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COUNCIL MEETING

Tuesday 3 July 2018

Commencing at 1.00pm

Waimakariri District Council Chamber
215 High Street
Rangiora

Members:

Mayor David Ayers
Deputy Mayor Kevin Felstead
Councillor Neville Atkinson
Councillor Kirstyn Barnett
Councillor Al Blackie
Councillor Robbie Brine
Councillor Wendy Doody
Councillor Dan Gordon
Councillor John Meyer
Councillor Sandra Stewart
Councillor Paul Williams
The Mayor and Councillors

WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

A meeting of the WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL will be held in the COUNCIL CHAMBER, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA on TUESDAY 3 JULY 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. REGISTER OF INTERESTS

4. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

5. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

5.1. Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Tuesday 5 June 2018

RECOMMENDATION
THAT the Council:
(a) Confirms as a true and correct record the circulated minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Tuesday 5 June 2018.

(to be circulated separately)

5.2. Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Tuesday 19 June 2018

RECOMMENDATION
THAT the Council:
(b) Confirms as a true and correct record the circulated minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Tuesday 19 June 2018.
5.3 Minutes of the public excluded portion of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on 5 June 2018

(refer to Blue agenda papers)

MATTERS ARISING

6. DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

7. ADJOURNED BUSINESS
   Nil.

8. REGENERATION REPORTS

8.1. Oxford Museum and Jaycee Room Strengthening – Craig Sargison (Manager Community and Recreation)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives report No. 180510051351
(b) Notes that the strengthening of all of the community buildings is now complete with the exception of the Oxford Museum/Jaycee building.
(c) Approves the Oxford Museum/Jaycee building not being strengthened to 67% NBS and retaining a seismic strength of 34-66%NBS.
(d) Approves staff proceeding with the new entranceway and toilets for the building up to a total cost of $125,500
(e) Notes that the Oxford Museum will contribute $15,000 towards the cost of the new entranceway to the Museum.
(f) Circulates this report to the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board

8.2. Public Consultation of the Reviewed Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan – Simon Hart (Business and Centres Manager)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives report No.180621069246.
(b) Approve public consultation of the Draft Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan – 2028 and Beyond and related Consultation Plan.
(c) Notes that the consultation process allows for a four (4) week period of engagement activities and receipt of submissions.

9. REPORTS
9.1. **Multi-Use Sports Facility Project Management and Structure – Craig Sargison (Manager Community and Recreation)**

`RECOMMENDATION`

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180613065468

(b) **Approves** the multi-use indoor sports facility being delivered on the traditional methodology with separate design, procurement and construction phases.

(c) **Approves** the project structure for the multi-use indoor sports facility development (Trim: 180618067298)

(d) **Approves** the Project Steering Group Terms of Reference and membership (Trim 180618067303)

(e) **Delegates** to the Chief Executive and Manager Community and Recreation the authority:

(i) to engage Warren and Mahoney for architectural and lead design services.

(ii) to engage AECOM for Quantity Surveying Services for the project

(iii) to approve Warren and Mahoney engagement of the necessary engineering disciplines

(f) **Delegates** to the Chief Executive and Manager Community and Recreation the authority to engage AECOM for Quantity Surveying services for the project.

(g) **Delegates** to the Manager Community and Recreation the authority to engage Richard Lindsay for peer review services on the design.

(h) **Notes** that the Minutes of each Project Steering Group (PSG) meeting will be circulated to Councillors.

(i) **Notes** that the PSG will provide a recommendation to Council for contractor procurement.

(j) **Notes** that there will be a separate report to Council on the proposed Heads of Agreement and Operating Agreement with the North Canterbury Sports Trust.


(The Waimakariri Water Zone Committee Chairperson Dave Ashby will be present during consideration of this report.)

`RECOMMENDATION`

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report no. 180531060559.

(b) **Receives** the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee Annual Report 2017 (TRIM 180531060476);

(c) **Approves** the distribution of the Annual Report to Community Boards, and Drainage and Water Supply Advisory groups, for their information.
9.3 **Sustainability Strategy – Scoping Report – Mike O’Connell (Senior Policy Analyst)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180611064136.

(b) **Approves** the preparation of a corporate Sustainability Strategy for the Council.

(c) **Recommends** the appointment of Mayor David Ayers to be Project Champion for the promulgation of the Sustainability Strategy.


**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180620068478.

(b) **Approves** contracting out the operations and maintenance of Southbrook resource recovery park and Oxford transfer station to a private waste business with the option of the main contractor engaging, managing, and supporting a community group to undertake resource recovery activities.

(c) **Approves** staff undertaking a registration of interest process to identify potential suppliers from the community in addition to the private sector.

(d) **Approves** this departure from the Council’s standard procurement process to enable social procurement objectives to be achieved.

(e) **Approves** the term of the solid waste contracts for kerbside collection and transfer station operations being 7 years plus three one-year rights of renewal (7+1+1+1)

(f) **Approves** the procurement strategy appended as Attachment iii

(g) **Notes** that the Solid & Hazardous Waste Working Party has approved the consultation materials and the Communications Action Plan

(h) **Notes** that letters, feedback cards and Q&A sheets will be posted to ratepayers during the first week of July 2018
9.5. **Request for Additional Funding for Kaiapoi Well Head Security Improvements – Colin Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager) and Mark Andrews (Civil Engineer)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180621068890.

(b) Approves an increase to the Kaiapoi Well Head Improvement capital budget from $100,000 to $180,000 in the 2018/19 financial year to allow for the full required scope to be completed.

(c) Approves staff to engage G&T Construction to undertake well head security works at Darnley Square and Rugby Park to the value of $62,728.

(d) Notes that the reason for not publicly tendering the works is due to the specialised nature of the works, the expertise and availability of the contractor, the competitive price received and the criticality of the works given the likely consequences if security is not maintained for the scheme.

9.6. **Mainpower Trust’s Ownership Review and Capital Distribution – Jeff Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No 180621069047

(b) Resolves to submit to the MainPower Trust in support of the Trustees proposal to retain 100% of the Distributable Capital with the MainPower Trust.

(c) Authorises the Chief Executive Officer to sign and submit the submission.

9.7 **Final Greenspace Activity Management Plan 2018 – Chris Brown (Community and Greenspace Manager) and Ryan O’Loughlin (Community Greenspace Asset Information Officer)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180614066068

(b) Adopts the final 2018 Activity Management Plan for Greenspace

(c) Notes that reports will be presented to the Community and Recreation Committee on the implementation of the Asset Management Improvement Plan.

(d) Circulates this report to all Community Boards for their information.

9.8 **Environment Canterbury Representation Review – Sarah Nichols (Governance Manager)**
RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180624069683.

(b) Notes the Canterbury Regional Council proposal is for two members to represent the North Canterbury constituency that would come into existence for the 2019 Local Body Elections.

(c) Submits in support of the representation arrangements proposed by the Canterbury Regional Council (Ecan) for implementation for the 2019 Local Body Elections, with the submission to be approved by the Mayor.

(d) Notes a copy of the final submission will be circulated to all Councillors and Community Boards.

10. HEALTH AND SAFETY

10.1 Health and Safety Reports for May and June 2018 – Jim Palmer (Chief Executive)

(a) Receives report Nos. 180524057333 and 180618067368.

11. REPORT FOR INFORMATION FROM THE REGENERATION STEERING GROUP MEETING OF 11 JUNE 2018

11.1 Proposed Permanent Rowing Base in Murphy Park, Kaiapoi – Michelle Flanagan, Landscape Planner – District Regeneration and Cathy Batchelor, Communications Advisor – District Regeneration

(a) THAT the report no. 180521055764 be received for information.

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

12.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Audit and Risk Committee held on 22 May 2018

12.2 Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri Youth Council held on 29 May 2018

12.3 Minutes of a meeting of the Regeneration Steering Group held on 11 June 2018

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the information in items 12.1-12.3 be received.

13. COMMUNITY BOARD MINUTES FOR INFORMATION
13.1. Minutes of a meeting of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board held on 14 May 2018

383 - 392

13.2. Minutes of a meeting of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board held on 7 June 2018

393 - 401

13.3. Minutes of a meeting of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board held on 11 June 2018

402 - 408

13.4. Minutes of a meeting of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board held on 13 June 2018

409 - 416

13.5. Minutes of a meeting of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board held on 18 June 2018

417 - 424

RECOMMENDATION
THAT the information in items 13.1 to 13.5 be received.

14. CORRESPONDENCE

15. MAYOR’S DIARY
15.1. Mayor’s Diary 30 May – 24 June 2018

425 - 427

RECOMMENDATION
THAT the Council:
(a) Receives report no. 180619067641.

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:</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>19.1</td>
<td>Minutes of the public excluded portion of Council meeting of 5 June 2018</td>
<td>Confirmation of minutes</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>Minutes of the public excluded portion of Audit and Risk Committee meeting of 22 May 2018</td>
<td>Minutes to be received for information</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>Report of Kevin Dwyer (Landscape Architect – District Regeneration)</td>
<td>Contract 18/07 Kaiapoi Riverview Terraces and Boardwalk Construction Contract Price Evaluation Report</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>Report of Raymond Qu (Property Assets Advisor) and Simon Hart (Business and Centres Manager)</td>
<td>Sale of Council Property at 137 Williams Street, Kaiapoi</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>Report of Jim Palmer (Chief Executive)</td>
<td>Re-Appointment of Trustees to Enterprise North Canterbury Board</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>19.1 – 19.5</td>
<td>Protection of privacy of natural persons To carry out commercial activities without prejudice</td>
<td>A2(a) A2(b)ii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CLOSED MEETING

See Public Excluded Agenda (blue papers)
OPEN MEETING

20. NEXT MEETING

The next scheduled meeting of the Council is on Tuesday 7 August 2018 commencing at 1pm.
MINUTES OF THE MEETING FROM THE WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA, ON TUESDAY 19 JUNE 2018, COMMENCING AT 2PM.

PRESENT:

IN ATTENDANCE:
J Palmer (Chief Executive), J Millward (Manager, Finance & Business Support), K Simpson (3 Waters Manager), K LaValley (Project Delivery Manager), S Collin (Infrastructure Strategy Manager), and S Nichols (Governance Manager).

1. APOLOGIES

Moved: Councillor Atkinson Seconded: Councillor Felstead

An apology was accepted and sustained from Councillor A Blackie for absence.

CARRIED

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Nil.

3. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

3.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Tuesday 29 May to Thursday 31 May 2018

Moved: Mayor Ayers Seconded: Councillor Felstead

THAT the Council:

(a) Lay the matter on the table to the 3 July 2018 Council meeting.

CARRIED

4. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

Nil.

5. REPORTS

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

S Collin spoke to the report, advising of the process, including the peer review, and commenting on the changes that will be implemented once the plans are adopted by the Council.

Councillor Atkinson enquired about the strategic direction that comes from the plans. J Palmer explained the linkage is the 30year infrastructure strategy which is included in the Long Term Plan. This strategy incorporates district growth factors, the level of service provided and an explanation of where the documents sit within their respective layers was provided. The Activity Management Plans (AMP’s) are reviewed every three years and have a life of at least one asset cycle and potentially up to 150 years.
S Collin commented on an improvement project for 3waters asset management which will be developed over the next three years.

Councillor Atkinson queried further the overall framework of the various documents. J Palmer commented on two key documents being the District Development Strategy and the Infrastructure Strategy. The asset renewal cycle is being pushed out to 150 years which assists with funding planned infrastructure renewal. Comment was made on the degree of difficulty in assessing how the whole of the district will look and feel in 30 years to 100 years’ time.

Moved: Councillor Gordon    Seconded: Councillor Atkinson

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180521055689.

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

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

   ii) **Roading AMP, IFR-02-02**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme / Document Reference</th>
<th>TRIM Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 1 Executive Summary Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018</td>
<td>170321027383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 2 Introduction Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018</td>
<td>170321027382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3 Levels Of Service Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018</td>
<td>170321027378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4 Future Demand Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018</td>
<td>171004107027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5 Risk Management Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018</td>
<td>170321027377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 6 Life Cycle Management Plan Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018</td>
<td>170321027282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 7 Financial Summary Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018</td>
<td>170321027375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 8 Asset Management Practices Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018</td>
<td>170321027374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 9 Plan Improvement And Monitoring Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018</td>
<td>170321027381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 10 Appendices Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018</td>
<td>170321027373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix A Glossary of Terms Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018</td>
<td>170321027372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix B 2018 Strategic Business Case</td>
<td>171025115475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix C Maintenance Contract Levels Of Services Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018</td>
<td>170321027288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix D 2018 Roading Valuation Report Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018</td>
<td>171201130750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix E Risk Register Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018</td>
<td>170321027286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   iii) **Water Supply AMP, IFR-02-03**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme / Document Reference</th>
<th>TRIM Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Supply AMP Overview Document 2018</td>
<td>170822090191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme / Document Reference</td>
<td>TRIM Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi (including Pines/ Kairaki) Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus/Woodend Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Urban Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Rural No. 2 Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Rural No. 1 Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikuku Beach Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cust Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville/Fernside Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summerhill Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poyntzs Road Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Eyreton Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrymere Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117714</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

iv) Wastewater AMP, IFR-02-04

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

v) Drainage AMP, IFR-02-05

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

vi) Stockwater AMP, IFR-02-06

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme / Document Reference</th>
<th>TRIM Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stockwater Race AMP 2018</td>
<td>161115117090</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

vii) Solid Waste AMP, IFR-02-07

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

(c) Notes that progress on the AMP Improvement Programme will be reported to the U&R Committee.

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

CARRIED

Councillor Gordon appreciated the wider understanding of the various strategy documents outlined by the Chief Executive and how the documents link to the overall plan of the Council.

5.2 Final 2018/2019 Development Contribution Schedule – K LaValley (Project Delivery Manager)

K LaValley spoke briefly to the report, advising that once the schedule has been adopted by the Council, it would be included on the website.

There were no questions from elected members.

Moved: Councillor Meyer       Seconded: Councillor Gordon

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180607063077.

(b) Approves the 2018/19 Development Contribution schedules (TRIM 180611064705), to be effective on 1 July 2018 at the start of the new financial year.

(c) Notes that consent and connection applications receipted prior to 1 July 2018 will include the 2017/18 Development Contribution rate.

(d) Notes that there are no proposed changes to the Development Contributions Policy following the 2018-28 Long Term Plan consultation.

CARRIED

Councillor Meyer stated he appreciated the work undertaken by staff.

5.3 Adoption of the Long Term Plan (LTP) 2018-2028 – J Palmer (Chief Executive)

J Palmer reflected on the work undertaken from the beginning of the term, discussions, budget reviews, consultations, hearings and deliberation meetings to this point.
J Palmer spoke to the recommendation and commented on changes from the draft LTP document to the final LTP document, which included, but not limited to UV water treatment, increased cost of recycling and changes made by the Council during the deliberation meeting. He believed the end result of the LTP from both a budget and strategy viewpoint stands the community in good stead for the next three to ten years.

J Palmer commented on discussions with Audit NZ officers and their acceptance of the documentation.

Moved: Mayor Ayers  Seconded: Councillor Gordon

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No 180605062043.

(b) Adopts the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan (Trim document 180522056008) commencing 1 July 2018;

(c) Authorises the Chief Executive and the Manager Finance and Business Support to make necessary minor edits and corrections to the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan prior to printing.

CARRIED

Mayor Ayers reflected on the significance of the LTP document for the term, and commented on the work of staff, as well as Councillors being involved on many levels. Mayor Ayers stated this LTP document does drive the work to be undertaken for the next three years and both the Council and community will see how well we have done when next years Annual Plan is discussed and debated.

Councillor Gordon, commented on the excellent work from staff and acknowledged their contribution to the document. Councillor Gordon believed the LTP was an ambitious budget with a large number of capital projects, including providing key assets such as the stadium which had been discussed for many years previously. Councillor Gordon reflected on the Councillors working well together, in part due to the leadership of the Mayor. Councillor Gordon remarked on the engagement with the community being reflected in the high volume of submissions received which assisted greatly in decision making.

Councillor Barnett, remarked that the LTP provided a good understanding of areas to keep eye on as well as providing for district growth. Councillor Barnett stated there was a need for this Council to consider affordability. Councillor Barnett also remarked on being mindful of central government changes such as those related to water. Councillor Barnett believed that overall the LTP is responsible, prudent and ambitious.

5.4 Rates Resolution 2018/19 –L Palmer (Credit Controller)

L Palmer spoke briefly to the report, outlining its purpose.

Councillor Felstead queried community board costs. Staff explained budgets related to a population ratio, and rates set reflected a combination of per property rates and rate in the dollar across the different community wards.

Moved: Councillor Atkinson  Seconded: Councillor Doody

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180607062995.
(b) **Resolves** to set and assess the following rates under the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 and in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Long Term Plan 2018/28 and Funding Impact Statement for the 2018/19 year, on rating units in the Waimakariri District for the financial year commencing on 1 July 2018 and ending on 30 June 2019.

Rates are inclusive of the Goods and Services Tax (GST).

All section references are to the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002.

1. **GENERAL RATES**

   (a) a general rate set under Section 13 as a rate in the dollar on the rateable capital value for all rateable land; and

   (b) a uniform annual general charge set under Section 15 as a fixed amount per rateable rating unit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uniform annual general charge per rateable rating unit</th>
<th>$120.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General rate in the dollar on rateable capital value</td>
<td>0.000453</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **ROADING RATES**

   Targeted rates set under Section 16-18 comprising a fixed amount per rateable rating unit in the District; and a rate in the dollar on the rateable capital value for all rateable land in the District.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fixed amount on each rateable rating unit</th>
<th>$101.03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roading rate in the dollar on rateable capital value</td>
<td>0.000662</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **THONGCASTER ROAD & BROWNS ROCK ROAD SEAL EXTENSION LOAN RATE**

   A targeted rate set under sections 16-18 as a fixed amount per rateable rating unit in the Thongcaster Road & Browns Rock Road Seal Extension rating area where a lump sum contribution has not previously been paid.

