the future.  
B blocks which allow the taking of high flow water are not suitable for spring-fed streams and are not supported here unless strong evidence demonstrates a sustainable B Block can be provided. |
| **Ohoka Stream**                    | Current minimum flow of 300 L/s is to be increased to 420 L/s  
Current allocation limit of 500 L/s to be retained.  
SWAZ is predicted to be over-allocated in the future.  
Phase out over-allocation by 2032.  
The current B block is to be removed meaning no B block water will be available unless investigations show that a sustainable B block can be provided. | Minimum flow is to be increased to a level which better protects the ecology of the stream.  
This SWAZ is currently under-allocated but a change from the WRRP to the LWRP stream depletion regime is predicted to result in this catchment becoming over-allocated.  
B blocks which allow the taking of high flow water are not suitable for spring-fed streams and are not supported unless strong evidence demonstrates a sustainable B Block can be provided. |
Silverstream - Current minimum flow of 600 L/s is to be increased to 900 L/s, with a future goal of 1,200 L/s. Current allocation limit of 1,000 L/s to be reduced to the current allocation at plan notification (432 L/s at Nov 2017). The current B block is to be removed meaning no B block water will be available unless investigations show that a sustainable B block can be provided.

Subject to monitoring, the Zone Committee would like consideration given to increasing the minimum flow to 1200 L/s as a future goal for the next plan change. This would further increase the protection for instream ecology and increasing contribution to the Kaiapoi River during low flows.

The allocation size is being reduced to minimise the risk to flow variability in the future.

B blocks which allow the taking of high flow water are not suitable for spring-fed streams and are not supported unless strong evidence demonstrates a sustainable B Block can be provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface Water Allocation Zone (SWAZ)</th>
<th>Proposed Environmental Flow Regime</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Courtenay Stream</td>
<td>Current minimum flow of 260 L/s is to be increased to 330 L/s. Current allocation limit of 140 L/s to be reduced to the current allocation at plan notification (128 L/s at Nov 2017). The current B block is to be removed meaning no B block water will be available unless investigations show that a sustainable B block can be provided.</td>
<td>Minimum flow is to be increased to a level which better protects the ecology of the stream. Subject to monitoring, the Zone Committee would like consideration given to increasing the minimum flow to 400 L/s as a future goal for the next plan change, further increasing the protection for instream ecology and increasing contribution to the Kaiapoi River during low flows. The allocation size is being reduced to minimise the risk to flow variability in the future. B blocks which allow the taking of high flow water are not suitable for spring-fed streams and are not supported here unless strong evidence demonstrates a sustainable B Block can be provided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 – Rationale for the Northern Waimakariri Tributaries
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Current Conditions</th>
<th>Proposed Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Greigs Drain</strong></td>
<td>Current minimum flow of 150 L/s is to be increased to 230 L/s.</td>
<td>Minimum flow is to be increased to a level which better protects the ecology of the stream.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current allocation limit of 70 L/s to be reduced to the current allocation at plan notification (46 L/s at Nov 2017).</td>
<td>The allocation size is being reduced to minimise the risk to flow variability in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The current B block is to be removed meaning no B block water will be available unless investigations show that a sustainable B block can be provided.</td>
<td>B blocks which allow the taking of high flow water are not suitable for spring-fed streams and are not supported unless strong evidence demonstrates a sustainable B Block can be provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>McIntosh/Kairaki</strong></td>
<td>No surface water allocation block.</td>
<td>To protect the important wetland/lagoon complex here the zone committee propose no surface water be available for allocation. Groundwater takes are permitted, so long as they have a low, or no, stream depleting effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eyre River</strong></td>
<td>No surface water allocation block.</td>
<td>This area has no permanently flowing waterways and therefore the assigning of a surface water block is problematic. Therefore, it is proposed that there be no surface water block available in this SWAZ. All takes would be assigned to the groundwater allocation block.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upper Eyre River</strong></td>
<td>Minimum flow – 54 L/s Allocation limit of 66.5 L/s</td>
<td>Minimum flow is to be kept the same as the current regime. The allocation size is being reduced to minimise the risk to flow variability in the future and will be capped at the current level of allocation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.4 – Rationale for the Northern Waimakariri Tributaries**

**Aligned with Community Outcomes**

The following recommendations for managing surface water quantity align with the following community outcomes:

- The water quality and quantity of spring-fed streams maintains or improves mahinga kai gathering and diverse aquatic life.
- The Ashley River/Rakahuri is safe for contact recreation, has improved river habitat, fish passage, and customary use; and has flows that support natural coastal processes.
- The Waimakariri River as a receiving environment is a healthy habitat for freshwater and coastal species and is protected and managed as an outstanding natural landscape and recreation resource.
- The zone has safe reliable drinking water, preferably from secure sources.
- Indigenous biodiversity in the zone is protected and improved.
- Highly reliable irrigation water, to a target of 95%, is available in the zone.
- Optimal water and nutrient management is common practice.
- There is improved contribution to the regional economy from the zone.
- Land and freshwater management in the Waimakariri Water Zone will, over time support the maintenance of the current high-quality drinking water from Christchurch aquifers.
D4.3 Recommendations – Managing Surface Water Quantity

Recommendations across all of the Waimakariri Water Zone

Rec 4.1
In over-allocated Surface Water Allocation Zones, that Environment Canterbury uses the methods set out in Rec 4.2 to reduce and where possible eliminate the over-allocation by 2032.

Rec 4.2
That Environment Canterbury use the following suite of options to recover over-allocation, prioritising those options which reduce paper allocation.

a. Prohibit any abstraction, other than for community drinking water supplies, where a limit has, or would be, exceeded.

b. Enable the substitution of existing surface water or stream depleting groundwater takes with deep groundwater in over-allocated catchments provided there is no increase in the rate of take or annual volume.

c. In the case of site to site water transfers
   i. Prohibit the transfer of any unexercised water permit, and/or of any unused water from the previous 5 years, based on actual usage records.
   ii. For transfers of water within over-allocated catchments 50% of the transferred water (rate of take and/or annual volume) is to be surrendered unless the water is to be used for a community water supply.
   iii. Retain Land and Water Regional Plan Section 8 policy that there are no transfers of river water takes within the Ashley River/Rakahuri catchment above State Highway 1.

d. That Environment Canterbury identifies water permits that have not been exercised in the past five years and works with consent holders to seek their surrender.

e. Lapsed consents
   i. For any water permit that lapses, is surrendered, or expires and is not renewed, the rate of take and/or annual volume is not reallocated
   ii. Lapse dates on unexercised consents are prevented from being extended except where exceptional extenuating circumstances are demonstrated.

f. Past water use
   i. The Plan Change includes policy direction that records of past water use are assessed and considered when determining an efficient allocation for replacement consents in accordance with Schedule 10.
   ii. That Environment Canterbury reports annually on how metered usage compares to consented allocation within the Waimakariri Water Zone.

g. Region-wide policy in the Land and Water Regional Plan for reducing over allocation by adjusting the allocation on replacement consents applies throughout the whole of the Waimakariri Water Zone, not only within the Ashley River/Rakahuri catchment.

Rec 4.3
That Environment Canterbury applies LWRP requirements for partial restrictions and requires that pro-rata restrictions be applied to all surface water takes, and stream-depleting groundwater takes which require a minimum flow in the zone.

Rec 4.4
That Environment Canterbury adopt the methodology for classifying stream-depleting groundwater takes laid out in Schedule 9 of the Land and Water Regional Plan.

Rec 4.5
That Environment Canterbury remove B allocation blocks from all spring-fed rivers unless further investigations indicate that sustainable B blocks can be supported.

Rec 4.6
That Environment Canterbury extend existing SWAZ and/or introduce new SWAZ to ensure that there are no gaps in the environmental flow regime framework which manages the Waimakariri Water Zone.

Rec 4.7
In currently under-allocated catchments, that Environment Canterbury cap the allocation at the currently allocated amount, so no further surface water can be allocated.

Rec 4.8
That Environment Canterbury support water users to set up water user groups such that the available water resource can be best managed, particularly in times of restriction.

Rec 4.9
Environment Canterbury investigate how takes for community supplies (and, back-up supplies) are...
incorporated into the allocation block system, such that they do not unnecessarily impact on the reliability of takes by other users.

Rec 4.10
The zone committee will prioritise over-allocated catchments in its catchment management plan programme and actively promote the use of non-statutory mitigations to offset the effects of over-allocation.

**Augmentation**

Rec 4.11
That Environment Canterbury ensure:

a. The Plan Change to section 8 of the Land and Water Regional Plan (Waimakariri) includes policies and rules that adequately provide for augmentation of water bodies, including the Cust River, for environmental benefit.

b. Ngā Tūāhuriri Rūnanga are actively involved in any decision-making with other relevant stakeholders regarding water used in the zone for augmentation purposes.

**Water Race Losses**

Rec 4.12

That any changes to the water race network (e.g. race closure or piping) in the Waimakariri Water Zone be subject to wider consideration by Environment Canterbury and Waimakariri District Council, given the existing benefits of race losses in diluting nitrate concentrations, and supporting groundwater levels and stream flows.

**Review of water permits**

Rec 4.13

The zone committee recommends that Environment Canterbury allocates resources to improve monitoring of permitted surface water irrigation takes for compliance with limits in the Land and Water Regional Plan.

Rec 4.14

That in any year it chooses within the date range below, Environment Canterbury considers, prioritises and may undertake a review of water permits to align with any revised environmental flow and allocation regime following the Waimakariri plan change becoming operative:

a. Ashley River/Rakahuri Catchment – between 2026 and 2027

b. Northern Waimakariri Tributaries – between 2028 and 2029

**Recommendations specific to the Ashley/Rakahuri Catchment**

In addition to the zone-wide recommendations provided, the following recommendations are made which apply to SWAZ within the Ashley/Rakahuri Catchment.

Rec 4.15
For the Ashley River/Rakahuri B and C blocks, that Environment Canterbury designate an allocation for mahinga kai enhancement purposes equal to 50% of the water available within the existing block system at plan notification. This allocation would be included in, and subject to, the prevailing management rules for that block (minimum flow and restriction regime).

Rec 4.16

That Environment Canterbury adopt the minimum flow and allocation recommendations in Table 4.5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.5: Ashley River/Rakahuri and Tributaries – Recommended Minimum Flows and Allocations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applying to all SWAZ:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Stream depletion effects estimated using the method laid out in Schedule 9 of the Land and Water Regional Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Partial restrictions applied to all takes on a pro-rata basis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Minimum Flow</th>
<th>Allocation Limit</th>
<th>Allocation status (at Nov 2017)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current plan</td>
<td>From 2023</td>
<td>From 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saltwater Creek SWAZ</td>
<td>A Block</td>
<td>100 l/s</td>
<td>100 l/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikipiri Stream SWAZ</td>
<td>A Block</td>
<td>150 l/s (Nov-Ray)</td>
<td>150 l/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taranski Creek SWAZ</td>
<td>A Block</td>
<td>100 l/s</td>
<td>100 l/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Ashley Creek SWAZ</td>
<td>A Block</td>
<td>50 l/s, 20 l/s 4 days/month</td>
<td>50 l/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashby River / Rakahuri SWAZ</td>
<td>B Block</td>
<td>2500 l/s (Jan-Jul), 4000 l/s (Aug-Nov), 3000 l/s (Dec)</td>
<td>2500 l/s (Jan-Jul), 4000 l/s (Aug-Nov), 3000 l/s (Dec)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C Block</td>
<td>3000 l/s (Jan-Jul), 4700 l/s (Aug-Nov), 3700 l/s (Dec)</td>
<td>3200 l/s (Jan-Jul), 4700 l/s (Aug-Nov), 3700 l/s (Dec)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
* LWRF allocation (noted as being incorrectly calculated).
** Same as 'Current Plan' value after correction for methodology.
† Resulting from revised allocation limit methodology.
Recommendations specific to the Northern Waimakariri Tributaries

In addition to the zone-wide recommendations provided, the following recommendations are made which apply to SWAZ within the Northern Waimakariri Tributaries.

General recommendations

Rec 4.17
For the Cam River/Ruataniwha A block, that Environment Canterbury designate an allocation for mahinga kai enhancement purposes equal to 50% of the water available within the existing block system at plan notification. This allocation would be included in, and subject to, the prevailing management rules for that block (minimum flow and restriction regime).

Rec 4.18
That Environment Canterbury adopt the minimum flow and allocation recommendations in Table 4.6.

Silverstream and Kaiapoi River recommendations

Rec 4.19
In all zone committee proceedings and documentation, the local naming convention is to be adopted:

a. The term ‘Silverstream’ will be used to define the section of watercourse from the springheads to the three streams confluence.
b. The term ‘Kaiapoi River’ will be used to define the section of watercourse from the three streams confluence to the Waimakariri River confluence.

Rec 4.20
Environment Canterbury investigate further actions necessary to reverse the degraded features of the water quality and habitat of the ‘Kaiapoi River’ that detract from its vision of being ‘New Zealand’s best Rivertown’.

Cust River recommendations

Rec 4.21
That Environment Canterbury, along with Ngāi Tūāhuriri, Waimakariri Irrigation Limited and other stakeholders, investigate the potential to create an enduring flow regime for the Cust River. This is to be given effect in the upcoming Waimakariri sub-regional plan change, as part of the minimum flow and allocation recommendations, detailed in Table 4.6, under Rec 4.18.

The regime would provide for improved stream health and habitat availability, noting that:

a. 230 L/s of allocation from the Waimakariri River is already reserved for such purposes in the Waimakariri River Regional Plan and

b. Such a flow regime may result in an increased minimum flow.

Rec 4.22
That Environment Canterbury investigate a sustainable B allocation limit for the Cust River prior to plan notification.
### Table 4.6 Northern Waimakariri Tributaries – Recommended Minimum Flow and Allocation Limits

**Applying to all SWAZ:**

1. Stream depletion effects estimated using the method laid out in Schedule 9 of the Land and Water Regional Plan
2. Partial restrictions applied to all takes on a pro-rata basis
Table 4.6 Northern Waimakariri Tributaries – Recommended Minimum Flow and Allocation Limits

Applying to all SWAZ:

1. Stream depletion effects estimated using the method laid out in Schedule 9 of the Land and Water Regional Plan
2. Partial restrictions applied to all takes on a pro-rata basis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tributary</th>
<th>Current plan</th>
<th>Flow goal</th>
<th>Allocation Limit</th>
<th>Allocation status (Nov 2017)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oiuku Stream SWAZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Block</td>
<td>300 L/s</td>
<td>400 L/s</td>
<td>500 L/s</td>
<td>Allocation available (potentially over-allocated under LARP regime)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Block</td>
<td>500 L/s</td>
<td>See Recommendation 4.5</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>See Recommendation 4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Allocation available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverstream SWAZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Block</td>
<td>500 L/s</td>
<td>900 L/s</td>
<td>1,100 L/s</td>
<td>Allocation available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Block</td>
<td>1,000 L/s</td>
<td>See Recommendation 4.5</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>See Recommendation 4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Allocation available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtney Stream SWAZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Block</td>
<td>250 L/s</td>
<td>350 L/s</td>
<td>400 L/s</td>
<td>Allocation available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Block</td>
<td>500 L/s</td>
<td>See Recommendation 4.5</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>See Recommendation 4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Allocation available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wateg Drain SWAZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Block</td>
<td>150 L/s</td>
<td>250 L/s</td>
<td>70 L/s</td>
<td>Allocation available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Block</td>
<td>250 L/s</td>
<td>See Recommendation 4.5</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>See Recommendation 4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Allocation available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McIntosh/Kairaki SWAZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Block</td>
<td>No minimum flow</td>
<td>No surface water allocation</td>
<td>No plan limit</td>
<td>No surface water allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Block</td>
<td>No minimum flow</td>
<td>No surface water allocation</td>
<td>No plan limit</td>
<td>No surface water allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eros River SWAZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Block</td>
<td>No minimum flow</td>
<td>No surface water allocation</td>
<td>No plan limit</td>
<td>No surface water allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Block</td>
<td>No minimum flow</td>
<td>No surface water allocation</td>
<td>No plan limit</td>
<td>No surface water allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Eros River SWAZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Block</td>
<td>No minimum flow</td>
<td>No surface water allocation</td>
<td>No plan limit</td>
<td>No surface water allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Block</td>
<td>No minimum flow</td>
<td>54 L/s</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>See Recommendation 4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D5. RECOMMENDATIONS – MANAGING GROUNDWATER QUANTITY

D5.1 Key Issues

The Eyre River Groundwater Allocation Zone (GAZ) is fully allocated. Groundwater allocation limits in the Ashley, Cust, Kowai and Loburn GAZs currently allow for further water to be allocated. Increased abstraction could have economic benefits for new water users but could have detrimental impacts on stream flows and on the reliability of existing groundwater and surface water takes. Reduced reliability would have an adverse economic impact.

The technical assessments indicated that groundwater levels in the Eyre River GAZ and flows in some of the watercourses in and adjacent to the Waimakariri Irrigation Ltd (WIL) command area are higher now than they used to be before the irrigation scheme was developed. This is due to additional aquifer recharge associated with race leakage and irrigation losses. Improvements in irrigation efficiency in river-fed irrigation areas (e.g. the WIL command area) under GMP are expected to reduce recharge to the aquifer system and cause flows to decline in some of the spring-fed streams. Modelling indicates that flow could decline significantly in the Cust River and Cust Main Drain. This would impact cultural and ecological values and the reliability of surface water and groundwater takes and compound the effects of increased groundwater abstraction if this is provided for by leaving the current allocation limits unchanged.

Flows measured at the gorge in the Ashley River/Rakahuri have been declining for several decades, most likely due to climatic factors. Groundwater levels and flows in the spring-fed streams are also declining, probably because of reduced groundwater recharge by the Ashley River/Rakahuri. The Lees Valley (where the Ashley River/Rakahuri is sourced) currently has no groundwater allocation limit; this makes the cumulative effects of any future increases in groundwater abstraction on surface water bodies such as the Ashley River/Rakahuri difficult to manage.

Current Groundwater Allocation Zone boundaries terminate at the edge of the plains. This leaves some areas of the zone with no allocation limit and no means by which the cumulative effects of abstraction can be managed.
## D5.2 Rationale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groundwater Allocation Zone (GAZ)</th>
<th>Recommended Allocation Limit</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kowai</strong></td>
<td>Current allocated volume + 10% for additional takes that are not stream depleting</td>
<td>Reduces potential for future increases in groundwater abstraction. Reduces the potential for further declines in Saltwater Creek and local groundwater levels due to new abstraction. Supports current reliability of existing water takes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ashley</strong></td>
<td>Current allocated volume plus an amount to enable switches from surface water to groundwater in SWAZs where surface water is over allocated such as Ashley River/Rakahuri A Block, Taranaki Creek, Waikuku Stream, Saltwater Creek and Little Ashley Creek + 10% for additional takes that are not stream depleting</td>
<td>Reduces potential for future increases in groundwater abstraction. Reduces the potential for further declines in spring-fed streams and local groundwater levels due to new abstraction. Supports current reliability of existing water takes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Loburn</strong></td>
<td>Current allocated volume + 10% for additional takes that are not stream depleting</td>
<td>Reduces potential for increase in groundwater abstraction which could exacerbate low flows in the Ashley River/Rakahuri and may result in increased duration, frequency and length of dry reaches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cust</strong></td>
<td>Current allocated volume plus an amount to enable switches from surface water only for SWAZs where surface water is over allocated (e.g. Cust River A Block, Cust Main Drain) + 10% for additional takes that are not stream-depleting</td>
<td>Full usage of the current allocated volume could cause flows in Ohoka Stream, Cust River and Cust Main Drain to reduce by more than 10%. Improved irrigation efficiency (GMP) is expected to cause flows in the Cust River and Cust Main Drain to decline by 16% and 12% respectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eyre River</strong></td>
<td>99,070,000 million m3/yr (Current allocation limit)</td>
<td>Fully allocated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D5.3 Recommendations – Managing Groundwater Quantity

Groundwater Allocation Limits

The Waimakariri Water Zone committee recommends Environment Canterbury set the following allocation limits for the Groundwater Allocation Zones:

Rec 5.1

That the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee proposes within the Kowai Groundwater Allocation Zone to:

a. cap the current allocation volume,

b. allow an extra 10% (based on current allocation volume) for additional groundwater takes that are not stream-depleting and

c. provide an allocation for the substitution of existing surface water and stream depleting groundwater takes for non-stream depleting groundwater, provided

i. the existing take is surrendered and

ii. the new groundwater take is abstracted from the same property as the surrendered surface water or stream depleting groundwater take, and there is no increase in the proposed rate of take or annual volume.

Rec 5.2

That the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee proposes within the Ashley Groundwater Allocation Zone to:

a. cap the current allocation volume,

b. allow an extra 10% (based on current allocation volume) for additional groundwater takes that are not stream-depleting and

c. provide an allocation for the substitution of existing surface water or stream depleting groundwater takes for non-stream depleting groundwater, provided

i. the existing take is surrendered and

ii. the new groundwater take is abstracted from the same property as the surrendered surface water or stream depleting groundwater take, and there is no increase in the proposed rate of take or annual volume.

Rec 5.3

That the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee proposes within the Loburn Groundwater Allocation Zone to:

a. cap the current allocation volume,

b. allow an extra 10% (based on current allocation volume) for additional groundwater takes that are not stream-depleting and

c. provide an allocation for the substitution of existing surface water or stream depleting groundwater takes for non-stream depleting groundwater takes, provided

i. the existing take is surrendered and

ii. the new groundwater take is abstracted from the same property as the surrendered surface water or stream depleting groundwater take, and there is no increase in the proposed rate of take or annual volume.
Rec 5.4

That the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee proposes within the Cust Groundwater Allocation Zone to:

a. cap the current allocation volume,
b. allow an extra 10% (based on current allocation volume) for additional groundwater takes that are not stream-depleting and
c. provide an allocation for the substitution of existing surface water or stream depleting groundwater takes for non-stream depleting groundwater, provided

i. the existing take is surrendered and

ii. the new groundwater take is abstracted from the same property as the surrendered surface water or stream depleting groundwater take, and there is no increase in the proposed rate of take or annual volume.

Rec 5.5

That the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee proposes within the Eyre Groundwater Allocation Zone to:

a. cap the current allocation volume, and
b. provide an allocation for the substitution of existing surface water or stream depleting groundwater takes for non-stream depleting groundwater, provided

i. the existing take is surrendered and

ii. the new groundwater take is abstracted from the same property as the surrendered surface water or stream depleting groundwater take, and there is no increase in the proposed rate of take or annual volume.

Rec 5.6

That the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee propose to create a Lees Valley Groundwater Allocation Zone.
Within the proposed Lees Valley Groundwater Allocation Zone:

a. cap the current allocation volume,
b. allow an extra 10% (based on current allocation volume) for additional groundwater takes that are not stream-depleting.

Rec 5.7

That Environment Canterbury extend the Groundwater Allocation Zone boundaries further inland, to the edge of surface water catchment boundary.

Rec 5.8

That Environment Canterbury allocates resources to improve monitoring of permitted groundwater irrigation takes for compliance with limits in the LWRP.

The proposed GAZ boundaries are shown on Map X4.
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Vision

• “The Canterbury community values and cares for the region’s biodiversity and accepts the shared responsibility to work together to ensure it is sustained and enhanced, both now and into the future.
• As a result, there is a full range of healthy ecosystems stretching from the mountains to the sea, reflecting the unique and diverse natural character of the Canterbury region. Our indigenous biodiversity is an integral part of our everyday lives and landscapes, it complements the productivity of our sustainable economy and working lands, and where appropriate, it supports sustainable harvest.”

Goals & Targets

Goal 1.  Protect and maintain the health of all significant habitats and ecosystems.
Target 1. There is no further loss of significant habitats and ecosystems from 2010.

Goal 2.  Restore the natural character of degraded indigenous habitats and ecosystems.
Target 2. There is an ongoing increase in the number, quality and effectiveness of ecosystem-based restoration projects and initiatives, particularly in areas where less than 30% indigenous cover remains.

Goal 3.  Increase the integration and sustainable use of indigenous species in modified environments (e.g. farm, urban, lifestyle blocks).
Target 3. Awareness of the multiple benefits of incorporating indigenous biodiversity into working and urban landscapes is increased by 2012.

Goal 4.  Enhance public awareness, understanding and support of biodiversity.
Target 4. Public awareness, understanding and support of biodiversity is increased by 20% by 2012, leading to increasing instances of consequential behaviour change.

Goal 5.  Encourage, celebrate and support action by landowners and communities to protect, maintain and restore biodiversity.
Target 5. The accessibility and usability of information, guidance, advice and funding relating to biodiversity protection and restoration is improved by 2012.

Goal 6.  Improve the range and quality of knowledge and information about Canterbury’s biodiversity for its sustainable management.
Target 6. A framework for monitoring the status of regional biodiversity is established by 2012.
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Allocation Limit
The total amount of water (in litres per second and/or cubic metres per year) that is available to be taken from a river or groundwater. See also Plan Limit.

Artificial watercourse
A watercourse that is created by human action. It includes an irrigation canal, water supply race, canal for the supply of water for electricity power generation, and farm drainage channel.

Ashley River/Rakahuri and Tributaries
The area within the Waimakariri Water Zone as shown on Map X Refer Map 4

Baseline GMP Loss Rate
The average nitrogen loss rate below the root zone, as estimated by the Farm Portal, for the farming activity carried out during the nitrogen baseline period (2009-13), if operated at good management practice.

Catchment management plan
In the Waimakariri Water Zone, a Catchment Management Plan is a non-statutory document that, in consultation with the community, sets out a vision and the legislative, biophysical and cultural drivers for land and water management in a specific catchment. It also sets out a programme for, and details of, actions needed for working towards the vision, including indicative costs and responsibilities.

Drain
Includes any artificial watercourse that has been constructed for land drainage of surface or sub-surface water and can be a farm drainage channel, an open race or subsurface pipe, tile or mole drain or culvert.

Future goal
This is a nitrate concentration, minimum flow or total allocation figure that is not recommended for inclusion in this Waimakariri sub-region plan change, due to a lack of certainty about a feasible pathway for achieving it.

The zone committee considers the future goals could eventually be achievable. For example, if mitigations such as managed aquifer recharge are proven over the next 5-10 years, this may make it feasible to achieve higher minimum flows or lower nitrate concentrations.

Accordingly, the Zone Committee expects the future goals listed in this ZIP Addendum will be revisited by Environment Canterbury at the 10-year plan review, and where possible, introduced into the plan as new statutory limits.

Good Management Practice or GMP

Good Management Practice Loss Rate
The average nitrogen loss rate below the root zone, as estimated by the Farm Portal, for the farming activity carried out over the most recent 4-year period, if operated at Good Management Practice.

Farm Environment Plan or FEP
A plan prepared in accordance with Schedule 7 of the LWRP. Applies to farming activities that require a land use consent and LWRP requires these to be audited periodically and performance graded A to D.

Farm Portal
Nutrient management database accessed at www.farmportal.ecan.govt.nz and used to derive a Baseline GMP Loss Rate and Good Management Practice Loss Rate.

Groundwater Allocation Zone or GAZ
A planning tool for determining an allocation limit and managing groundwater abstraction. GAZ are primarily based on areas of similar hydrogeology and recharge sources. Each GAZ has an allocation limit expressed as an annual volume in cubic metres per year. Their boundaries are set out in Planning Maps in the LWRP.
Intensively farmed stock

Defined in the LWRP and means:

1. cattle or deer grazed on irrigated land or contained for break-feeding of winter feed crops;
2. dairy cattle, including cows, whether dry or milking, and whether on irrigated land or not; or
3. farmed pigs.

Land and Water Regional Plan or LWRP

Plan made under the Resource Management Act (1991) for managing land and water resources in Canterbury. It identifies resource management goals (objectives) and sets out the policies and rules to achieve them and direct the processing of resource consent applications.

Lifestyle Block Management Plan

A voluntary plan for small scale, low intensity lifestyle properties that are not required to produce a Farm Environment Plan or Management Plan under Plan Change 5. Useful for getting the best use out of lifestyle properties and addressing small issues that can help achieve environmental outcomes.

See template at: https://www.canterburywater.farm/assets/Uploads/PU8C-6023-Lifestyle-Block-Management-Plan-October-20152.pdf

Plan limit

This is the nitrate concentration, minimum flow or total allocation figure recommended for inclusion in the Waimakariri sub-region plan change.

Where over-allocation is an issue (or for nitrates is expected to become an issue given lag effects), there may be a period of time where the plan limit is not achieved. The final ZIP Addendum will include more details on likely timeframes for achieving plan limits in situations of over-allocation.

Management Plan A plan prepared in accordance with Schedule 7A in Plan Change 5 to the LWRP. Applies to permitted farming activities above a certain property size (currently 10 ha) that do not require a land use consent.

Minimum flow

The flow, when measured at the relevant water flow monitoring site, at which abstractions from a water body must cease.

Northern Waimakariri Tributaries

The area within the Waimakariri Water Zone as shown on Map B2 on page 8.

Over-allocation

The situation where the resource (water quantity and water quality) (a) has been allocated to users beyond a limit or (b) is being used to a point where a freshwater objective is no longer being met.

Partial restrictions

Restrictions that reduce water takes as the river approaches its minimum flow, to prevent the minimum flow from being breached because of abstraction.

Plan Change 5 or PC5 (Nutrient Management Plan Change)

A plan change to the LWRP on managing nutrient losses from farming. When operative it will introduce new definitions, policies, rules, limits and schedules to require farming activities to operate at “Good Management Practice”.

Surface Water Allocation Zone or SWAZ

A planning tool for managing surface water abstraction. SWAZ are based on river catchments and each SWAZ has an allocation limit expressed in litres per second and a minimum flow site to manage water takes.
Waimakariri River Regional Plan or WRRP
An older style separate regional plan that controls specific aspects of water quantity, water quality and works in river
and lake beds within the Waimakariri River catchment. Any objectives, policy or rule on the same subject matter in
the WRRP prevails over those in the LWRP.

Waimakariri Water Zone
The Waimakariri Water Zone Committee boundary under the CWMS. This is generally the same as the Waimakariri
District boundary. See Map B1 on page 5.

Waimakariri sub-region
The area defined in Section 8 (Waimakariri) of the LWRP. The area is generally the same as the Waimakariri District
Council boundary and the Waimakariri Zone boundary under the CWMS. See Map B1 on page 5.

Winter grazing (Plan Change 5 definition)
Means the grazing of cattle within the period of 1 May to 30 September, where the cattle are contained for break-
feeding of in-situ brassica and root vegetable forage crops or for consuming supplementary feed that has been
brought onto the property.
1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report requests Council to adopt the Local Alcohol Policy and to set the date for it to come into force as required by the provisions of section 87 and 90 of the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012 (the Act).

1.2 The provisional Local Alcohol Policy was publically notified on Friday 26 October 2018, the appeal period was for 30 days (26 October to 27 November 2018). The only ground on which an element of the provisional policy can be appealed is that it is unreasonable in light of the object of the Act (Part 2 (16-18) of the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Regulations 2013).

1.3 Appeals are sent to the secretary of the Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority (ARLA or licensing authority).

1.4 No appeals to the Council’s provisional Local Alcohol Policy have been received by ARLA.

1.5 As required by the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Regulations 2013 section 19(2) a public notice has been prepared to be published.

1.6 All licensees in the District will be individually advised, by letter, of the adoption of the Local Alcohol Policy and how and when the elements of the policy will affect their licences.

Attachments:

i. Local Alcohol Policy (Trim No: 180409037871)
ii. Public Notice (Trim No: 181128139883)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 181128139713.

(b) Adopts the Local Alcohol Policy (Trim No: 180409037871)

(c) Resolves to bring the Local Alcohol Policy into force on Monday 17 December 2018.

(d) Approves the Public Notice for publication in the Christchurch Press and the Northern Outlook on Wednesday 12 December and Saturday 15 December 2018.

(e) Notes that the Licensees will be individually advised, in writing, of the elements of the policy affecting their licences and the date any changes come into effect.
3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 The review of the Local Alcohol Policy was an early review, three years instead of the statutory time frame of six years. It has been undertaken in accordance with the provisions of the *Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012, sections 95 and 97*.

3.2 The provisional policy was adopted by Council for public notification on 26 October 2018 followed by a period of 30 days for submitters, Police or Medical Officer of Health to appeal the policy.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1 At this stage of the process the option for Council is the date the policy comes into effect. The recommendation proposes Monday 17 December with public notices preceding this. The advantage of this option, with the policy having effect before New Year’s Eve, is that it provides for premises to take advantage of the new provision in the policy for them to open on New Year’s Eve (within the maximum trading hours) without needing to gain a Special Licence.

4.2 The provisional LAP was notified and did not attract any appeals.

4.3 The policy will have effect for 6 years or such earlier time by Council resolution.

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1 **Groups and Organisations**

Police, Medical Officer of Health and Licensing Inspectors were consulted during this review. Council also sought the view of licensees, Community Boards and other stakeholders such as Social Services Waimakariri, Waimakariri Health Advisory Group, Te Ngai Tu Ahuriri Runanga and the Waimakariri Youth Council.

All Licensees in the District will receive notice, in writing, of the adoption of the Local Alcohol Policy. They will be advised of the elements in the policy affecting their licences and the date the changes take effect.

5.2 **Wider Community**

To develop the provisional policy, a comprehensive special consultative procedure was undertaken followed by an appeal process available for all submitters to ARLA.

Individual submitters were sent letters with a copy of the provisional policy for their information and advised of their opportunity to appeal any element of the policy.

Public notices and a media release will also be prepared.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1 **Financial Implications**

The cost of reviewing the Local Alcohol Policy 2015, developing the provisional policy and adopting and notifying the Local Alcohol Policy 2018 is programmed and met from existing budgets and staff resources.

6.2 **Community Implications**

Members of the community wanting to express their views were able to at drop in sessions or through the public submissions process as described above.

6.3 **Risk Management**

The review of the Local Alcohol Policy has been undertaken in accordance with the provisions of the *Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012, sections 95 and 97*. 

Section 95 of the Act requires that any amendment of the Policy is undertaken as if it were the adoption of a local alcohol policy. For this reason the provisional policy was notified and submitters advised of their right to appeal against elements of the provisional policy.

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*

*Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012, subpart 2 local alcohol policies, sections 95 and 97*

*Sale and Supply of Alcohol Regulations 2013*

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 to 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. **Delegations**

Nil
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1 Introduction
The Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012 (the Act) enables the Council to develop a Local Alcohol Policy (LAP) to further control the location of licensed premises, the number of licensed premises in the District or any part of the District, the maximum trading hours, impose discretionary conditions on the issue of licences and impose one-way door restrictions. The District Licensing Committee (DLC) and Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority (ARLA) are required to consider the LAP when making licensing decisions.

2 Policy Context
This Local Alcohol Policy contributes towards control of the adverse effects created by the misuse of alcohol. It reflects the local community’s wishes regarding the sale and supply of alcohol providing local solutions to local problems.

2.1 Definitions
“Alcohol Management Plan” is a plan of measures and actions designed to manage the sale and supply of alcohol to achieve the objectives of the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012.

“Club” has the same meaning as section 5 of the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012.

“Club Licence” has the meaning given by section 60 of the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012.

“Discretionary conditions” in considering any application for a special licence, the Committee may, in deciding whether to grant or refuse the licence, apply any reasonable conditions if, in its opinion, the issuing of the licence, or the consequences of issuing the licence, without those conditions would be inconsistent with the policy.

“Off-Licence” has the meaning given by Section 17 and 18 of the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012.

“On-Licence” has the meaning given by Section 14 of the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012.

“One-way door restriction” has the meaning given by section 5 of the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012.

“Ready to drink (RTD)” is an alcoholic drink, combining a spirit with a soft drink.

“Special Licence” has the meaning given by section 22 of the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012.

“Stand-alone bottle store” is an off-licensed premises, selling primarily only alcohol, displayed and sold from that site, and is not part of an on-licensed business such as a hotel or tavern or a supermarket. An exemption to item 4.2.2 in this policy is available where a stand-alone bottle store was lawfully established at the date of the policy adoption.

“The Act” is the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012.
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3 Policy Objective
This policy has the objective of being consistent with the Community Development Strategy\(^1\) and the Community Action Plan on Alcohol\(^2\) prepared for the District as well as the objectives of the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012 which is provided for in Section 4 of the Act as:

- the sale, supply and consumption of alcohol should be undertaken safely and responsibly; and
- the harm caused by the excessive or inappropriate consumption of alcohol should be minimised.

4 Policy Statement

4.1 On-licence

Policies related to on-licences also apply to:

- Bring Your Own (BYO) restaurants (endorsed under section 37 of the Act)
- Caterers (endorsed under section 38 of the Act)

4.1.1 Hours of Operation

The hours of operation for on-licences are set by the District Licencing Committee (DLC) after consideration of the reports from the Licensing Inspector, Police, Medical Officer of Health and any objections. Note: an application for an on-licence must comply with the Resource Management Act 1991 before it is lodged, however, additional restrictions in respect of hours of operation may be required.

The permitted hours of operation of on-licence premises are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days of Week</th>
<th>Earliest opening time</th>
<th>Latest closing time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sunday to Thursday</td>
<td>7.00 am</td>
<td>11.00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday to Saturday</td>
<td>7.00 am</td>
<td>1.00 am the following day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Year’s Eve (31 December)</td>
<td>7.00 am</td>
<td>1.00 am the following day (New Years Day)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.1.1 Public holidays

On any day preceding a public holiday the hours of operation are 7.00am to 1.00am (the morning of the public holiday).

4.1.1.2 Clause 4.1.1.1 does not apply to those days preceding Good Friday, Easter Sunday, or Christmas Day, or before 1 pm Anzac Day as identified in section 47 of the Act. For the preceding day before those listed in section 47 of the Act, the hours of operation are 7.00 am to 12.00am (midnight).

4.1.2 Discretionary conditions of on-licences

These discretionary conditions may include (but are not necessarily limited to):

- Provision of additional security (staff)
- The installation and operation of CCTV cameras on the exterior of, and within premises
- Provision of effective exterior lighting
- Restriction on the use of outdoor areas
- Noise control

---

\(^1\) Waimakariri District Council Community Development Strategy 2015-2025 (TRIM: 150605089108)

\(^2\) Waimakariri District Council Community Action Plan on Alcohol (TRIM: 090821025046)
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- One-way door restrictions
- New staff to complete 'serve-wise' training within the first month of employment.

4.2 Off-Licences

4.2.1 Hours of Operation
The permitted hours of operation of off-licence premises is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days of Week</th>
<th>Earliest opening time</th>
<th>Latest closing time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday to Sunday</td>
<td>7.00 am</td>
<td>10.00 pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.2 Section 48 of the Act provides that an off-licence must ensure that no alcohol is sold on or delivered from the premises on Good Friday, Christmas Day or before 1 pm on Anzac Day. Moreover, no alcohol is to be sold on or delivered from the premises on Easter Sunday, unless it is grape wine or fruit or vegetable wine made on the premises or from product harvested from the land on which the premises are situated.

4.2.3 Off-Licence Location
No off-licence is to be issued for any business being a new ‘stand-alone’ bottle store, unless that bottle store is located on land zoned Business 1 Zone or Business 2 Zone as defined in the Waimakariri District Plan. Where a stand-alone bottle store was lawfully established prior to the adoption of this LAP, its use is exempt from clause 4.2.2 until such time as the Council amends this part of the Policy.

4.3 Club Licences
A number of clubs are situated in or adjacent to residential zoned areas. The sale of liquor must be secondary to the objectives of the Club, and the licensed hours must also be relevant to the Club’s activities.

4.3.1 Hours of operation
The permitted hours of operation of Club Licenced premises is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days of Week</th>
<th>Earliest opening time</th>
<th>Latest closing time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sunday to Thursday</td>
<td>7.00 am</td>
<td>11.00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, and Saturday</td>
<td>7.00 am</td>
<td>1.00 am the following day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.1.1 Public Holidays
On any day preceding a public holiday the hours of operation are 7.00am to 1.00am (the morning of the public holiday).

4.3.1.2 Anzac Day trading hours for licensed RNZRSA clubs
Clause 4.3.1.1 does not apply to licensed RNZRSA clubs under section 47A of the Act. The permitted trading hours for any licensed premises to which this section applies include the hours from 4 am to 1 pm on Anzac Day. Additionally, any one-way door restriction applicable to the premises does not operate during the hours specified.

4.3.2 Discretionary conditions of club licences
These discretionary conditions may include (but are not necessarily limited to):
- Advertising signage dimensions, number and location
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- For premises in residential zones reduced hours may be considered on the circumstances of each application
- The installation and operation of CCTV cameras on the exterior of, and within premises
- Provision of effective exterior lighting
- Restriction on the use of outdoor areas
- New staff to complete ‘serve-wise’ training within the first month of employment.

4.4 Special Licences

4.4.1 Hours of operation
Restrictions on hours will be imposed if the DLC considers it appropriate in respect of any environmental or other considerations which may require constraints on the hours of operation. Such issues may be raised by the Licensing Inspector, Police or other relevant affected parties.

4.4.2 Discretionary conditions of special licences include:
These discretionary conditions may include (but are not necessarily limited to):

- No premises would generally have more than 12 events under one licence application, however where the events are low risk, of short duration and are ‘like’ events, as determined by the District Licensing Committee, one application could cover a single 12 month period.
- Sale of alcoholic drinks to be limited, e.g. two per customer at any one time
- Meet the terms of the Alcohol Management Plan for public events
- No alcohol is to be sold in glass containers
- The District Licensing Committee may decline a licence extending beyond 3.00 am.

4.4.3 Alteration to hours of operation
An alteration to hours of operation for an event may be applied for by way of a Special Licence to the DLC. A minimum of 20 working days will be required for processing such a licence.

5 Links to legislation, other policies and community outcomes
Alcohol Control Bylaw 2018
Community Outcomes
2011 – 2016 Road Safety Strategy
Canterbury Regional Policy Statement
Waimakariri District Plan
Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012

6 Adopted by and date
This policy was adopted by Council on 4 December 2018 to come into force on 17 December 2018.

7 Review
Review in six years or by resolution of Council.
At its meeting on 4 December 2018 the Waimakariri District Council (the Council) adopted the provisional Local Alcohol Policy for public notification on Wednesday 12 December and Saturday 15 December 2018 under Section 90 of the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012 (the Act). The Local Alcohol Policy has therefore ceased to be provisional.

The Council resolved to bring the Local Alcohol Policy into force on Monday 17 December 2018.

The Council’s Local Alcohol Policy (LAP) is available at the Council’s service centres or on the Council’s website at Waimakariri.govt.nz.

Malcolm Johnston
Environmental Services Manager

Please insert:

Christchurch Press – Public Notice
Wednesday 12 December 2018 and Saturday 15 December 2018

Northern Outlook – Public Notice
Wednesday 12 December 2018

Order No: P0016796
1. SUMMARY

1.1. This report seeks Council’s direction for the preparation of the Draft 2019/20 Annual Plan regarding the rating for the Ultraviolet (UV) treatment of water supplies. The Council is being asked to consider this matter in advance of Draft Annual Plan deliberations in late January to enable staff to provide more certainty as to the likely outcome. Without this Council direction, because of the potential effect of this policy decision, staff would be required to either prepare two versions of the Draft Annual Plan before the end of January, or public consultation on the Draft Annual Plan would need to be deferred to enable the effect of the policy changes to be worked through.

1.2. The Mayor has asked that staff present a proposal for Council’s consideration that would see the costs of all UV treatment (capital and operating costs) of drinking water supplies being apportioned equally on a per-property basis across all water supply schemes.

1.3. Reasons asking for this matter to be considered by the Council include:

- There is an expectation that following the recommendations arising from the Havelock North enquiry that drinking water standards will be changed such that groundwater supplies will not be considered ‘secure’. The Council anticipated this when it prepared its 2018-28 Long Term Plan (LTP) and included a provision of $7.8 million of capital costs and associated operating costs into its budget to enable the installation of UV disinfection. The rate effect, particularly on smaller water supply ratepayers, is significant.

- The Council is due to embark on engagement with the Garrymere and Poyntzs Road communities about their drinking water supply upgrades. The anticipated costs of the upgrades are significant and having alternate funding options, other than the status quo, will assist discussion about providing affordable potable drinking water that will continue to meet revised drinking water standards.

- The Council, prior to adoption of the LTP, undertook a review of rating options for 3 Water services, particularly considering a more district-wide approach to rating. The Council decided to defer consideration of a district wide approach until 2022 with the review being signalled in the 2021-31 LTP.

1.4. The policy rationale for the proposed approach is that UV treatment is anticipated to be required across all potable water supplies in the District and through district-wide UV treatment the Council has accepted this outcome, through its 2018-28 LTP budget provisions. Effectively, it is stating that all people who drink water from those supplies will be assured that the water leaving the source
The approach reinforces that the Council has a responsibility to any user of its supplies (ratepayers, other district residents and visitors) that water is safe to drink and is meeting all national standards.

1.5. The Council has resolved not to chlorinate its urban on-demand supplies to provide residual disinfection of its reticulation network. It has resolved to uphold its current policy position, unless directed to do otherwise by national regulation. Currently, rural supplies are chlorinated, due to rural restricted supplies needing on-site water tanks where water may need to be held for several days. Hence, this report is proposing that the current rating policy applies to chlorination costs, in that each water supply funds its own costs.

1.6. The effect of the proposed policy change is:

- All water supply ratepayers will be charged the same uniform charge for UV disinfection costs. This can be either shown as a separate targeted rate on the rates invoice, or form part of the water supply rate. Albeit administratively more efficient to have it included in the water supply rate, the Mayor's preference is for a separate targeted rate to be disclosed.

- While the total amount of water rates collected will not change, should this proposal be accepted, the incidence of rating will alter. Compared the water rates disclosed in the 2018-28 LTP, most smaller water supplies would see a reduction in their water rates, while larger water supplies are likely to see an increase. While the work to estimate the charge has yet to be finalised, staff estimate that the increase for larger urban supplies is likely to be up to an additional $30 per year, per property, over what was signalled in the 2018-28 LTP. Rural water supplies could see reductions of several hundred dollars per property. Note, that because the programme of installing UV treatment is spread over a number of years, it would take a few years for the full effect of this change to be felt.

1.7. Should the Council agree to this proposal, the change in rating policy would need to be consulted on as part of the Draft 2019/20 Annual Plan.

Attachments:
1. Rate samples showing the effect of proposed rate changes (Appendix 1)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 181126138621

(b) Either

i. Resolves to include a rating proposal into the Draft 2019/20 Annual Plan to aggregate the costs of UV disinfection treatment for water supplies into one account; and:
   1. Establishes a new uniform annual charge for each property connected to a Council water supply, or
   2. Incorporates a share of the UV disinfection costs in each water supply account based on a standard per property charge, and.

ii. Notes that staff will further refine the estimates for the Council's consideration when it deliberates on the Draft 2019/20 Annual Plan,

Or.

iii. Retains the current rating policy in regards to water supply costs.
3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1. The Havelock North Drinking Water Enquiry has generated a number of recommendations to the Government which it is currently considering. One major change that is considered likely to be given effect to is the removal of the status of ‘secure’ groundwater. The Council has developed its strategy for drinking water sources based on the current drinking water standards which state that provided groundwater quality meets a number of defined parameters it is considered ‘secure’ and no treatment of water is required for on-demand schemes.

3.2. With the likely removal of ‘secure’ groundwater status the Council has included provision in its 2018-28 Long Term Plan (LTP) for $7.8 million of capital costs to enable the installation of UV disinfection. Provision has also been made for ongoing operating costs associated with the UV treatment. The rate effect, particularly on smaller water supply ratepayers, is significant.

3.3. The Council is due to embark on engagement with the Garrymere and Poyntzs Road communities about the drinking water supply upgrades. The anticipated costs of the upgrades are significant and having alternative funding options, other than the status quo, will assist discussion about providing affordable potable drinking water that will continue to meet the likely revised drinking water standards.

3.4. The Council, prior to adoption of the LTP, undertook a review of rating options for 3 Water services, particularly considering a more district-wide approach to rating. The Council decided to defer consideration of a district wide approach in preparation for the 2021-2031 LTP. The Council resolved in August 2017 that it:

   (b) **Approves** including in the draft 2021/31 Long Term Plan a proposal to carry out a comprehensive public engagement process regarding an alternative 3 Waters rating structure that is based on:

   i. A common sewer rate for all connected properties in the district
   ii. A common water supply rate for all properties connected to an urban supply, and a separate common rate for those connected to a restricted water supply, and
   iii. A common drainage rate for all properties within existing urban drainage rating areas, and a separate common rate for those in rural drainage rating areas

   (c) **Notes** that this engagement process is proposed to commence in 2022, and that Council staff will seek approval from Council before commencing consultation.

4. ** ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. The issues the Council should consider include:

   - The need to provide safe and high quality drinking water to all ratepayers connected to Council supplies, as well as other residents and visitors.
   - The affordability of receiving drinking water – the costs of drinking water per water supply are outlined in Attachment 1, along with the proposed costs if the proposal in this report is adopted.
   - The equity issues of how costs should be allocated to ratepayers – the Council uses a variety of mechanisms to allocate costs – for water and drainage supplies costs are currently allocated and targeted to the supplies’ ratepayers. For activities like earthquake recovery and reserves rates are targeted across all district ratepayers, and the Eastern Districts Sewer rate was created to spread the affordability of the scheme across the different-sized communities joined to that scheme on an equal basis.
   - the merit of the proposed approach, versus the status quo, and the merits of it versus the options considered under the 3 Waters rating review undertaken in 2017. The complexity
of arriving at a district-wide rate for all three services proved such that the Council deferred reconsideration of the 3 Waters rating review for three years. The proposal presented in this report is considering one of the costs of one of the 3 Water activities, and therefore is not as complex as the broader 3 Waters review that was undertaken.