   The boundary of the Thongcaster Road & Browns Rock Road Seal Extension rating area is shown on Rating Policy Map 47.

| Fixed amount per rateable rating unit | $354.39 |

4. **BARKERS ROAD SEAL EXTENSION LOAN RATE**

   A targeted rate set under Sections 16-18 as a fixed amount per rateable rating unit in the Barkers Road Seal Extension rating area where a lump sum contribution has not previously been paid.

   The boundary of the Barkers Road Seal Extension rating area is shown on Rating Policy Map 51.
5. **EARTHQUAKE RECOVERY RATE**

A targeted rate set under Sections 16-18 as a fixed amount per rateable rating unit in the District.

| Fixed amount per rateable rating unit | $60.92 |

6. **COMMUNITY PARKS AND RESERVES, BUILDINGS AND GRANTS RATES**

Targeted rates set under Sections 16-18 on a differential basis according to where the land is situated and the use to which the land is put, and targeted to each rateable rating unit or separately used or inhabited part of a rateable rating unit as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Fixed amount per rateable rating unit</th>
<th>Fixed amount per separately used or inhabited part of a rateable rating unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town Residential category</td>
<td>$467.60</td>
<td>$467.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Commercial category</td>
<td>$467.60</td>
<td>$467.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Vacant category</td>
<td>$58.70</td>
<td>$58.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Residential category</td>
<td>$408.90</td>
<td>$408.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Commercial category</td>
<td>$408.90</td>
<td>$408.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Town boundaries for Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend, Oxford and Pegasus are shown on the Rating Policy Maps 1-4.

A full explanation of the differential categories is contained in the Funding Impact Statement.

7. **PEGASUS SERVICES RATE**

Targeted rate set under Sections 16-18 as a fixed amount per rateable rating unit situated in the Pegasus Town boundary.

| Fixed amount per rateable rating unit | $64.79 |

The town boundary for Pegasus is shown on Rating Policy Map 1.

8. **COMMUNITY LIBRARY AND MUSEUMS RATE**

A targeted rate set under Sections 16-18 as a fixed amount per rateable rating unit in the District that is used for business purposes; and each separately used or inhabited part of a rateable rating unit in the District that is used for residential purposes.

| Fixed charge per rateable rating unit used for business purposes | $183.34 |
| Fixed charge per separately used or inhabited part of a rateable rating unit used for residential purposes | $183.34 |

9. **COMMUNITY SWIMMING POOLS RATE**

A targeted rate set under Sections 16-18 as a fixed amount per rateable rating unit in the District that is used for business purposes; and per separately used or inhabited part of a rateable rating unit in the District that is used for residential purposes.
10. **CANTERBURY MUSEUM OPERATIONAL LEVY RATE**

A targeted rate set under Sections 16-18 as a fixed amount per rateable rating unit in the District that is used for business purposes; and per separately used or inhabited part of a rateable rating unit in the District that is used for residential purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed charge per rateable rating unit used for business purposes</td>
<td>$28.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed charge per separately used or inhabited part of a rateable rating unit used for residential purposes</td>
<td>$28.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. **CANTERBURY MUSEUM REDEVELOPMENT LEVY RATE**

A targeted rate set under Sections 16-18 as a fixed amount per rateable rating unit in the District that is used for business purposes; and per separately used or inhabited part of a rateable rating unit in the District that is used for residential purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed charge per rateable rating unit used for business purposes</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed charge per separately used or inhabited part of a rateable rating unit used for residential purposes</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. **ANIMAL CONTROL (STOCK) RATE**

A targeted rate set under Sections 16-18 as a rate in the dollar on the rateable capital value on rating units situated in the Residential 4A, Residential 4B and rural zones in the Waimakariri District Council District Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rate in the dollar on rateable capital value</td>
<td>0.000009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. **COMMUNITY BOARD RATES**

Targeted rates set Under Sections 16-18 as a fixed amount per rateable rating unit plus a rate in the dollar on the rateable capital value according to where the land is situated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed amount per rateable rating unit situated in the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board area</td>
<td>$19.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate in the dollar on rateable capital value on each rating unit situated in the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board area</td>
<td>0.000010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed amount per rateable rating unit situated in the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board area</td>
<td>$19.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate in the dollar on rateable capital value on each rating unit situated in the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board area</td>
<td>0.000008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed amount on per rateable rating unit situated in the Woodend-Sefton Community Board area</td>
<td>$23.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rate in the dollar on rateable capital value on each rating unit situated in the Woodend-Setton Community Board area 0.000013

Fixed amount per rateable rating unit situated in the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board area $25.20

Rate in the dollar on rateable capital value on each rating unit situated in the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board area 0.000007

Community Board boundaries are those in place at 1 July 2018 and are illustrated on Rating Policy Map 11.

14. RANGIORA CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICTS AREA MAINTENANCE AND STREET WORKS RATE

A targeted rate set under Sections 16-18 as a rate in the dollar on rateable capital value on rating units situated in the Rangiora Central Business District rating area that are used for business purposes.

| Rate in the dollar on rateable capital value | 0.0001410 |

The boundary of the Rangiora CBD rating area is shown on Rating Policy Map 12.

15. KAIAPOI CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICTS AREA MAINTENANCE AND STREET WORKS

A targeted rate set under Sections 16-18 as a rate in the dollar on rateable capital value on rating units in the Kaiapoi Central Business District rating area that are used for business purposes.

| Rate in the dollar on rateable capital value | 0.0002427 |

The boundary of the Kaiapoi CBD rating area is shown on Rating Policy Map 13.

16. PROMOTION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT RATE

A targeted rate set under Sections 16-18 as a rate in the dollar on rateable capital value on each rating unit that is used primarily for business purposes.

| Rate in the dollar on rateable capital value | 0.00028 |

17. URBAN STORMWATER DRAINAGE RATES

Targeted rates set under Sections 16-18 as a rate in the dollar on the rateable land value on each rating unit situated in the Rangiora, Oxford, Pegasus and Coastal Urban (Woodend, Waikuku and Pines/Kairaki) urban drainage rating areas.

Targeted rate set under Sections 16-18 as a rate in the dollar on the rateable land value on each rating unit situated in the Kaiapoi urban drainage rating area on a differential basis according to where the land is situated.

A targeted rate set under Sections 16-18 as a fixed amount per rating unit on the properties in Alexander Lane that benefit directly from the private stormwater pump, to be charged in addition to the Kaiapoi urban drainage rate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rate in the dollar on rateable land value in the Kaiapoi urban drainage</td>
<td>0.001988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rating area excluding the Island Road extension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate in the dollar on rateable land value in the Kaiapoi urban drainage</td>
<td>0.000994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rating area Island Road rural extension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed amount per rating unit in the Alexander Lane Drainage Rating area</td>
<td>$120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate in the dollar on rateable land value in Rangiora urban drainage area</td>
<td>0.0010749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate in the dollar on rateable land value in Coastal Urban</td>
<td>0.0011023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Woodend, Waikuku and Pines/Kairaki) urban drainage rating areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate in the dollar on rateable land value in the Oxford urban drainage</td>
<td>0.0007777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rating area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate in the dollar on rateable land value in the Pegasus urban drainage</td>
<td>0.0013088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rating area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rangiora Urban Drainage Rating Area is shown on Rating Policy Map 14.
Kaiapoi Urban Drainage Rating Area, including the Island Road extension is shown on Rating Policy Map 15.
Pegasus Urban Drainage Rating Area is shown on Rating Policy Map 16.
Coastal Urban Drainage Rating Area is shown on Rating Policy Maps 17 (Waikuku and Waikuku Beach), 18 (The Pines Beach and Kairaki) and 19 (Woodend).
Oxford Urban Drainage Rating Area is shown on Rating Policy Map 21.
Alexander Lane Drainage Rating Area is shown on Rating Policy Map 22.

18. KERBSIDE REFUSE AND RECYCLING COLLECTION

A targeted rate set under Sections 16-18 as a fixed amount per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit within the Kerbside Collection Contract areas to which the refuse and recycling service is available.

A targeted rate set under Sections 16-18 as a fixed amount on each separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit in the Ohoka Recycling Area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed charge per separately used or inhabited parts of a rating unit to</td>
<td>$103.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>which the Kerbside Refuse and Recycling Collection service is available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed charge per separately used or inhabited parts of a rating unit in</td>
<td>$93.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Ohoka Recycling Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kerbside Collection contract areas are shown on Rating Policy Maps 34-44.

19. WATER RATES

Targeted rates for water supply set under Sections 16-19

On a differential basis according to the provision or availability of the service, a fixed amount per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit that is provided with an unrestricted connection to the Cust, Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Waikuku Beach, Woodend-Tuahiwi-Pegasus, Oxford Township water supplies. A fixed amount (40% of the rate for an unrestricted connection) for each unit of water supplied is set on rating units provided with a restricted connection to the above named water supplies.

A fixed amount per rating unit connected to the Summerhill, West Eyreton, Poyntzs Road, Garrymere and Ohoka restricted water supplies together with a fixed amount for each unit of water supplied.
A fixed amount per unit of water supplied from Oxford Rural No. 1, Oxford Rural No. 2 and Mandeville (including the Fernside extension) water supplies.

(1 unit of water = 1,000 litres/day)

Targeted loan rates set under Sections 16-18 on a differential basis according to the provision or availability of a service, on rating units in the Tuahiwi residential area that are serviced by the Woodend Tuahiwi-Pegasus Water Supply, where a lump sum contribution has not been paid. Loan rates are set as a fixed amount on each rating unit that is connected to the Woodend-Tuahiwi-Pegasus Water Supply, with a reduced amount payable on rating units that are not connected (pipeline share). The lower differential reflects the cost of installing the main pipeline and does not include the cost of property connections.

Targeted loan rate set as a fixed amount per rating unit in the rural land adjacent to the Tuahiwi residential area that have a restricted connection to the Woodend-Tuahiwi-Pegasus Water supply, where a lump sum contribution has not been paid.

Targeted loan rate set as a fixed amount per unit of water in the Fernside Water Loan area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cust</td>
<td>$899.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cust – restricted supply per unit of water</td>
<td>$359.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summerhill – per unit of water</td>
<td>$104.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summerhill – per rating unit</td>
<td>$921.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernside Loan Rate per unit of water</td>
<td>$179.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>$342.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora – restricted supply per unit of water</td>
<td>$136.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kairapoi</td>
<td>$196.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kairapoi – restricted supply per unit of water</td>
<td>$78.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikuku Beach</td>
<td>$398.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikuku Beach – restricted supply per unit of water</td>
<td>$159.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend-Tuahiwi-Pegasus</td>
<td>$396.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend-Tuahiwi– Pegasus restricted supply per unit of water</td>
<td>$158.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Eyreton – per unit of water</td>
<td>$70.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Eyreton – per rating unit</td>
<td>$734.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Township</td>
<td>$456.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Township – restricted supply</td>
<td>$182.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Rural Water No 1 per unit of water</td>
<td>$407.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Rural Water No 2 per unit of water</td>
<td>$362.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville – per unit of water</td>
<td>$208.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka – per unit of water</td>
<td>$21.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka – per rating unit</td>
<td>$1,093.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poyntz Road – per unit of water</td>
<td>$32.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poyntz Road – per rating unit</td>
<td>$544.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrymere – per unit of water</td>
<td>$31.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrymere – per rating unit</td>
<td>$1,234.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuahiwi residential area water connection loan rate</td>
<td>$667.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuahiwi residential area water pipeline loan rate</td>
<td>$489.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuahiwi rural water loan rate</td>
<td>$778.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tuahiwi residential area (water supply) is shown on Rating Policy Map 45
Tuahiwi rural restricted water supply area is shown on Rating Policy Map 46
Fernside Water Loan area is shown on Rating Policy Map 49
Mandeville Water Supply area (including Fernside extension) is shown on Rating Policy Map 50
20. **SEWER RATES**

A targeted rate under Sections 16-18 per water closet or urinal within a rating unit connected to the Eastern Districts Sewer in Rangiora, Waikuku Beach, Woodend, Woodend Beach, Pines Kairaki, Tuahiwi, Kaiapoi, Pegasus, Swannanoa, Mandeville, Ohoka Meadows and Ohoka Utilities.

A targeted rate set under Sections 16-18 as a fixed charge per rating unit in the Oxford, Fernside and Loburn Lea sewer rating areas.

Targeted loan rates set under Sections 16-18 as a fixed amount per rating unit and as a rate in the dollar on rateable land value per rating unit in the Oxford sewer rating area where a lump sum contribution has not been paid.

Targeted loan rates set under Sections 16-18 as a fixed amount per rating unit and as a rate per hectare of land area in each rating unit located in the Southbrook Services (Sewer) Extension Stage 1 area where a lump sum contribution was not been paid.

Targeted loan rates set under Sections 16-18 as a fixed amount per rating unit located in the Ohoka Utilities Connection Loan rating area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eastern Districts (Rangiora, Waikuku Beach, Woodend, Woodend Beach, Pines Kairaki, Tuahiwi, Kaiapoi, Pegasus, Swannanoa, Mandeville, Ohoka Meadows and Ohoka Utilities) per WC or urinal.</th>
<th>$472.50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka Utilities Connection Loan Rate</td>
<td>$378.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernside fixed amount per rating unit</td>
<td>$2,105.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loburn Lea fixed amount per rating unit</td>
<td>$1,845.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbrook Services (Sewer) Extension Stage 1 loan rate fixed amount per rating unit</td>
<td>$746.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbrook Services (Sewer) Extension Stage 1 loan rate per hectare of land area</td>
<td>$4,889.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford operating rate fixed amount per rating unit</td>
<td>$859.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford fixed loan rate fixed amount per rating unit</td>
<td>$216.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford variable loan rate in the dollar on rateable land value</td>
<td>0.001165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Oxford sewer rating boundary is shown on Rating Policy Map 32
Fernside sewer rating boundary is shown on Rating Policy Map 30
Loburn Lea sewer rating boundary is shown on Rating Policy Map 31
Southbrook Services (Sewer) Stage 1 Extension boundary is shown on Rating Policy Map 33
Ohoka Utilities Connection Loan rating area is shown on Rating Policy Map 48

21. **WATER RACE RATES**

Targeted rates set under Sections 16-18 as a fixed amount per rateable rating unit where the Waimakariri water race system is available assessed on a differential basis according to the area of land within each rating unit; together with a targeted rate per hectare of land area.

Small holdings for which special arrangements have been made to pipe water from this scheme are charged the special fixed charge only.
22. RURAL LAND DRAINAGE RATES

Targeted rates for rural land drainage set under Sections 16-18 on all rating units situated within the separate rural drainage targeted rating areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Rate Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri Coastal Rural</td>
<td>20% collected as a fixed amount per rating unit and 80% by a rate per hectare of land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cust</td>
<td>Rate per hectare of land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarkville</td>
<td>50% collected as a fixed amount per rating unit and 50% as a rate per hectare of land area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Ohoka &amp; Waimakariri Central Rural</td>
<td>20% collected as a fixed amount per rating unit and 80% as a rate in the dollar on the rateable land value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loburn Lea</td>
<td>Rate in the dollar on rateable land value</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Rate Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka</td>
<td>fixed amount per rating unit $47.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka rate in the dollar on rateable land value</td>
<td>0.0005440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>fixed amount per rating unit $25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford rate in the dollar on rateable land value</td>
<td>0.0001562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarkville</td>
<td>fixed amount per rating unit $126.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarkville rate on land area (per hectare)</td>
<td>$35.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri Coastal Rural</td>
<td>fixed amount per rating unit $42.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri Coastal Rural rate on land area (per hectare)</td>
<td>$26.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri Central Rural</td>
<td>fixed amount per rating unit $31.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri Central Rural rate in the dollar on rateable land value</td>
<td>0.0002413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cust</td>
<td>rate on land area (per hectare) $19.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loburn Lea</td>
<td>rate in the dollar on rateable land value $0.0022445</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ohoka Rural Drainage rating area is shown on Rating Policy Map 23

Oxford Rural Drainage rating area is shown on Rating Policy Map 28 (West) and Rating Policy Map 29 (East)

Clarkville Rural Drainage rating area is shown on Rating Policy Map 24

Waimakariri Coastal Rural Drainage rating area is shown on Rating Policy Map 27

Waimakariri Central Rural Drainage rating area is shown on Rating Policy Map 26

Cust Rural Drainage rating area is shown on Rating Policy Map 25

Loburn Lea Rural Residential Drainage Rating Area is shown on Rating Policy Map 20

(c) Resolves that rates are due and payable by four equal instalments on the dates listed below and resolves pursuant to Sections 57 and 58 that a penalty amounting to 10% of the amount unpaid will be added to any amount of the current instalment remaining unpaid seven days after the due date of that instalment. No penalty will be applied where a ratepayer has entered into an arrangement by way of a direct debit authority
and honours that arrangement so that all current years rates will be paid in full by 30th June in that year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instalment</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Penalty Charge Applies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20 August 2018</td>
<td>27 August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20 November 2018</td>
<td>27 November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>20 February 2019</td>
<td>27 February 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>20 May 2019</td>
<td>27 May 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(d) **Resolves** pursuant to Sections 57 and 58 a penalty charge amounting to 10% of the amount of unpaid rates from previous financial years, remaining unpaid at 1 July 2018 will be added on 2 July 2018 and a further penalty charge of 10% will be added on 3 January 2019 to amounts still remaining unpaid as at 1 January 2019.