- The likelihood that the cost of implementing further national regulations will see the need to further consider such issues and how to equitably distribute the effects of those regulations – e.g. enforced chlorination and increased sewer and stormwater discharge/treatment requirements.

4.2. Ultimately, when it comes to assessing matters related to fairness and equity that is political decision and one that the Council must decide on.

4.3. The options available to the Council are:

- Agree to the proposal contained in the report
- Extend the rationale of the methodology being proposed to include all water treatment and testing costs – i.e. UV, chlorination as well as water monitoring and testing costs. This would reflect the possibility that chlorination may also become mandatory and signal that water treatment costs are equalised across ratepayers – the effect of this option would be similar to those in the proposal but the increases to urban areas may be a little higher while rural ratepayers would pay less.
- Retain the status quo, with each supply bearing the full costs related to their supply.
- Defer consideration until a later time.

4.4. The Management Team have reviewed this report to ensure the Council has sufficient information to make a decision.

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

5.1.1. Previous consultation with water supplies advisory groups has shown there to be a very strong interest in any matters related to water treatment, quality and cost sharing mechanisms. The past consultation with Cust, West Eyreton, Summerhill, Rural Oxford communities, as well as Garrymere and Poyntzs Road show there is a very strong interest in the matters. All groups, at various times, have expressed concern about the cost of providing drinking water and that it is becoming unaffordable. Specific feedback was received from the Garrymere community as part of the 2018-28 LTP process and the Council has decided to establish a working group, including residents, to consider options for the water scheme.

5.2. **Wider Community**

5.2.1. The community has not been consulted with regard to this proposal but would need to be as part of the Draft 2019/20 Annual Plan

5.2.2. Other communities outside the District have debated these matters in recent years. Communities such in the Hurunui and Selwyn districts have both recently been consulted on moving to district-wide rating for water supplies and both Councils decided to do so. Many other Councils have, or are, considering following a similar approach.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

6.1.1. Should the proposal be supported, the overall rates cost remains unchanged, however the incidence of rating would change. Attachment 1 shows the effects on each Water Supply.
6.1.2. The Council has budgeted $7.8 million of the capital costs associated with installing UV disinfection, as well as the operating costs, and this is currently reflected in the 2018-28 LTP.

6.2. Community Implications

6.2.1. Community implications relate to fairness and equity of the proposal, and the affordability issues, especially facing rural communities for the cost of meeting national drinking water regulations.

6.3. Risk Management

6.3.1. Key risks for the Council are:

- Community reaction to the proposal - there will need to a good explanation of the rationale for the change as part of any communications.
- Process risk regarding the Local Government Rating Act and the Local Government Act. The proposal, if supported, will need to be consulted on using the Special Consultative Procedure.
- Timing risks regarding Annual Plan preparation. If this matter is left to be decided in January it will require staff to prepare a lot of additional information (almost the equivalent of an alternative Annual Plan). Depending on what is decided it will result in a delay to the production of the Draft Annual Plan and therefore constrain production, consultation and deliberation timeframes.

6.4. Health and Safety

6.4.1. The Council is required to meet the drinking water quality standards and protect against protozoa or bacterial contamination.

7. CONTEXT

7.1. Policy

7.1.1. This matter is likely to be a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy, given how it affects the rates of a large number of ratepayers. Note: the legislative requirements require the same process to be followed as though it were significant matter, in any event.

7.2. Legislation

7.2.1. The key legislation is the Local Government Rating Act which outlines how rates must be set, the process for doing so and the disclosure requirements. These matters will be addressed through the Draft Annual Plan.

7.2.2. The Local Government Act specifies the process that must be considered when making a decision and the process for making decisions in conjunction with the preparation of an Annual Plan.

7.3. Community Outcomes

7.3.1. The main community outcomes related to the issue are:

- There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision making that effects our District
- Core utility services are provided in a timely and sustainable manner
- Council sewerage and water supply schemes, and drainage and waste collection services are provided to a high standard.
7.4. **Delegations**

7.4.1. The Council must make this decision. The decision contained in the proposal is to include a proposal in the Draft Annual Plan, therefore a final decision cannot be made until the Annual Plan process is complete.
Appendix 1 – Comparison of Estimated Effect of Water Supply Rates per LTP v Proposal

Note:

1. Each graph has a different x axis scale

2. The green bar graph noted as “Water – test for district water” equates to the proposal contained in this report)
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1. **SUMMARY**

1.1 The purpose of this report is to establish a Waimakariri-Passchendaele Advisory Group.

1.2 The functions of the Advisory group will be as outlined in the attached terms of Reference

**Attachments:**

i. Draft Terms of Reference Waimakariri Passchendaele Advisory Group (180821094503)

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180821094427

(b) **Revokes** the resolution of report no. 100128002501 which went to Council on 3 March 2010, establishing the Waimakariri Passchendaele Trust.

(c) **Approves** the establishment of a Waimakariri Passchendaele Advisory Group.

(d) **Adopts** the Terms of Reference (Trim 180821094503.)

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 The existing Waimakariri Passchendaele Trust has never been officially registered as a Trust or a Charity.

3.2 The Trust has never sought outside funding.

3.3 Over the years since its establishment, the Trust has performed the functions outlined in the proposed Terms of Reference, including working with the two RSA’s.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1 The status quo could be maintained, but to use the term Trust would be misleading.
4.2. The Trust could be registered with the Registrar of Trusts and Charities Services. This was the original intention but as time has passed, the entity has acted more like an advisory group. An advisory group is more flexible.

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

- The existing Trust has discussed this and agrees with the establishment of an Advisory Group.

5.2. **Wider Community** – has not been consulted.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

There are no additional financial implications.

The Council through the Long Term Plan has budget for international relations with the two entities with which it has agreements and the Governance budget provides for a minute secretary at any meetings. This is envisaged to continue.

6.4. **Community Implications**

There are no negative community implications.

6.5. **Risk Management**

A risk could be that the Council in future could disestablish the Advisory Group, but it could probably do likewise with a trust that it had set up.

6.6. **Health and Safety**

There are no health and safety implications.

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 Council is able to establish Advisory Groups under the Local Government Act 2002.

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

The following community outcomes are relevant in this matter:

- The community’s cultures, arts and heritage are conserved and celebrated - Heritage buildings and sites are protected and the cultural heritage links with our past are preserved.

7.4. **Delegations**

The Council is able to establish Advisory Groups and has signed a fraternisation agreement with Zonnebeke.
TERMS OF REFERENCE

Waimakariri - Passchendaele Advisory Group

1. Purpose Statement

The Waimakariri-Passchendaele Advisory Group will help determine the framework of how the Waimakariri District Council and community interacts with the Municipality of Zonnebeke, Belgium, and supports the District’s ongoing commemoration and remembrance of the Battle of Passchendaele 1917 and World War I in general.

2. Membership

- Waimakariri District Council International Portfolio Holder (Chair), Waimakariri District Council Mayor, one representative each from the Kaiapoi and Rangiora Returned and Services Associations, the Honorary Consul for Belgium in Christchurch, one appointee of the Honorary Consul for Belgium, community representation of up to 4 (appointed by the Council on the nomination of the Advisory Group), others co-opted by the Advisory Group with the approval of the Council.

3. Quorum

A quorum will be half of the members if the number is even (including vacancies) or a majority if the number of members is odd (including vacancies) with at least one of the members present being a Waimakariri District Council elected member.

4. Terms of Reference

3.1 The Waimakariri – Passchendaele Advisory Group will be responsible for:

- Providing strategic oversight and advice on the District’s international relations and cultural links with Zonnebeke.
- Advising on strategy to promote international links where opportunity exists for tourism and educational and cultural links.
- Further advance the Fraternisation Agreement with the Municipality of Zonnebeke.
- Providing a point of engagement for the Council with the local community.
- Providing information to assist to Council’s Communications Team with media content.
- Developing and overseeing a programme that further strengthens relationships.
- Considering and making recommendations to the Council with regards to travel in support of international relationships.
- Assisting and receiving international visitors and representatives to the District.
5. **Meeting Frequency**

   As required, but the Advisory Group will meet at least quarterly.

6. **Staff Support**

   Administrator.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elected Member</th>
<th>Date of Update from Member</th>
<th>Member Declared Interest (Business/Patron/Club/Partnership)</th>
<th>Council Appointments</th>
<th>Spouse/Partner Declared Interest</th>
<th>OAG approval status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Mayor David Ayers      | 27 May 2018                | North Canterbury Radio Trust  
Rotary Club of Rangiora, including Charitable Trust  
Rangiora & Districts Early Records Society  
Rangiora Methodist Parish  
Patron – North Canterbury Musical Society  
Patron – Rangiora Brass Band  
Patron – Southbrook Sports Club  
Member – Landmarks  
Waimakariri Art Collection Trust | Trustee - Canterbury Museum Trust  
Enterprise North Canterbury  
Waimakariri Community Arts Council                                                                                       | Nil.                                                                                                                                    | n/a                             |
<p>| Councillor Kevin Felstead | 8 May 2018                | Sole Trader: Resource Consent Services                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |                                 | n/a                |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Councillor Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Other Details</th>
<th>Declaration</th>
<th>Approved或其他</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Neville Atkinson</td>
<td>28 May 2018</td>
<td>Kaiapoi Community Care and Employment Trust (KCC&amp;ET)(Tag Busters)</td>
<td>Trustee – Te Kohaka O Tuhaitara Trust</td>
<td>Nil.</td>
<td>Approved (KCC&amp;ET) June 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kaiapoi Railway Station Trust (Chair)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Kirstyn Barnett</td>
<td>8 May 2018</td>
<td>Nothing to declare</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Alistair Blackie</td>
<td>8 May 2018</td>
<td>Nothing to declare</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Robbie Brine</td>
<td>April 2018</td>
<td>Serving NZ Police Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Wendy Doody</td>
<td>8 May 2018</td>
<td>Nothing to declare</td>
<td>Trustee - North Canterbury Sport and Recreation Trust</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Dan Gordon</td>
<td>19 May 2018</td>
<td>Employed by Parliamentary Services</td>
<td>Trustee - North Canterbury Sport and Recreation Trust</td>
<td>Nil.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trustee – Rotary Club of Rangiora Charitable Trust</td>
<td>Board member – Rural Canterbury Primary Health Organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Member – Rotary Club of Rangiora (Current President)</td>
<td>Board member – Rangiora Promotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chair – Waimakariri Arts Trust</td>
<td>Chair – Friends of Rangiora Town Hall Incorporated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Committee Member – Waimakariri Community Arts Council</td>
<td>Member – Rangiora Airfield Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor John Meyer</td>
<td>8 May 2018</td>
<td>Patron Kaiapoi Tennis Club</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ref: 180419043077 As at 28 May 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Patron Kaiapoi Darnley Club</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Sandra Stewart</td>
<td>8 May 2018</td>
<td>Self-employed journalist, owner four hectare property Springbank (near Cust)</td>
<td>Nil. n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Paul Williams</td>
<td>8 May 2018</td>
<td>Nothing to declare</td>
<td>Nil. n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT FOR DECISION

FILE NO and TRIM NO: GOV-01-11 / 181115134591

REPORT TO: Council

DATE OF MEETING: 4 December 2018

FROM: Sarah Nichols, Governance Manager

SUBJECT: Register of Interests Policy

SIGNED BY: (for Reports to Council, Committees or Boards)

1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report seeks to formally review the Register of Interests for the Mayor and Councillors as a matter of best practice and as per Council resolution of 5 June 2018.

1.2 In May 2018 the Register of Interests Policy was adopted and a Register of Interests subsequently created and adopted in June 2018. The resolution of the Council included a review of the Register each December and June.

Attachments:

i. Register of Interests, current as at 28 May 2018 (Trim 180419043077).
ii. Register of Interests Policy (Trim 180419043038).

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 181115134591.

(b) Reviews the Register of Interests content, recording any amendments.

(c) Notes a Register of Interests will be republished in the February 2019 agenda and notes the Register of Interests is listed on the Council website.

(d) Notes the Register will be re-published in subsequent agendas and web page when an amendment has been notified and recorded.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1. Elected members of the Council are required to operate in a transparent and unbiased manner, and it is important to be seen to be operating in this manner by the community. The Auditor-General states elected member decision-making should be guided by the principles of integrity, honesty, transparency, openness, independence, good faith and service to the public.

3.2. The Council, Standing Committees and Community Boards, at the beginning of each meeting, ask for any conflicts of interest to be declared and this is duly recorded in the meeting minutes. It is recommended best practice to have a more formal disclosure of members’ interests where pecuniary (financial) interest may arise. The register is not
designed to be a ‘register of wealth’ but only record fact of a personal financial interest in matters that intersect with the Council business.

3.3. The Code of Conduct describes conflicts of interests in general terms using the Office of the Auditor General’s Good Practice Guide. Local Government NZ, the Auditor General and Deloitte’s recommended that the Council should establish a Register of Members’ Interests. The Council subsequently adopted a Policy and Register which is reviewable every December and June. Staff now present the Register for review.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. A conflict of interest, in any matter before the Council, must be declared to the meeting, recorded in the minutes and members refrain from discussing or voting on the matter, as is this Council’s present practice. The Local Authorities (Members’ Interests Act 1968) applies to the pecuniary interests of members of local authorities, and the Auditor-General recommends that the same procedure be followed for non-pecuniary interests.

4.2. It is recommended by the Auditor-General that the Council have a Register of Members Interests to help ensure that any conflicts of interest (both pecuniary and non-pecuniary) that arise are identified and managed before they cause issues. Such a disclosure signals openness, transparency and reduces the potential for false allegations of improper behaviour.

4.3. In the Auditor-General’s Best Practice Guide a conflict of interest is defined as “where a member’s or official’s duties or responsibilities to a public entity could be affected by some other interest or duty that the member or official may have”.

4.4. A pecuniary interest is not defined in the Act but the recommended test to use is: Whether, if the matter were dealt with in a particular way, discussing or voting on that matter could reasonably give rise to an expectation or a gain or loss of money for the member concerned. Would a reasonable, informed observer think that your impartiality might have been affected?

4.5. The Interests Register would also apply to any business activities/contracts with the Council undertaken by the spouses or partners or immediate family (including children/siblings), of any elected or externally appointed members.

4.6. While the Council has adopted to establish a register of interests, whether a member wishes to make a declaration, and the extent of such a declaration, is a matter for each member. The Council cannot require a member to make a disclosure.

4.7. It should be noted that declarations associated with an election fall outside the intention of the Interests’ Register and are subject to the Local Electoral Act 2001.

4.8. The Management Team have reviewed this report and support the recommendations.

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

Groups and Organisations

5.1. No groups or organisations have been consulted.

Wider Community

5.2. The wider community has not been consulted.
6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Financial Implications

6.1. Under section 3 (Disqualifying contracts between local authorities and their members) of ‘the Act’, no person shall be capable of being elected as or appointed to be or of being a member of a local authority or of any committee of a local authority, if the total of all payments made or to be made by or on behalf of the local authority in respect of all contracts made by it in which that person is concerned or interested exceeds $25,000 in any financial year. This is applicable unless approval from the Auditor-General is obtained (section 3,(3)).

6.2. Any elected member that commits an offence under ‘the Act’ is liable on conviction to a fine not exceeding $200.

6.3. No cost is associated with maintaining a Register of Members Interests, which would be maintained by the Governance Manager.

Community Implications

6.4. Perceived conflict of interest of undemocratic and appropriate best practices being upheld and loss of confidence from the community if a breach occurs.

Risk Management

6.5. By having a Register of Interests, and reviewing at least annually, elected members are aware of their responsibilities and minimal risk to the organisation due to best practices and appropriate declarations. All Council, Committee and Community Board agendas will continue to list “conflicts of interest” for recording at each decision meeting.

6.6. It is proposed that in the new electoral term (October 2019) the Register of Interests will be extended to include all Community Board members.

Health and Safety

6.7. Not applicable.

7. CONTEXT

Policy

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

Legislation

7.2. Local Authorities (Members’ Interests Act 1968)

7.2.1. ensuring that members are not affected by personal motives when they participate in decisions of their local authority, and

7.2.2. preventing members, in contracting situations, from using their position to obtain preferential treatment from the authority.

7.2.3. controls the making of contracts worth more than $25,000 in a financial year between members and their authority, and

7.2.4. prohibits members from participating in matters before the authority in which they have a pecuniary interest, other than an interest in common with the public.
7.3. Local Government Act 2002


Community Outcomes

7.5. There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision making that effects our District:

- The Council makes information about its plans and activities readily available.
- The Council takes account of the views across the community including mana whenua.
- The Council makes known its views on significant proposals by others affecting the District’s wellbeing.
- Opportunities for collaboration and partnerships are actively pursued.

Delegations

7.6. The Council has the authority to approve or amend any Policy at any time.

Sarah Nichols
Governance Manager
1 Introduction

Elected members of the Council have a number of professional and personal interests and roles. Conflicts of interest sometimes cannot be avoided but they need not cause problems when promptly disclosed and well managed. Disclosure by an elected member is voluntary.

This policy is intended to reflect best practice, and will generally be applied by the Council (ie Councillors).

Examples of conflicts include paid outside employment, company directors or commercial relationships that interface with the Council or a Community Board.

2 Policy Context

This policy applies to all elected members, including committees and hearing panels. A disclosure of interest policy is already in place for Council employees.

A conflict of interest occurs when:

- the activities of an elected member leads, or could lead, to material benefit for that elected member concerned or to an external entity, either directly or indirectly, to the detriment, or potential detriment, of the Council.
- the activities of an elected member interfere, or could interfere, with that elected member's fulfilment of their obligations.

If elected members are unclear about the application of this policy to specific circumstances or situations they should seek clarification from the Governance Manager or Chief Executive.

3 Policy Objective

The objective of this policy is to:

- provide best practice guidance to Council members so that such decisions are seen to be transparent and unbiased and without giving rise to any perception of conflict of interest;
- set rules around disclosing actual, potential and perceived conflicts and accepting gifts and other benefits; and
- set out Council’s expectations for its members to ensure compliance with the provisions of the legislation and good practice guides listed below;
- preserve public trust in Council by avoiding actual, perceived or potential bias.

4 Policy Statement

Elected members must carry out their duties in an efficient and competent manner and avoid any behaviour which might impair their effectiveness, or damage the integrity or standing of the Council. Thus it is fundamental to the protection of the reputation of Waimakariri District Council that no elected members have, or are perceived to have, a conflict between their official responsibilities and their personal interests.

A conflict of interest can arise where two different interests overlap, i.e. in any situation where an elected member has a financial interest, a private or personal interest or business interest...
sufficient to influence or appear to influence the impartial exercise of their official duties or professional judgment.

Members must at all times avoid situations where their integrity might be questioned or where they may appear to favour one party, supplier or customer over another. In addition, members must act honestly and impartially and in no circumstances reveal or make private use of personal, confidential or other non-public information obtained as a result of their employment by the Council.

The existence of a conflict of interest may not necessarily mean that the elected member concerned has done anything wrong or that the interests of Council or the public have been compromised. For an elected member a conflict of interest that creates risks may be where their duties or responsibilities to Council could be affected by some other interest or duty that they may have. For example, other interests or duties might exist for an elected member because of their own financial affairs; a relationship (private or personal interest) or other role (business interest) that the elected member has; or something the elected member has said or done.

Disclosure provides transparency and protects those concerned from allegations of duplicity and enables the avoidance of being unwittingly placed in situations that may lead to a conflict of interest.

5 Policy Actions

Council members are to conduct themselves at all times under the above principles, ensuring that:

- self-interest or personal factors are not permitted to influence their decision making;
- financial, family, personal or business relationships or interests do not in fact, nor appear to, unfairly advantage or disadvantage the Council, elected members or other individuals or organisations;
- they are not involved in the appointment process of people with whom they have a close personal or family relationship;
- they do not take part in discussions, deliberations, decision-making or voting on a matter in which he/she (or a member of his/her immediate family or a dependent) has a material interest;
- they observe the highest standards of behaviour in accepting gifts or rewards. Any gift that might attract the suspicion of improper motive, or which obligates the individual should not be accepted. In any event all gifts offered (received or not) are to be declared (refer to WDC Gifts & Hospitality Policy and Elected Members’ Code of Conduct);
- Council’s name, resources, information and time are not used for private or personal benefit without prior written consent of an authorised person;
- any conflict of interest identified is declared as soon as possible;

As part of the induction process, new Council members will receive advice on how to identify, report, and manage conflicts of interest.

Council members must monitor any business interactions between the Council and any company or organisation in which the member has a material interest and ensure that such business does not exceed $NZ25,000 (including GST) in value without the prior approval of the Auditor-General.
Elected Members shall:

- declare any interests in contracts in the Council’s Interest Register;
- discuss any proposed interest in contracts (of whatever value) in advance with the Chief Executive and/or the OAG and follow the advice that they are given;
- not participate in decision-making relating to any contract in which they have an interest;
- not accept any gifts (including hospitality, entertainment) from tendering parties where the Council or community board/committee will be part of the decision-making process.

6 Interests Register

The Governance Manager will maintain an elected member Interests Registers which is to be updated at least annually (1st December) and as required when an elected member declares a conflict of interest at any time during the year.

The Elected Members Interests Register will be published on the Council website and in the Council agenda each December and following any amendment.

7 Links to legislation, other policies and community outcomes

- Local Authorities (Members Interests) Act 1968
- Managing Conflicts of Interest: Guidance for Public Entities (Office of the Auditor-General)
- Guidance for Members of Local Authorities about the Local Authorities (Members’ Interests) Act 1968
- Purchasing Policy (including Tendering) 2017
- Elected Members Code of Conduct.

8 Guidance Notes relating to the making of returns:

The following explanatory notes are intended to assist members in preparing their returns for the register but a final judgment on interpreting the requirements is in the responsibility of the members themselves.

- You may have financial interests that are not covered by the requirements for the register but do need to be declared orally to a committee before you participate in debate relating to that interest. This might include an interest you have acquired but is not due for registration until several months later, or it may relate to an interest of a family member. If in any doubt, you should consider making an oral declaration to the committee before participating in consideration of a related item of business, regardless of any written registration.
- There is no formal requirement to register any change in your interests 1st December each year (or any other date required for an initial return) until the next return is required. However the requirements for an oral declaration will apply to any interests that have not been registered.
- At no stage are you required to state the actual value or extent of any interest. You simply need to register its existence.
- If any interest is held jointly with another person or persons, you should indicate the interest. You can list it as jointly owned but do not need to name the other owner(s).
9 Definitions

Business entity means anybody or organisation, whether incorporated or unincorporated, that carries on any profession, trade, manufacture, or undertaking for pecuniary profit, and includes a business activity carried on by a sole proprietor.

Company means:
   a) A company registered under Part 2 of the Companies Act 1993, or
   b) A body corporate that is incorporated outside New Zealand

Relevant Interest is when an elected member has a business, financial or personal interest in a company, trust, or community organisation that is likely to do business with council at any time.

Conflict of Interest means any situation when a person has a financial, personal or business interest sufficient to influence or appear to influence the impartial exercise of their official Council duties or professional judgement.

Matter means the Council’s performance of its functions or the exercise of its powers, or an arrangement, agreement or contract the Council has entered into or proposes to enter.

Member means elected members of Waimakariri District Council and Community Boards.

Business Interest An elected member will have a business interest in an enterprise seeking to do business with the Council if they:
   • are a director of the enterprise;
   • are an owner of or partner in the enterprise;
   • have a shareholding in the enterprise;
   • have a close personal or familial relationship with a person who is an owner or partner or significant shareholder in the enterprise.
   • Holds a significant managerial role that trades with Waimakariri District Council.

Declarations of a Conflict is a reference to a real, perceived or potential conflict and is valid for Council, Committees and Community Boards.

Financial Interest means anything of monetary value, including but not limited to:
   • Salary or payments for service, e.g. consulting fees and honoraria;
   • Equity interests, e.g. stocks, stock options and other ownership interests;
   • Gifts;
   • Allowances, forgiveness of debts, interests in real estate or personal property, dividends, rents, capital gains; and
   • Intellectual property rights, e.g. patents, copyrights and royalties from these rights.
   • The term does not include salary or other remuneration received from or approved by Council.

Pecuniary Interest: An interest that involves money.

Personal Interest An elected member has a personal interest in a matter if their spouse or partner, or other person in their family with whom there is a close friendship or relationship, could be advantaged or disadvantaged by any decision that the
POLICY
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staff or elected member either can make, or does make, or is in a position to influence.

Relevant Interest is when an elected member has a business, financial or personal interest in a company, trust, or community organisation that is likely to do business with council at any time.

Spouse/Partner/ Family: Under the various Acts pertaining to Conflict or Pecuniary Interests it is also relevant to the elected member if the conflict of interest pertains to their spouse, partner or close family member (ie brother/sister, son/daughter, parent).

10 Adopted by and date

This Policy was considered and adopted by the Council at its meeting of 1 May 2018.

11 Review

First Review October 2019, then review every six years thereafter, or sooner on request.
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1. The purpose of this report is to update the Council on Health and Safety matters for the month of November.

**Attachments:**

i. Discharging Officer Health and Safety Duties

ii. November 2018 Health and Safety Dashboard Report

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No 181119135719

(b) **Notes** that there are no significant Health and Safety issues at this time, and that WDC is, so far as is reasonably practicable, compliant with the PCBU duties of the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015.

2. **BACKGROUND**

2.1. The Health and Safety at Work Act 2015 requires that Officers must exercise due diligence to make sure that the organisation complies with its health and safety duties. Discharging Officer Health and Safety Duties for WDC is outlined in Appendix 1.

2.2. An officer under the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015 is a person who occupies a specified position or who occupies a position that allows them to exercise a significant influence over the management of the business or undertaking. Councillors and Chief Executive are considered to be the Officers of WDC.

3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

3.1. There are 4 work-related incidents in this report, one of which is pending investigation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Occurrence</th>
<th>Event description</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18/10/2018</td>
<td>Injury</td>
<td>Worker received new chair as the old one was broken. After only a few hours pain in right arm set in. The following Monday the H&amp;S team have arranged for Southern Rehab to come and do a workstation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2. The Health and Safety Team will be commencing the SafePlus online assessment in early December. Full information has been emailed to staff and Councillors, and they will be receiving an email with a questionnaire as of Monday 3rd December. The opportunity to respond to the questionnaire will be available for two weeks.

3.3. In addition to the above, the Health and Safety Team will be conducting ‘deep dive’ audits in the following areas of critical risk:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/11/2018</td>
<td>Injury</td>
<td>Worker was taking photos of the Rangiora dog park when a large dog ran into worker’s knee and knocked them off their feet. Worker landed face first and damaged the Council camera. Right knee was bent backwards (strain/sprain injury). Was an accident – caused by a dog running round who ran straight into worker by accident while it was running around after another dog (owned by staff). Worker was looking through camera at the time so questionable whether if they weren’t taking a photo whether there would have been a chance to move in time or not. Dogs are allowed off leash, but need to be under control/supervision in the Council-owned dog park. Discussed lesson learned about trying to keep wits about us when in that environment. While it is a public space and others were doing the same activity and exposed to the same hazard – we were there on work duties so need extra care/alertness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/11/2018</td>
<td>Near Miss</td>
<td>While conducting survey at Kairaki, worker spoke with elderly man who had just pulled up in his vehicle. Worker approached him and asked if he was willing to participate in the survey. Worker noticed the man had BB Gun ammunition, and then at the end of the survey worker saw he had the BB gun his hand. Worker did not feel unsafe. More concerned because elderly man had it for protection of his own dogs and that he would “shoot” other dog owners if their dogs bothered his. This could be prevented by waiting for a person to leave their vehicle before approaching them for a survey. This would provide the surveyor with time to gauge the character of the person and assess whether they pose a risk. Not going to potentially hostile places without being accompanied by another staff member. Worker will also attend training in conflict de-escalation and personal safety awareness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/11/2018</td>
<td>Injury</td>
<td>Whilst carrying a laser level and Tripod across a building site worker tripped on a string line and fell heavily injuring ribs and arm. The pink string was hard to see about 40-50mm above the grass. There was no construction on this specific lot at the time as the builders were still setting out. Worker was carrying survey equipment at the time and had a decent fall (PENDING FULL INVESTIGATION).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3.3. Confined space entry

These audits will be completed during late 2018/early 2019, and results of all audits will be submitted to the Management Team and the Audit and Risk Committee.

3.4. The Management Team have reviewed this report and support the recommendations.

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. Groups and Organisations

4.1.1. The above reporting is shared with Management Team and the Health and Safety Committee in particular, for their review and comment.

4.2. Wider Community

4.2.1. The community has not been consulted with regard to this matter, as this is internal compliance reporting, relating to Health and Safety at Work.

5. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. Financial Implications

5.1.1. All financial implications for the upcoming year’s health and safety activities have been accounted for within approved project costs (such as Promapp implementation), or via departmental budgets already allocated to health and safety.

5.2. Community Implications

5.2.1. Community implications have not been included in this report as this is internal compliance reporting, relating to Health and Safety at Work.

5.3. Risk Management

5.3.1. Risk Management is one of the key performance requirements of a functioning Health and Safety system, therefore an updated version of the Health and Safety Register Action Plan is a key aspect of this monthly report (see Attachment 2).

5.4. Health and Safety

5.4.1. Continuous improvement, monitoring, and reporting of Health and Safety activities are a key focus of the health and safety management system. Attachment 1 indicates the health and safety monitoring and improvement activities that are in progress at WDC.

6. CONTEXT

6.1. Policy

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

6.2. Legislation

6.2.1. The key legislation is the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015.

6.2.2. The Council has a number of Human Resources policies, including those related to Health and Safety at Work.

6.2.3. The Council has an obligation under the Local Government Act to be a good employer.

6.3. Community Outcomes
6.3.1. There is a safe environment for all

The Health, Safety and Wellbeing of the organisation, its employees and volunteers ensures that Community Outcomes are delivered in a manner which is legislatively compliant and culturally aligned to our organisational principles: ta mātou mauri.

6.4. Delegations

6.4.1. An officer under the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015 is a person who occupies a specified position or who occupies a position that allows them to exercise a significant influence over the management of the business or undertaking. Councillors and Chief Executive are considered to be the Officers of WDC.
### 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>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Update on legislation and best practice changes to Audit Committee</td>
<td>As required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Various Committee reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Start of each new term and as required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Six monthly, or where major change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• At least annually</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNDERSTAND</strong></td>
<td>• Induction of new Council through tour of District and ongoing site visits.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• H&amp;S Risk register to Audit Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Training on H&amp;S legislation and best practices updates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CCO activities reported to the Audit Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Programme of H&amp;S internal work received by Audit Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Internal Audit reports to Audit Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Incident Investigations reported Audit Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Worksafe review of incidents/ accidents reported to Audit Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Receive any external audit results and remedial actions (if any) reported to Audit Committee</td>
<td>Two yearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESOURCE</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></td>
<td>• Worksafe review of incidents/ accidents reported to Audit Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Programme of H&amp;S internal work received by Audit Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Internal Audit reports to Audit Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Incident Investigations reported Audit Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Worksafe review of incidents/ accidents reported to Audit Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Self-assessment against Canterbury Safety Charter and/or SafePlus reported to the Audit Committee</td>
<td></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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Programme of H&amp;S internal work received by Audit Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Internal Audit reports to Audit Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Incident Investigations reported Audit Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Worksafe review of incidents/ accidents reported to Audit Committee</td>
<td></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 any external 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 and/or SafePlus reported to the Audit Committee</td>
<td>As completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Projects</td>
<td>Current Progress</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 1: Improve Health and Safety systems, to align with organisational objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action 1:</strong> Re-develop Safety Management System to ensure that all Policies align with SafePlus framework (see TRIM 180315027921), and all critical risk procedures are captured in Promapp.</td>
<td>Policy structure has been drafted, and re-writing of policies has commenced. Policy structure has 3 key policies: Leadership &amp; Commitment, Risk Management and Worker Engagement. There will be several sub-policies under the ‘Risk Management’ main policy, to address critical risks (e.g. Asbestos Management, Drug and Alcohol, Driver Safety etc.) To date, the following number of health and safety procedures have been captured in Promapp: Published (finalised) = 26 Unpublished (in progress) = 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action 2:</strong> Implement Promapp training module to improve the management of all Health and Safety training.</td>
<td>The Promapp training module has been purchased, and key staff (including H&amp;S Admin and Manager) are trained in how to use the module. Single sign-on has been confirmed, and all staff are creating their Promapp profiles. Once all profiles are created, Health and Safety team will transfer current training data across to the Promapp Training Module. Estimated date of data transfer completion = 21 December 2018 (dependent on resource availability).</td>
<td>AS PER LAST MONTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action 3:</strong> Review and re-develop internal health and safety auditing system, aligned with SafePlus. (see TRIM 180315027921).</td>
<td>The SafePlus Online Self-Assessment tool from WorkSafe has been issued. From there the team will complete the following actions: • Assess the suitability of the tool (and determine any changes in approach – if required) <strong>COMPLETE</strong> • Confirm audit timing and approach (report to Management Team) <strong>COMPLETE</strong> • Arrange audit <strong>IN PROGRESS – DEC 2018</strong> • Complete audit and submit findings to Management Team • Develop action plan and monitoring schedule • Review process and adjust if required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Objective 3: Ensure that all contractors are managed according to health and safety procedural requirements, and improve staff knowledge of those requirements.

**Action 4**: Contractor management process improvement project (carry-over).
- Deliver training to all staff once Promapp processes are complete (Oct 2018).
- Develop audit function based on PDU audit role.

Contract Management training is complete as of 12th November. Training delivered to 55 contract managers from across the Council, and notes sent out to a total of 90 (including the staff that attended training). Timing of the training was determined by the Promapp rollout project (access to the system).

Additionally:
- Health and Safety Manager provides a H&S Contract Management overview to all new staff at their induction.
- Health and Safety Manager also provided an overview of current procedures to U&R, Water Unit, Greenspace and Regeneration teams at a June workshop.
- A 6-monthly reminder email was sent to staff on 24/08 to inform them of H&S processes and tools to manage contractors.
- A ‘deep-dive’ audit of adherence to H&S aspects of contract management will be completed during late 2018/early 2019 as part of SafePlus assessment (see above).

### Objective 4: Improve the Health and Wellbeing of staff, and create measures to ensure success.

**Action 5**: Wellbeing strategy development and implementation project (carry-over).

COMPLETE

A Wellbeing Committee has been established, the wellbeing strategy is complete, and has been submitted to Management Team for their approval in early August. Additionally, the Management Team approved:
- Wellbeing calendar of events
- Wellbeing presence on intranet
- Wellbeing branding
- Wellbeing communications plan.

The Wellbeing Committee has now issued the strategy and communications to all staff (September 2018), and will co-ordinate and communicate all wellbeing activities going forward.

**LEGEND**

- On track
- Slightly behind schedule (less than one month)
- Behind schedule (greater than one month)

In addition to the above workplan, there will be a particular focus on working with volunteers to manage their health and safety. This will include creating written agreements with high risk volunteers, and proactively engaging with all volunteers to ensure that health and safety expectations are aligned with all parties.
Incidents/Injuries - September 2018 (**as at 18th September 2018**)

November 2017 to Current: Worker Incident Reporting

- **Injury**: 33 (61%)
- **Near Miss**: 10 (18%)
- **Property or Vehicle Damage**: 8 (15%)
- **Illness/Medical Incident**: 2 (4%)
- **Ambulance Callout (Aquatics only)**: 1 (2%)

Legend:
- Ambulance Callout (Aquatics only)
- Illness/Medical Incident
- Injury
- Near Miss
- Property or Vehicle Damage
Lost Time Injuries:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Injuries</th>
<th>Total Hours</th>
<th>Causes of LTIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2017/18  | 4        | 294         | Body stressing x2 (manual handling) (63hrs)
|          |          |             | Falls, trips, slips x2 (231hrs) |
| 2018/19  | 1        | 60.5        | Carryover Injury – Falls, trips, slips x1 total 49 hours |
|          |          |             | Body stressing x1 (manual handling) (11.5 hrs) |

### LEAD INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety Inspections</td>
<td>Q3 2018: 16 out of 16 Workplace Walkarounds completed for Q3 (September) 2018. Hazards raised for any non-compliances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Delivered</td>
<td>2017/18: People Trained: 460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Delivered</td>
<td>2018/19: People Trained: 284 (to October)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contractor Database (drawn from SiteWise Database)

**CONTRACTOR PIPELINE**

**CONTRACTOR ASSESSMENT SCORES**

**YOUR CONTRACTORS**

Number of Preferred Contractors at Each Stage

- Avg Score: 83%

**ALL CONTRACTORS**

Number of Contractors at Each Stage in SiteWise

- Avg Score: 71%
## WDC Health and Safety Risk Register Action Plan (High Risk Actions Only) 2018

**Note: under review for next reporting period**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk rating</th>
<th>Risk type</th>
<th>Suggested Actions</th>
<th>Action Owner</th>
<th>Due date</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Contractor Health and Safety Management</td>
<td>*Train all contract managers in H&amp;S processes/requirements at time of induction.</td>
<td>Charlotte Browne</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Contractor Health and Safety Management</td>
<td>*Develop comprehensive contract administration/contract management training package to deliver to all staff managing contractors.</td>
<td>Charlotte Browne</td>
<td>30/11/2018</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Contractor Health and Safety Management</td>
<td>*Identify volunteer groups and leaseholders that engage contractors on behalf of WDC and train in contract H&amp;S management processes.</td>
<td>Managers &amp; Team Leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Contractor Health and Safety Management</td>
<td>*Complete development of Safety in Design procedures and embed in design processes.</td>
<td>Gerard Cleary</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Vehicle Use &amp; Driver Safety</td>
<td>*Deliver driver training as per training strategy (Driver Safety / 4WD).</td>
<td>Charlotte Browne</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Vehicle Use &amp; Driver Safety</td>
<td>*Identify any drivers that require further progressive driver training on an as-needs basis and provide relevant training.</td>
<td>Managers &amp; Team Leaders</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Vehicle Use &amp; Driver Safety</td>
<td>*Provide information and training regarding use of safety equipment such as fire extinguishers in staff pool vehicles to all drivers.</td>
<td>Charlotte Browne</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Vehicle Use &amp; Driver Safety</td>
<td>*Issue reminder to staff about winter driving season (re-send Driving in Waimakariri brochure).</td>
<td>Charlotte Browne</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Volunteers conducting hazardous activities</td>
<td>*Undertake a review of operations to ensure that all activity and training is being carried out as per internal H&amp;S processes.</td>
<td>Liz Ashton</td>
<td></td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Volunteers conducting hazardous activities</td>
<td>*Develop Memorandum of Understanding with NZRT12, which will define accountabilities and expectations. May require some further operational and administrative support to implement the requirements. (TBC)</td>
<td>Liz Ashton</td>
<td></td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Adverse weather</td>
<td>*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.</td>
<td>Charlotte Browne, Kelly La Valley, Kalley Simpson, Chris Brown, Joanne McBride</td>
<td>31/07/2018</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Adverse weather</td>
<td>*Create pre-prepared briefing/toolbox talk for all field staff - regarding specific hazards of an extreme weather event, and the required control measures. Briefing prior to deployment.</td>
<td>Gerard Cleary</td>
<td>31/07/2018</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Investigate use of monitoring and tracking systems for all field staff for use in extreme weather events.</td>
<td>Charlotte Browne</td>
<td>30/06/2018</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Extend vehicle GPS tracking monitoring capability to the managers of all field staff.</td>
<td>Jill Brightwell/Liz Ashton</td>
<td>30/06/2018</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Airfield operations</td>
<td>*Develop of Airfield Safety Committee and appointment of Airfield Safety Co-ordinator to administer all actions from safety review.</td>
<td>Craig Sargison</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Airfield operations</td>
<td>*Develop of Airfield Operations Manual, and adoption of the manual by Council as the key safety document for the Airfield operations.</td>
<td>Craig Sargison</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Airfield operations</td>
<td>*Provide regular Airfield Operations report to Council</td>
<td>Craig Sargison</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Actions in **blue bold** are new (since the most recent Risk Register review).
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT FOR DECISION

FILE NO and TRIM NO: RGN-02-01 / 181024124235
REPORT TO: Regeneration Steering Group
DATE OF MEETING: 3 December 2018
FROM: Roxanne Ramsay, Project Administrator – District Regeneration
       Duncan Roxborough, Implementation Project Manager – District Regeneration
SUBJECT: Regeneration Steering Group Continuation and Meeting Dates for 2019

1. SUMMARY
1.1 This report is seeking to extend the term of the Regeneration Steering Group until the end of the current Council term and to confirm the meeting dates for the Regeneration Steering Group for 2019. The dates are based on meeting each month generally on the first Monday of the month, at 4pm in the Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre, Kaiapoi.

Attachments:
i. Regeneration Steering Group Terms of Reference (Trim 16112913269)

2. RECOMMENDATION
THAT the Regeneration Steering Group recommends:

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives report No. 181024124235.
(b) Approves the extension of the term of the current Regeneration Steering Group to the end of September 2019, with no other changes to the Terms of Reference.
(c) Approves the meeting schedule for 2019 as per Section 4.2, commencing at 4pm, in the Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre of the Kaiapoi Service Centre.

3. BACKGROUND
3.1 During 2017 and 2018 the Regeneration Steering Group met on a monthly timetable at 4pm.

3.2 The Terms of Reference for the Regeneration Steering Group and the establishment report to Council from the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board (Trim 16112913237) indicated a functional duration of the Steering Group from 2017 until December 2018, with the need and make-up of the group to be reviewed in light of implementation progress annually thereafter.
3.3 At the same time the Council disestablished the Kaiapoi Riverbanks Steering Group and the remaining roles of the Riverbanks Steering Group were incorporated into the Terms of Reference of the Regeneration Steering Group.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. Implementation works are ongoing and if the Regeneration Steering Group are to provide ongoing Governance of the Implementation programme then the term of the Steering Group function will need to be extended. It is suggested that the make-up of the group is unchanged but the term of the current Steering Group appointment is extended to the end of September 2019 (prior to the 2019 Local Government elections).

4.2. Recommended meeting dates for 2019 are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday 4 February 2019</th>
<th>Monday 1 July 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday 4 March 2019</td>
<td>Monday 5 August 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 1 April 2019</td>
<td>Monday 2 September 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 6 May 2019</td>
<td>Monday 30 September 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 10 June 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3. Noting the first meeting for 2019 is scheduled for Monday 4 February 2019 which will fall in the same week as Waitangi Day on Wednesday 6 February 2019.

4.4. Noting the first Monday in June 2019 will fall on Queen’s birthday with this meeting being scheduled for Monday 10 June.

4.5. Due to the elections being held there will be no meeting scheduled for October, however there are two meetings scheduled for September to enable matters to be cleared up for the new term.

4.6. An option available to the Council could include holding Regeneration Steering Group meetings at different times to those recommended. However this course of action is not recommended as the current meeting frequency and timing has proven to work over the initial term of the Steering Group as it aligns with the meeting schedules for both the Kaiapoi Tuahiwi Community Board and the Council.

4.7. Another option is to not continue with the Regeneration Steering Group and transfer the functions of the Steering Group to either the Council or the Kaiapoi Tuahiwi Community Board. This is not recommended, as the key advantage of the Regeneration Steering Group, is the wider membership with representatives from Ecan, Te Kokaha o Tuhaitara Trust and the Runanga as well as the Mayor and the Chief Executive.

4.8. Note that the incoming Council will determine the Committee Structure and Steering Groups that it wishes to operate during its term.

4.9. The Management Team have reviewed this report and support the recommendations.

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

5.1.1. The established pattern of the Regeneration Steering Group meetings has generally worked well for members, taking into account other community
commitments and the timing of Kaiapoi Tuahiwi Community Board and Council meetings..

5.2. **Wider Community**

5.2.1. The Regeneration Steering Group meetings schedule and agendas will made public through the usual process and will be published on the Regeneration website page.

5.2.2. Community views were not sought. We are not aware of any adverse comments from the public on meeting times.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

6.1.1. All meetings are serviced from existing Council budgets. Meeting venues are generally Council owned assets and are not charged.

6.2. **Community Implications**

6.2.1. The Regeneration Steering Group meetings are advertised on the Council website and at Service Centres on in-house television screens. The Regeneration Steering Group agendas and meeting minutes are also published on the Council website and members or the community are welcome to attend the open meeting sessions.

6.3. **Risk Management**

6.3.1. The Regeneration Steering Group are to provide a regular project overview to the Council, Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board or relevant Council Committee, and the Crown (if required) reporting on milestones, programme, budget, issues and risk.

6.4. **Health and Safety**

6.4.1. This report has no health and safety implications.

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**

7.2.1. Local Government Act 2002 Schedule 7 Clause 19 – A local authority must hold the meetings that are necessary for the good government of its region or district.

7.2.2. Meetings must be called and conducted in accordance with Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (LGOIMA) and the standing orders of the local authority.

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

- There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision-making by local, regional and national organisations that affect our District.
7.4. **Delegations**

- The Regeneration Steering Group has the delegated authority to set its meeting dates. The proposed meeting dates for 2019 follow the same pattern as previous years.

- The Regeneration Steering Group are to provide advice and recommendations to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board and Waimakariri District Council on key decisions relating to the implementation of the Waimakariri Residential Red Zone Recovery Plan.
TERMS OF REFERENCE

REGENERATION STEERING GROUP

1. PURPOSE
The purpose of the Regeneration Steering Group (RSG) is to provide advice and recommendations to the Kaiapoi - Tuahiwi Community Board and Waimakariri District Council on key decisions relating to the implementation of the Waimakariri Residential Red Zone Recovery Plan.

2. MEMBERSHIP
- Mayor
- Council Portfolio Holder – Kaiapoi Regeneration (Chair)
- Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board (full Board)
- Kaiapoi-Woodend Ward Councillors
- Te Ngāi Tūhuriri Rūnanga (representative(s))
- Te Kohaka o Tūhaitara Trust (representative)
- Environment Canterbury (representative)
- Chief Executive
- Manager, Community & Recreation
- Implementation Programme Manager, District Regeneration

3. ROLE
The members of the RSG will engage in a positive and collaborative manner to enable the efficient and effective implementation of the Recovery Plan. This includes (but is not limited to) the following roles:
- Govern the District Regeneration programme;
- Make recommendations to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board, Council or Council Committees, and oversee the implementation of Board, Council or Council Committee decisions;
- Lead and support community and partner engagement;
- Strategic level decision making and guidance, in accordance with the Decision Framework;
- Make recommendations to Council regarding the division of the overall budget for specific projects;
- Recommend any material changes to the Implementation Strategy;
- Review and monitor overall progress (including budget tracking);
TERMS OF REFERENCE

REGENERATION STEERING GROUP

- Provide a regular project overview to the Council, Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board or relevant Council Committee, and the Crown (if required) reporting on milestones, programme, budget, issues and risk;
- Provide recommendations on key documents where necessary, including but not limited to:
  - Implementation Strategy
  - Participation Strategy
  - Reports or briefings to Council, Council Committees or Boards
- Recommend approval of master plans, concept plans, and strategies
- Participate in design and planning workshops;

Members have a key role to ensure the effective flow of information between member organisations and the Steering Group.

4. MEETING FREQUENCY
The RSG shall meet every four weeks or when requested to do so for urgent matters, or matters relating to the purpose of the RSG.

A quorum is considered to be 50 percent of members.

5. ADMINISTRATION
The agenda and minutes for the RSG meeting will be prepared by the Core Project Team Project Administrator. The agenda and minutes will be filed in TRIM and distributed to all members. The agenda for the meeting shall generally be as follows:
1. Introductions / Apologies
2. Previous Minutes
3. Implementation Programme Manager Report (milestones, programme, issues, budget, risk)
4. Community participation review
5. Reports to Council, Committee or Community Board
6. General Business

6. DURATION
The RSG will function until December 2018. The need and make-up of the group will be reviewed in light of implementation progress annually thereafter.
MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF THE CANTERBURY WATER MANAGEMENT STRATEGY WAIMAKARIRI ZONE COMMITTEE HELD IN THE RAKAHURI COMMITTEE ROOMS 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA ON MONDAY 10 OCTOBER 2018 AT 3.10PM.

PRESENT
Grant Edge (Acting Chair), Carolyne Latham, Gary Walton, Michael Blackwell, Claire McKay (Environment Canterbury Councillor), Arapata Reuben (arrived at 3.20pm during item 2) and Sandra Stewart (Councillor, Waimakariri District Council).

IN ATTENDANCE
WDC Councillor Paul Williams, James Ensor (Member Oxford-Ohoka Community Board), Phillip Redmond (Member Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board), Sophie Allen (Water Environment Advisor, WDC), Owen Davies (Drainage Asset Manager, WDC), Libica Hurley (Technical Administrator, WDC), Meredith Macdonald (Senior Resource Management Planner), Jocelyne Allen (ECan), Gina McKenzie (Real Communications Ltd), Andrew Arps (ECan), Bruce Stokes (Farmer), Michael Bate, (Kaiapoi resident), Murray Griffin (CWMS Facilitator, ECan) and Sarah Nichols (WDC Governance Manager).

1. APOLOGIES
Moved C McKay seconded M Blackwell
That an apology for lateness be received from Arapata Reuben.
That apologies for absence were received and sustained from David Ashby, Judith Roper-Lindsay and Cameron Henderson.

CARRIED

2. REGISTER OF INTERESTS
There were no changes to the Register of Interests.

3. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of the Canterbury Water Management Strategy Waimakariri Zone Committee meeting – 10 September 2018
Moved: C Latham Seconded: G Walton
That the CWMS Waimakariri Zone Committee:
(a) Confirms the minutes of the Canterbury Water Management Strategy Waimakariri Zone Committee meeting, held on 10 September 2018, as a true and accurate record.