(e) **Resolves** pursuant to Section 55, a discount amounting to 4% of the general rate, uniform annual general charge, roading rates, community parks and reserves, buildings and grants rate, community library & museums rate, community swimming pools rate, Pegasus services rate, Canterbury Museum operational levy rate and Canterbury Museum redevelopment levy rate, will be allowed if the total year’s rates and charges assessed, including those rates collected on behalf of the Canterbury Regional Council are paid in full by 27 August 2018.

(f) **Resolves** that rates shall be payable by cash, cheque or eftpos (debit card) at any of the following places during office opening hours:

- Rangiora Service Centre, 215 High Street, Rangiora
- Kaiapoi Service Centre, 176 Williams Street, Kaiapoi
- Oxford Service Centre, 34 Main Street, Oxford

Or by using on-line banking, e-payments, direct credit or direct debit facilities established by the Council.

(g) **Resolves** to set the following Lump Sum Contributions for the early repayment of loans.

1. **OXFORD SEWER LOAN REPAYMENT LUMP SUM CONTRIBUTIONS**

Lump sum contributions under Section 117B towards the early repayment of the Oxford Sewer Loans on all rating units in the Oxford sewer rating area where an election has been made to pay a lump sum contribution in accordance with Section 117H and the Capital Project Funding Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lump Sum Contribution</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Lump Sum Contribution</td>
<td>fixed amount per rating unit $153.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable Lump Sum Contribution</td>
<td>rate in the dollar on rateable land value 0.001813</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Oxford sewer rating boundary is shown on Rating Policy Map 32

2. **SOUTHBROOK SERVICES (SEWER) EXTENSION STAGE 1 LUMP SUM CONTRIBUTIONS**

Lump sum contributions towards the early repayment of the Southbrook Services Extension Loans on all rating units in the Southbrook Services (Sewer) Extension Stage 1 rating area where an election has been made to pay a lump sum contribution in accordance with Section 117H and the Capital Project Funding Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fixed Lump Sum Contribution fixed amount per rating unit</th>
<th>$4,730.02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable Lump Sum Contribution rate per hectare of land area</td>
<td>$30,997.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Southbrook Services (Sewer) Stage 1 Extension boundary is shown on Rating Policy Map 33.

CARRIED

6. **QUESTIONS**

Nil.

7. **URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS**

Nil.

8. **NEXT MEETING**

The next scheduled meeting of the Council is on Tuesday 3 July 2017 commencing at 1.00pm.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 2.25PM.

CONFIRMED

________________
Chairperson

________________
Date
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT FOR DECISION

FILE NO and TRIM NO: RES-23 /466-04 /180510051351

REPORT TO: Council

DATE OF MEETING: 3 July 2018

FROM: Craig Sargison

SUBJECT: OXFORD MUSEUM AND JAYCEE ROOM STRENGTHENING

SIGNED BY: [Signatures]

1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report is seeking Council approval to allow a variance to the policy of seismic strengthening of all Council owned buildings to 67% of NBS.

1.2 Currently all of our community buildings are now at 67% or greater with the exception of Woodend Lions Building which is 50% NBS and Rangiora Museum which is 49% NBS.

1.3 The report is also seeking Council approval to open a new entranceway to the Oxford Museum off the carpark on the western wall of the building.

Attachments:
   i. Alteration Plans for the Jaycee/Museum Building (Trim 180622069289)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180510051351

(b) Notes that the strengthening of all of the community buildings is now complete with the exception of the Oxford Museum/Jaycee building.

(c) Approves the Oxford Museum/Jaycee building not being strengthened to 67% NBS and retaining a seismic strength of 34-66%NBS.

(d) Approves staff proceeding with the new entranceway and toilets for the building up to a total cost of $125,500

(e) Notes that the Oxford Museum will contribute $15,000 towards the cost of the new entranceway to the Museum.

(f) Circulates this report to the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board
3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 Following the 2010 Earthquakes staff have been working on assessing and strengthening, or rebuilding, all of the Council owned Community Buildings.

3.2 All of the Council owned Community Buildings are now of greater than 67% with the exception of Woodend Lions Club building which is 50% and Rangiora Museum which is 49%.

3.3 The only building with remedial work still to be completed is the Jaycee/Museum building at Oxford.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1 The following table summarises the current NBS assessment for the Council owned Community Facilities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Name</th>
<th>%NBS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baker Park Pavilion</td>
<td>Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cust Community Centre</td>
<td>&gt;67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cust Domain Pavilion</td>
<td>&gt;100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cust Museum</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudley Park Pavilion</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernside Hall</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Aquatic Centre</td>
<td>&gt;100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Community Centre</td>
<td>&gt;67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi War Memorial</td>
<td>Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal Park Pavilion</td>
<td>&gt;100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loburn Domain Pavilion</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka Domain Pavilion</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Centennial Building</td>
<td>&gt;67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Oxford Jaycees Rooms and Museum</td>
<td>34-66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Library</td>
<td>&gt;100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Pool</td>
<td>&gt;67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Town Hall</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Park Pavilion</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pines Beach Cricket Pavilion / Rinaldi</td>
<td>Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pines Beach Paddling Pool</td>
<td>Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pines Beach Surf Club</td>
<td>Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Library</td>
<td>&gt;74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Museum</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Town Hall</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Toy Library</td>
<td>&gt;67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora War Memorial Building</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruataniwha Centre</td>
<td>&gt;130%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sefton Domain Pavilion</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilets - Pines Beach</td>
<td>&gt;100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>Seismic Strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trousselot Park new toilets</td>
<td>&gt;100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View Hill Pavilion</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikuku Beach Hall</td>
<td>&gt;67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Eyreton Hall</td>
<td>&gt;100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend Community Centre</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend Toy Library &amp; Pavilion</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend Lions Building</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2. Oxford Museum/Jaycee building

4.2.1. There has been a lot of work and discussions about the strength of the Museum building.
4.2.2. The key issue with the building is in the Museum part of the building and it is the two interior gable walls which have been constructed using earth bricks and have low seismic capacity.
4.2.3. The engineers (OPUS) have advised us that failure of those walls would not affect the stability of the building but pose a localised risk of falling bricks in the vicinity of the walls. They also noted that the substantive museum exhibits located in front of the walls will limit the risk of the public being in the fall zone of the walls.
4.2.4. There are some other issues with the structure around the toilets which serve all of the building and the proposed alterations will remedy those issues.
4.2.5. The state of the toilets is also one of the biggest complaints staff get from users and they are not currently accessible.
4.2.6. The overall seismic strength of the building is also limited by hardboard linings used throughout the complex which have less capacity to resist seismic loads than gib/plasterboard or plywood linings.
4.2.7. Once the proposed alterations are completed the building will have a seismic strength of between 34-66% of NBS which is above the legal requirement.

4.3. Option of 67% NBS

4.3.1. To achieve a 67% NBS rating would involve emptying the Museum and removing the two gable brick walls and then rebuilding new walls and relining ceilings.
4.3.2. While this may seem a relatively straightforward task the removal of some of the exhibits is very problematic. Some are very old glass cases approximately 2m high that would be unlikely to remain intact if moved.
4.3.3. A coal range and associated joinery and “imitation” chimney structure would also have to be dismantled. Some of the joinery has been constructed in situ and would have to be dismantled and then rebuilt.
4.3.4. Discussions have been held with the Museum Committee and the Community Board and there is unanimous support for leaving the exhibitions intact and accepting the risk that there could be some damage in a seismic event.
4.3.5. As noted by the engineers this risk is mitigated by actual exhibits and it should also be noted that there are normally very few people in the Museum at any one time.
4.4. Museum entranceway

4.4.1. The Museum Committee has been asking for some years for an improved entranceway to the museum.

4.4.2. At present the only entrance is on the eastern side of the building adjacent to the tennis courts.

4.4.3. The key reason for having the entranceway to the building in this position was to allow easy access for tennis players who can utilise the toilets in the building.

4.4.4. A few years ago Council supported improving the parking for the complex and now to access the Museum, visitors have to walk around 3 sides of the building.

4.4.5. A new entranceway is relatively easy to construct as it would utilise one of the existing window spaces and thereby avoid structural alterations to the wall.

4.4.6. The proposed plan also allows for a small porch at the entry to block the wind and also to create a distinct entry point from the carpark.

4.4.7. The Museum has offered to contribute $15,000 towards the cost of the new entranceway and the QS has estimated the total cost of the new entranceway to be $42,300.

4.5. Staff have already applied for and been granted a building consent for the alterations to the toilets and new entranceway.

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

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

The proposal is supported by the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board and the Oxford Museum Committee.

5.2. Wider Community

There is support in the Oxford Community to have a new entranceway to the Museum as it will enhance access to the Museum and with the new building at the rear housing agricultural machinery the Museum is an important visitor attraction in the Oxford township.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

6.1.1. The QS estimate for all of the work proposed on the building, which includes new reconfigured toilets, a new entranceway to the Museum and associated finishing work, is $125,500.

6.1.2. There is sufficient budget for this work as there was always a provision in the community buildings earthquake strengthening budget for the Jaycee/Museum building.

6.1.3. There is currently an unallocated balance of around $150,000 in that budget and the Museum has $15,000 in hand to contribute to the cost.
6.2. Community Implications

There is support in the Oxford Community to have a new entranceway to the Museum as it will enhance access to the Museum and with the new building at the rear housing agricultural machinery the Museum is an important visitor attraction to the Oxford township.

6.3. Risk Management

The risk to the community by leaving the building at a seismic rating of 34-66% of NBS is minimal and mitigated by the location and structure of the museum exhibits.

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 staff.

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

Building Act – note that a building consent has been granted for this work.

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 appropriate decision making body
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1. VISIT THE SITE AND LIAISE WITH THE CLIENT TO
2. REMOVE ALL WORK SHOWN HATCHED OR DASHED ON
3. NOTE: Internal doors to be removed
4. Timber wall cladding to be removed for
5. LIGHTING UNIT TO BE RELOCATED TO NORTH END
6. DISTRIBUTION BOARD AND EMERGENCY
7. DISTRIBUTION BOARD AND EMERGENCY
8. NOTE: INTERNAL DOORS TO BE REMOVED
9. REPAIR AS REQUIRED
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13mm GIB ceiling over 90x45 H1.2 Timber battens @ 600 CRS

Colorsteel ridge flashing

Concrete strip foundation, refer detail
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Colorsteel barge facia to match adjacent, refer note A-1300
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3118

4092

A-4001

VOID

A-4001

A-4001

A-4001

A-4001

10mm

50

100

200mm

300mm

NOTES:

1. ARCHITECTURAL DRAWINGS SHALL BE READ IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE STRUCTURAL AND SERVICES DRAWINGS.

2. ARCHITECTURAL DRAWINGS HAVE BEEN BASED UPON AVAILABLE EXISTING DOCUMENTATION. OPUS ARCHITECTURE ACCEPTS NO RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE DIMENSIONAL ACCURACY OF EXISTING BUILDING ELEMENTS. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL VERIFY ALL EXISTING DIMENSIONS AND CONDITIONS ON SITE. ANY DIMENSIONAL ANOMALIES SHALL BE MADE KNOWN TO ARCHITECT IMMEDIATELY.

GENERAL NOTES

1. ARCHITECTURAL DRAWINGS SHALL BE READ IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE STRUCTURAL AND SERVICES DRAWINGS.

2. ARCHITECTURAL DRAWINGS HAVE BEEN BASED UPON AVAILABLE EXISTING DOCUMENTATION. OPUS ARCHITECTURE ACCEPTS NO RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE DIMENSIONAL ACCURACY OF EXISTING BUILDING ELEMENTS. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL VERIFY ALL EXISTING DIMENSIONS AND CONDITIONS ON SITE. ANY DIMENSIONAL ANOMALIES SHALL BE MADE KNOWN TO ARCHITECT IMMEDIATELY.

SECTION - EW entrance

SECTION - NS entrance

SECTION - EW w/c area

SECTION - NS w/c area

Drawing in progress
NOTES:

1. ARCHITECTURAL DRAWINGS SHALL BE READ IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE STRUCTURAL AND SERVICES DRAWINGS.

2. ARCHITECTURAL DRAWINGS HAVE BEEN BASED UPON AVAILABLE EXISTING DOCUMENTATION. OPUS ARCHITECTURE ACCEPTS NO RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE DIMENSIONAL ACCURACY OF EXISTING BUILDING ELEMENTS. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL VERIFY ALL EXISTING DIMENSIONS AND CONDITIONS ON SITE. ANY DIMENSIONAL ANOMALIES SHALL BE MADE KNOWN TO ARCHITECT IMMEDIATELY.
Existing timber framed wall
Retain existing lining above new floor level
Demolish existing wall lining below floor line as required only
13mm wet area GIB ceiling over 90x45mm H1.2 timber battens
Additional 140x45 over top plate provides ceiling fixings
240x45 joists at 600 CRS max.
20mm particle board flooring, match existing loft level
Blocking as required by NZS3604:2011
Boundary joist against existing wall framing, do not allow floor to load existing wall
Services void
R3.6 Thermal insulation
60x12mm Timber skirting board

FLOOR - Left extension to existing wall
NOTES:

GENERAL NOTES
1. ARCHITECTURAL DRAWINGS SHALL BE READ IN
   CONJUNCTION WITH THE STRUCTURAL AND SERVICES
   DRAWINGS.
2. ARCHITECTURAL DRAWINGS HAVE BEEN BASED UPON
   AVAILABLE EXISTING DOCUMENTATION. OPUS
   ARCHITECTURE ACCEPTS NO RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE
   DIMENSIONAL ACCURACY OF EXISTING BUILDING
   ELEMENTS. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL VERIFY ALL
   EXISTING DIMENSIONS AND CONDITIONS ON SITE. ANY
   DIMENSIONAL ANOMALIES SHALL BE MADE KNOWN TO
   ARCHITECT IMMEDIATELY.

GENERAL NOTES
Existing
earth brick
veneer

WALL LININGS LEGEND

LINING TYPE DESCRIPTION
WL-01 Standard 13mm GIB plasterboard with paint finish.
WL-03
P C01 Internal, for review
INT 23-01-18

NOTES:

Plot date: 26/01/2018 11:01:15 AM
G:\PROJECTS\4-11521.00 Oxford Museum Entrance and Strengthening\A5 Detailed Design Services\Detailed Design Drawings\411521-OIC-00-ZZ-M3.rvt
26/01/2018 11:10:15 AM

ARCHITECTURE
1. All suspended ceiling systems to be installed as per manufacturers specifications.
2. All trades to be read in conjunction with services documents and fire report.
3. Make good to any existing ceilings damaged during the construction period.
4. Confirm all existing ceiling heights on site prior to construction.
5. Any discrepancies to be notified to the project manager as soon as possible.
6. Contractor to allow for suspended ceiling compression bracing where applicable.
7. Contractor to ensure the suspended ceiling is rigid and held firmly from existing structure.
8. Refer M&E drawings for ceiling mounted fittings and layout.
9. Confirm required access hatch locations with architect prior to installation on site.

Ceiling finishes schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CT-01</td>
<td>13mm GIB PLASTERBOARD WITH SELECT PAINT FINISH ON SKILLION CEILING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT-02</td>
<td>13mm GIB PLASTERBOARD WITH SELECT PAINT FINISH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT-03</td>
<td>13mm GIB WET AREA PLASTERBOARD WITH SELECT PAINT FINISH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT-EX</td>
<td>EXISTING CEILING, REPAIR AS REQUIRED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:

- Downlight
- Downlight, adjustable angle to suit being mounted on skillion ceiling
- Soffit to match existing
- Existing soffit
- Vertical section of soffit board (set back from corner of cladding)
- Section through soffit board

Notes:

- Plott date:
- Original sheet size A1 (841x594)
1. SUMMARY

1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek approval from Council to undertake a public consultation process for the reviewed Draft Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan. It is proposed that Public Consultation will occur between Monday 6th August and Sunday 2nd September 2018, with public submissions collated and processed in September. Current timeframes forecast the final plan being finalised and adopted by early October.

1.2 This report also provides detail about the process undertaken to review the Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan.

Attachments:

i. Draft Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan – 2028 and Beyond (To be Tabled)
ii. Draft Kaiapoi Town Centre Consultation Document (To be Tabled)
iii. Draft Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan – Consultation Plan (Trim 180626070508)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No.180621069246.

(b) Approve public consultation of the Draft Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan – 2028 and Beyond and related Consultation Plan.

(c) Notes that the consultation process allows for a four (4) week period of engagement activities and receipt of submissions.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 The Kaiapoi Town Centre (KTC) Plan prepared in 2011 provided the strategic framework for the restoration and redevelopment of the Kaiapoi town centre. Development of the KTC Plan was accelerated following the 4 September 2010 earthquake, recognising that the Kaiapoi town centre was significantly damaged and that a coordinated approach was needed to be undertaken for its restoration and redevelopment. The 2011 KTC Plan built on the background work carried out for the Kaiapoi Town Centre Revitalisation Plan that had been in progress since 2008.
3.2 There were a number of drivers for the review of the 2011 KTC Plan. The first of which relates to the significant progress made on the 32 identified actions in the Plan, with 26 of these completed, and the other six either partially completed or underway.

3.3 Another driver related to Council’s responsibilities as the planning authority to give effect to the Recovery Plan. This required the Council in the short to medium term to work with third parties as appropriate to determine the best uses for the mixed-use business regeneration, areas and to develop District Plan provisions to provide for them in the context of an overall integrated ‘concept plan’ for the two areas (i.e. the existing Kaiapoi town centre and prospective mixed use business areas). This included a range of prospective business uses, ‘future proofed’ public transport facilities, a motor caravan park and public car parking. It was considered that the most appropriate way to implement the Recovery Plan was to review the KTC Plan in tandem with regeneration Mixed Use Business land master planning.

3.4 The third key driver for the project was that the Council also, as a result of finalisation of the Recovery Plan in December 2016, was likely to take on ownership/custodianship and divestment responsibilities of the mixed-use business regeneration areas.

3.5 With the above review drivers in mind, the following process was put in place and undertaken to generate an updated ‘Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan – 2028 and Beyond’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Task</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introductory Report to Management Team</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Project Plan Developed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTC Monitoring Report Developed</td>
<td>February 2017</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Board Briefing # 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Report – Budget Implications</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Documentation and Council Approval</td>
<td>March 2017</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Board Briefing # 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirm External Advice Requirements</td>
<td>May – June 2017</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish Stakeholder Reference Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Group Initial Meeting</td>
<td>July 2017</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry By Design Workshop # 1</td>
<td>September 2017</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iterative MUB Concept Design Work</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry By Design Workshop # 2</td>
<td>October – November 2017</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iterative MUB Concept Design Work</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regeneration Steering Group Briefing</td>
<td>December 2017</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iterative MUB Concept Design Work, &amp; Initial Exiting Town Centre Concepts</td>
<td>January 2018</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry By Design Workshop # 3</td>
<td>February 2018</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting of Draft KTC Plan and Summary Document</td>
<td>March – May 2018</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. Feedback on the first Draft KTC Plan and Consultation Document was received from members of the Regeneration Steering Group, Councillors, Staff and Project Consultants following the presentation made of these documents on June 11\(^{th}\) 2018. Staff have collated and reviewed these comments and made a number of minor changes, improvements and editing corrections as a result. Whilst much of the feedback was incorporated, some was considered but left out of the attached drafts for public consultation as it was not consistent with the outcomes of the Inquiry by Design (IBD) workshops, or current project thinking or consultant advice. Staff will be contacting all those who have submitted feedback directly to discuss the rationale for the inclusion/exclusion of their respective feedback and comments.

4.2. As illustrated in the table above, there are a number of important ‘next steps’ over the coming months. Should Council support the recommendations in this report staff would prepare all of the relevant information, printed documents, social media and community engagement arrangements for the four week engagement period in August. In September, staff would then collate and evaluate the submissions received and make appropriate refinements to the Final Draft Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan – 2028 and Beyond for presentation of the final draft to Council at their October meeting for adoption.

4.3. An issue the Council may wish to consider is whether to provide for the hearing of submissions on the Draft Plan. If so a later report would be provided, as there are a number of issues to consider in light of the fact that the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board is itself a likely submitter on the Draft Plan. That said, once the Council has adopted a final Plan, it is anticipated that monitoring oversight of its implementation would be undertaken by the Board.

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

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

5.1.1. The Regeneration Steering Group has been briefed on the Draft KTC Plan and Consultation Document and have been provided with the opportunity to give initial feedback. Project staff and consultants have also been provided with this opportunity. A number of refinements to this document have been made as a result of consultation with these stakeholders.

5.1.2. Staff believe the attached Draft KTC Plan and Consultation Document are consistent with the views and aspirations of the projects Stakeholder reference Group.
5.2. **Wider Community**

5.2.1. Views have not yet been sought from the wider community, however approval of the recommendations in this report will see public consultation with the wider community undertaken.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

6.1.1. The following table provides an overview of the Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan Review Budget:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Funding Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Town Centre Improvement Budget</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Regeneration Budget</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Capitalisation of Mixed Use Business Development</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$300,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Expenditure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draft KTC Plan Development – As at June 2018</td>
<td>$290,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further Forecast Expenditure</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$330,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.1.2. The expenditure to June related to the Draft Plan development includes work related to the FENZ proposal (including the additional Inquiry by Design workshop and additional transport consultancy work). This is the reason for the likely over spend in this budget of around $30,000. Any additional funding would also be funded from ‘Unallocated’ portion of the Kaiapoi Town Centre budget.

6.2. **Community Implications**

6.2.1. The community will be publically consulted with during a four week period in August should Council support the recommendations in this report.

6.3. **Risk Management**

6.3.1. Staff anticipate limited risk associated with the recommendations in this report.

6.3.2. Financial risks associated with the recommendations in this report are articulated in the Financial Implications section (6.1).

6.4. **Health and Safety**

6.4.1. There are no specific anticipated health and safety implications resulting from the recommendations should they be supported. All relevant Council health and
safety policies and procedures will be followed during the course of any normal activities that are required as a result of these recommendations.

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**


Greater Christchurch Regeneration Act 2016.

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

- The distinctive character of our towns, villages and rural areas is maintained
- Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable, affordable and sustainable
- Core utility services are provided in a timely, sustainable and affordable manner
- Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality
- Businesses in the District are diverse, adaptable and growing
- Our community’s needs for health and social services are met
- Public effect is given to the spirit of the Treaty of Waitangi
- There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision making by local, regional and national organisations that affects our District

7.4. **Delegations**

The Council has delegated authority to approve public consultation of the Draft Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan and associated documents.
Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan Review 2018
Draft Communications Plan | April – September
1.0 Purpose

This communication plan provides an outline for communications surrounding the drafting and subsequent consultation on the Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan 2018-2028. It establishes key dates and deadlines within the consultation period and sets out which communication tools will be used over that time.

2.0 Background

A viable and vibrant Kaiapoi town centre is critical if the Council is seeking to reinforce the primacy of the town centre and prevent further leakage of retail spend and business to new commercial centres in suburban locations, particularly on the northern fringes of Christchurch.

The KTC Plan prepared in 2011 provided the strategic framework for the restoration and redevelopment of the Kaiapoi town centre. Development of the KTC Plan was accelerated following the 4 September 2010 earthquake, recognising that the Kaiapoi town centre was significantly damaged and that a coordinated approach was needed to be undertaken for its restoration and redevelopment. The KTC Plan built on the background work carried out for the Kaiapoi Town Centre Revitalisation Plan that had been in progress since 2008. Significantly, the KTC Plan did not address the issues and opportunities arising from the residential red zone areas of Kaiapoi, which at the time were only just at the beginning of the red zoning process.

There are three key drivers for the KTC Plan review project.

1. As set out in the KTC Plan Monitoring Report, of the 32 identified actions, the vast majority (26) have been completed and the remaining six are either in progress or partially completed. There has also been very substantial progress made by the private sector with the commercial rebuild. Also, through the development of the Recovery Plan and the work underway on the District Development Strategy (DDS), the information underpinning assumptions about future prospects for the town centre has been updated - and the Recovery Plan completed to provide for mixed use business areas to complement and extend the existing town centre on three sides. Given all these changes a KTC Plan review is warranted.

2. The Council now has responsibilities as the planning authority to give effect to the Recovery Plan. This requires the Council in the short to medium term to work with third parties as appropriate to determine the best uses for the mixed-use business Regeneration areas and to develop District Plan provisions to provide for them in the context of an overall integrated ‘concept plan’ for the two areas (i.e. the existing Kaiapoi town centre and prospective mixed use business areas). It is considered that the most appropriate way to implement the Recovery Plan is to review the KTC Plan and include mixed-use business Regeneration areas as part of the review.

3. The Council also, as a result of finalisation of the Recovery Plan in December 2016, has prospective ownership/custodianship and divestment responsibilities of the mixed-use business red zone areas. The Recovery Plan states that these areas will be vested in the Council with conditions ensuring the Council seeks to obtain maximum financial return on any future sale or lease of the land divested, with the Council and the Crown each receiving a share of any net financial returns (where applicable), less any cost incurred by the Council in interim management and divestment activities.
It’s intended that this review will see a plan published, tentatively titled ‘Kaiapoi Town Centre 2028’, that will last for at least the next 10 years, hence the 2028 tag.

The Council approved the review at the March 2017 Council meeting, and significant progress has been made since that date.

- An external reference group has been established.
- External advice has been contracted.
- Inquiry by Design sessions have been held with Community Board members and key stakeholders.
- The Draft KTC plan and Summary Document are currently being written.

The proposed timeline for the remainder of the review process is as follows:

- April/May 2018 - Prepare draft KTC Plan and Summary Document.
- June 2018 – Regeneration Steering Group approval of the draft KTC Plan for consultation.
- July 2018 - Draft KTC Plan (published version) and summary document completed for consultation.
- July 2018 - Council approval of the draft KTC Plan for consultation.
- August 2018 - Consultation period (including Hearing if required).
- November 2018 - Finalise and adopt reviewed KTC Plan.

Targeted engagement took place over the second half of 2017, and public consultation will occur from August 2018 – September 2018. This was initially placed to align with the draft LTP consultation in March, however an extended review process now means consultation will open after the draft LTP consultation closes.

3.0 Communication Objectives

To support the Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan Review, the communication objectives are to:

- Raise resident awareness of the KTC Plan Review within Kaiapoi.
- Identify and publicise key items within the Draft KTC Plan.
- Educate the public about the purpose and need for the KTC Plan.
- Ensure the Draft KTC Plan and Consultation Document are easy to find and accessible.
- Ensure the Consultation Document is clear and easy to understand.
- Ensure it is easy to make a submission, and that a variety of submission methods are available to suit the different needs within the community.
- Ensure all business owners and property owners within the town centre area are provided with information on the plan and have the opportunity to make a submission.
- Make sure other relevant stakeholder groups are provided with information on the plan and have the opportunity to make a submission.
- Promote the importance and success of the previous KTC plan.
- Promote Council’s commitment to the development of the Kaiapoi Town Centre, local economic activity, and employment.
## 5.0 Risks and Mitigation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication issue or risk</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Backlash from members of the public who disagree parts of the KTC Plan, particularly on social media.</td>
<td>Closely monitor social media channels in regards to the KTC plan and use prompt replies to encourage complainants to make a formal submission with their concerns. Correct misinformation if required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Community allow negativity around red zoning and the pace of Regeneration to cloud their views on the KTC Plan.</td>
<td>Direct complainants to information about the Regeneration project and recent progress. Make clear what’s covered by the scope of the KTC plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Community feel that they haven’t been consulted properly.</td>
<td>Use multiple mediums of communication to reach residents and businesses, including advertising and local media. Make sure it’s easy to make a submission and hold public drop-in sessions and hearings. Ensure community board members and resident associations are well informed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key stakeholders don’t receive information, read communication material or engage with the consultation.</td>
<td>Use multiple mediums of communication to target key stakeholders. Make sure every business owner and landowner in the area also receives written information about the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media portray the plan or consultation in a negative light.</td>
<td>Brief media about the project before consultation begins, and discuss with them key messages. Correct misinformation if it arises.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrealistically optimistic expectations around the plan and the timeframe for completion.</td>
<td>Clearly identify the purpose of the plan in the consultation documents and the reliance on private developers. Also explain the challenge and cost involved in remediating the underlying land. Be clear that this is a plan for 10 years and beyond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints over the location of the transport hub / park n’ ride, and concerns over rail commuting options.</td>
<td>Have clear reasoning in the document for the proposed transport options. Encourage complainants to make a submission with their preference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern over the cost to ratepayers.</td>
<td>Clearly identifying the roles of Council and private developers in the plan. Show how costs could be spread over a long time frame and balanced against increased economic activity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Media / Public backlash in relation to FENZ decision.

FENZ location not described in KTC Plan.
Communicate KTCB’s concerns over preservation of the rail corridor.
Assure public that we are working closely with FENZ to find a solution that works for everyone.
Encourage those concerned to make a submission.

6.0 Audiences and stakeholders

Directly affected
- Residents of Kaiapoi
- Business Owners & Land Owners within the Kaiapoi Town Centre.
- FENZ (Kaiapoi Fire Station)
- St. Johns Ambulance
- NZ Police
- MainPower / Utility Providers
- Local Developers
- KiwiRail
- Environment Canterbury
- Go Bus
- Motor Home Association

Internal
- Project Control Group
- Simon Hart (Business & Centres Manager)
- Communication & Engagement Manager (Matt McIlraith)
- Council Roading (Bill Rice)
- Council Property (Rob Hawthorne)
- Customer Services
- Policy and Customer Service Manager (Simon Markham)
- Kaiapoi Community Board Members
- Mayor and Councillors
- Management Team

Interest Groups
- Schools in the vicinity of the Kaiapoi Town Centre
- Retirement Villages in the vicinity in the Kaiapoi Town Centre
- Waimakariri Access Group
- Kaiapoi Promotions Association
- You, Me, We, Us
- Waimakariri MP Matt Doocey
- Land Information New Zealand
- Local Economic Group
- DPMC / MP Megan Woods
- Greater Christchurch Group
- Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga
- Enterprise North Canterbury
- Visit Waimakariri and iSite Kaiapoi
- Blind Foundation/Access Group
- WDC Facebook and Twitter users
- Local media
- Age Concern Canterbury
7.0 Key messages

Key messages will be focussed on all residents and businesses of Kaiapoi.

Key messaging:

- We achieved a lot with the current KTC Plan.
- This will guide the development of Kaiapoi’s town centre over the next 10 years and beyond.
- This plans for how the mixed-use business Regeneration areas will be used.
- The Council is seeking ideas and feedback from residents of Kaiapoi.
- This is not just about businesses, we want to build a vibrant town centre where people enjoy spending time and showcase our town as a destination. It needs to have a sense of place, be an asset for the community and not just a place to shop.

8.0 Communications Approach

Communication tools will be adapted as required to meet the project requirements and key milestones of the Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community &amp; Stakeholder Engagement:</th>
<th>Media &amp; Advertising:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mail-out to every business and landowner in the Kaiapoi Town Centre.</td>
<td>Media release directly before the consultation period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail-out to Interest Groups.</td>
<td>Will pro-actively work with local media as opportunities arise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Drop-In Session / Business Breakfast</td>
<td>Regular newspaper adverts through consultation period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Drop-in Sessions</td>
<td>Northern Outlook alternating with North Canterbury News and Kaiapoi Advocate fortnightly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal contact with important stakeholders such as Utilities / Emergency Services</td>
<td>Posters for Business windows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copy of consultation document for schools, retirement village.</td>
<td>Advertise webpage and community drop-in sessions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copy of consultation document + cover letter, and invite to drop-in sessions.</td>
<td>Copies of consultation document for waiting areas in local businesses, medical centres, MP’s Office &amp; iSite.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One session during day, and one session in the evening, to take place late in the consultation period. Simon + KCB.</td>
<td>Local takeaways, hairdressers, doctors etc..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon to make contact as required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video produced for social media and screens in Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre.</td>
<td>One video produced and boosted at start &amp; end of campaign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information display and copies of all documents at Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre.</td>
<td>Pull-up banner, large TV display with video, copies of consultation document &amp; draft plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular social media posts.</td>
<td>Once a week or as required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information page &amp; submission form on Council website.</td>
<td>Update current KTC plan page.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News articles on Council website.</td>
<td>As required, link through to KTC plan page.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April / May</td>
<td>Early June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>May 15</strong></td>
<td><strong>June 11</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beck &amp; Caul</strong></td>
<td><strong>Beck &amp; Caul</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Comms - Dan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Writing Draft KTC Plan</strong></td>
<td><strong>Revising Draft KTC Plan, Consultation Document And Technical Document</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew / Simon</td>
<td>Andrew / Simon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Write Consultation Document</strong></td>
<td><strong>Write Submission Form</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Script &amp; Produce Video</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 July – 5 August</td>
<td>6 August – 12 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consultation Period:</strong> Monday 6 August– Monday 3 September</td>
<td><strong>KTC Plan Adopted</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Update Internal Stakeholders</strong></td>
<td>Mail-outs Delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail-outs posted</td>
<td>Simon / Customer Services / Comms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverts:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video Released</td>
<td>Video Final Push</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comms - Dan</td>
<td>Comms - Dan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Page &amp; Online Submission Ready</td>
<td>Web Page &amp; Online Submission Live</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comms - Ruben</td>
<td>Comms - Ruben</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media &amp; Website Posts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comms – Dan/Karen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Release</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comms - Dan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media &amp; Website Post</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comms – Dan/Karen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliver printed material to Ruataniwha.</td>
<td>Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre: Information Display</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliver printed material - MP Matt Docey &amp; Internal Stakeholders.</td>
<td>Posters &amp; consultation documents to waiting rooms etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Developer Drop-In</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comms – Karen / Simon / KCB / KPA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daytime Drop-In Session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comms - Karen / Simon / KCB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening Drop-In Session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comms - Karen / Simon / KCB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Hearings (If required)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon / KCB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1. The purpose of this report is for Council to approve the project structure and engagement of consultants for the detailed design and contractor procurement for the Multi-Use Indoor Sports Facility, on Coldstream Road, Rangiora.

1.2. The report proposes a traditional design and construction methodology with the Council directly engaging AECOM to provide Quantity Surveying Services and engaging Warren and Mahoney as the lead consultant. The other consultants necessary for the detailed design process will be engaged by Warren and Mahoney, with appropriate input from Council into the consultant selection process.

1.3. A project structure is also proposed which involves Councillors in the Project Steering Group.

**Attachments:**

i. Project Structure (Trim: 180618067298)

ii. Multi-Use Indoor Sports Facility Project Steering Group Terms of Reference (Trim:180618067303)

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180613065468

(b) Approves the multi-use indoor sports facility being delivered on the traditional methodology with separate design, procurement and construction phases.

(c) Approves the project structure for the multi-use indoor sports facility development (Trim: 180618067298)

(d) Approves the Project Steering Group Terms of Reference and membership (Trim 180618067303)

(e) Delegates to the Chief Executive and Manager Community and Recreation the authority:

- (i) to engage Warren and Mahoney for architectural and lead design services.
- (ii) to engage AECOM for Quantity Surveying Services for the project
- (iii) to approve Warren and Mahoney engagement of the necessary engineering disciplines
(f) **Delegates** to the Chief Executive and Manager Community and Recreation the authority to engage AECOM for Quantity Surveying services for the project.

(g) **Delegates** to the Manager Community and Recreation the authority to engage Richard Lindsay for peer review services on the design.