CARRIED

MATTERS ARISING
S Stewart queried when the Committee could expect the report related to R Johnston’s property on the banks of the Ashley River that had been raised at previous meetings. C McKay advised the report was currently being reviewed by ECan staff.

M Blackwell queried an update related to the Pines Beach meeting with K Simpson (WDC). S Stewart and Councillor P Williams (WDC) advised the matter was in hand and sorted.
M Blackwell queried the Lineside Road paddocks. It was advised that Sicon had started a work assessment and drone footage was being taken of the area. General discussion occurred. G Edge requested the 3Waters team investigate and report back to the Committee.

G Edge enquired of C McKay on the alternative economic outlook for diversification. C McKay advised this project was market led, and not ECan led, noting that Lincoln University were undertaking some work in this area.

A Reuben arrived at 3.20pm.

4. COMMITTEE UPDATES – ZONE COMMITTEE MEMBERS, MURRAY GRIFFIN, (CWMS FACILITATOR, ECAN)

4.1 CWMS Regional Committee working group meeting 11 September 2018 – Carolyne Latham, (Waimakariri Zone Regional Committee Representative)

M Griffin clarified with C Latham there were no additional updates to add to her report.

G Edge asked for an explanation of the Fit for Future projects with a focus on the targets. C Latham explained there were six task groups and noted that the task group for Regional and National Economic indicators target areas had not yet met to discuss this issue, although some of other groups had discussed economic issues. She commented on a spreadsheet of potential targets for 2025 and the group being asked for input.

C McKay explained much of the work for the economic target area was related to economic contributions from water management, employment and other values associated with water in Canterbury. It was difficult to get the right people together on this task.

C Latham said the Zone Committee would have input/feedback later (currently the work was at a very preliminary stage). C McKay confirmed the project organisers appreciated both the Waimakariri and OTOP zone committees would have limited capacity to provide feedback at this early stage of the project, because of current workloads focused on their respective ZIP Addendums. M Griffin explained there will be a second round of feedback for this project and the Zone Committee would input during that phase. G Edge asked for information to be circulated to the Committee.

C Latham noted the targets for irrigated land. C Latham provided an update on recent discussions regarding year 2040 targets and noted more discussion would occur at tomorrow’s Regional Committee meeting.

4.2 Media and Communications – September 6 – October 1 Update – Gina McKenzie (Director – Real Communications)

M Griffin introduced the information, commenting on feedback received at the Ohoka Market, where people had taken documents and discussed the information with committee members and support staff. G McKenzie noted there are more articles to come, which will be accessible on the ECAn website, local news and the Council. She also confirmed the Irrigation NZ magazine was being trialed for disseminating information.

S Stewart asked about articles published and what has come from community interest rather than by ECAn communications. She remarked that many of these articles are PR rather than legitimate information. G McKenzie commented on her monthly meetings with local newspapers and their discretion on what they chose to publish. S Stewart asked if in future reports it could be differentiated on what was PR information from ECAn and what was legitimate news generated by newspapers themselves. G McKenzie confirmed that request could be accommodated in the future.
C Latham asked S Stewart why this distinction matters. S Stewart responded that it is useful to know what is generated by community concern rather than PR. General discussion occurred. C McKay commented on the importance of education.

Moved: C McKay Seconded: M Blackwell

THAT the CWMS Waimakariri Zone Committee:

(a) Receive these updates for its information and regard to the committee’s 5 Year Outcomes and community engagement priorities.

CARRIED

5. PROPOSED STOCK WATER RACE CLOSURES - Owen Davies (Drainage Asset Manager, WDC) AND LIBICA HURLEY (TECHNICAL ADMINISTRATOR, WDC)

O Davies advised the Committee of recent applications received by the Waimakariri District Council to close Council owned stock water races R8-1 and R3Q-5. He provided a general overview and outlined reasoning for recommending closure, including effects on neighbouring properties.

C Latham queried para 5.5 and 5.6 of the report asking for an explanation in the increase of WDC water race closures.

O Davies spoke on water race effects on the region and changes to the way ground water operates in the District. He spoke of the Managed Aquifer Recharge trial occurring currently and effects on ground water take levels, believing it would have minimal effect. Staff advised that there are approximately 835km of water race in the Waimakariri District, of which there are areas not closed but re-routed around paddocks for pivot irrigators. Short lengths of water race may close and potentially even out the situation, however it does not mean that overall WDC are reducing water races. O Davies spoke of self-funding and how the Council is protective of the water race system, which he does not envisage will be closed any time soon.

C McKay asked that given the value of water races is the WDC looking at rating on the overall area. O Davies advised the Council were looking at wider benefits for bio-diversity, however the matter had not been considered in depth by Council at this time. O Davies spoke of the relevance that the resource consent allows use for stock water, electricity generation and irrigation. At present WDC do not have the right to use water races as a supply to recharge water. O Davies cautioned getting into a robbing Peter to pay Paul scenario. The WDC will have further discussions in the future.

G Edge tabled a question from J Roper-Lindsay in her absence related to assessment methods. O Davies advised that staff had yet to look closely at ecological values and noted the difficulty of assessment given some water races do not have water for most of the year. Ecological value is minimal in many cases and the matter could be looked at more closely in the future. G Edge referred to one example in the report and wondered if more discussion on Farm Environment Plans (FEPs) and assessment prior to closure could occur to help farmers under their FEPs. He referred to photos 4 and 5. O Davies commented it may have been a secondary stormwater drain at the time. Photo 1 of gum trees was commented on in regard to ecological/biological areas and removal of the race. G Edge commented that this example may not comply with the WDC Water Race Policy but it may have broader ecological benefits. O Davies commented there is no mechanism at present for that to happen and more investigation and discussion would be required. The matter could potentially be discussed in the future as a Council debate.

C Latham sought clarification on the decision sought from the zone committee. Staff advised the final decision is with the WDC Utilities & Roading Committee, which would receive a report prior to Christmas.
C Latham mentioned draft ZIPA feedback received about ECan/WDC bringing closures to the Committee for input prior to final decision and this aspect should be strengthened. O Davies advised that matter needed to be debated at Council level.

A Reuben advised the Rūnanga were supportive of this race closure and have provided feedback on the proviso that native species are removed prior to the closure.

G Walton believed closure of the water race made sense in this situation, given the pivot irrigator path. He commented that the farmer does not need the race as they have alternative solutions for stock. C Latham reiterated the ZIPA feedback shared.

S Stewart stated it is timely that this Water Zone Committee asked the Council for a report on the matter.

Moved:  S Stewart Seconded:  G Edge

(a) That the Canterbury Water management Strategy Waimakariri Zone Committee requests Waimakariri District Council to prepare a wider strategy for water race closures, looking at benefits of ecological and biological and reasoning. The report is to include firefighting capacity of closure impacts.

CARRIED

6. WAIMAKARIRI LAND AND WATER SOLUTIONS PROGRAMME - DRAFT ZIP ADDENDUM – ENGAGEMENT FORUM – MEREDITH MACDONALD (SENIOR RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLANNER) AND MURRAY GRIFFIN (CWMS ZONE FACILITATOR)

M Macdonald provided an update on the consultation process. There had been seven sessions at various venues, involving a combination of day and evening sessions. In Kaiapoi 30 people were present, whilst the Pegasus session received a low turn-out. There were seven groups attending one Rangiora session with the morning session being full. Oxford had the best turnout with 20 people present in the morning, and 40 people attending the evening session. Belfast had only single numbers of attendees. At the Ohoka Market 35 people attended the first session and 45 people were present during the second session and provided great feedback. The Ohoka Market had been a positive engagement with people commenting on a range of issues including fencing, seeking an understanding of what to do, when and how.

G Edge acknowledged the work of ECan staff during the consultation process. The last session was being held this Thursday 7-9pm at Rossburn, Rangiora.

M Bates spoke briefly, expressing his concern about minimum flows and the timeframes. He believed that the timeframes needed to be brought forward. He commented on the diminishing fish life he had observed and that the Waimakariri River aspect has to be factored in to assist the Kaiapoi River proposals. M Bates also expressed concern that the Ashley flow is too low at the Gorge. He commented on the declined in wetland areas and the benefits that wetlands can bring for wildlife. M Bates posed the question of what are we trying to solve.

G Edge suggested M Bates put his views in writing and the Committee will review all the feedback. The comments were noted by staff.

Moved:  C Latham Seconded: M Blackwell

THAT the CWMS Waimakariri Zone Committee:

(a) Receive this update and feedback as part of the community engagement on the Waimakariri Land and Water Solutions Programme Draft ZIP Addendum 2018.

CARRIED
7. **GENERAL BUSINESS**

C Latham commented on a newspaper extract related to herbicide trials (*Weedex*) and a desire for WDC to investigate the matters further.

8. **NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the CWMS Waimakariri Water Zone Committee will be held on Monday 19 November 2018 at 4.00pm.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 4.15pm.

CONFIRMED

______________________
Chairman

______________________
Date
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE DISTRICT PLANNING AND REGULATION COMMITTEE MEETING HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA ON TUESDAY 16 OCTOBER 2018 1.00PM.

PRESENT
Councillor D Gordon (Chair), Mayor D Ayers (from 1.30pm), Councillors N Atkinson, W Doody and S Stewart.

IN ATTENDANCE
Councillors A Blackie, P Williams and K Felstead. J Palmer (Chief Executive), N Harrison (Manager Regulation), M Bacon (Team Leader Resource Consents), W Taylor (Building Unit Manager), T Ellis (Development Planning Manager), M Johnston (Environmental Services Manager), Neil Sheerin (Senior Policy Planner), Shelley Milosavljevic (Intermediate Policy Planner), Cameron Wood (Senior Policy Planner) Lynley Beckingsale (Policy Analyst) and E Stubbs (Minute Secretary).

1. APOLOGIES
Moved D Gordon second W Doody
An apology was received and sustained from J Meyer for absence and Mayor Ayers for lateness. CARRIED

Acknowledgement of Les Pester Retirement
Les Pester was invited to the meeting to provide an opportunity for the Committee to thank L Pester for his many years of work in Civil Defence in the Waimakariri District. He had retired from his role of Civil Defence Controller. He had lead the Civil Defence team and played a vital role in building up the Waimakariri community team. Prior to that he was at the Ministry of Civil Defence as Deputy Commissioner in a role involving training, mentoring and caching. N Harrison noted in particular his role with the building assessment team following the Canterbury earthquakes. His relationship skills and calm manner would be missed.

D Gordon thanked L Pester on behalf of the Council and community for his work and wished him and Margaret well for retirement.

N Atkinson thanked L Pester on behalf of the Kaiapoi community for his role following the earthquakes in particular his calm, collected and organised approach at an extremely difficult time.

W Doody concurred with the sentiments.

J Palmer acknowledged L Pester’s work on behalf of the Canterbury group to which he had made a huge contribution. He had generously provided support to other local authorities including the South and mid Canterbury snow of 2006. He had been a part of forming policy and strategy for wider Canterbury. He echoed the sentiments of those around the table regarding L Pester’s calmness under pressure and valuable advice. He also thanked Margaret for her support.

L Pester was humbled and appreciated the sentiments. He acknowledged the support of Council Management including J Palmer to Civil Defence in Waimakariri and also the good working relationships with the community. He
commented that Waimakariri District Council had always been a leader in Civil Defence and it was held in high esteem by others for that reason.

On behalf of the District Planning and Regulation Committee, the Chair presented L Pester a small gift in appreciation for his service in the role of Civil Defence Controller.

2. **CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

There were no conflicts of interest.

3. **CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**

3.1 Minutes of a meeting of the District Planning and Regulation Committee held on 21 August 2018

Moved N Atkinson second W Doody

THAT the District Planning and Regulation Committee:

(a) Confirms as a true and correct record the minutes of a meeting of the District Planning and Regulation Committee held on 21 August 2018.  

CARRIED

4. **MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

There were no matters arising.

*Item 6.1 was taken at this time. Note that the minutes have been recorded in accordance with the order of the agenda as circulated.*

5. **DEPUTATION**

Gillian Giller spoke to a Powerpoint presentation (Trim 181031127785) titled Waimakariri District – Protecting our Flora and Fauna Heritage. G Giller explained that she had grown up on a dairy farm where she had learned to value and protect vegetation remnants which had gone hand in hand with farm operations.

G Giller showed images of forest cover in Canterbury pre human times compared to modern times noting that there was a fraction of forest cover left. Much of the Waimakariri District was in the ‘redzone’ meaning there was less than 10% of indigenous cover left.

G Giller explained that the Waimakariri District had a range of different ecosystems including:

- Inland basin frost-flat vegetation
- Inland basin wetland vegetation
- Inland hill country beech forest
- Induced (secondary) vegetation
- Foothills and high plains podocarp forest
- Plains drylands
- Plains wetlands
- Lowland swamp forest
- Coastal vegetation

There was little remaining of these ecosystems with many species declining and vulnerable. Some ecosystems were the only known habitat for species. The
lowland swamp and coastal forests were gone and were now limited to re-creation attempts.

G Giller advised that Waimakariri District had the best dryland kanuka remnants on the Canterbury Plains however these were highly threatened and were undervalued and under protected. Aerial images from 2005 and 2015 were compared to show the effect of changing land use. In that time Kanuka remnants had reduced from 95ha to 35ha.

G Giller outlined some strategies that could assist with looking after the ecosystems including:
- Addressing knowledge gaps – Council, landowners and the community
- Monitoring trends
- Physical protection – fencing
- Weed control
- Pest control

G Giller recommended the Committee read the Canterbury Regional Biodiversity Strategy to which Waimakariri District Council was a signatory. It outlined guiding principles including protection, restoration and re-creation. Protecting remnant vegetation was the best option as it provided the best available representativeness rather than superficial re-creation. It was also the most cost efficient at $0.5-1k/ha compared to $50k-100k/ha.

G Giller looked at management issues noting that much of the biodiversity was on private land. Protection required awareness, understanding and engagement as well as costing money. The Council had statutory responsibilities and could also provide non-statutory leadership.

In practical terms G Giller suggested that Waimakariri District Council could conduct a survey of all indigenous flora and fauna in the District, employ a biodiversity officer to coordinate actions and adequately fund a Resource Management Programme for indigenous flora and fauna. She noted that the fund had not increased since 2005. In the District Plan there was the option for a ‘carrot or stick’ approach. She suggested it was better to encourage and help people protect biodiversity.

D Ayers asked if areas were set aside adjacent to remnant areas was there an increased chance of ecosystem development in the new area and G Giller replied there was, over time associated micro-horizons could move.

D Ayers asked if there was any usefulness to replacing pine plantations with kanuka plantations, for example in a shingle pit reserve. G Giller replied if it was on the basis that there was remnant kanuka in that location it was. Complete re-creation could never be like the original, however in some cases it was the only option. Kanukas were only one part of the ecosystem and the total was extremely difficult to recreate.

Mayor Ayers asked in the case of climate change would the climate be similar enough for original vegetation cover to re-establish. G Giller explained that it would not be that different that plants could not adapt. They could handle a degree of disturbance, what they could not handle was to be completely wiped out.

D Gordon asked in a question to staff whether it was worthwhile having a workshop or report on the issue to consider the points raised. T Ellis commented there had been one or two workshops on biodiversity options and obligations under the Resource Management Act. There was a broad goal of ‘doing better’. He was happy to come back to the issue in due course. T Ellis noted the biodiversity strategy was not 10 years old and had never had much ownership, it required an action plan to make it happen. From a District Plan point of view ecologists were looking at certain sites to see if they were significant. G Giller suggested that the whole area needed surveying rather than isolated sites as
even within broad categories there were subsets and it was important to understand the entirety.

T Ellis commented that biodiversity in the District Plan was a hot topic. G Giller commented that in the community it was a fear of the unknown, for that reason a biodiversity officer with ecological as well as excellent communication skills was important.

S Stewart commented it was a timely presentation. She asked G Giller if she had seen a local authority in New Zealand that had been successful in enhancing biodiversity – was there a model? G Giller replied that the only place she knew that had a biodiversity officer was Selwyn District Council and that initiative was in early days. There was a cumulative effect of neighbours taking to neighbours. She gave the example of QEII clusters of covenants where that discussion occurred. It was important to start the process and have someone available to speak to landowners. With financial assistance there was often goodwill of landowners to spend their own money on a project.

S Stewart asked if G Giller believed financial assistance was a successful method and G Giller believed the ‘carrot’ option was better.

Mayor Ayers asked M Bacon how much was in the contestable fund. M Bacon replied there was $147,000. It was covered heritage buildings and notable trees. M Bacon was happy to workshop that fund with the Committee.

6. REPORTS

6.1 Waimakariri District Plan Review – Possible Council Designations – Neil Sheerin (Senior Policy Planner) and Trevor Ellis (Development Planning Manager)

N Sheerin spoke to the report noting it related to the technical intricacies of designations. There are no Council designations in the current District Plan, prior to that there had been. By 2020 the current District Plan will be nearing 25 years old and the district had changed a lot in that time.

N Sheerin outlined the advantages of designations. Firstly it provided the holder of the designation certainty in regard to project delivery. Secondly it allowed strategic sites or routes were protected into the future and thirdly it provided a useful advance notice to the general public of what may happen where. For example, looking at the District Plan, land acquisitions and resource consents would not show up by designations would thus assisting with decision making.

As the Council had no designations at the moment, if designations were included in the new plan it would mean all new designations would need to be publically notified and subject to submissions. Staff believed potential advantages outweighed the disadvantages. It was a statutory power that Council’s could use to make projects happen that was not currently being used.

Questions

W Doody asked if it would assist with current issues regarding the consent process and N Harrison replied that was the direction of a more Activities Based plan approach.

A Blackie noted at the recent Kaiapoi Town Centre Hearing, Mainpower had referred to a designation umbrella for the mixed use business area and asked for a comment on why Mainpower would want that. T Ellis replied that may be in reference to zoning. Mainpower had designations in the current plan for assets such as substations. J Palmer commented...
that he was unsure whether Mainpower had a designation for their substation next to Ruatanuiwha and it may be they wanted sites like that designated. A Blackie asked how designations could be made now, when it was not known who or what was going into those areas. N Sheerin commented that designations could only be used by the authority that was requiring it, only certain types of authority could have designations. MainPower may have been referring to the use of designations for facilities within the zoned area, it was different to designating a wider area for commercial use which a network utility like MainPower wouldn't be able to do.

N Atkinson noted asked if designations could be used for something existing that the Council wanted to protect such as Woodford Glen or the Airport or did it have to a new activity and how easy was it to take designations in or out. N Sheerin replied yes, they could be used for existing activities such as wastewater treatment plants. With regard to Woodford Glen it was proposed to include that in a sport and active recreation zone rather than designation. For Council designations it was for Council owned and operated facilities. For Greenfields sites – for example a large facility, a designation could be put on a particular site.

K Felstead referred to the new Multiuse Stadium facility and asked about the advantages of designation rather than Resource Consent. N Sheerin advised that MainPower Oval was a site proposed for sport and active recreation zone in the new plan. There had been preliminary discussions regarding options for facilitating development of the new stadium through designation or Resource Consent. In terms of timing, with possible construction by March 2019, it would be a tight time frame for a designation in the proposed District Plan and in that case it would be potentially a longer process than for a Resource Consent. In the long term, a designation would give the ability to manage the site with less difficulty than a consent in terms of extension or upgrade requirements. Even if the new stadium was constructed under Resource Consent a designation for the stadium could still be included in the new plan. J Palmer commented that a March start was optimistic, early May was current expectation. The option for designation as part of the proposed District Plan was something to consider.

S Stewart referred to issues around drinking water and asked if designations could be applicable for recharge areas as a way of protection. She noted the Waimakariri Zone Committee had provided maps of protection areas. N Sheerin commented he had not heard of designations for that kind of purpose. They were normally for above ground physical infrastructure, for example a wastewater plant and associated with that there may be a large area of land for effluent disposal field. In terms of a recharge area it would depend on the size of the area and may be better facilitated by zoning or overlay rather than designations. T Ellis commented that Council typically used designations for head works or specific purposes. Designations were for a requiring authority to do some works or provide a service within that area rather taking a broader water preservation perspective.

W Doody asked whether the hockey turf at Coldstream road needed designation, N Sheerin advised it was proposed to be zoned for sport and active recreation in the new plan. Designation was an option, but he believed zoning was more appropriate. Zoning allowed for other groups such as a sports club wanting to build clubrooms whereas a designation only applied to the authority. A proposed sport and active recreation zone also applied to the Oxford Speedway.

Moved Atkinson seconded Councillor Gordon
THAT the District Planning and Regulation Committee

(a) **Receives** report No. 181008116926;

(b) **Notes** the information on designations outlined in Sections 3 to 8 and Appendix 1 below;

(c) **Approves** the preparation of notices of requirement for Council designations, and their lodgement once the formal call for designations to be included in the proposed new District Plan is made;

(d) **Notes** draft Council notices of requirement will be provided to Council for review, comment and approval prior to lodgement.

**CARRIED**

Councillor Atkinson thanked staff for a full report noting the topic had been addressed in a number of briefings, it would now come out in the proposed District Plan for the public to have a say.

Councillor Gordon agreed with Councillor Atkinson commenting it had been well workshopped.


S Milosavljevic spoke to the report noting that it outlined preparation of a revised Rural Residential Development Strategy to inform the District Plan Review. Within Greater Christchurch, rural residential development was required to be guided by a strategy. A communications plan sat behind the Strategy. She noted the topic had been well workshopped.

Moved Mayor Ayers seconded Councillor Atkinson

THAT the District Planning and Regulation Committee recommends:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180720081057.

(b) **Approves** the preparation of a District wide Rural Residential Development Strategy.

(c) **Notes** that different approaches to zoning are identified for areas within and outside of the Urban Development Strategy area, as outlined in Paragraph 4.1 of this report.

(d) **Notes** that matters associated with 4ha subdivision will be reported to the Committee as part of the District Plan Review within a separate report.

**CARRIED**

Mayor Ayers commented that the strategy was important in terms of managing population growth and rural land use. One of the important things was to get an understanding of the difference between lifestyle blocks and rural residential.

6.3 **Structure Planning – Residential East / West Rangiora and East Kaiapoi and linkages with the review of Rangiora Town Centre Plan – Cameron Wood (Senior Policy Planner)**

C Wood would take the report as read noting that it had been well workshopped prior to the meeting.

**Questions**
Councillor Stewart asked when outline plans were completed were significant features like water courses and spring heads identified. C Wood replied yes.

Councillor Doody referred to greenfields areas and asked if there was an opportunity to grow native vegetation. C Wood replied that structure plans would look at character and what could be done to support urban development including landscaping.

Moved Councillor Atkinson seconded Councillor Doody

**THAT** the District Planning and Regulation Committee recommends:

(a) ** Receives ** report No. 181003114567.

(b) ** Approves ** the preparation of a Structure Plan for East and West Rangiora and for East Kaiapoi as shown on Map 1 of this report.

(c) ** Notes ** that the Structure Plans for East and West Rangiora will have linkages with the review of Rangiora Town Centre Plan.

CARRIED

Councillor Atkinson commented the issue had been well traversed. He would like to see it progressed.

7. **MATTER REFERRED FROM RANGIORA ASHLEY COMMUNITY BOARD**

7.1 **Request for Parking Restrictions on Edward Street, Rangiora – Joanne McBride (Roading and Transport Manager)**

N Harrison spoke briefly to the report advising that Rangiora Ashley Community Board had chosen the option for 3 time restricted parks outside the car yard on Edward Street. If the Committee agreed the Parking Bylaw 2007 would be amended.

Moved W Doody seconded Councillor Atkinson

**THAT** the District Planning and Regulation Committee:

(a) ** Receives ** report No. 180919108757;

(b) ** Amends ** the Parking Bylaw 2007 to include parking on Edward Street as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Item</th>
<th>Rangiora</th>
<th>Edward St</th>
<th>Immediately east of the Blackett St Roundabout</th>
<th>North side</th>
<th>P120</th>
<th>3 Parks, North side</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CARRIED

W Doody supported the Rangiora Ashley Community Board’s decision.

8. **PORTFOLIO UPDATES**

8.1 **District Planning Development** - Councillor Neville Atkinson

N Atkinson noted the District Planning reports before the Committee in today’s agenda and urged Councillors to attend the workshops where
they could as it was beneficial to work through the issues prior to a formal meeting. The process would continue for some time.

8.2 Regulation and Civil Defence – Councillor John Meyer

Mayor Ayers noted that National Shakeout Day was 18 October 2018.

8.3 Business, Promotion and Town Centres – Councillor Dan Gordon

D Gordon commented there was a lot happening in this space and he was having regular briefings with Simon Hart (Business and Centres Manager). It was heartening to see progress on projects.

Kaiapoi Promotions Association was going well, there was work in progress for the Christmas parade and good feedback from Kaiapoi retailers. There was a joint meeting for the three district promotions associations at the end of November.