(h) **Notes** that the Minutes of each Project Steering Group (PSG) meeting will be circulated to Councillors.

(i) **Notes** that the PSG will provide a recommendation to Council for contractor procurement.

(j) **Notes** that there will be a separate report to Council on the proposed Heads of Agreement and Operating Agreement with the North Canterbury Sports Trust.

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 The Council included a provision of $27.85 million in the LTP for the design and construction of a Multi-Use Indoor Sports Facility at Coldstream Road, Rangiora as part of the LTP process.

3.2 The May 2018 report seeking approval for the funding noted that there would be a report to Council on the next stages of the project and the associated project structure.

3.3 The following was the indicative timetable included in the May report to Council:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commence design</td>
<td>01 July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete design</td>
<td>31 January 2019 (7 months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement for construction complete</td>
<td>30 March 2019 (2 months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction complete</td>
<td>30 September 2020 (18 months)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 Once the design team is engaged a timetable will be confirmed.
4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. Each significant building construction project has 6 stages:

![Project Stages Diagram](image-url)
4.2. Stage 1 Concept design has been completed and this report is primarily focused on Stages 2-4, which is Preliminary Design through to design completion and consent applications ready for submission.

4.3. There will be a further report to Council, from the Project Steering Group (PSG) with recommendations on Procurement and construction.

4.4. The suggested project structure is attached (Trim 180618067298). This structure is further discussed below.

4.5. The proposed structure will facilitate the integration of the following key elements of the project:
   - Site clearance and development. There are several outbuildings that need to be removed from site
   - Provision of infrastructure services – including power, water, sewer and stormwater
   - Road /footpath treatment for pedestrian and vehicle access to the Multi-Use Indoor Sports Facility and hockey turf
   - Resource consent from WDC and potentially from ECAN for stormwater discharge
   - Detailed design of the Multi-Use Indoor Sports Facility including building consent and any associated consents that may be required such as earthworks
   - Contractor procurement
   - A proposed tennis complex may be progressed and this would be best governed through the PSG depending on the progress that is made in working with Southbrook and Rangiora Tennis Clubs and there will be a separate report to Council on this.

4.6. Design team

4.6.1. As well as being responsible for the architectural design it is proposed to have Warren and Mahoney as the lead consultant. This means that Warren and Mahoney would be engaging, after approval by the Council, the other professional consultants required to complete the detailed design and consenting of the Facility. The scope of services provided by Warren and Mahoney is further discussed in Section 4.9 of this report.

4.6.2. The other engineering disciplines required in the Design Team will include: Mechanical, Structural, Civil, Geotechnical and Electrical.

4.6.3. An alternative project structure would be to have the Council separately engaging engineering services from each discipline and then the Council would be responsible for managing and coordinating the work of all of the Design Team.

4.6.4. The preference, and the model that was successfully used at the Ruataniwha Centre, Oxford Town Hall, Oxford Library and Rangiora Town Hall, is to have one lead consultant which in all of these recent builds was the Architect.

4.6.5. Landscape design services will be supplied in-house from the Greenspace Team. Infrastructure design services, outside of the building footprint, will be also be designed in house through PDU.

4.6.6. Quantity Surveying Services will be delivered by AECOM who have provided QS services for all of our recent capital projects including the Concept Design for the Facility. If this work was contested by sourcing proposals from alternative QS providers this would add cost to the project as AECOM has undertaken all of the QS services for the concept design. Another advantage of AECOM is that they have provided QS Services for recent similar facilities such as the Ashburton Stadium and also have the contract for QS Services for the Metro Sports Facility.
Their cost estimates on all of the capital building projects that the Council have undertaken since 2007, including Dudley Pool, have all been accurate and all of those projects, including all of the earthquake repairs on community buildings, have all been completed within budget.

4.6.7. The design team will work for Craig Sargison as the Project Coordinator.

4.6.8. Note that there will be a separate report to Council, with recommendations from the PSG on contractor procurement and contract management (Stages 5 and 6) of the project.

4.7. Alternative Project Structure – Design and Build

4.7.1. The Council could consider a design and build option whereby a contract is concluded with a firm to undertake the design and construction of the facility.

4.7.2. The following is a summary of the pros and cons of a design and build approach from AECOM:

**Pros**
- Risk transfer
- Opportunity for shorter timeframe
- Opportunity for innovation
- Less contract administration

**Cons**
- Client brief needs to be resolved up front with robust principal’s requirements necessary in order to get what you want
- Cost to change is higher than traditional
- Contractor market capability immature in this space
- Lower quality likely
- You get what you get
- A more complex model if client is unfamiliar with the model

4.7.3. For the Multi-Use Indoor Sports Facility in particular, there are high risks around the robustness and lifecycle of materials used, the level of HVAC and the whole of life operating costs. These are similar concerns that existed around other recent capital projects such as Ruataniwha, Oxford Library and others and on balance staff do not consider that the risks associated with a design and build option should be accepted by Council.

4.7.4. This is not the recommended option and this report recommends the more traditional project delivery approach of detailed design, procurement and construction.

4.8. Project management structure – Project Steering Group (PSG)

4.8.1. The proposed management structure is represented on the attached diagram (Trim: 180618067298)

4.8.2. The PSG Group will provide the appropriate level of Governance support to the Project.

4.8.3. It is proposed that the PSG will have 7 members, plus staff support so that the Group is small enough to be able to meet regularly (monthly) and more often if required.

4.8.4. The proposed structure also provides for representation from the North Canterbury Sports and Recreation Trust. It is proposed to have the Chair of the Trust as a member of the PSG and to have Trust Staff on the Client Reference Group.
4.8.5. The proposed membership is:
- Kevin Felstead, Portfolio Holder Audit, Risk & LTP (Chair)
- Wendy Doody, Portfolio Holder Community Facilities
- Jim Palmer, Chief Executive
- Craig Sargison, Manager, Community & Recreation
- Jeff Millward, Manager, Finance & Business Support
- North Canterbury Sport and Recreation Chair
- Ross Davidson, Quantity Surveyor AECOM

4.8.6. The project structure also recognises the need to coordinate the provision of infrastructural services as well as potential road/footpath enhancement.

4.8.7. The structure also includes provision for Peer Review of the detailed design. It is proposed that this Peer Review service would be undertaken by Richard Lindsay. Richard was responsible for the development of the functional design brief for the facility and has significant experience of indoor sports facilities. Richard was at Sport NZ for around 13 years and developed the National Facilities Framework “Better value from NZ Sporting Facilities”.

4.8.8. The Client Reference Group will have the task of working with key users such as netball and basketball to ensure the detailed design and fit out will be suitable for their needs.

4.8.9. Project communications with the Community will be undertaken by the Council’s Communications Team.

4.3.7 The Terms of Reference for the PSG is attached (Trim:180618067303)

4.9. Professional Services

4.9.1. The QS estimate for the project has a provision of $3,235,000.

4.9.2. The Architect’s fees are likely to be around $2.3million based on 11% of the $19,700,000 contract value which is the industry standard. A confirmed fee will be provided once requested. This figure was included as part of the proposal for the preparation of the Concept Design as Stage 2 of the project.

4.9.3. When Warren and Mahoney submitted their tender for the concept design they included their fee estimate for Stage 2. Based on providing a typical level of service in general accordance with NZ Construction Industry Council guidelines, Warren and Mahoney will provide a confirmed fee once requested from Council.

STAGE TWO FEE ESTIMATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Design</td>
<td>$242,664.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed Design</td>
<td>$363,996.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed Design &amp; Construction Documentation</td>
<td>$829,104.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Commissioning</td>
<td>$545,995.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defects</td>
<td>$40,444.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$2,022,205.00</strong> Excl GST</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.9.4. If the recommendations in this report are approved, Warren and Mahoney will source prices from the other engineering disciplines and submit recommendations to Council for approval.

4.9.5. This report is seeking delegated authority from the Council to the Chief Executive and Manager Community and Recreation to finalise engagement of the necessary engineering consultants.
4.10. The Management Team have reviewed this report and support the recommendations.

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

5.1.1. Potential user Groups were consulted as part of the preparation of the Functional Design Brief and also during the LTP consultation with the Concept Design.

5.1.2. During the detailed design phase of the project staff will be working with the North Canterbury Sport and Recreation Staff and key users to ensure that the building is fit for purpose.

5.2. Wider Community

5.2.1. The wider community had opportunity for comment on the proposal during the LTP process.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

6.1.1. The Council has budgeted $27.85 million for the project.

6.1.2. The project will be levied Council development contributions on the same basis of any other development and provision for those are included in the QS estimate of $27.85 million. There are provisions for the development of infrastructure services in separate budgets.

Water supply

6.1.3. A new 150mm main along Coldstream Road will be required. The section under the railway line and up to East Belt will be paid for by the Rangiora water account as this provides an improvement to the existing network. The section east of this point would be solely to serve the sports complex this will be a cost to the development. The estimates for this work are shown below.

6.1.4. The section under the railway line is estimated to cost $75,000 and this will be funded from the Rangiora Water account.

6.1.5. The section east of East Belt is estimated to cost $145,000 and this will be attributable to the site development.

6.1.6. Development contributions for Rangiora water are currently $6,802 per property. Assuming that DC’s are applied and a household unit equivalent (HUE) of 15 (to be confirmed based on actual expected water usage), this would give a figure of $102,030.

Wastewater

6.1.7. A dedicated pressure main from the onsite pump station to the existing sewer system in East Belt would be required which would cost around $80,000.

6.1.8. Development contributions for Rangiora and Eastern Districts sewer are currently $12,188 per property. Assuming that DC’s are applied and HUE of 15 (as per water), this would give a total of $182,820.
Roading

6.1.9. It is also likely that when a traffic impact assessment is undertaken there will be some roading modifications required addressing vehicle, pedestrian and cycling access to the facility and the existing hockey turf. The LTP budget for roading includes a provisional sum of $500,000 for future works to accommodate the needs for the multi-use sports centre and the proposed tennis development.

6.2. Community Implications

6.2.1. The submissions received from the Community 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

6.3.1. 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 2 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

The decision to build the facility is a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy and was subject to the LTP Special Consultative Process. The decision to appoint a consultant team is not a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s significance and engagement policy.
The provision of an indoor court facility has been the subject of several reports to Council. Key reports considered by Council include:

- Multi Use Sports Facility May 2018 (Trim 180430046651)
- Multi Use Sports Facility January 2018 (Trim 180118003759)
- Contract 17-20: Indoor Court Architectural Services May 2017 (Trim 170519050621)
- Indoor Court Design and Location, February 2017 (Trim 170127007516)
- Indoor Court Functional Design Brief, September 2016 (Trim 160825086360)
- Indoor Court Project Steering Group August 2015 (Trim 150730113868)
- LTP Provision for an Indoor Court Facility May 2015 (Trim 150508074259)
- Draft LTP: Options for Provision of an Indoor Court Facility January 2015 (Trim 150115005057)
- Indoor Court Feasibility Study February 2014 (Trim 140205011156)

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 appropriate decision making body.
Multi-Use Indoor Sports Facility Project Structure

PROJECT STEERING GROUP

PROJECT CO-ORDINATOR – Craig Sargison

Admin Support
- Juli Tyler

Project Reference Group
- WDC
  - 3 Waters
  - Roading
  - Landscape Architect

QS Services
- AECOM

Design Team
- Warren & Mahoney Lead
  - Civil
  - Electrical
  - Mechanical
  - Structural
  - Landscape Architecture WDC

Peer Review
- Richard Lindsay

Client Reference Group
- North Canterbury Sport and Recreation Trust Staff
- Chris Brown
- Craig Sargison

TRIM Ref: 180618067298
Stage 1  Concept Design  Completed

Stage 2  Preliminary Design  - 30% design completed  - estimated

Stage 3  Developed Design  - 60% design completed  - cost estimate

Stage 4  Developed Design & Documentation for Consents  Cost estimate at 90%

Stage 5  Procurement and Construction

Stage 6  Construction monitoring / contract administration
TERMS OF REFERENCE
Multi – Use Indoor Sports Facility Project Steering Group

1. PURPOSE
The purpose of the Multi-Use Indoor Sports Facility Project Steering Group (PSG) is to oversee the detailed design, procurement and construction of the Facility and associated site works and infrastructure at Coldstream Road Rangiora. The PSG shall guide, enable and monitor the implementation of the project.

2. MEMBERSHIP
- Kevin Felstead, Portfolio Holder Audit, Risk & LTP (Chair)
- Wendy Doody, Portfolio Holder Community Facilities
- Jim Palmer, Chief Executive
- Craig Sargison, Manager, Community & Recreation
- Jeff Millward, Manager, Finance & Business Support
- North Canterbury Sport and Recreation Trust Chair
- Ross Davidson, Quantity Surveyor AECOM
- Juli Tyler, Administration Support

3. STAFF AND CONSULTANT SUPPORT
- Warren and Mahoney, Architects and lead designer
- Chris Brown, Community Green Space Manager
- Duncan Roxborough, Implementation Project Manager

4. ADMINISTRATION SUPPORT
- Juli Tyler, Executive Assistant

5. ROLE
The project is in two key stages:
Stage 1 – Detailed design, consenting and contractor procurement
Stage 2 – Contract construction monitoring

Stage 1
- To oversee the detailed design of the building and associated infrastructural development at the site
- To provide directives as required to the Project Manager and consultant team
- Approve any variations to the concept design which will add more than $5,000 to the construction cost estimate
TERMS OF REFERENCE
Multi – Use Indoor Sports Facility Project Steering Group

- To assist the Project Coordinator with background discussion on any issues arising related to budget, schedule, risk and quality where required
- Review any significant operational/planning items for the facility after consideration of feedback from the Peer Reviewer
- Recommend to the Council a procurement strategy for the construction of the stadium
- Recommend to the Council the preferred contractor for construction.
- Report to Council and make recommendations as required.

Stage 2 - Contract Construction Monitoring
- To oversee the project and review progress against budget and project timeline. Note that the scope includes the necessary infrastructure developments which will be a separate contract from the construction contract for the stadium
- Review any 'significant' scope changes to physical works
- To approve any contract variations that impact the project cost for more than $5,000.
- Approve/endorse issue of key certifications etc. including practical completion, defects liability, retentions release and the like
- Review any significant operational/planning items for the planned facility opening
- Monitor the fit-out of the complex with reference to the agreement with North Canterbury Sport and Recreation Trust
- Report to Council and make recommendations as required.

6. MEETING FREQUENCY
The PSG shall meet monthly or when requested to do so for urgent matters, or matters relating to the purpose of the PSG.

7. ADMINISTRATION
The agenda and minutes for the PSG meeting will be prepared by the Project Administrator. The agenda and minutes will be filed in TRIM and distributed to all members. The Minutes will be included in the Council’s meeting agenda.

The outline agenda for the meeting shall generally be as follows:
1. Apologies
2. Previous Minutes
3. Matters Arising
4. Architects Reports (milestones, issues, programme)
TERMS OF REFERENCE
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5. Project Co-ordinators Report (milestones, programme, issues, budget, risk)
6. QS report
7. General Business

8. **DURATION**
   The PSG will function until the completion of the project.
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1. The purpose of this report is to present Council with the Waimakariri Zone Committee Annual Report 2017.

1.2. As a joint committee of Environment Canterbury and the Waimakariri District Council, the Zone Committee is required to report annually to its partner Councils.

1.3. The Annual Report includes the following highlights:

   - Over $100,000 of **Immediate Steps** funding was invested in local biodiversity projects;
   - Extensive community engagement was undertaken on the current state and future scenarios to understand potential impacts for Solutions Package recommendations;
   - Targeted engagement with consent holders was undertaken to assess how Solutions Package recommendations would impact on consent holder’s livelihoods;
   - Groundwater investigations were undertaken to understand the potential risk to Christchurch aquifers.

Attachments:

   i. The Waimakariri Water Zone Committee Annual Report for 2017 (TRIM 180531060476)

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

   **THAT** the Council:

   (a) **Receives** report no. 180531060559

   (b) **Receives** the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee Annual Report 2017 (TRIM 180531060476);

   (c) **Approves** the distribution of the Annual Report to Community Boards, and Drainage and Water Supply Advisory groups, for their information.

3. **BACKGROUND**
3.1 The Waimakariri Zone Committee is a joint committee of Waimakariri District Council and Environment Canterbury, and was formed in partnership with local runanga and Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu to facilitate implementation of the Canterbury Water Management Strategy in the zone. Zone Committees are required to report annually to partner councils, runanga and Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu.

3.2 Membership of the Zone Committee is set out on page 4 of the Annual Report and reflects a diverse range of community views.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1 The Zone Committee has distilled six key decisions areas for recommendations for the Solutions Package. These key decision areas are:

- Instream Ecosystems;
- Groundwater Allocation;
- Biodiversity;
- Surface Water and Stream Depletion;
- Reducing Nitrates;
- Protecting and Enhancing Cultural Values.

4.2 The Zone Committee were scheduled to complete their recommendations on each of the above key decision areas by June 2018, however have asked the Regional Council for a two-month extension until the end of August 2018, as they seek to achieve agreement about recommendations relating to Reducing Nitrates and Protecting and Enhancing Cultural Values.

4.3 An extension of two months will still allow for notification of a plan change (Waimakariri sub-regional chapter) to the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan by June 2019, and ahead of the expiry of the Environment Canterbury (Temporary Commissioners and Improved Water Management Act) 2010 in October 2019.

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1 Groups and Organisations

The Zone Committee have engaged a range of industry groups through the Science Stakeholder Advisory Group which has included Dairy NZ, Beef and Lamb, Federated Farmers, Fish and Game, Whitewater NZ, and the Canterbury District Health Board.