9. QUESTIONS

10. URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 2.18pm

CONFIRMED

________________________
Chairperson

________________________
Date

Briefing
- At the conclusion of the meeting there was a briefing regarding the Rangiora Airfield Plan Change.
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE UTILITIES AND ROADING COMMITTEE HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA ON TUESDAY 16 OCTOBER 2018 AT 4.00PM

PRESENT

Councillor S Stewart (Chairperson), Mayor D Ayers, Deputy Mayor K Felstead, Councillors R Brine, and P Williams.

IN ATTENDANCE

Councillors W Doody, D Gordon (for part of meeting) and Councillor Barnett (from 4.35pm) Messrs J Palmer, (Chief Executive), K Simpson (3 Waters Manager), O Davies (Drainage Asset Manager), C Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager), Ms J McBride (Roading and Transport Manager), Messrs D Roxborough (Implementation Project Manager – District Regeneration), Ms S Allen (Water Environment Advisor) and A Smith (Committee Advisor)

1 APOLOGIES

Moved Mayor Ayers seconded Councillor Stewart

THAT an apology for absence be received and sustained from Councillor J Meyer.

CARRIED

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

There were no conflicts of interest recorded.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

3.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Utilities and Roading Committee held on Tuesday 21 August 2018

Moved Councillor Stewart seconded Councillor Williams

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee:

(a) Confirms, as a true and correct record, the minutes of a meeting of the Utilities and Roading Committee held on Tuesday 21 August 2018.

CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING

Councillors Williams and Stewart enquired if there had been any further sea foam testing undertaken. K Simpson (3 Waters Manager), advised that staff member Sophie Allen has been communicating with Michael Bate regarding further occurrences of sea form since the last meeting. There has been meeting held on the beach and there was the presence of sea form. Although this was not the type of foam that Mr Bate was specifically concerned about, it was agreed that this foam would be tested. There is to be a briefing following this meeting where a more detailed update would be provided by S Allen.
5 DEPUTATION

There were no deputations.

6 REPORTS

6.1 Review of Water Supply Bylaw 2012 - Colin Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager)

Mr C Roxburgh presented this report requesting the Committee recommend the Council's approval to renew the Water Supply Bylaw 2012. This review is triggered by the five year anniversary of the original Bylaw and it is now a requirement for it to be reviewed. Staff have been through a review process and identified changes required and could not find a need for significant changes but rather to update the document to reflect policies and procedures that have been approved since 2012. The most significant change would be the introduction of the Backflow Prevention Policy which was put into place in 2014 and there have been other changes that reflect other changes to policies or procedures.

It is recommended that the proposed new Bylaw be adopted by Council, rather than going through a Special Consultative Procedure as staff did not consider there had been significant changes to the Policy.

Councillor Stewart noted that this Bylaw is for public water supplies and asked if there was a need for a bylaw that covers private water supplies and if there was a Bylaw required for these. C Roxburgh noted that it is clearly indicated at the beginning of this Bylaw that it does not cover private water supplies. This Bylaw is about protecting public water supplies from any interference which could adversely impact on users of the supply. Such a Bylaw to cover private water supplies would need to be written in a completely different way and would need to be a stand alone document. K Simpson said the concerns regarding private water supplies are about water quality, whereas this Bylaw covers the integrity of reticulation is protected and infrastructure for water supplies. There are other avenues to protect private water supplies, which would also apply to the source of supply of water to public water supplies.

Councillor Williams asked about the protection of a Council water supply against any possible contamination of private water supply and there is no Bylaw to add protection to Council supplies. C Roxburgh noted that Environment Canterbury have consent requirements in place and to allow for protection zones. It was noted that if a landowner proposes a new activity, the Council can oppose that consent and this will be noted by Ecan. Following the Havelock North incident, K Simpson noted that it is important for everybody to be working together, including Regional Councils, District Councils, and District Health Boards and the formation of the Canterbury Drinking Water Reference Group with representatives from these groups.

Moved Councillor Williams seconded Councillor Brine

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee recommends;

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180910103408.
(b) Notes that a review of the Water Supply Bylaw 2012 has been undertaken, and it has been confirmed that there is a need for a water supply bylaw, and that the 2012 document is generally fit for purpose.

(c) Notes that the proposed Water Supply Bylaw 2018 does not provide Council with extra rights or powers than it currently has, but rather is an update of the existing document to accurately reference current practices, to clarify some clauses and to reference other policies (the Backflow Prevention Policy) that have been developed since the 2012 bylaw was adopted.

(d) Adopts the Waimakariri District Council Water Supply Bylaw 2018.

(e) Circulates this report to the Council’s Community Boards for their information.

CARRIED

6.2 Annual Compliance Report for Waimakariri District Council owned Drinking-Water Supplies with the Drinking Water Standards for New Zealand - Colin Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager)

The Chair noted that copies of an amended recommendation from staff for this Item have been circulated to members (reflecting changes to recommendations (f) and (g)). Members noted receipt and Councillor Gordon also suggested an addition to recommendation (g).

C Roxburgh presented this report with the results of the annual compliance report for the Council’s drinking-water supplies with the Drinking Water Standards of New Zealand 2005 and the Health Act 1956 for the 2017/18 monitoring period. This is published by the Canterbury District Health Board.

Council achieved bacterial compliance was achieved on all schemes with all its plants and within all distribution zones. Council had chemical compliance on all schemes and complied with the Health Act on all schemes.

Council achieved protozoal compliance on eight of its 15 supplies and C Roxburgh provided information on the upgrade plans in place for the Fernside, Mandeville, Oxford Rural No. 1 and Oxford Rural No 2 Schemes and Waikuku Beach supplies to gain protozoal compliance during the current 2018/19 monitoring period. Garrymere and Poyntzs Road require complete upgrades in order for them to be compliant. These require detailed consultation due to the rating implications.

Regarding the costs of investigations, C Roxburgh said that when discussing this with the communities, the Council is going to need to provide more details and analysis work is going to take time and resources to provide the answers. Councillor Gordon queried the costs of hiring consultants for detailed investigations. Staff are conscience of costs and already endeavouring to keep the costs down for projects.

Moved Councillor Brine seconded Councillor Williams

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 181002113999.

(b) Notes that all 15 of the Council’s drinking-water supplies met the monitoring and management obligations of the Health Act for the 2017/18 monitoring period.
(c) **Notes** that all 15 of the Council’s drinking-water supplies achieved bacterial compliance with the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand for the 2017/18 monitoring period.

(d) **Notes** that 8 of the Council’s 15 water supplies achieved full protozoal compliance with the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand (DWSNZ) and that of those schemes that didn’t achieve compliance in the 2017/18 period 5 are expected to gain compliance throughout the 2018/19 period.

(e) **Notes** that the Garrymere and Poyntzs Road water supplies require source upgrade projects to be completed in order to gain compliance, both of which are budgeted for completion in the 2019/20 financial year.

(f) **Notes** that further consultation is required on both the Poyntzs Road and Garrymere schemes before the projects can be completed.

(g) **Approves** staff to commence with further detailed investigations and analysis of the potential solutions for the Garrymere and Poyntzs Road schemes that will help staff to better refine cost estimates, and enable the required consultation with the effected communities and Water Advisory Group on the respective projects to progress.

(h) **Circulates** this report to Council and all Community Boards for their information.

**CARRIED**

Councillor Brine noted there is time to engage with the communities and supports a lot of the work being undertaken inhouse.

Councillor Williams is disappointed that it has taken so long to establish the Advisory Groups. Would like to see this progressed now.

Councillor Gordon supports the recommendation and consulting with the communities and groups. Is heartened at the Council’s endeavours to keep the costs down.

6.3 **Jones Street Reconstruction Concept Design - Joanne McBride (Roading and Transport Manager), Duncan Roxborough (Implementation Project Manager - District Regeneration), Gavin Lake (Roading Recovery Programme Manager)**

J McBride and D Roxborough presented this report to provide further information on the proposals for repairing Jones Street Kaiapoi and seeking approval from the committee to develop the design as proposed. J McBride noted that a report has previously been brought to the U&R Committee on the Jones Street reconstruction. This report proposed to install kerb and channel on the western side of Jones Street and a swale on the eastern side. This report was put on hold to allow staff additional time to work on the cross section and particularly look at the effectiveness of a swale in this area. Jones Street is linked to the adjacent mixed business use area, but how and when this development occurs is still to be confirmed. The concept design would include ability to accommodate anticipated traffic for such a proposal and the swale on the eastern side of the street has been further considered. Due to the flat topography of the area, it is considered that a swale would not operate effectively. It is therefore proposed to install kerb and channel on both sides of the street. It is noted that currently there is no provision for water or waste water services in Jones Street.

Councillor Barnett sought clarification of the use of the shared pathway in this area. J McBride said this is a shared pathway for cyclists and pedestrians and is a continuation of the new Feldwick Drive. Currently there is work being
undertaken looking at getting the best linkages with the town centre and a continuing of what is already on Feldwick Drive.

Councillor Stewart sought assurance that with no sewerage wastewater infrastructure that this is not something that be required at some future time. J McBride said there is a lot of uncertainty regarding future use of the land and this has been discussed. Provision of sewer facilities will not be a problem and could be onsite pumps. The road will not have to be dug up for this. The services could be put in, but at this time this may not be the right capacity. Future provision of water supplies could be through use of trenchless supply, but there would need to be some access to current supplies. Councillor Stewart asked about the Motor Caravan Association and what their members requirements will be. D Roxborough advised they will have a requirement to be self-contained for a minimum of three days, but have indicated that they would like to have a potable water supply to the site. This would not be individual taps for each site, but a place where vehicles can pull up to fill their own water tanks. Regarding waste water, there is a dump station across the street, but long term they may look to have dump stations on site which would be at their cost. This could be serviced by connecting to the existing station across the street and discharged via the existing pumping site across the street.

Moved Councillor Brine seconded Councillor Williams

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 181003114944
(b) Approves the proposed road cross section as shown in Figure 2 of the report which includes the installation of kerb and channel along both sides of the road;
(c) Notes that there is currently no funding available to allow for water and sewer reticulation to be installed and therefore this work will be required to be undertaken in the future;
(d) Notes the recovery works construction programme as presented in Attachment 1 of this report.
(e) Forwards this report to the Regeneration Steering Group for their information.

CARRIED

Councillor Brine does have concerns that the road will be put in and may be ripped up again in a few years’ time to account for future development. This would be good for development in Kaiapoi, but not so good for the infrastructure.

Councillor Williams concurred with Councillor Brine’s comments, and believes it is important to move ahead with this road renewal in Jones Street. Any future improvements will need to be considered at the time.

Mayor Ayers commented that it is important to carry on with this project as part of the earthquake recovery. It is unknown at this time what the timing of development will be in this area and it is important for this road to be replaced.

7 MATTER REFERRED FROM THE OXFORD-OHOKA COMMUNITY BOARD MEETING OF 3 OCTOBER 2018

7.1 Proposed Closure of Stockwater Race R8-1 - Owen Davies (Drainage Asset Manager) and Libica Hurley (Technical Administrator)
O Davies spoke to this report which was consulted by the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board, asking their approval of the report to go to the U&R Committee to approve the closure of Council owned stockwater race R8-1. This matter has been brought to the Water Zone Committee and it is now intended that this go to the Stock Water Race Advisory Group for consideration. Following this step, a revised report will be brought back to the Utilities and Roading Committee for consideration.

Moved Councillor Stewart seconded Councillor Brine

THAT this matter lie on the table until it has been to the Stock water race Advisory Group.

CARRIED

8 REPORTS FOR INFORMATION ONLY

8.1 Safety Barrier for Meyer Place Footpath - Joanne McBride (Roading and Transport Manager)
(report no. 180921109526 to the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting of 3 October 2018).

There was discussion on the issuing of the consent for this building and the reason for the requirement of a safety barrier. Deputy Mayor Felstead provided clarification on this matter.

Moved Deputy Mayor Felstead seconded Mayor Ayers

THAT the information in Item 8.1 be received.

CARRIED

9 PORTFOLIO UPDATES

9.1 Roading – Councillor John Meyer

Councillor Meyer was not present.
9.2 **Drainage and Stockwater – Councillor Sandra Stewart**

There has been a continuation of Drainage Advisory Group meetings, which has included an interesting tour of the Mega Ten site at Southbrook. This is on one of the hazardous discharge sites in the Council's area and there is a lot of positive improvements being done on this site.

Drainage Groups have asked again for a single district wide drainage rate and Councillor Stewart passed this on to the Committee. It was noted that this matter comes up for discussion at almost every Drainage Advisory Group meeting. This has been deferred until the 2022 year.

Regarding the applications for stock water race closures, these have been brought to the Zone Committee for their information. The Zone Committee sees the need for a strategy for these closures because even though these systems are just to provide stock water, the Committee would like to see a more comprehensive holistic, evaluation of the ecosystems before any closures. This has been given a sympathetic approach by Council staff and the concerns of the Zone Committee members are to be addressed.

9.3 **Utilities (Water Supplies and Sewer) – Cr Paul Williams**

Councillor Williams noted that all the Kaiapoi wells now comply with specifications required. Thanks were extended to C Roxburgh for saving the Council some money on this system.

It is hoped that the Oxford boiled water notice will be finished by November, with the new system connected. The Smith Street bore in Kaiapoi is being tendered at the moment.

9.4 **Solid Waste – Cr Robbie Brine**

Councillor Brine attended a landfill meeting on 7 September 2018. Meeting items included operational and financial reporting. The two generators are running at capacity at Kate Valley, producing a significant amount of electricity. There are issues with pigs and deer coming from the nearby rural surroundings into Tiromoana Bush. Waste levy money has been allocated to six waste minimisation projects across the region, totalling $112,000.

Additional subsidies requested for the car seat recycling programme have been approved. The programme has been so successful that the Corrections Facility is receiving more seats than they can process. The additional subsidy will allow Kilmarnock, a social enterprise organisation, to recycle the extra car seats. The cost for recycling these seats is $25, versus the $10 recycling cost from the Corrections Facility. A video of mattress recycling occurring in Timaru is available, which was attached to the minutes.

Mr Palmer noted that there were four tenders that are in the evaluation process for the Kerbside collection contract.

The Chairperson adjourned the meeting at 5.05pm to go into workshop to discuss a technical memo on the Draft ZIPA – Feedback on Drinking Water. These staff comments will be taken forward to the joint committee to be considered on 23 October. The meeting reconvened at 5.25pm.

10 **MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED**

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987
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>10.1</td>
<td>Report of Engineering Technician (Glenn Kempton) and Water Asset Manager (Colin Roxburgh)</td>
<td>Bay Road, Gammans Creek and Pegasus Reservoir Repairs Tender Evaluation and Contract Award Report</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Reason for protection of interests</th>
<th>Ref NZS 9202:2003 Appendix A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>Protection of privacy of natural persons To carry out commercial activities without prejudice</td>
<td>A2(a) A2(b)ii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CLOSED MEETING

Resolution to resume in Open Meeting

THAT open meeting resumes and the business discussed with the public excluded be made public.

CARRIED

OPEN MEETING

11 QUESTIONS

There were no questions.

12 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS

There was no urgent general business.
There being no further business, the meeting closed at 5.30pm.

CONFIRMED

_______________________
Chairperson

_______________________
Date

BRIEFING

At the conclusion of the meeting, a briefing was held for the committee, on the following matter:

- Pond C Update on vegetation die-off investigations, sediment sources, and catchment management work.
Minutes: Solid and Hazardous Waste Working Party Meeting held 23 October 2018 in Rakahuri Committee Room


ITEM 1 - Apologies


ITEM 2 - Minutes from Previous Meeting 13 September 2018

- Minutes approved as true and correct.

  Moved as true and correct: Clr. Gordon and seconded by Clr. Brine.

Matters Arising

- Kitty followed up with a query from Rangiora Toyota who wanted the reinstatement of a cardboard cage. An email was sent on 3 October to provide feedback to the Party noting that the Council had not supplied this cardboard cage. Clr. Gordon explained that Rangiora Toyota has since come to their own solution.

- In response to a question from Cr. Williams that Waimakariri kerbside recycling was now taken directly to Christchurch, Kitty confirmed that the contractor hasn’t stopped consolidating the recycling at Southbrook.

ITEM 3 - Verbal update on feedback received from visitors to the Solid Waste stand at the Rangiora A&P Show, 20 October 2018

- Kitty advised that the Solid Waste stand advertised the 3 bins option, the RFID tag retrofitting project and Love Food Hate Waste. Clr. Williams was present at the Council tent. It seemed like there was a lower attendance this year compared to the previous years. Kitty counted 47 persons approaching the stand to discuss the 3 bins. Several customers used the tablet to record their choice at the time. Some residents reflected on bin size. Note that one person was surprised to learn that they will be no delivery if they haven’t submitted their choice and that some advised that they did not submit their feedback as they want to keep the status quo. There were conversations with 111 people around food waste minimisation.

ITEM 4 - Verbal update on the Southbrook green waste transport trial
Kitty advised that she planned to produce a memo to report on the trial, however this has been delayed due to some miscommunication between CWS and Waste Management. The transfer station contractor now has a truck and trailer based unit at Southbrook, and these used to cart the green waste to the composting facility. The use of the trailer unit has resulted in approx. a 25% decrease in green waste cartage costs. There are significant health and safety concerns about unloading compacted green waste at Living Earth with the trialled methodology and containers.

ITEM 5 – Verbal Update on uptake on rubbish and organics wheelie bins

Kitty advised that the Council has received 440 more responses compared to last month’s update. We are now reaching a 63.5% response rate for the campaign, which means that 36.4% or 6,566 residents in the collection area haven’t provided feedback yet. There was a consensus amongst the Party that the response rate is very high.

Approx. 70% of those that replied want a rubbish bin, meaning that a minimum of 44% of those in the collection area want a rubbish bin. Approx. 57% of those that replied want an organics bin, meaning that a minimum of 36% of those on the collection area want an organics bin.

It is very difficult to predict what the 36.4% of residents that are on the collection route, and that haven’t responded want. It’s unlikely that they all want to keep using bags or private collectors.

Clr. Gordon asked whether staff have undertaken an analysis to gauge the desired level of service per area. Kitty replied that this has not been investigated.

Clr. Gordon asked about the process to identify those that haven’t provided feedback. Kitty replied that new residents receive a pack that contains some information on the future 3 bin system. Further, a letter will be sent to property owners in the collection area to remind them of their choice, to offer them the opportunity to change their bin selection prior to bin deliveries, and inform those who have not responded that they will not receive a bin unless they inform the Council of their bin choice. As numbers need to be finalised early, this information will be sent with the February/March rates instalments.

Clr. Brine asked whether there will be some ads on the community papers in February to push for the message, e.g. we will not deliver any rubbish or organics bin to the 35% of residents on the collection who haven’t informed us of their choice. Kitty replied that this will be done in conjunction with the letters sent to ratepayers.

Simon added that the tender allows for a stock that is reasonable to provide to those who haven’t received any bin and requested some later on. Clr. Gordon expressed some concerns over the cost of a significant stock for the Council. Simon replied that the contractor will manage this risk and order additional bins when required. Clr. Williams asked the timeframe to receive the bins following order. Simon replied that it would depend whether the bins are made in New Zealand or overseas. Elodie indicated that it can take about a month for bins made in New Zealand, based on previous experience. Clr. Stewart asked about minimum order numbers. Kitty replied that we would usually order a container of bins.
• Clr Stewart asked who would pay for damaged bins. Kitty replied that any negligent or malicious destruction would result in the customer paying for replacement.

ITEM 6 – Verbal update on the retrofitting of Council recycling bins with RFID tags

• Kitty advised that the RFID tagging project will start on 19 November and run until the end of May 2019. The communication will start two weeks prior to the work in the identified areas, e.g. flyer delivery and social media. Service users will be aware that their bin has been retrofitted when a yellow dot has been stickered on their recycling bin.
• Elodie is in charge of this project. She has been liaising with the contractor, the communications team and the BATS team. The BATS team will reconcile bin data with targeted rates data and plan for the import of data into our system.
• We are looking at working with community groups to deliver the pamphlets. The contractor has worked with PMP in Christchurch. Clr. Gordon suggests Council does not use the services of PMP due to known issues with deliveries in the district.
• Clr. Brine asked about the process followed by the contractor if there are more bins than rated for a property. Kitty replied that extra bins will be removed after the contractor checks with the Council how many bins should be at the property.

ITEM 7 - General business

• Kitty advised that she has received an email from Loburn School. They complimented Lesley Ottey from EcoEducate who assisted them with the waste management at the NZ Cycling event which had around 2,000 attendees.
• Clr. Gordon reported that councillors used to have very good relationships with Enviroschools until recently, where they have been made aware of events at short notice. Clr. Gordon asked for a timeline of events. Kitty advised that Linley is a representative of the group and that she will follow up with Lynley.
• Clr. Williams asked why the visit to the Christchurch Material Recovery Facility has been cancelled. Elodie to follow up.

ITEM 8 - Resolution for 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>8</td>
<td>Verbal Update from Kitty Waghorn, Solid Waste Asset Manager and Simon Collin, Infrastructure Strategy Manager.</td>
<td>Solid Waste Contract Tendering Process Update</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>8</td>
<td>Protection of privacy of natural persons</td>
<td>A2(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To carry out commercial activities without prejudice</td>
<td>A2(b)ii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out of public excluded 4.37 pm

Meeting finished 4.37 pm

Next meeting: Thursday, 15 November, 4 pm. Pencilled in, TBC.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Present:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sam Redman (WDC), Andrew Besuyen (Co-Chair), Ellie Tizzard, Caitlin Tipping, Jacob Harford, Olivia Silby, Benya Ickenroth, Katie Lange (late arrival), Dan Gordon (late arrival), Eris Le Compte (Minute Secretary).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Apologies:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kirstyn Barnett (WDC - Councillor), Mayor David Ayres, Arabella Jarman, Stella Graydon.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Waimakariri Youth Development Strategy:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sam Redman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sam circulated some draft design documents for the Youth Development Strategy booklet and asked for opinions. Andrew suggested the Waimakariri Youth Council logo be incorporated. Sam has researched statistics from the census data relating to the 12-24 age bracket and gender within the region. It is planned to look forward for the next ten years and what goals should be aimed for.

Andrew will arrange to set up a survey on line – Google.doc – where items and suggestions can be added with a brief description of each theme. To be completed by the end of this week if possible.

Sam thanked the working group for their input into this document.

**ACTIONS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sam/Andrew</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>End of Year Report:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Andrew Besuyen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A report is to be prepared for presentation to the Waimakariri District Council on the current years activities and engagements that have been attended throughout the year, as well as any worthy item of interest. Sam asked members to forward a brief description to him which can be collated and discussed at next months meeting. He will forward a copy of last years WDC report to council to members as a guide as to what is required.

**ACTIONS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Items for End of Year Report to Sam before next meeting on 27 November.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dan Gordon WDC Councillor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dan has recently returned from a trip to China where he attended a Business Corporation Conference. He was very impressed with the current relationship between New Zealand and China.

Chris Brown has been appointed as the new Community and Recreation Manager to the council.

Dan attended the sports awards function last Friday night.

And Dan congratulated Ellie Tizzard on being chosen to

**ACTIONS:**
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represent the Waimakariri district as a Youth MP.

**6. General Business**

**End of Year Breakup**

Thought and ideas needed on dates, venue and activities. Late November was suggested, with Bowling and a meal as a potential activity. Andrew to put a poll on Facebook.

**Potential Community Hub for Rangiora**

Sam Redman

The Youth Council discussed various ideas for this future development in conjunction with WDC. Sam showed a map and slide of the area adjoining Dudley Park. Dan suggested that a site meeting be held before the next Youth Council meeting.

**Waimakariri Community Age-Friendly Group**

Sam Redman

Sam has been approached by Madeleine Burdon asking if any youth council members would be interested in representing younger people at the next consultation meeting of this potential group on 5 November. It envisages the bringing together of the different age groups. Caitlin could be interested in attending if she is available.

Dan Gordon suggested that it may be a good idea for Madeleine to make contact with Sam Johnson with a view to him speaking at a future meeting.

**Youth Grant:**

Caitlin Tipping

Caitlin has sat in on the first meeting of applicants for this award and will also attend the next interview session in a few weeks. Caitlin said there were some very interesting applicants for this award.

**Hoodies:**

All agreed to go ahead with the hoodies.

**Recovery Plan for Kaiapoi Red Zone**

Olivia Silby

Feedback included a lack of detail in some areas and no provision made for future netball courts. A submission to be prepared to present to WDC. Sam to enquire re the submission time period. Dan suggested liaising with Alan Blackie at WDC.

**Resignation of Andrew Besuyen:**

Due to Andrew moving to Wellington to take up an internship position with the Reserve Bank, he reluctantly said he will not be available to attend Youth Council meetings next year and this was to be his last meeting. However, he would like to keep in touch.

Sam made a presentation to Andrew and thanked him for what he has achieved for the youth council in his capacity as Co-

**ACTIONS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>Assigned To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam/Caitlin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivia/Sam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dan Gordon stated that Andrew had done an excellent job and he also thanked him for the leadership he has shown. Everyone was unanimous in wishing Andrew well for his future years ahead.