5.2 Wider Community

Community views have been gleaned through an opportunity for the public to speak at Zone Committee meetings, and through targeted engagement meetings at Woodend, Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Pegasus, Waikuku Beach, Loburn, Cust, West Eyreton, Oxford, Ohoka, Fernside, Clarkville and Tuahiwi.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1 Financial Implications

The Solutions Package will include recommendations for both statutory and non-statutory actions. There may be financial implications for the Council depending on the final recommendations decided by the Zone Committee.

6.2 Community Implications
There could be many landholders whose livelihoods will be impacted by a change in their consents to take surface and ground water, depending on the final recommendations decided by the Zone Committee.

6.3 **Risk Management**

The range of potential risks includes the risk of nitrate leaching to groundwater, the risk of declining surface water quality, the risk of negatively impacting on the District's economy from reducing water take consents, and the risk of stream depletion from surface water and groundwater takes.

6.4 **Health and Safety**

Health and Safety implications are not directly relevant to this Annual Report.

7. **CONTEX**

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 63 of the *Resource Management Act 1991* requires Regional Councils to prepare Regional Plans to carry out its functions. Section 30(1)(c)(ii) and (iii) includes a Regional Council's functions as the maintenance of the quality and quantity of water in water bodies.

The *Environment Canterbury (Transitional Governance Arrangements) Act 2016* repeals parts of the *Environment Canterbury (Temporary Commissioners and Improved Water Management) Act 2010* but saves the vision and principles of the Canterbury Water Management Strategy in Schedule 3. Both acts will be repealed in full following the October 2019 local government elections.

7.3 **Community Outcomes**

- People have wide-ranging opportunities for learning and being informed;
- There is a healthy and sustainable environment for all.

7.4 **Delegations**

N/A

Geoff Meadows, Policy Manager
Delivering the community's aspirations for fresh water

The Waimakariri Water Zone Committee was formed in 2010 and has achieved several significant milestones since then.

The first was the preparation of the Zone Implementation Programme. This was developed with the community to outline the community’s priorities, and what needs to be done, to achieve their outcomes for water management. Since then, the committee has allocated over $500,000 towards biodiversity projects and continued to engage with the community and industry partners on a range of local projects and initiatives.

This work includes hosting more than 20 community meetings to raise awareness around the Waimakariri sub-regional planning process, which began in August 2016. This planning process has been reframed as the Waimakariri Land and Water Solutions Programme. A key feature of this programme is an emphasis on exploring on-the-ground actions and other tools to help the community implement water management solutions for the future.

The focus for 2018 will be on continuing to work with the community to prepare recommendations for the Land and Water Solutions Programme to help achieve the community’s water management outcomes.

Creating solutions through collaboration

Throughout 2017 the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee continued to engage with the community and stakeholders to develop collaborative solutions for water management throughout the zone.

In March, the committee held a series of interactive workshops that explored alternative pathways for water management. These sessions examined the improvements we could expect if changes were made to the way we currently use and manage water in Waimakariri.

Bringing local people together from a wide range of backgrounds to discuss issues from a variety of perspectives provided plenty of informative feedback for the zone committee. Face-to-face engagement with local residents has fostered a broader understanding of community aspirations for Waimakariri’s waterways.

Numerous opinion pieces and videos were published or broadcast during the year. These highlighted some of the major issues facing Waimakariri and encouraged locals to provide feedback to the zone committee. The feedback and community interaction gained through this collaborative process have provided invaluable assistance to the zone committee. This information will be incorporated into the committee’s draft recommendations for the Waimakariri Land and Water Solutions Programme.

Key achievements 2017

- Over $100,000 of Immediate Steps funding was invested in local biodiversity projects with a focus on springheads, wetlands and high-value natural areas.
- Community engagement was undertaken on the current state and future scenarios as part of the Waimakariri Land and Water Solutions Programme.
- Engagement with consent holders sought feedback on water use and reliability across the sub-catchments of the district.
- Groundwater investigations for the Waimakariri Land and Water Solutions Programme were undertaken to understand the potential risk to Christchurch aquifers.
- Valuable contributions were incorporated into the committee’s preparation of the Solutions Programme from the Science Stakeholders Advisory Group, Farmers’ Reference Panel and Biodiversity Stakeholders Group.
- A Lifestyle Block Management Plan was piloted in 2017 with positive feedback received from those participating.
Taking action to connect communities

Communities, environmental groups and farmers can often feel overwhelmed when considering the best course of action to improve local waterways. Waimakariri Zone’s ‘Big Rocks’ is a community-driven plan that sees residents taking action locally to improve water quality, while linking projects together over a wider area to produce cohesive results.

The ‘First 500’ project is a proactive approach to the protection and enhancement of major springheads and the first 500 metres beyond the springheads throughout Waimakariri. The focus for this project is the Silverstream catchment. Landowners receive funding for fencing the springheads and for riparian planting. This project helps better manage springs and the waterways they feed in priority catchment areas.

The Old Waimakariri wetlands project focuses on the Old North Branch of the Waimakariri. This area is currently under-utilised farmland, which has been only used for light grazing in recent years. Turning the area into a wetland will help resolve high nitrate levels at the upper Silverstream. This project incorporates major springhead protection while restoring and enhancing critical biodiversity values.

The Ashley/Rakahuri stepping stones project expands upon work already carried out by the zone team and the Ashley Rakahuri Rivercare Group (ARRG) to provide a holistic plan for improving the entire river from the headlands right through to the estuary.

The zone committee has worked closely with the ARRG to remove woody weeds from the river banks, while also funding projects to decrease predators and increase public understanding of the value of the Ashley/Rakahuri River. These initiatives enhance the biodiversity values of the Ashley/Rakahuri River, while protecting the unique braided river environment.

Biodiversity – protecting and enhancing ecological and cultural values

With over 90% of New Zealand’s original wetlands already lost, the zone committee is focused on protecting wetlands throughout Waimakariri. Over $100,000 of Immediate Steps funding was allocated to protect and enhance the ecological and cultural values of three important wetland areas last year. This process sees the zone committee contribute 30% of the funding for each approved project.

The zone committee continues to support the Tūhaitara Trust’s efforts to restore the Pines Beach wetland. The committee provided $83,000 of Immediate Steps funding to control all willow and pine species throughout the wetland. This will prevent the loss of an important coastal wetland due to weed invasion.

The Morriss farm near Saltwater Creek received over $10,000 of Immediate Steps funding to retire the wet edge of a paddock from farming and to increase the stream setback from 2 metres to 20 metres.

This will increase the habitat for flora and fauna, while improving the habitat for inaka (whitebait) spawning.

An area of the Wakeman Trust farm near Woodend Beach, which reverted to wetlands following the earthquakes, will be enhanced after receiving over $7,000 of Immediate Steps funding. The funding will be used for planting to form a series of ecosystems from the dunes through to wetlands. A wider range of native plant species will provide an enhanced habitat for invertebrates, lizards and birds.
## Progress towards Canterbury Water Management Strategy targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ecosystem health and biodiversity</th>
<th>The zone committee has allocated the first five years of Immediate Steps biodiversity funding ($500,000) supporting over 30 braided river, wetland and coastal projects. In 2017 the committee focused on springheads through the 'First 500' project, and weed control in the Ashley/Rakahuri to help protect nesting sites in the river fairway.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural character of braided rivers</td>
<td>Immediate Steps funding supported the Ashley/Rakahuri Rivercare Group with the protection of braided river nesting sites for endangered birds on the Ashely/Rakahuri River.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaitiakitanga</td>
<td>The committee received guidance on protecting and enhancing cultural areas in 2017, including a report by Mahaanui Kurataiao Ltd explaining how wāhi tapu and wāhi taonga apply in the Ngāi Tūāhuriri takiwā.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking water</td>
<td>The Waimakariri District Council operates 16 schemes supplying water to over 18,000 properties and 85% of the district population. Six of the rural water supply schemes are fully restricted. Three others are semi-restricted, with the remaining being on demand schemes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational and amenity opportunities</td>
<td>The bathing sites monitored this summer were reported as acceptable at the Ashley/Rakahuri gorge and caution was advised due to bacterial risk at Loburn Bridge. Kaiapoi River was unsuitable for swimming at the Boat Ramp. All the coastal sites from Waikuku to Pines Beach were reported as acceptable. The Kayaking on Canterbury Rivers report highlights Ashley/Rakahuri Gorge and the Okuku and Waimakariri rivers as having outstanding kayaking and scenic values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water use efficiency</td>
<td>As the Environment Canterbury Zone Delivery Team and industry partners informed the committee, all irrigated farmers completed Farm Environment Plans (FEPs) by the end of the year. Of those, 106 have been audited as well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigated land area</td>
<td>The Waimakariri Irrigation Ltd (WIL) oversees a scheme with nearly 250km of irrigation race and an irrigated area of 18,000ha within the command area of 40,000ha. WIL is currently seeking to build a storage facility to increase the scheme’s reliability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy security and efficiency</td>
<td>Currently there are no hydro generation developments of scale in the Waimakariri Zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional and national economies</td>
<td>The key industries using groundwater in the Waimakariri Zone are irrigation (70%) and public water supply (20%). Surface water use is dominated by irrigation, intensive farming (non-irrigation uses) and stockwater, with stockwater forming 60% of the total take rate. Agriculture collectively constitutes 98% of the use for surface water. There are an estimated 285 farms in the Waimakariri Zone, with over 200 now having a Farm Environment Plan. The zone has 126 dairy farmers, with 50 based outside of the Waimakariri irrigation Scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental limits</td>
<td>The Waimakariri Land and Water Solutions Programme commenced in 2016. This Solutions Programme was originally scheduled to be presented to both the Waimakariri District Council and Christchurch City Council in November 2017 but was extended to enable further investigations of the groundwater flow paths between the Waimakariri Zone and Christchurch. The committee’s recommendations for the Solutions Programme will now be presented to both councils in October/November 2018.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Key work programmes underway

- **Develop and implement the Waimakariri Land and Water Solutions Programme.**
- **Develop priority project work programmes, most notably in the Ashley/Rakahuri River, Kaiapoi River / Silverstream catchments, and coastal lowlands incorporating Tūhaitara Coastal Park.**
- **Continue to develop closer relationships with District Council staff to foster a better understanding of Kaitiakitanga and an integrated approach to the planning and management of land and water use in the district.**
Canterbury Water Management Strategy vision:
“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.”

Waimakariri Zone Committee
The Waimakariri 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 to the eastern part of the zone is naturally 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 zone is part of the Rūnanga’s takiwā.

Consents – working with farmers to achieve GMP
A campaign to encourage priority farms in Waimakariri’s red and orange nutrient allocation zones to get a land use consent to farm has resulted in progress towards good management practice (GMP) for all 62 farms involved in the project.

Throughout 2017, the zone delivery team held drop-in days, visited farms and discussed the consent process with all farms that exceed the current threshold of 20kgN/ha/year of nitrogen loss. Half of the farms are covered by Waimakariri Irrigation Limited’s consent or do not currently require a consent. The remaining farms, approximately 32, require a consent. Eleven have obtained a consent or their consent is currently being processed. The remaining 22 farms are preparing their applications for submission.

Focusing on a collaborative process where the zone delivery team provides practical assistance to farmers has accelerated progress towards good management practice for the Waimakariri Zone.

Zone committee members reflect a diverse range of community views
Each of the Canterbury region’s 10 zone committees includes four to seven community members whose membership is regularly refreshed to ensure a wide range of perspectives is reflected. All current members are listed below. For profiles, visit www.ecan.govt.nz/canterburywater.nz/myzone

New appointments to the Committee
Cameron Henderson – is an Oxford-based dairy farmer. He brings practical and farm systems development experience to the committee, as well as financial management, project coordination and business analysis. He has an Honours degree in Mechatronic Engineering.

Michael Blackwell – is the Working Director of Blackwell’s Department Store, Kaiapoi. With over 20 years of commercial work experience in marketing, sales and communication, Michael brings strategic, financial planning and promotional skills to the committee. He also brings a focus on balancing rural and urban views in addressing water management issues.

Arapata Reuben – is a Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga representative on the committee. Arapata has a strong commitment to the Canterbury Water Management Strategy. He is also the current Chair of the Christchurch/West Melton Zone Committee and a Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga representative on the Ashburton Zone Committee. One further role is as the Manager of the Whakapapa Team at Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu.
1. SUMMARY

1.1 The purpose of this report is to recommend to Council the preparation of a corporate Sustainability Strategy for the Council.

Attachments:
   i. Background information and scoping report - A Sustainability Strategy for Waimakariri District Council – Stage 1 (TRIM No. 180306023511).
   ii. Project Plan: Sustainability Strategy 2018-2048 (TRIM 180427045797)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180611064136.

(b) Approves the preparation of a corporate Sustainability Strategy for the Council.

(c) Recommends the appointment of Mayor David Ayers to be Project Champion for the promulgation of the Sustainability Strategy.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1. Global issues such as ecosystem degradation and resource depletion are becoming more evident nationally and locally. Increasingly there is evidence available to demonstrate the knock-on effects occurring within our physical, societal and economic systems. Detailed information and references are included in the scoping report (Attachment i).

3.2. As part of the response to these determinants for action, the imminent introduction of a Zero Carbon Act, the development of climate change responses and the transitioning of the country to a low emissions economy has been firmly signalled by the Government.

3.3. The Council highlighted sustainability when it discussed the 2018-48 Draft Infrastructure Strategy during preparation of the Long-Term Plan. It has also been identified as a top ten organisational priority for the 2018/19 financial year with the Sustainability Project being sponsored by the Chief Executive.
4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. The adoption of a sustainability approach within the organisation complements the need for a new approach to the way Council goes about its business.

4.2. The attached report (Attachment i) is Stage 1 of this project. It describes sustainability concepts, outlines the legislative and regulatory context for the Strategy. It also describes sustainability-related best practice adopted by other councils and organisations.

4.3. The groundwork for the development of the corporate Sustainability Strategy with an overview of indicative content is also outlined. It provides background and context to the concept of sustainability and sustainable organisational practice, documenting examples of best practice and leadership adopted by the Council.

4.4. The project plan (TRIM 180427045797) outlines the four stages of strategy development. Stages 2 and 3 involve development and implementation of the Sustainability Strategy for the Council; Stage 4 is the development process for the Community and Council Strategy. The project plan also outlines risks for the development and implementation of the project.

4.5. Strategy development (Stage 2) would start in July 2018. The strategy is expected to be developed and adopted by Council by no later than 30 June 2019.

4.6. The Management Team has reviewed this report and support the recommendations.

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

Some general communications were held with territorial authorities to provide case study material for the attached scoping document (TRIM 180306023511).

5.2. **Wider Community**

No views have been sought at this stage from the wider community.

6. **IMPLIED RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

The project has been identified by management as a priority and staff resourcing from across the organisation will be made available as and when required.

6.2. **Community Implications**

Community input into Stage 1 is negligible. As the project progresses into Stages 2-4, there may be increased costs associated with operational requirements, for example, to facilitate and implement best-practice or demonstration projects. Costs will become clearer when an associated strategy implementation plan, initially for Stage 2, is developed and adopted.

6.3. **Risk Management**

This is a strategy for change of both Council (and later, community) culture. There will be risks associated in developing and implementing this strategy. These are outlined in detail, along with assumptions, in the project plan (Attachment ii).

6.4. **Health and Safety**
There are no implications for health and safety in developing this strategy.

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

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

Adoption of Stage 1 in the strategy development process will not require any immediate changes to existing Council policy.

7.2. **Legislation**

The development of this policy supports the success and implementation of existing Council documents under the *Local Government Act 2002* and the *Resource Management Act 1991*.

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

This report relates to the following community outcomes:

- There is a safe environment for all
- There is a healthy and sustainable environment for all
- There are areas of significant indigenous vegetation and habitats for indigenous fauna
- Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality
- Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable and sustainable
- Core utility services are provided in a timely and sustainable manner
- Businesses in the District are diverse, adaptable and growing.

7.4. **Delegations**

There are no delegated responsibilities associated with the report.
A Sustainability Strategy for Waimakariri District Council – Stage I

*Toitū te marae a Tāne, Toitū te marae a Tangaroa, Toitū te Iwi*

*If the domain of Tāne stands, if the domain Tangaroa stands, then the domain of humankind will stand*
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1. Introduction

The essence of sustainability is the capacity for humans and all other species to endure and withstand external pressures causing detrimental impacts globally, nationally and locally.

Waimakariri District is responding locally, developing a sustainability approach which is taking place in the context of the need to respond to the threats to our endurance posed by global resource depletion, increasing greenhouse gas emissions, ecosystem degradation and population increase and climate change.

Locally, the urgency to respond to these sustainability drivers is acknowledged by the Government and is gathering pace. These include:

- The proposal to introduce a Zero Carbon Act in 2019
- The development of a climate change programme which includes adaptation actions
- The transitioning of NZ to a low emissions economy by 2050
- Development of Government Policy Statement on Land Transport
- National Policy Statements addressing renewable electricity generation, freshwater management and (pending) biodiversity
- Improving health and well-being outcomes within the health sector and systems.

Climate change is a key driver for sustainability. Climate change is not just an environmental issue - it also has social and economic implications. Climate change also exacerbates existing risks and creates new risks (IPCC 2014).

The Stern Review on climate change outlined clearly that the costs of action on climate change are far less than the costs of inaction¹. The Climate Change Minister James Shaw was quoted in May 2018 as saying ‘taking early action in the right areas is likely to avoid the need for more abrupt action later’. He added that he sees ‘risk assessment as a priority’, with the intent of bringing options to Cabinet for a decision on how and when a risk assessment is undertaken. Over time, the Government’s decisions will filter down to local government with requirements likely to be prescribed in the Zero Carbon Act.

Waimakariri District Council is in the process of developing a Sustainability Strategy, a Strategy for the council in the initial stages, widening over the next 2-3 years to a strategy for the wider community. The wider community strategy will be strongly shaped and influenced by government direction.

The project report outlines project organisation, the strategy’s proposed high-level elements, methodology, deliverables and timing for completion².

This report firstly summarises how the strategy development will be approached. It also provides a background to sustainability (principles of and drivers for), examines what WDC and other councils are doing and the legislative framework.

A key element of the strategy will be about the Council taking action to reduce its own carbon footprint, that is, reduce its greenhouse gas emission profile³. This is discussed in more detail in Section 4.

¹ Popularly known as the Stern Review, the Economics of Climate Change released in 2006 focused on understanding risks associated with and on policy responses to addressing climate change.
² Project report (this document): TRIM 180306023511; project plan: TRIM 180427045797.
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2. Background to sustainability

Sustainability is derived from the Latin word sustinere meaning ‘maintain, ‘support’ or ‘endure’. In ecology, the word describes how biological systems remain diverse and productive over time. Long-lived and healthy forests or wetlands in their natural condition are examples of sustainable biological systems that are capable of retaining their natural condition without human intervention.

For humans, sustainability is the potential for long-term maintenance of well-being which has environmental, economic and social dimensions. Healthy ecosystems and natural environments provide vital goods and services to the community. However, people use natural resources to sustain life which impacts on the condition of the natural environment.

![Figure 1: sustainability models](image)

Sustainability can be represented as in Figure 1. A typical representation is either three integrated pillars - or overlapping bubbles - of society, environment and economy. These are meaningful tools for capturing the essence of the sustainability problem. If any pillar becomes weak or any bubble inflates or deflates, then the system as a whole becomes unsustainable.

**Economic sustainability** is the ability of an economy to support a defined level of economic production indefinitely. An example of unsustainable economic behaviour would be allowing unchallenged expansion of land use practices which on one hand provides productive financial returns in the short to medium term, but on the other hand does not recognise environmental system limits.

**Environmental sustainability** is the ability of the environment to support a defined level of environmental quality and natural resource extraction rates indefinitely. For example, extraction of oil and the subsequent refining and use of petroleum products is not environmentally sustainable.

**Social sustainability** is the ability of a social system, such as a country, family, or organisation, to function at a defined level of social well-being and harmony indefinitely. For example, an under-functioning health system is a symptom of a system that is socially unsustainable.

Achieving a sustainable global national or local system requires undertaking approaches to reduce human impact and enhance ecosystem services. Two key ones are:

---

3 Carbon footprint is a term in increasingly common usage. Essentially, it is a measure of greenhouse gas (direct or indirect) emissions from an organisation’s activities, e.g. fleet fuel usage, waste disposal, and air miles from domestic flights.
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• Environmental management – based on information gained from science that informs decisions about protection and conservation of the natural environment.
• Management of human consumption of resources – largely based on information gained from economics.

However, the reality is that the pillars, or bubbles, are dominated by ‘economy’ and conventional economic growth models, typical of what is commonplace in OECD countries. The economy typically intensifies and dominates the system, squeezing the environmental and societal aspects apart. This is a much bigger discussion beyond the scope of this report.

Some additional background notes are included in Appendix A plus additional information on key determinants of sustainability: climate change (Appendix B) and health and well-being (Appendix C).

**Limits? Or limitations to growth?**

What is sustainable development? And how does it relate to sustainability? The two terms commonly used, and commonly confused and used interchangeably. And there is no universally agreed definition on what sustainability means. There are many different views on what it is and how it can be achieved.

The idea of sustainability stems from the concept of sustainable development which became common language at the World's first Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro in 1992, however, the origins to the current sustainability discourse can be traced back earlier to Club of Rome report in 1972 which talked about limits and questioned the role of growth.

This is a message which still holds today, that the earth’s interlocking resources – the global system of nature in which we all live – probably cannot support present rates of economic and population growth much beyond the year 2100, if that long, even with advanced technology. In the same year, the UN Stockholm Conference (the precursor to the Earth Summit) focused on human interactions with the environment.

The IISD (International Institute for Sustainable Development) cite the most frequently quoted definition from Our Common Future (1987), better known as the Brundtland Report, i.e.

‘Sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.’

Limits to growth? Or limitations to growth? The Brundtland Report in contrast to the Club of Rome does not imply limits but instead talks of ‘limitations’ - limitations which can be overcome by technology and social organisation, as well as biosphere absorption (offsetting).

The Brundtland philosophy is that growth is needed to invent and develop new technologies to overcome biophysical problems and poverty. The technology may be successful but what if it has unintended or risky consequences?

One of the successes of sustainable development has been its ability to serve as a grand compromise between those who:

• Are principally concerned with nature and the environment;
• Value economic development; and
• Are dedicated to improving the human condition\(^4\).

Thus, the well-known Brundtland definition makes a tidy sound-bite, however, that is only a small part of much larger context. The Brundtland Report also identified a clear social mandate to be included alongside environmental responsibilities. What is less well known about the report is that it is also an endorsement of economic growth.

In the wake of the Brundtland Report, sustainability has become the foundation for today’s leading global framework for international cooperation – the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and its associated **Sustainable Development Goals** (SDGs). These goals (17 in total) are core to the sustainable development approach being adopted by organisations including the Canterbury District Health Board (see Section 3.5).

**Resilience**

The terms sustainability and resilience are frequently used to mean the same thing, but they are actually two markedly different concepts. They are, nonetheless, closely connected, as is clear from their definitions\(^5\).

In a sense, the goal of sustainable development could be described as bringing about a state of balance in the world which must be kept as stable as possible – which is very difficult, if not impossible to achieve. The Stockholm Resilience Centre defines resilience as: ‘the capacity of a system, be it an individual, a forest, a city or an economy, to deal with change and continue to develop’.

The New Zealand Chief Science Advisor defines resilience as meaning: ‘being shock-ready, and having the ability to resist, survive, adapt and/or even thrive in response to shocks and stresses’. (PMCSA, 2016).

Resilience is something that Council is nevertheless giving attention to through Waimakariri District’s partnership role in the implementation of the Greater Christchurch Resilience Plan. Resilience and risk were also the subject of a workshop held for the Council in March 2018\(^6\) and these topics are likely to play a more prominent role in development of the wider community sustainability strategy.

---


\(^5\) The terms are becoming more often interwoven. Victoria University state they’re ‘committed to helping New Zealand and the world develop a sustainable and resilient future, and being a leader in sustainable practice’.

\(^6\) Reducing Risk and Building Resilience. Risk (reduction and management) is an extremely important topic in its own right but is beyond the scope of this report.
3. Legislative and regulatory context

Climate change and emissions management

Sustainability is referenced in New Zealand’s legislative and policy framework, chiefly through the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA), going some way to reflect what is now a growing reality that the economy operates within certain environmental limits with finite resources.

The most important legislative and regulatory instruments that are relevant to TAs or impact on TA decision-making with regard to ‘sustainability’ are listed in this section.

The coalition government elected in 2017 has unveiled a raft of new measures under its climate change programme. This includes the introduction of a Zero Carbon Bill, establishment of a Climate Change Commission7 and a reset of the country’s carbon budget under the NZ Emissions Trading Scheme.

Under the Paris Agreement, New Zealand’s Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) is a target to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 30 per cent below 2005 levels by 2030 (the 2030 target). The Government has three target ‘net zero’ options to replace the current (NZ) target of 50 per cent below 1990 levels by 2050.

The climate change programme of work and initiatives is designed to help the country reduce greenhouse gas emissions, adapt to climate change effects and transition to a low emissions and resilient economy. A national risk assessment is also proposed which in turn will inform development of a national adaptation plan.

Public consultation on the Bill opened in June 2018 with the Bill expected to be introduced to Parliament before the end of 2018. The Zero Carbon Act will pass into law in 2019.

The Ministry for the Environment (MfE) is progressing with work on strengthening and improving the operation of the NZ ETS including forestry accounting and future phase-out of free emission unit allocations to reflect the global price of a tonne of carbon (dioxide equivalent). Public consultation is planned in late 2018 to help inform the Government’s final policy decisions.

Resource Management Act 1991

The purpose of this Act (the RMA) is to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources (Section 5(1)). In the Act, sustainable management means managing natural and physical resources in a way, or at a rate, which enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing and for their health and safety.

Section 6 is about recognising and providing for the matters of national importance including preservation of the natural character of water bodies (and the protection of them from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development), protection of indigenous flora and fauna; and relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral taonga.

In Section 7, territorial authorities ‘shall have particular regard to’, for example, the efficiency of the end use of energy; intrinsic values of ecosystems; and the effects of climate change.

Non-renewable and renewable energy sources can be used to produce fuel and generate electricity. The use and development of renewable energy also provides benefits to the district and can deliver clean, secure, affordable energy. Renewable energy can also aid community resilience where there

---

7 An interim (independent) Climate Change Commission was established in April 2018.
are developments ‘off the grid’ when challenging situations are encountered such as a severe weather event.

As mentioned above, energy efficiency and the use and development of renewable energy are matters a District Plan must have particular regard to under Section 7. The District Plan must also give effect to the National Policy Statement on Renewable Electricity Generation 2011 which requires recognition of the benefits of renewable electricity generation (see next section).

National Policy Statements (NPS)

National policy statements are instruments issued under section 52(2) of the RMA and state objectives and policies for matters of national significance. NPS of immediate relevance include those for Freshwater Management 2014 (with 2017 amendments) and the NPS for Renewable Electricity Generation 2011 (NPS REG).

The former is implemented locally through the Canterbury Water Management Strategy and Zone Implementation Plans. The latter sets out the objective and policies for renewable electricity generation under the RMA which requires all councils to make provision for it in their plans. Policies focus on facilitating small and community-scale distributed renewable electricity generation from any renewable energy source to the extent applicable to the district. Partnerships with external organisations will be important in this regard.

The NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity is also being developed with a Biodiversity Collaborative Group making recommendations for supporting measures for terrestrial, freshwater and coastal biodiversity on public and private lands. A draft is expected for public consultation by late 2018.

Local Government Act 2002

In performing its role (Section 14 – Principles relating to local authorities), a local authority must act in accordance with the following principle in relation to sustainable development:

- (i) the social, economic, and cultural interests of people and communities; and
- (ii) the need to maintain and enhance the quality of the environment; and
- (iii) the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations.

A Bill is before Parliament in 2018 to re-establish the four sustainability well-beings (see Canterbury Mayoral Forum reference below).

Building Act 2004

Within the Building Act, the key references to sustainability are in Section 3 (Purpose) and Section 4 (Principles). The current Government has signalled its intent to, among other things, review the Building Code to strengthen sustainability-related provisions.

4. Local government sustainability initiatives

New Zealand Councils are at varying stages of their ‘sustainability journey’. A snapshot overview of council sustainability initiatives around the country is shown in Table 1, with more detail provided in Appendix D.

---

8 Excellent recent examples within Waimakariri include Mainpower’s investigation of small scale hydroelectricity generation at Brown’s Rock and the farm-scale trial of the BioGenCool system using effluent to make electricity, heat water and cool milk. Note in Section 3.1 the 2018 partnership project between Meridian Energy and Whakatāne District Council.
As described above, sustainability is a difficult term to define. Most have begun their journey with an organisational approach which, anecdotally, then applies lessons learned along the way to a wider council and community approach. Some councils have focused on particular sustainability determinants such as emissions reduction or climate change.

All the larger councils profiled undertake some form of sustainability approach in the form of targeted action plans. A handful of smaller councils have also incorporated sustainability principles and prescriptive elements within their statutory documents, in particular Long-Term Plans and District Plans, e.g. Far North District, Kāpiti Coast and New Plymouth Councils.

A couple of smaller council approaches either underway or under review are discussed below. They provide instructive case studies from similar order-of-magnitude population councils to Waimakariri District: Whakatāne District (pop. 40,000) and Whangarei District (pop. 90,000).

**Case Study: Whakatāne District Council:**

In 2010, this council adopted a sustainability strategy; however, political support for the strategy waned, in part reflecting the then government’s priorities. Apart from measurable reductions in energy use in facilities, no formal action plans were approved or progressed and Whakatāne has not continuing with its sustainability strategy, instead progressing a climate change action plan.

It was announced in late 2017 that Meridian Energy would work in partnership with Whakatāne on a number of projects including incorporating photovoltaic (PV) panels on council facilities. In this example, Council purchases the electricity but Meridian retains ownership of the panels. It is envisaged that such an initiative could be scaled up, tailoring to the high local annual sunshine hours profile, with business and community applications. The Action Plan is expected to be adopted by December 2018.

**Case Study: Whangarei District Council**

This council is developing a two-part climate change strategy. Part 1 is an internal corporate sustainability strategy with a climate change focus (reducing greenhouse gas emissions); and Part 2 is a climate change adaptation strategy which includes council and community.

The Business Support team is reviewing the procurement policy to include sustainability outcomes as part of the assessment process and is also determining what meaning and scope ‘sustainability’ will have in this context.

Council staff are targeting problem areas such as waste. While there is good data for waste management in the district, internally there is no system for tracking waste. Council staff are also using a suite of tools for tracking in-house energy usage, fleet fuel usage and staff air travel. When the data is collected, appropriate targets are expected to be approved and set by Council.

The council is also refining its procurement policy. Practical initiatives include recent purchase of 3-4 electric vehicles for the fleet (and installation of charging stations) and a biogas system established at the main waste water treatment plant which can produce electricity. Partnership activities are also being developed with the local lines company and District Health Board.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council</th>
<th>Strategic and regulatory documents or approaches</th>
<th>Feature / comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Far North District</td>
<td>District Plan</td>
<td>District Plan has section on renewable energy; provisions allow for domestic-scale renewable energy devices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāpiti Coast District</td>
<td>Long-Term Plan District Plan</td>
<td>- Sustainable development has been adopted as building block of LTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- DP chapter on renewable energy with provisions for subdivisions / new developments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Council uses CEMARS energy management system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaikōura District</td>
<td>Zero Waste Community initiative</td>
<td>Kaikōura is Platinum Certified under the Earthcheck Sustainable Communities programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental and Social Sustainability Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson City (unitary)</td>
<td>Nelson 2060 (plus Implementation Plan and Decision Framework)</td>
<td>NB A strategy for Council and the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Plymouth District</td>
<td>District Plan, Subdivision Design Guide and Residential Design Guide</td>
<td>- Energy is assigned as a district-wide activity;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Member of Global Covenant of Mayors for Climate and Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotorua District</td>
<td>Rotorua Sustainable Living Strategy – Rotorua 2030</td>
<td>NB Sustainability strategy for Council and the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selwyn District</td>
<td>Waste minimisation and management focus</td>
<td>SDC has a waste-related policy and bylaw to support implementation of the mandatory Waste Management and Minimisation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tauranga City</td>
<td>Corporate Sustainability Strategy 2011-2016</td>
<td>An Environment Strategy is also in development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Wellbeing Strategic Plan - 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whakatāne District</td>
<td>Sustainability Strategy 2010-2015</td>
<td>- NB A strategy in two parts, for Council initially and then community CCAP a targeted replacement for strategy; the energy component is in partnership with Meridian Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Climate Change Action Plan (CCAP) - 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whangarei District</td>
<td>Climate Change Strategy (Part I – corporate)</td>
<td>- NB The corporate strategy focuses on reducing greenhouse gas emissions;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Climate Change Strategy (Part II – corporate and community)</td>
<td>- Council uses E-Bench energy management system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland (unitary)</td>
<td>Low Carbon Strategic Action Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Unitary Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch City</td>
<td>Energy Action Plan 2015</td>
<td>- The Innovation and Sustainability Fund encourages innovative projects that support the Council’s vision and strategic priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Climate Smart Strategy 2010-2025 (CCS – under review)</td>
<td>- Council uses CEMARS energy management system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target Sustainability</td>
<td>- Member of Global Covenant of Mayors for Climate and Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunedin City</td>
<td>Te Ao Tūrao – The Natural World - Dunedin's Environment Strategy 2016 - 2026</td>
<td>Council uses CEMARS energy management system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emissions Reduction and Management Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington City</td>
<td>Towards 2040: Smart Capital District Plan and Subdivision Design Guide</td>
<td>DP chapter on renewable energy with provisions applying particularly to wind energy sources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Overview of sustainability initiatives for selected South and North Island Councils
5. WDC Sustainability Strategy

5.1 Strategic approach

Implicitly, many Council activities, projects and initiatives do have sustainability elements present though these are not always obvious. They may also have been incorporated because of RMA and LGA requirements. Some examples are shown in Table 2 below.

Internationally, nationally and regionally, there are a number of political, legislative and regulatory determinants (or drivers) for sustainability. These act as an imperative for the Council to take action on sustainability-related issues. Examples include:

- Internationally – the Paris Accord 2015 (new global agreement on climate change) and 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development
- Regionally – the Canterbury Water Management Strategy.