**Meeting closed at 8.23 pm**

**Next meeting** on Tuesday 27 November 2018 at 7pm in the Rakahuri Room, at the Rangiora Service Centre.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INUTES OF A MEETING OF THE REGENERATION STEERING GROUP HELD IN THE RUATANIWIHA KAIAPOI CIVIC CENTRE ON MONDAY 5 NOVEMBER 2018 AT 4.00PM

PRESENT:
Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust C McMillan, D Ayers (Mayor), J Palmer (Chief Executive), C Brown (Manager Community and Recreation), D Roxborough (Implementation Project Manager - District Regeneration), C Sargison (Manager Special Projects).

IN ATTENDANCE:
M Flanagan, WDC, F Scales, WDC, G Lake, WDC, S Lodge, WDC.

1. APOLOGIES
An apology was received and sustained from S Stewart and McKay for absence.
An apology was received and sustained from D Ayers and J Palmer for lateness.
Moved: R Blair Seconded: P Redmond
CARRIED

2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
Moved: C Greengrass Seconded: A Blackie
THAT the Regeneration Steering Group:
Confirms as a true and correct record the minutes of a meeting held on Monday 1 October 2018.
CARRIED

N Atkinson asked if apologies are being received from the Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri representative.
C Sargison will follow this up.
3. MATTERS ARISING

A Blackie noted in regard to the bees club that he has spoken with others who have given a good recommendation for the North Canterbury AA Bees Club.

4. DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

4.1 Reserves Master Plan Submission – S Cairns

A deputation was received from S Cairns in regard to the Reserves Master Plan. S Cairns expressed a number of concerns.

- Removal of the trees.
- Requested that the trees in the BMX area be re-used.
- Requested that the trees in the sports field area be planted now as a wind break.
- No new playground proposed, and raised concerns as to when the NCF and Gray Crescent playgrounds will be updated.
- Building consent for the club rooms on red zone land.

In support of the submission please refer to the attachment in the Kaiapoi Reserves Master Plan report on page 13 of the agenda.

C Greengrass thanked S Cairns for her report and asked if she knew the number for the amount of people that requested that the land stay as it is when the ideas where being put forward for the Recovery Plan.

S Cairns replied she does not know the final number.

J Meyer noted that the submission from S Cairns gives the impression that her belief is that the actual red zone area in a few month’s time is going to be stripped of all the trees.

S Cairns replied that some of the trees have been left but noted that replanting needs to start now and there needs to be a shelter belt planted straight away.

A Blackie asked if S Cairns is aware that the major earthworks in the Kaiapoi East area involves raising the level the soil a considerable amount and how does she expect trees to be planted until the earthworks are completed.

S Cairns replied she follows this very well and noted there will be a lot of dust and by getting the trees in now could help reduce some of these issues.

P Redmond thanked S Cairns for her submission and noted her passion for the trees. P Redmond noted from the submission that S Cairns made an offer to relocate the trees and suggested this may be something that can be discussed during the offers report as to whether this is an option or not.

S Cairns replied that some trees where relocated to the Food Forest so this could also be done elsewhere to preserve what we have. S Cairns suggested that Corcoran Reserve could be used as an area to relocate trees to.

P Redmond noted he liked the reference in the submission to picnic areas and feels this has some merit. P Redmond noted there is a Recovery Plan and that the Reserves Master Plan does not reiterate what is in the Recovery Plan. The sports fields are going in as part of the Recovery Plan therefore trees will need to be removed or relocated.

S Cairns noted that trees in the sports field did not get relocated.
C Sargison advised the Reserves Master Plan was put out for consultation and this plan is effectively giving effect to the Government’s Recovery Plan. The Recovery Plan is quite detailed in the specificity of the uses of land and has no relation to sports fields and BMX etc. in there. The issue of trees is slightly different from the Reserves Master Plan as a lot of the area is being worked on now.

C Sargison noted the cost of removing all of the trees in that area would have been enormous and whether they would have survived is another matter. It would be very expensive to get a tree company in to move the trees, and this was considered as part of the budget. There is a demand for the proposed uses in the reserves and they will be used, and this will bring different types of activity to Kaiapoi. C Sargison noted the Enabling Works is underway now and the area for the sports fields has already been cleared and they will be clearing the area for the stormwater management area next. The stormwater management area will be developed and replanted with funding from Honda NZ into a native forest.

Once the Reserves Master Plan has been adopted this will enable us to work on seeking other funding sources and income for more planting. C Sargison noted in terms of process that these have been followed appropriately. The Reserves Master Plan does not need to be in place for the Enabling Works to start as the Government Red Zone Recovery Plan specifies the uses of that land.

P Redmond asked if there is any opportunity to have some of the existing trees that remain relocated by a community group.

C Sargison replied that the trees from the sports fields and stormwater management area are being taken out now so there would be no opportunity to have these trees relocated.

J Watson commented that many horticulturalists would say that it is better economically and practically to plant new trees rather than try to replant an old tree. The survival rate would be much easier to manage a shelter belt of trees or a grove of new trees than to go around and replant them as many of them would not survive, especially at this time of the year.

S Cairns acknowledged that this time of the year is very dry but noted she is looking at the time factor.

5. **TE KŌHAKA O TŪHAITARA TRUST UPDATE**

C McMillian advised the Trust are having discussions with LINZ around the practicalities of land transfer, and there are some technical areas to be discussed. They are working on the concept plan for their Reserves Management Plan.

6. **REPORTS**

6.1 **Kaiapoi Reserves Master Plan – Sarah Lodge (Communications Advisor – District Regeneration), Michelle Flanagan (Landscape Planner – District Regeneration)**

M Flanagan advised the report seeks a recommendation from the Regeneration Steering Group for the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board to approve the Reserves Master Plan for the Kaiapoi Regeneration Area. The preparation of the Reserves Master Plan has been driven by the Recovery Plan and the land uses and activities within it. The Recovery Plan essentially provided the base blueprint for the new reserves. While the Recovery Plan approved the new reserves and the general recreational activities within them it provided only limited detail on the development. The purpose of the Reserves Master Plan is to guide the development of the reserves in the Kaiapoi East, West and South Regeneration Areas in line with the Recovery Plan. This is essentially the next step in implementing the approved land uses. The draft Reserves Master Plan was approved for consultation at the September Regeneration Steering Group meeting and consultation was undertaken during September and October this year. The consultation actions are outlined in Sections 4.1 and 4.3 of the report. The feedback in full is included as an attachment to the report. Staff have considered the feedback received and the responses are detailed in sections 4 and 5 of the report. The feedback included support for and opposition to the draft Reserves Master Plan. The comments or issues generally fell into two categories, the first was general support for the Reserves Master Plan with comments and requests that can be addressed during detailed design and implementation. Other feedback suggesting seating and picnic areas can also be addressed during implementation. The second category of feedback included comments that fundamentally opposed primarily the sports fields and the consequential loss of trees and local heritage. These comments suggest that additional sports fields were not needed and they did not contribute to the community. The use of the Kaiapoi East Regeneration Area for sports fields and softball diamonds was signalled during the development of the Recovery Plan and included in the approved Recovery Plan. The sports fields and softball diamonds are proposed to cater for future and current district needs. The Kaiapoi Softball Club do not currently have a home. The Northern Bulldogs Rugby League have also advised they require additional fields and cannot provide these at Murphy Park due to space. When the fields are not in
use for organised sport they will be available as an open space for the community. It is acknowledged that to develop sports fields, diamonds and the stormwater wetlands that trees and shrubs would need to be cleared. Staff have tried to keep larger trees around the wetland area, and have also tried to keep some trees around the edges of the sports fields. The trees in the dog park area will be retained, and the in the adjacent mixed-use business area and rural area trees will only be disturbed at this time to form the swale drains. While it is always unfortunate to remove trees there are plans to plant more trees as the reserves develop. The Honda Forest will be developed in and around the stormwater wetland area and will include planting of more than 15,000 native trees and plants. It is proposed more trees will be planted around Cass and Jollie Streets and around the edges of the sports field area. It is important to look at the reserves as a whole rather than isolation. While the trees in the sports field area are being removed it is planned to retain and plant more trees south of Cass Street. The trees in the new reserves along Feldwick Drive have been retained as have the trees in the Mahinga kai area in Kaiapoi South, and over time these areas will see many more trees planted. The Reserves Master Plan also looks at other ways of telling the local stories through our reserves through points of interest, further native planting and use of specific materials. Additional activities for the sport fields where also proposed in the feedback such as a culinary campus, and a Go Kart track. It is considered that both of the activities could be accommodated within the Regeneration Area should a provider wish to take up these opportunities. As mentioned, staff have considered the feedback received and commentary from this is included in the report. Based on the feedback received and the clear direction provided by the Recovery Plan, staff have made no changes to the Reserves Master Plan.

M Pinkham noted in item 4.5 that the Northern Bulldogs do not propose to shift so that mean there is a need for clubrooms.

M Flanagan replied that at this stage the Northern Bulldogs have advised they wish to keep their current clubrooms at Murphy Park.

C Sargison noted the Reserves Master Plan is making space for a club rooms but is not suggesting that the clubrooms be built at this stage. It will happen at a point in time.

P Redmond asked if any response has been received from Piet Oudolf.

A Blackie advised that a formal letter has been sent but not reply has been received at this stage.

THAT the Regeneration Steering Group recommends:

THAT the Kaiapoi- Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 181011118491.

(b) Approves the Reserves Master Plan for the Kaiapoi East Regeneration Areas.

(c) Notes that $18.6 million has been allocated for the implementation of the Recovery Plan, and this includes the development of the new reserves in the Kaiapoi Regeneration Areas.

(d) Notes that staff will progress with the design and development of the sports fields, softball diamonds, dog park, community BMX track, and stormwater management area, and recreation and ecological linkages without further community consultation.

(e) Notes that the Reserves Master Plan will be updated once the new reserve names are adopted.

(f) Circulates this report to the Community and Recreation Committee for their information.

CARRIED
6.2 District Regeneration Communications Report – October 2018 – Sarah Lodge - (Communications Advisor – District Regeneration), Duncan Roxborough (Implementation Project Manager – District Regeneration)

D Roxborough noted the key activities to be noted from the report include the communications around the start of the Enabling Works contract. There is a drop-in session being held on Tuesday 6 November from 6pm – 7pm at the Paris for the Weekend café. The contract works will be going until May 2019.

On item 4.10 noting the sponsorship agreement with Honda NZ has now been signed for the establishment of the forest. The media release is still being prepared and this will be coordinated by Honda.

D Roxborough advised there will be presence at the Kaiapoi Christmas Carnival at the council stand by the Regeneration department.

Moved: A Blackie Seconded: J Meyer

THAT the Regeneration Steering Group:

(a) Receives report No. 181025125073.

CARRIED

6.3 District Regeneration – Implementation Plan Publication – Duncan Roxborough (Implementation Project Manager – District Regeneration), Roxanne Ramsay (Project Administrator – District Regeneration)

D Roxborough advised the purpose of this report is to present the first draft of the Implementation Plan and to seek adoption. The Implementation Plan is a requirement of the Recovery Plan. Its purpose is to set out how we are going to implement the land uses and activities that are outlined in the Recovery Plan. It will be a living document. The plan attached to the report is a front end document that brings together quite a few elements of works, strategies and plans that staff have been working on over the last two years. Some of the strategies that are referred to in the plan have not yet been developed so there is some more ongoing work. The document will be a public document, and once it is approved and our strategic partners have had an opportunity to read the document this will be made available on the council website regeneration page with links to the supporting documents. The next steps are to send to the other implementing parities.

A Blackie noted that the Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Runanga will need to be included in recommendation (c).

M Pinkham asked that any future versions also include the budget.

D Roxborough noted there is another key plan that will follow this as well which is the Monitoring Plan and this is another requirement of the Recovery Plan. D Roxborough noted that in terms of tracking expenditure this will be included in the Monitoring Plan. The budget information can also be included in the Implementation Plan.

C Sargison advised that a quarterly report is sent to the Audit Committee and the information for Regeneration area can be extracted and included in the Regeneration Steering Group agenda every three months.

Moved: J Watson Seconded: P Redmond

THAT the Regeneration Steering Group recommends:

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 181015119901.
(b) **Approves** the initial draft Implementation Plan.

(c) **Notes** that the initial draft of the plan will be sent to Land Information New Zealand (LINZ) and Te Köhaka o Tūhaitara Trust (TKTT) for information and comment.

(d) **Notes** the plan will be made publicly available on the website, and at service centres and libraries, once any feedback from LINZ and TKTT has been received.

(e) **Notes** the Implementation Plan will be a ‘living’ document and will be updated as the implementation programme progresses.

**CARRIED**

7. **CORRESPONDENCE**

There was no correspondence.

8. **GENERAL**

There was no general business.

9. **NEXT MEETING**

The next scheduled meeting of the Regeneration Steering Group commences at 4.00pm on Monday 3 December 2018 at the Ruataniwha Centre, Kaiapoi.

**THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS THE MEETING CLOSED AT 5.01PM.**
MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF THE OXFORD-OHOKA COMMUNITY BOARD
HELD IN THE OHOKA COMMUNITY HALL, MILL ROAD, OHOKA ON THURSDAY
8 NOVEMBER 2018 AT 7.05PM.

PRESENT
D Nicholl (Chair), M Brown, W Doody, J Ensor, S Farrell, K Felstead, J Lynn and T Robson.

IN ATTENDANCE
S Markham (Manager Strategy & Engagement), Maree Harris (Customer Services Manager), C Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager), C Brown (Community and Recreation Manager), E Cordwell (Governance Team Leader), and E Stubbs (Governance Support Officer).

Seven members of the public were present in the gallery.

1  APOLOGIES
There were no apologies.

2  CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
Item 7.2 f & g T Robson as a member of the Oxford Community Trust.

3  CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

3.1 Minutes of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board – 3 October 2018
Moved J Ensor seconded J Lynn

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Amends the minutes of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board 7 June 2018, the name of the Mandeville Residents Association member in Item 5.2 should be Mike Tyree.

(b) Confirms the circulated minutes of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting, held 3 October 2018, as a true and accurate record.

CARRIED

4  MATTERS ARISING
D Nicholls asked if the safety barrier at Meyer Place had been installed. S Farrell advised it had not, E Cordwell would follow up with the Roading Manager.

J Lynn referred to the $1,500 funding for the Gatekeepers Lodge which was outstanding. C Brown advised it would be addressed in an upcoming General Landscaping report.

Item 7.1 was taken at this time. Note that the minutes have been recorded in accordance with the order of the agenda as circulated.
5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

Jill Falloon and Barbara Chambers spoke to the Board regarding concerns over the local water supply.

J Falloon advised the Board that the rates for water in her area had recently increased by $600. A local subdivision she did not want, had not sold, and therefore in her view there were 86 households who had to pay another $600 to compensate for this. She felt that cost should go back to the developer rather than the residents. She asked when that extra $600 would come off the rates. J Falloon also asked how much water a month their property was allocated and if they went over would they be charged and if they went under would they be refunded.

J Falloon advised that they had recently had a restrictor put on their supply. When they moved into the property they did not have a restrictor. Under the new system it meant they could not have a shower, washing machine or tap going at the same time. As they had a small header tank it was not enough to keep the flow going. She requested that the restrictor be removed. She did not believe they should have to pay for a new header tank to be installed. She asked who she could talk to get the problems resolved.

E Cordwell advised she had noted the key concerns and invited C Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager) to address these after the deputation of B Chambers.

B Chalmers had concerns about the amount of chlorine going into the water supply. She lived close to the pumping station and advised that she could smell the chorine. She asked what chlorine levels were used in the system.

B Chalmers referred to an elderly rural neighbour who she believed had been forced to connect to a water scheme. She believed the costs were excessive and that it was morally wrong for the Council to force that connection particularly as she was not rural-residential. She understood that the lady in question used to have her own well and water supply which she was no longer able to use. She believed the elderly resident had been treated badly. J Lynn noted that the lady in question had a free water supply for several years and B Chalmers commented that rural residents did have free supply.

S Farrell asked who owned the well. Some historical information was provided. The land had been donated to Council many years ago for a well, the well had not been used by the Council but was used by the house.

D Nicholl commented it was difficult to look at the issue without the resident present as the information provided was hearsay.

C Roxburgh was invited to the table to speak to the points raised in the deputations.

C Roxburgh noted that he had previously discussed the issues raised by J Falloon with her in May 2017. He outlined the reasons for the water supply upgrade work in Ohoka. The old Ohoka well did not comply with the Drinking Water Standards 2015. Council therefore had an obligation to upgrade the supply regardless of any subdivision. While it was not possible to make the developer pay for upgrades already required by the scheme, the requirement for a new well for the subdivision meant costs could be offset to upgrade the existing scheme.

When consultation occurred with the community it had been on the basis that the developer would pay part of the cost. While the upgrade had occurred, the development had not happened immediately which meant the scheme was required to pay interest. C Roxburgh acknowledged it was a significant increase to the rates however the upgrade was required with or without the subdivision. He noted there were other schemes, which did not have developments to help fund the upgrades which had increases of over $1,000 annually. Those increases were not a good situation, however the Council had no choice but to comply with the National Drinking Water Standards.
With regard to removing the restrictor C Roxburgh advised the restrictors were required in order to ensure everyone received water. Without the restrictors bigger pipes and pumps would be required for the scheme which would be an additional cost. The restrictors allowed for 13l/minute. The scheme had been on restrictors for 30 years and it may be that a previous owner had illegally removed the restrictor at the property. Some properties had two unit restrictors which provided less flow with lower rating. A tank was an option to allow water to build up during the day.

S Farrell asked about the possibility of a tank and J Lynn advised it was possible for anyone to put in a tank at their own expense.

S Markham acknowledged there were significant issues specific to a situation. He suggested a meeting be held with C Roxburgh and J Falloon with D Nicholl as Board Chair to attend the meeting on behalf of the Board. There was an appreciation that C Roxburgh was bound by constraints of what he could or could not offer.

C Roxburgh advised B Chalmers that the volume of chlorine was about 0.5ppm which was relatively low for the Waimakariri District. Larger schemes or river sourced water had volumes up to 1.2ppm. The maximum was 5ppm and the minimum was 0.2ppm. The reason for 0.5ppm was that the system was not perfectly flat all of the time and 0.5ppm allowed room for error. Christchurch used 0.15ppm, however they were using chlorine for issues at source. In restrictor schemes issues could occur at tanks on properties thus requiring chlorine to the furthest point of the scheme.

C Roxburgh advised that the only source of the chlorine smell could be from the Chlorine room at the headworks. It was asked why there was now a stronger chlorine smell at tap and C Roxburgh replied that the actual amount of chlorine in the system was less as better quality water consumed less chlorine, it did not mean there was more chlorine going in.

S Markham noted that the discussion was about a particular situation which may be better addressed at a one on one meeting.

K Felstead thanked the members of the public for attending. The Board was not able to resolve the concerns tonight however the Chair could attend a follow-up meeting and report back to the Board which would ensure the discussion continued and was reported back.

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS

There was no adjourned business.

7 REPORTS

7.1 Service Request Information – Maree Harris (Customer Services Manager)

M Harris advised that the report looked at service request activity to give the Board a feel for what was happening and how it compared to other areas of the district. The information presented was basic data as more detailed analysis could take some time. She welcomed feedback on what the Board would like to see in future reports.

W Doody suggested it would be helpful to have some breakdown on animal control – were reports related to dogs or stock on road? M Harris replied it was predominantly lost and found dogs. An example was that per month there could be up to 6 requests for animals other than dogs.
J Lynn referred to high roading service requests the previous quarter and asked was it localised or spread across the district. M Harris replied they were all spread across the Ward area. Many of the requests were for potholes.

J Lynn asked if these were Snap/Send/Solve requests. M Harris replied some were and the usage of the App was slowly increasing. The largest proportion was over the phone, but people also emailed. Council staff and contractors were a large user of Snap/Send/Solve.

J Lynn asked regarding the water service requests was that flooding or drinking water supply? M Harris replied that flooding came under the drainage category. J Lynn noted the upcoming deputation regarding water supply and asked if water service requests were localised to Ohoka or did they come from across the district. M Harris advised the location and issues ranged and included low pressure, no water or enquiry to connect.

J Ensor appreciated the information and commented on areas he would like further breakdown on including:

- Dog bites
- Drainage – road flooding or around houses?
- Greenspace parks – was it mowing or how they were being used?
- Roading – broken signs or road damage?
- Roading/sewer/water in smaller schemes.

M Harris commented while there was a lot of information that could be provided there needed to be a balance. She was happy to sit down with members and go through in more depth and noted that she was at Oxford every second Friday.

J Ensor noted that the actual targets were not recorded and M Harris advised that was because the target days to deliver varied depended on the request. For example a Stop sign down was 24 hours.

J Ensor asked if the 177 drainage requests were rural or urban and M Harris replied they were a mix.

S Farrell asked why the Oxford-Ohoka ward roading requests did not meet the same target as the rest of the district – was it due to them being further distant? M Harris replied no, it could be related to the type of request. Service requests were not signed off until completed.

T Robson asked if there were surveys of service request satisfaction – while they were being signed off by Council did residents feel they had been completed to the expectation of the requester. M Harris replied that there were no specific surveys. She had spoken to their ‘mystery shopper’ who had undertaken a similar exercise. S Markham advised that Council completed a global council survey periodically which included questions around customer satisfaction and responsiveness. S Markham advised that he could provide the latest survey results in which 600 persons were sampled and rigorously selected. A ward breakdown could be completed but the sampling error increased.

M Harris advised that if Board members were aware of people not satisfied she would be keen to hear of that so she could follow through. It was better to be aware of that early as it easier to follow-up and resolve. The key was to get an issue logged in the system. S Markham noted that the Utilities and Roading team had a live display of service requests as a reminder of responsiveness and improve ability to handle peaks. There was an organisational priority this year around service request reporting.

K Felstead asked if staff were called direct regarding an issue would that be logged. S Markham advised that was the expectation however it may not be.
He suggested if ringing staff directly that they ask that a service request be entered. Having that information allowed a build-up of information and history and provided an accurate picture of where issues may arise. There was a further step to link into the geographic information system to provide a geographic display which was of operation value to see a pattern of service requests and potentially stay ‘ahead of the game’, for example it may show where an asset was aging faster than expected.

M Brown asked when a service was logged online was there an algorithm to prioritise requests. M Harris replied no, during the day staff monitored requests as they came through. At night it was suggested that urgent requests be phoned through. The response time was generally good for urgent requests.

Moved W Doody seconded M Brown

THAT the Oxford - Ohoka Community Board:

(c) Receives report No. 181025125373.

(d) Notes that all Boards will receive quarterly reports.

(e) Notes the importance of ensuring service requests are lodged in the Technology One computer system to enable effective response management and monitoring

CARRIED

7.2 Applications to the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board's Discretionary Grant Fund 2018/2019 – Edwina Cordwell (Governance Team Leader)

E Cordwell spoke briefly to the report.

She advised in response to a query that the cost of the Quail Island trip was for the 30 young people.

The Board decided to consider each application in turn.

Eyreton Pony Club

M Brown, as a member of the Mandeville Sports Club Board (MSCB) expressed concern that a club was proposing to plant trees without signoff from the Sports Club Board who had control over the grounds. He supported planting, however believed written support from the MSCB was required. D Nicholl suggested the application could be left on the table until written support was received. J Ensor agreed that support was required from the MSCB, however was concerned that the requirement might cause a delay to the project if the application was left on the table. W Doody advised that the MSCB was aware of the request. S Markham confirmed that approval of the body responsible for the ground needed to be documented.

Moved S Farrell seconded J Ensor

THAT the Oxford - Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 181018122624.

(b) Approves a grant of $450 to Eyreton Pony Club towards the cost of trees to be planted at the pony club grounds at Mandeville Sports Centre subject to approval of the Mandeville Sports Centre Board.

CARRIED

J Ensor commented that the trees were required due to the recent shift of the pony club to the bare site.
Clarkville Playcentre

The Chair gave approval for representatives of Clarkville Playcentre to provide a brief update to the application. Aisha Cook explained they were aware the Playcentre was in the Kaiapoi Tuahiwi Ward however 50% of those attending were from the Oxford Ohoka Ward, 30% from Kaiapoi Tuahiwi and 20% from the rest of the district. It was advised that the Kaiapoi Tuahiwi Community Board had declined an application from the Playcentre four times in the past.

Moved J Lynn seconded J Ensor

THAT the Oxford - Ohoka Community Board:

(c) Approves a grant of $500 to Clarkville Playcentre towards the cost of new puzzles to enhance learning and development.

CARRIED

J Lynn commented that while the Playcentre was outside of the Oxford-Ohoka Ward area, 50% of the participants came from their Ward. He was more than happy to support a program for children.

Oxford Community Trust

E Cordwell noted that the grant amount requested was over the normal grant criteria. She had included $500 in the report which would cover the total cost for the ferry and ten fishing lines. It was assumed that a reduced number of fishing lines would not prevent the initiative as children could share lines.

Moved K Felstead seconded W Doody

THAT the Oxford - Ohoka Community Board:

(d) Approves a grant of $500 to Oxford Community Trust towards the cost of 30 young people visiting Quail Island as part of a holiday programme on 14 December 2018.

CARRIED

T Robson sat back from the table and took no part in discussion

K Felstead was happy to support the Trust.

W Doody commented the Trust did a lot of good work in the community and was well respected.

Meeting Dates from February 2019 to October 2019 –Edwina Cordwell

E Cordwell spoke briefly to the report. She noted to be fair to all boards there were no meetings in October 2019 prior to elections. She had provisionally booked Mandeville Sports Club for 3 April 2019, in order to get exclusive use that meeting date was required to be a Wednesday.

W Doody asked if the Ohoka meetings would be in the Community Hall or Domain Pavilion. E Cordwell replied that they could be held in the Domain Pavilion if it was assessed as a suitable venue for meetings (size of hall and suitable furniture).

W Doody commented that the W Eyreton Hall was extremely cold for winter meetings.

J Ensor asked if a second meeting could be held at Mandeville.

Moved J Ensor seconded S Farrell

THAT the Oxford - Ohoka Community Board:
(a) **Receives** report No. 181018122399.

(b) **Resolves** to hold Board meetings at the following venues, commencing at 7.00pm on the following dates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Venue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 February</td>
<td>Ohoka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 March</td>
<td>Oxford Town Hall or West Eyreton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 April</td>
<td>Ohoka or Mandeville Sports Centre subject to availability and may require a date change to Wednesday 3 April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 May</td>
<td>West Eyreton or Oxford Town Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 June</td>
<td>Ohoka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 July</td>
<td>Oxford Town Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 August</td>
<td>Ohoka or Mandeville Sports Centre subject to availability and may require a date change to Wednesday 7 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 September</td>
<td>West Eyreton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CARRIED**

E Cordwell advised that staff would confirm dates subject to availability.

K Felstead commented two meetings at Mandeville evened out the venues so that two meetings could be held at each over the year.

7.4 **Submissions on the Draft Zone Implementation Programme Addendum and Greater Christchurch Element of the Draft Regional Public Transport Strategy – Edwina Cordwell (Governance Adviser)**

E Cordwell noted the report ensured the Board's submissions were in the public record.

Moved T Robson seconded M Brown

**THAT** the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No. 181017121825.

(b) **Notes** the Board’s submissions to the Draft Zone Implementation Programme Addendum and Greater Christchurch Element of the Draft Regional Public Transport Strategy.

**CARRIED**

8 **CORRESPONDENCE**

W Doody commented that those awarded Community Service Awards were very deserving recipients.

9 **CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT**

9.1 **Chairperson’s Report for October 2018**

D Nicholls advised that the Youth Development Grant had been awarded to two students setting up a Waimakariri Student Army starting in Kaiapoi High School. The two students, Artemis and Carli were very community minded young women.

D Nicholls commented the Community Service Awards had been a very successful evening.
The recipients from the Oxford-Ohoka Ward were noted, it was suggested the Board should be more active to encourage nominations from the ward.

Moved W Doody  seconded M Brown

**THAT** the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a)  **Receives** report No 1801030127018.

**CARRIED**

W Doody commented that those awarded Community Service Awards were very deserving recipients.

10 **MATTERS FOR INFORMATION**

10.1  **Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting minutes – 10 October 2018**  (Trim No. 181003114872).

10.2  **Kaiapoi - Tuahiwi Community Board meeting minutes - 17 September 2018**  (Trim No.180911104350).

10.3  **Kaiapoi - Tuahiwi Community Board meeting minutes – 15 October 2018**  (Trim No.181010118122).

10.4  **Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting minutes – 10 September 2018**  (Trim No.180905101421).

10.5  **Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting minutes – 8 October 2018**  (Trim No. 181003114663).


10.7  **Review of Water Supply Bylaw 2012 – report to Utilities and Roading Committee 16 October 2018**  (Trim No 180910103408).

10.8  **Annual Compliance Report for Waimakariri District Council owned Drinking-Water Supplies with the Drinking Water Standards for New Zealand – report to Utilities and Roading Committee 16 October 2018**  (Trim No 181002113999).

Moved M Brown  seconded T Robson

**THAT** the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board receives the information in items 10.1-10.8

**CARRIED**

11 **MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE**

**J Ensor**

- Woman’s Institute Ohoka – looking at putting seat in Reserve.
- Raised car parking at Mandeville Shopping Centre was still an issue.
- Raised concerns regarding nitrate levels in wells.

**J Lynn**

- Attended Neighbourhood Support AGM. There were new members and a new Chair and W Doody had moved to Deputy Chair.
- Attended Rangiora A&P show to promote GetsReady alongside NZ Police. Was surprised at the lack of awareness of the campaign.
- Attended Ohoka Gatekeepers Lodge meeting – the money held over from the previous year was discussed. Rata had granted $20,000 for the
renovation work. Initially weather tightness, painting and spouting would be completed. A public open day was being planned.

**S Farrell**
- Attended Oxford Museum Community meeting. Renovations were continuing. Issues with the engineering design meant the building would not be open to nearly December rather than October. They had decided not to advance the alarm system until everything was in place.

**M Brown**
- Attended Swannanoa Cricket Club meeting. The pavilion work was continuing with final renovations after which they would do the landscaping with the General Landscaping funds awarded.
- West Eyreton No2 well – piping going in.
- Noted upcoming meetings with Council staff and West Eyreton and Summerhill schemes in November and December.
- Noted correspondence regarding Downs Road (Trim 181107130789).

**T Robson**
- Attended Oxford Area School prize giving.
- Attended Ashley Gorge Advisory Group meeting. Track progress was going well and tracks had held up well over winter. A new series of trapping was underway with schools.
- Attended OPAC meeting.

**W Doody**
- Congratulated C Brown for his new role as Manager Community and Recreation and huge thankyou to C Sargison for his work over the last 13years and the many projects progressed especially following the earthquakes including the West Eyreton Archway.
- Thanked K Felstead for his work in putting together the citations for the Community Service Awards.

Tabled her Councillor’s Report (Trim No 181114134254). Points noted were:
- The changes in staffing within Community and Greenspace.
- Multi Use Sports Facility – more internal detailed design refinements.
- Request to re-establish Oxford rifle range at the Pearson Park Pavilion.
- Aquatic Facilities – Oxford Community Aquatic Centre on target to open end of November. There have been improvements to accessibility.
- Continued improvements to accessibility.
- Oxford Rural No.1 Water Supply – progressing well.
- Solid and Hazardous and Waste Working Party – a number of bins have been ordered.
- Community Service Awards

**K Felstead**

**Council Meeting 6 November**
- Presentation from Pegasus Golf Club – exciting plans including PGA deal and hotel accommodation.
- Adopted Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan.
- Discussion regarding carryover budget adjustments – slow getting projects over the line – management were working on that.
- Reallocation of footpath maintenance – Burnt Hill and Harewood, approved by Council. NZTA had confirmed subsidy for footpaths which they had not provided in the past.
• Discussion of roading subdivision contribution. Council set aside funds each year for seal extensions. 50% cost share arrangement with property owners for sealing.
• Hearing panel appointed for Rangiora Bus Shelter.
• Confirm submission to Draft Regional Public Transport Plan.
• Confirm meeting dates
• Water Supply Bylaw 2018 adopted.

12 CONSULTATION PROJECTS
   Oxford Footpaths
   Consultation closes Friday 9 November 2018.
   https://www.waimakariri.govt.nz/have-a-say/lets-talk/consultations/oxford-footpaths

13 BOARD FUNDING UPDATE
   13.1 Board Discretionary Grant
       Balance as at 31 October 2018: $3,177.
   13.2 General Landscaping Fund
       Balance as at 31 October 2018: $9,508.

14 MEDIA ITEMS

15 MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED
   Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

   Moved W Doody seconded K Felstead

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

   CARRIED

   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>15.1</td>
<td>Chris Brown (Community and Greenspace Manager)</td>
<td>Pearson Park Advisory Group – Appointment of New Member.</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>15.1</td>
<td>Protection of privacy of natural persons</td>
<td>A2(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CLOSE MEETING**

*See Public Excluded Agenda (blue papers)*

**OPEN MEETING**

16 **QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**

17 **URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**

**NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board is scheduled for Thursday 6 December 2018 commencing at 7.00pm, in the Oxford Town Hall.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 9.17pm.

CONFIRMED
Chairperson

Date

Workshop

- Members Forum

Briefing
(Note a briefing is public excluded)

- Mandeville – Potential use of Reserve Land
  Nick Harrison (Regulation Manager) and Chris Brown (Community and Greenspace Manager)
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE WOODEND-SEFTON COMMUNITY BOARD
HELD IN THE WOODEND COMMUNITY CENTRE, SCHOOL ROAD, WOODEND ON
MONDAY 12 NOVEMBER 2018 AT 7.00PM.

PRESENT
S Powell (Chairperson), A Thompson (Deputy Chair), J Archer, A Blackie and R Mather.

IN ATTENDANCE
C Brown (Community and Recreation Manager), S Nichols (Governance Manager), M Harris (Customer Services Manager), Joanne McBride (Roading & Transport Manager) and E Stubbs (Minutes Secretary).

1 APOLOGIES
Moved A Blackie seconded J Archer
Apologies for absence were received and sustained from A Allen and J Meyer. CARRIED

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
There were no conflicts of interest.

3 CONFIRMATION MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board – 8 October 2018
Moved J Archer seconded R Mather
THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:
(a) Confirms the circulated minutes of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting, held 8 October 2018, as a true and accurate record. CARRIED

S Powell highlighted the recent Community Service Awards in particular the award to J Archer. The community service of the Woodend-Sefton ward residents Angela Cramond, Judy Evans and Mark Paterson were also celebrated at the awards and S Powell provided a summary of their work in the community.

S Powell formally recorded the Board’s thankyou to Craig Sargison for his work with the Board and congratulated Chris Brown in his new role as Manager - Community and Recreation.

4 MATTERS ARISING
There were no matters arising.

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS FROM THE COMMUNITY
There were no deputations.

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS
There was no adjourned business.
7 REPORTS

7.1 Service Request Information – Maree Harris (Customer Services Manager)

M Harris spoke to the report advising that the management team were keen to get the service request information out to the Boards and community. For this report activity was compared to the previous year, and response timeframes compared across all Board areas.

M Harris welcomed feedback on what information the Board would find useful in future reports. The purpose was to try and provide overview information while more specific queries could be worked through on an individual basis.

M Harris commented that there was reasonable consistency, however the jump in requests in quarter one reflected the rain storms in July/August 2017. She commented that there had also been an increase in staff and contractors using Snap/Send/Solve to capture requests and load into system.

A Thompson commented that the graphs were useful to look at performance. He noted the percentage of service requests completed inside target was consistently around 80% across the wards and asked what prevented it being 100%? M Harris commented that while staff would love that to be higher there were some problems that required a longer time to fix.

A Thompson was surprised to see Animal Control had the highest number of service requests and M Harris advised that was because it included lost and found dogs. It was noted that the Facebook Page was a good tool in this area and had reunited many pets with their owners.

S Powell asked who set the target timeframe. M Harris advised they were set by the departments and often related to external reporting requirements, for example water supply targets. A standard timeframe was around 10 working days however there were urgent priorities, such as a Stop sign down that had a tighter timeframe.

S Powell asked whether for those requests that took longer was there any feedback to the person that the request was being responded to but it would take time. M Harris replied if the work was part of a formal programme the service request was signed off and the feedback provided.

S Powell commented that there had been complaints from people not having heard anything about a service request. M Harris replied as an example that there could be a fine line between drainage and greenspace requests and in some cases a request could be overlooked/fall between. Also in some cases the issue did not relate to Council and the person could be directed to where the issue could get resolved. M Harris made the comment that when something went wrong it could go badly wrong and it was better to hear feedback and know before it got to that stage. The type of thing that could sit around a while were problems with unsealed roads after heavy rain and an issue on private property that staff were not simply able to go and fix. Staff were working hard to improve the feedback loop and communication back to residents.

R Mather appreciated the report. As a suggestion she would like to see the information broken down further into areas – Woodend, Pegasus, Sefton, rural etc. M Harris replied that the breakdown at this stage was at ward level and that currently it was not possible to break the data down further. In the future they were looking to display requests on a map to provide more geographic information and identify hot spots. If a request was related to a particular property that was easier to track, however others could be related to a broader area such as a road.
J Archer asked if service requests captured complaints and M Harris replied most were requests for service rather than a complaint; however, if it escalated or was not completed, it could then be categorised as a complaint.

Moved J Archer seconded R Mather

**THAT** the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No: 181026125997.
(b) **Notes** that all Boards will receive quarterly reports.
(c) **Notes** the importance of ensuring service requests are lodged in the Technology One computer system to enable effective response management and monitoring.

CARRIED

7.2 **Gladstone Road Cycleway Update: Kieran Straw (Civil Project Team Leader) and Joanne McBride (Roading & Transport Manager)**

J McBride spoke to the report advising it was to provide an update on progress made on the design of the project. The team had been working on the preferred alignment, surfacing material and width.

The map in the report showed the three sections of the footpath.

Section 1 – the alignment was well set already with purchased property and the alignment on the southern side.

Section 2 – the path could be located to the north or south. A crossing was required at some point. Locating the path on the southern side would incorporate a historic place.

Section 3 – proposed to run the path up the unformed legal road and through Gladstone Park to tie in with the existing path.

J McBride advised they were proposing to go to tender with two options for surfacing: gritted or asphalt. The preferred asphalt would be budget dependant. With regard to the timeframe for the project, the tender closing date was proposed to be 13 February, with construction in March 2019.

J McBride noted there was still no announcement from NZTA regarding the Woodend Bypass, it was likely still some time away.

R Mather asked about the alignment of Section 3. J McBride replied that there were requirements around the run off area and to achieve these it needed to be on the unformed road, not the park.

A Thompson referred to the crossing point and asked if staff had considered a central crossing point with fewer traffic movements as an easier place to cross. J McBride acknowledged there were a number of crossing points, the reasoning for the southern path alignment was incorporation of the Scout monument and absence of shady trees. From a safety perspective there was no issue with crossing at Gladstone Park.

A Thompson referred to the question of surfacing material and the rare opportunity to save $52,000 with a gritted rather than asphalted path. He asked who staff saw as likely users of the path. J McBride commented that with the location and connectivity to Woodend there was potential for a wide range of users, including families, on a walking loop which could include scooters and push chairs. It was unlikely that there would be commuter cyclists. Gritted was an option but would not be as attractive to scooters or push chairs.
S Powell asked if this could be considered as the main cycle route between Pegasus and Woodend. J McBride commented that it was a key link and another key link was that between Ravenswood and Pegasus.

R Mather asked what had happened to the $700,000 of funds for a link between Pegasus and Waikuku and could some of those funds be used? J McBride advised they had been refunded to the developer. The contribution was specifically for an upgrade on Kaiapoi Pa Road which had not eventuated.

Moved A Blackie seconded A Thompson

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board recommends:

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 181012119448
(b) Supports the proposal for a 2.3m wide shared path, located on the southern side of Gladstone Road;
(c) Notes that the preferred surfacing is a paver-laid asphalt surface on the shared path, however should budget not allow, then the path may remain unsealed with a crusher-dust surface. Section Three of the path through Gladstone Park will be sealed with Asphalt due to the requirements of the Community Greenspace team.
(d) Notes that NZTA have made no further announcements regarding the future Woodend Bypass, and that it is unlikely to be constructed for at least ten years.
(e) Notes the contract has an estimated tender closing date of 13 February 2019, with construction likely to commence in March 2019

CARRIED

A Blackie noted that the Council was ‘pulling heads in’ financially with a $12 million carryover deficit. The Long Term Plan had allocated $300,000 and there was no appetite to exceed that. He did not think the option to asphalt would be approved by Council. The Passchendaele Path had gone $100,000s over budget. He supported a $2.3m gritted path.

A Thompson commented that it was worthwhile that the Board consider the money spent on the path and he was pleased to be given options around spending as $50,000 was a considerable sum.

J Archer commented that the Woodend connection to Gladstone Park was very important. Children could walk or cycle to sports training.

R Mather noted the conversation on Pegasus Facebook Page about the track including suitability for a mobility scooter, there was a need to take that into consideration.

7.3 Meeting Dates from February 2019 to October 2019 – Edwina Cordwell (Governance Team Leader)

S Nichols spoke briefly to the report advising that it followed the same pattern during the term alternating between Pegasus and Woodend. Feedback was generally that it worked well. There was no meeting in October due to elections.

A Thompson noted that in the past Waikuku Beach Hall had been ruled out due to poor acoustics. He asked if the issues had been resolved would it be possible to hold meetings there in the future. C Brown advised that improvements had been made. To date there had been little feedback on those improvements. C Brown would follow up with user groups.
S Nichols advised that staff would report back in February 2019 on the use of Waikuku Beach Hall as a venue.

Moved S Powell seconded A Blackie

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No.181030127169.

(b) Resolves to hold Board meetings on the second Monday of the month, commencing at 7.00pm, and alternating venues between the Pegasus Community Centre and the Woodend Community Centre on the following dates:

- Monday 11 February 2019 Pegasus
- Monday 11 March 2019 Woodend
- Monday 8 April 2019 Pegasus or Waikuku Beach Hall dependant on availability and acoustics.
- Monday 13 May 2019 Woodend
- Monday 10 June 2019 Pegasus
- Monday 8 July 2019 Woodend
- Monday 12 August 2019 Pegasus
- Monday 9 September 2019 Woodend

CARRIED

7.4 Submissions on the Draft Zone Implementation Programme Addendum and Greater Christchurch Element of the Draft Regional Public Transport Strategy – Edwina Cordwell (Governance Team Leader)

S Nichols advised the report was procedural to ensure that the public were able to see what the Board submitted on their behalf. S Nichols noted that Public Transport was an agenda item for an upcoming meeting between Councillors and ECan.

Moved A Thompson seconded R Mather

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 181030127307.

(b) Notes the Board’s submissions to the Draft Zone Implementation Programme Addendum and Greater Christchurch Element of the Draft Regional Public Transport Strategy.

CARRIED

J Archer thanked S Powell for her contributions to the submissions.

A Blackie advised that the Councillors had expressed their dismay on the Transport Strategy. They had been advised not to focus on runs, schedules and routes as they would be investigated in depth in February.

8 CORRESPONDENCE

There was no correspondence.

9 CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT

9.1 Chairperson’s Report for October 2018

S Powell noted the Youth Development Grant had been awarded to two amazing young people. They had the goal of developing a Student Army in Kaiapoi High School (KHS) initially and extending to other schools in the
district. The project had the possibility of longevity and they had the support of KHS. There would be a further meeting with students next month.

Moved S Powell seconded J Archer

**THAT** the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 181101128440.

**CARRIED**

10 **MATTERS FOR INFORMATION**

10.1 **Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting minutes – 3 October 2018**
(Trim No. 180926111501).

10.2 **Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting minutes – 10 October 2018**
(Trim No. 181003114872).

10.3 **Kaiapoi Tuahiwi Community Board meeting minutes – 15 October 2018**
(Trim No. 181010118122).

10.4 **District Road Network – Term Service Contract 2015-18 – Extension of Service Period to 2019 – report to Council 2 October 2018**
(Trim No. 180822095061).

10.5 **Review of Water Supply Bylaw 2012 – report to Utilities and Roading Committee 16 October 2018**
(Trim No. 180910103408).

10.6 **Annual Compliance Report for Waimakariri District Council owned Drinking-Water Supplies with the Drinking Water Standards for New Zealand – report to Utilities and Roading Committee 16 October 2018**
(Trim No. 181002113999).

Moved R Mather seconded J Archer

**THAT** the Woodend-Sefton Community Board receives the information in items 10.1-10.6.

**CARRIED**

11 **MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE**

11.1 **October-November Diary for J Archer and R Mather**
(Trim No. 181101128460)

11.2 **A Blackie**

- Sam Huo of Pegasus Golf Club had presented to Council regarding upcoming annual international golf tournaments. There were plans for hotel development so visitors could stay in Pegasus for several days. There was potential for a Golf Academy.

- The Reserves Master Plan was approved at the Regeneration Steering Group meeting. There had been six submissions and only one presented. The plan provided an outline of the location and nature of each of the reserves and the roads. There was an implementation and monitoring plan.

- Congratulated J Archer on his Community Service Award.

- Attended Pegasus Bylaw BBQ in conjunction with local fire brigade, environmental group and council staff. The purpose was around education. A survey was completed with 70 replies. It asked if people knew the rules around the Bylaw such as not being able to drive a vehicle up the beach unless it was for recreational purposes. Commented that the Rangers did a great job however were underfunded and the Bylaw had no teeth. The situation was better than 12 months ago.
11.3 **J Archer**

- Thanked the Board for the acknowledgement of his Community Service Award.
- Concerns around horses on the beach and shellfish.

12 **CONSULTATION PROJECTS**

**Our Space 2018-2048 Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update**

Consultation closes Friday 30 November 2018.


S Powell asked if the Board wanted to do a submission around Our Space. The only thing S Powell noted was that it was focussed on Rangiora and Kaiapoi as the main growth settlement areas of Waimakariri. It was agreed that if members, after reviewing the document, wished to do a Board submission they would contact S Powell and a draft would be prepared.

13 **FOSTERING COMMUNITIES**

14 **BOARD FUNDING UPDATE**

14.1 **Board Discretionary Grant**

Balance as at 7 November 2018: $2,627.45.

14.2 **General Landscaping Fund**

Balance as at 5 September 2018 $12,160.

15 **MEDIA ITEMS**

The new boat River Queen was noted.

16 **QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**

17 **URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**

**NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board is scheduled for 7pm, Monday 10 December 2018 at the Pegasus Community Centre.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 8.06pm.

CONFIRMED

________________
Chairperson
Workshop

- Dan Lewis (Greenspace Community and Engagement Officer) and J McBride (Roading and Transport Manager) – Cycleways and Walkways.

Discussion of possible options for cycleways and walkways for commuter and recreational use and connectivity between key centres and localities.

- Members Forum
# Mayor’s Diary 27 October to 26 November 2018

## 1. SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 1 November</td>
<td>Multi-Use Sports Facility Project Steering Group meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting with Shaun Clarke, Chief Executive, and other senior staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>members of Far North District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Citizenship Ceremony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 2 November</td>
<td>Property Discussion with landowner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 3 November</td>
<td>Participated in re-opening of Rangiora RSA building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Re-Opened Northern A&amp;P building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 4 November</td>
<td>Visited Kaiapoi North School fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 5 November</td>
<td>Waimakariri Age Friendly Steering Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waimakariri Water Zone Committee briefing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regeneration Steering Group Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 6 November</td>
<td>Compass FM Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 7 November</td>
<td>Community Service Awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 8 November</td>
<td>Canterbury Police Honours and Awards Ceremony, Christchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Naval Reception at HMNZS Pegasus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 9 November</td>
<td>Canterbury Earthquakes Symposium: Recovery Governance Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Celebration of Poland's Independence Regained at Christchurch RSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 10 November</td>
<td>Anytime Fitness First Anniversary, Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 11 November</td>
<td>Deputy Mayor Kevin Felstead Armistice Day Wreath Laying at Kaiapoi Cenotaph on my behalf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Armistice Day Wreath Laying at Rangiora Cenotaph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visited Kaiapoi Community Garden open day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visited Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust open day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 12 November</td>
<td>LGNNZ Governance and Strategy Advisory Group Meeting, Wellington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apprentices Presentation with other Mayors, Christchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 13 November</td>
<td>Compass FM Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matt Doocey – regular catch-up meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 14 November</td>
<td>Mayors LGNZ Workshop, Wellington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 15 November</td>
<td>BNZ Corner Steering Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Solid and Hazardous Waste Working Party - Monthly Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 16 November</td>
<td>Met with the Philippine Ambassador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RNZN - Fund-Raising Dinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 19 November</td>
<td>Interview with David Hill North Canterbury News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WWZC Briefing Workshop &amp; Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 20 November</td>
<td>Compass FM interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spoke to Senior Net Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attended Rangiora Community Patrol 20-year function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 21 November</td>
<td>ENC Trustee Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting with Rural Canterbury PHO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waimakariri-Passchendaele Trust Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday-Friday 22-23</td>
<td>LGNZ Rural-Provincial Meeting, Wellington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 23 November</td>
<td>IHC Summer Soiree at Charles Upham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rangiora Christmas Summer Celebration Night</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 24 November</td>
<td>Opened National Summer Rose Show, Woodend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Canterbury Academy of Music Annual Concert, Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 25 November</td>
<td>Fernside PTA Garden tour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 26 November</td>
<td>Interview with David Hill North Canterbury News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Services Waimakariri Group Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Boards Briefing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THAT** the Council:

   a) **Receives** report No.: 181126138510

David Ayers
MAYOR