A more detailed analysis is shown in the mapping in Figure 2. The table below outlines broadly where sustainability sits locally, within the Council’s policy and planning framework.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council responsibility</th>
<th>Sustainability element or imperative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisational objectives and priorities</td>
<td>Community Outcomes: e.g. Environment: there is a healthy and sustainable environment for all; Places and Spaces: public spaces are plentiful, accessible and high-quality; Services: transport is accessible, convenient, reliable and sustainable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te mātou mauri (our principles)</td>
<td>Principles include: Our Purpose: to make Waimakariri a great place to be, in partnership with our communities Organisational Priority: Sustainability Strategy. Organisational Objectives 2017-2020: e.g. systems and management processes are integrated, effective and reflect best practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term planning</td>
<td>Long-Term Plan: Sustainable development elements have been included in the 2012, 2015 and 2018 LTPs. Infrastructure Strategy: identifies external factors influencing the Council’s management approach including demographic changes, natural hazards, climate change and sustainability and measures taken by each activity to increase resilience to the impacts of climate change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District planning</td>
<td>District Plan: mandated to implement legislation, higher order policies, plans and strategies including the District Development Strategy (DDS) and the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy DDS: e.g. community feedback has supported enabling and encouraging new buildings, subdivisions and long-term planning to use innovative, sustainable and cost effective alternatives to complement current practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste management</td>
<td>Waste Management Minimisation Plan 2010: each review presents an opportunity to consider the long term sustainability of waste generated to landfill and improvements to waste minimisation strategies. Council introduced a 3-bin waste collection system in the 2018 as part of the LTP process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-statutory</td>
<td>Accessibility Strategy: planning and development of an inclusive and accessible (natural and built) environment for everyone Walking and Cycling Strategy: a key priority is working with organisations to develop sustainable travel plans Water Conservation Strategy 2010: recognises the importance of saving financial outlay, minimises environmental effects and providing a sustainable water supply system into the future</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: sustainability-related initiatives undertaken by Waimakariri District Council
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Figure 2: Determinants for / drivers of a WDC Sustainability Strategy
5.2 Vision and purpose
The Council needs to make more progress in considering sustainability in terms of the District’s environment, its communities and the practices adopted by the Council in its operations.

The strategy sets out a clear **vision** for the future:

*Investing in a sustainable and resilient future for our people, our businesses, our infrastructure and our environment by taking responsibility and showing leadership.*

The strategy will focus on influencing ongoing activity and bringing about change in the workplace though process and in practice. The strategy will also describe the general principles and approaches to be used in achieving the vision, and may identify some key actions.

Its **purpose** is to:

*Provide an overarching framework that guides the adoption of economic, social, cultural, environmental sustainability and well-being principles into Council’s strategic planning and day to day operations.*

Detailed actions, responsibilities and timeframes will be set out in a separate implementation plan – which can be updated more frequently.

The strategy represents a shift in approach and will require substantial coordinated effort by the organisation to achieve the desired vision. While the strategy is not directly public-facing, it supports the Council’s vision, principles and community outcomes. The organisation should also develop in parallel, policies and procedures designed to achieve organisational change.

**Stage One** of this project is this report which defines sustainable development and organisational practice, explains the need for a new approach to the way Council goes about its business, outlines the legislative and regulatory context for the Strategy, and describes other Councils approaches.

**Stage Two** (to be completed by June 2019) is the development of the 2018-48 Sustainability Strategy which will focus on functions carried out from the Council’s Service Centres at Rangiora, Oxford and Kaiapoi. The Strategy will include an action plan which will be monitored on an annual basis.

Specific areas to be addressed include transport (vehicle fleet, commuting, flights), energy (fuel, electricity), water (grey water reuse), building/facilities (service centres), leadership and resources (paper, cleaning products). Base-line information needs to be gathered to assess and improve organisational performance.

**Stage Three** (and Four) will be undertaken in 2020 and 2021. It will be an audit of existing practice for other aspects of Council business such as network infrastructure, community facilities (including libraries and swimming pools), reserves, forestry and procurement, and the development of a related Strategy and Action Plan. This is the **transition** phase, where behaviour begins to change, for individual staff and collectively as an organisation.

**Stage Four** is a Strategy for developing sustainable communities within the District. This is the **transformational** stage, where sustainable behaviour in the Council and community begins to be normalised.

Ultimately, a policy framework may be developed for the Council and community where sustainability thinking and practice becomes become embedded and sustainability becomes a core
element of an overarching statement of the Council’s position on a matter that is relevant to the full range of activities that the organisation (and community) undertakes.

5.3 Objectives
The strategy objectives, to be confirmed, are based on the need to develop and adopt a 2018-2048 WDC Sustainability Strategy that:

- Is grounded in an understanding of current and forecasted demographic, economic, environmental and social factors unfolding within the Waimakariri district and beyond
- Guides decision-making to maximise benefits and outcomes for future generations by taking a consistent long-term and strategic approach to the planning and policy framework
- Enables all staff to have a clear understanding of sustainability and the opportunities within their roles to contribute to improving the sustainability of the organisation
- Identifies opportunities which help to create and raise the sustainability profile of the Council
- Includes actions to maximise efficient use of the resources to deliver the Council’s business and reduce Council’s carbon footprint and waste streams benchmarked at 2018 levels
- Allows for the procurement of products and services to deliver the best quality projects and services for the Council and its residents
- Improves health and wellbeing outcomes for Council staff.

5.4 Operational approach
The strategy requires some form of action plan. The action plan for Stage One will include the assessment and reporting of baseline information held by the Council across the themes outlined in Table 3. Additional action plans will need to be developed for Stages Two-Four.

Establishing base line information about energy consumption and waste management is a logical (and critical) first step in applying sustainability principles and practices. The saying goes something like ‘to be able to manage, one needs to be able to measure’.

Baseline data will be gathered for the council’s electricity and fuel consumption, waste management and consumption of consumables (such as paper). The data sets would be monitored on a regular basis and reported in the Annual Report to start assessing the Council’s footprint.

5.5 Monitoring and reporting
Monitoring of progress will be needed across what the organisation has achieved in terms of in-house economic (financial), social and environment outcomes.

WDC will likely use a monitoring system that is pragmatic and based on what other councils have adopted (see Tauranga City case study late in report. Indicators can also be incorporated in a reporting framework within the Council’s Annual Report to demonstrate progress to the community with key projects highlighted to the community, for example, progress being made on the District inter-town cycleway network.

5.6 Funding
Funding in Stage One will come from within existing programmes budgets. As the strategy projects moves into the wider community, partnerships will become important, for example with energy

---

9 There are suite of footprint measurement tools that can be utilised including: CEMARS, CarboNZero, Energy-Mark and Enviro-Mark. These ones are increasingly used by NZ organisations including Health Boards and Local Government.
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companies (e.g. Mainpower) and government agencies such as the Energy Efficiency and Conservation Authority (EECA).

EECA, under the Energy Efficiency and Conservation Act 2001, promotes energy efficiency, energy conservation and the use of energy from renewable sources. EECA has a range of business programmes to fund and support businesses, including publicly funded organisations.

In particular, EECA offers Crown Loans to local councils as a mechanism to fund energy efficiency and renewable energy projects. These loans can be used to fully or partially fund projects including energy-efficient equipment for new builds and targeted fleet replacement with electric vehicles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Possible approaches and actions</th>
<th>Unit lead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Leadership          | - Greater Christchurch Partnership - Mayoral Forum - Climate Change Working Groups | ▪ Sustainability principles applied to LTP and Annual Plan processes, and Annual Reporting  
                         |                                                                           | ▪ Sustainability principles applied to development and review of Council strategies, policies and plans  
                         |                                                                           | ▪ Be part of formal alliance with councils nationally – e.g. modelled on Communities for Climate Protection (ICLEI)  
                         |                                                                           | ▪ Sustainability principles applied to procurement of services  | All       |
| 2. Emissions            | - Assessment of organisational carbon footprint                           | ▪ Purchase and implementation of e.g. CEMARS (Carbon Emission Measurement and Reduction Scheme)  
                         |                                                                           | ▪ Begin development of an emissions management reduction plan  | FBS       |
| management             |                                                                           |                                                                                                |           |
| 3. Transport           | - Council Utilisation & Fleet Review February 2018[^1]                     | ▪ Creation of a travel plan for staff - modelled on CDHB’s ‘Clever Commuters’ or similar  
                         | and mobility                                                                | ▪ Appropriate low-emission vehicle replacement in fleet - modelled on CDHB’s ‘Green the Fleet’ or similar | FBS       |
|                         |                                                                           |                                                                                                |           |
| 4. Workplace           | - Development of workplace sustainability culture                          | ▪ Develop and enhance workplace sustainability culture - potentially modelled on CDHB’s ‘Zero Hero’ project  
                         | and office                                                                 | ▪ Sustainability incorporated into processes and SOPs and procurement of consumables  
                         |                                                                           | ▪ Work spaces created which enhance personal and collective well-being - e.g. optimising accessibility to natural light  | ODHR      |
| and office             |                                                                           |                                                                                                |           |
| 5. Service centre      | - Energy management - Heating and cooling                                  | ▪ Installation of energy efficient appliances and systems  
                         | management                                                                | ▪ Sustainability (better-than-code) principles applied to building retrofits or additions  | FBS       |
|                         |                                                                           |                                                                                                |           |

Table 3: Main themes across Council’s activities where actions will be focused

[^1]: See Fleet Review report in Appendix E.

[^10]: WDC Units: ODHR = Organisational Development & Human Resources; C&R = Community & Recreation; REG = Regulation; U&R = Utilities and Roading; S&E = Strategy & Engagement; FBS = Finance & Business Support.
Appendix A: Sustainability

Two common representations of the three integrated pillars of sustainability - society, environment and economy - are shown below. At left is the ‘strong sustainability model, at right, the ‘weak’ model. While these visual representations capture the essence of sustainability, their deceptive simplicity can lead to the mistaken sense that sustainability is easy to assess.

These models are ideals. The strong model is essentially utopian, a layered where the economy is dependent on people (society), in turn dependent on the environment. The weak model is the common three-pillar model in Section 2, the striking of a balance for sustainable outcomes.

The sustainability model in current reality (the prevailing global financial system) is weaker than the weak model, a system more akin to the ‘Mickey Mouse’ representation below. Here the economy intensifies and dominates the system, squeezing the environmental and societal aspects apart. Economic intensification produces environmental and societal effects that are external to the economic activity in question and are termed externalities.

Externalities generally affect the utility or wellbeing of the public who are uncompensated by the producer of the effect. Thus, the public is left to deal with the costs of the effects, whether these involve, for example, the cost of cleaning up pollution or the cost of having a degraded environment.

The sub-text of sustainability is about addressing the decline in resources and ecosystem services. This can be represented in the figure below using a funnel (double-ended) concept. Using time as the proxy for the x-axis (L-R horizontal progress), as the global population increases towards as expected 10 billion people, it is like approaching the mouth of a funnel - where the increase in
population places demand for those resources and services necessary for survival thereby causing a bottleneck or constriction\textsuperscript{12}.

As the global (or local) system to the right becomes sustainable (somewhere on the continuum between weak and strong sustainability) and in theory the pressure eases and the funnel widens.

However, humanity is clearly heading into the mouth of the funnel, at times hitting the walls. System limits for some systems are already being detected, e.g. in Canterbury in some catchments where some water zones are over-allocated and designated ‘red’.

This process for WDC is about moving towards a more equitable balance of economic, social and environmental outcomes for the organisation, in the first instance, a weak sustainable system.

Appendix B: Climate change

A key determinant for taking a sustainability approach is the growing need to implement measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions (\textit{mitigation}) and adapt to a changing (local) climate (\textit{adaptation}).

Climate change presents significant opportunities, challenges and risks to communities for the country’s cities and districts. Local and regional government undertakes a wide range of activities that will be impacted by climate change and provides infrastructure and services useful in reducing greenhouse gas emissions and enhancing resilience.

In 2015, Mayors and Chairs of New Zealand declared an urgent need for responsive leadership and a holistic approach to climate change, reaffirmed in 2017 in the lead-up to the general election. The impact of climate change is most prominent in areas where changes to the environment will either undermine the quality of decisions being made by local government - such as by creating investment uncertainty - or will increase the costs of providing local public services - such as by reducing the availability of resources used by the community or requiring more resilient local infrastructure (LGNZ, 2017).

Local government roles and responsibilities are and will increasingly be affected by climate change. These include:

\textsuperscript{12} There is no consensus on what constitutes a sustainable global population. For a recent analysis, see: \textit{How many people can our planet really support?} Source BBC, 2016. Author Vivien Cumming.
- **Decision-making**: allowing impacts on the needs of current and future generations to be considered in risk management decision-making
- **Provision of services**: consideration of the impacts of events or slow onset changes in sea level rise on services such as flood protection, water supply and transport networks.
- **Acting as consenting authority**: managing certain activities that exacerbate the effects of climate change or impose conditions to mitigate effects.

Acting as consent authority (Resource Management Act) - Councils can manage certain activities that exacerbate the effects of climate change or impose conditions to mitigate effects.

Prepare and implement civil defence and emergency management plans (Civil Defence Emergency Management Act)

**Ministry for the Environment (MfE)**

A wealth of information on the impacts of climate change on NZ is provided by MfE. Some impacts that are likely to be of direct relevance to the Council include:

- **Flooding**: More frequent intense winter rainfalls are expected to increase the likelihood of rivers flooding and flash flooding when urban drainage systems become overwhelmed.
- **Sea-level rise**: Rising sea levels will increase the risk of erosion, inundation and saltwater intrusion, increasing the need for coastal protection.
- **Biodiversity**: Warmer temperatures will favour conditions for many exotic species as well as the spread of disease and pests, affecting both fauna and flora.
- **Transportation**: Hotter summers may damage elements of transport infrastructure causing buckled railway lines and damaged roads, with associated disruption and repair costs.
- **Agriculture**: There are likely to be costs associated with changing land-use activities to suit a new climate.

Additionally, in May 2018 the Ministry’s Climate Change Adaptation Technical Working Group (TWG) has finalised and provided recommendations for the actions NZ needs to take ‘to build resilience to the effects of climate change while growing the economy sustainably’. The TWG recommends, inter alia, the setting out immediate actions which can be achieved relatively quickly and address a specific opportunity to act

**Coastal hazards**

Recent guidance is now also available for local government in preparing for coastal change (MfE report ME 1341, December 2017). In the MfE report, coastal risk exposure is identified as being high for three regions, including Canterbury due in large part to the length (and proximity to coastline) of exposed transportation networks.
Appendix C: Health and wellbeing

The environment in which we live is a major determinant of health and wellbeing. The map (Figure 4) shows the strong links between actions in the environment and human health and wellbeing. People are at the heart of the map\(^\text{13}\), reflecting not only the focus on health, but also the anthropogenic definition of sustainable development in the Brundtland report.

All the different facets of a human settlement are reflected in the series of spheres which move through social, economic and environmental variables. A settlement is set within its bioregion and the global ecosystem on which it ultimately depends. Broader cultural, economic and political forces which impact on well-being are also represented.

For example, the design and planning of settlements resides in the **built environment** sphere. Planners and urban designers have a role in determining health outcomes. Directly, that can affect the quality of that environment, e.g., settlement pattern and housing.

The model below demonstrates knock-on (or cascade) effects can often be more significant in terms of health. For example, a new road, changes travel behaviour and choice of destination. **Activity** in turn impacts on the local natural environment (e.g. vehicle emissions causing localised air pollution) and the **global ecosystem** (greenhouse emissions).

It also affects local economic efficiency and people’s lifestyle choices (the likelihood of walking or driving). Lifestyle changes may well in turn impact on the pattern of social networks.

As another example, safe drinking water is crucial to public health. The contamination of drinking water supply in Havelock North in 2016, which has led to chlorination of the Christchurch water supply in 2018, demonstrates that New Zealand and Canterbury communities are living in a time when the link between public health and sustainability issues are more frequently intersecting.

The Treasury released a **report** in early 2018 which evaluates a range of different frameworks for measuring current **wellbeing** as part of a refresh and re-articulation of the Treasury Living Standards

---

Framework (LSF)\textsuperscript{14}. This will become more important as WDC moves into Stage four, developing a Council and community strategy. Here, the Treasury report authors are recommending a wellbeing measurement framework (based on an OECD framework) which measures important dimensions including housing, income and wealth, social connections, health status, work-life balance and environmental quality.

Appendix D: Local government initiatives

A range of examples of approaches to sustainability (and sustainable development) adopted by NZ councils are outlined below. These include council, council/community and organisational framework approaches.

Auckland Council

Auckland Council released its Low Carbon Strategic Action Plan in 2014, a plan that is anticipating the low emissions approach promulgated by the Government in 2017/2018 (NZ Productivity Commission, 2018). The aim of the plan is to reduce emissions by 40 per cent by 2040. There are five key areas of transformation: built environment and green infrastructure; energy; travel; natural carbon assets; and waste.

Christchurch City

CCC has a number of initiatives including Target Sustainability which provides support to help Christchurch businesses become more resource efficient through reducing waste and being energy and water efficient. While it is aimed at businesses, there are elements which can be useful for WDC ‘in house’, in particular, some simple steps to reduce energy and water consumption, and waste generation.

In 2017, CCC approved a $400,000 Innovation and Sustainability Fund, the purpose of which is to encourage innovative community, school or business projects that support the Council’s vision and strategic priorities – which include: energy and water efficiency, waste minimisation, active and public transport and healthy waterways. CCC is also in the process of reviewing its Climate Smart Strategy 2010-2025.

Dunedin City

Dunedin City has developed a city-wide environment strategy which is structured around three high level goals: 1. resilience and zero carbon zero; 2. healthy environment; and 3. care for the natural world. The strategy undergoes a formal (triennial) monitoring and review process.

The Council has adopted sustainability as one of two key principles (with the Treaty of Waitangi) that cut across all the work they undertake as a key component of their strategic framework. Politically,

---

15 Key CCC contacts: Tony Moore (Principal Sustainability Advisor), Kevin Crutchley (Target Sustainability Programme Manager), Daniella Ramirez (Energy / Carbon Management Advisor); James Young (Travel Demand Management Advisor).
the Sustainability Audit Sub-committee was established to monitor and report to the Council on how effectively it meets LGA requirements, including any sustainability principles.

The Council also has an organisational commitment to reducing greenhouse gas emissions from its operations via an Emissions Reduction and Management Plan.\footnote{In a communication with Cashy Ball from Whakatāne DC, Dunedin has CEMARS but ‘doesn’t find it particularly useful. In contrast, Whangarei DC use a different tool which is proving effective (see above).}

**Far North District**

Natural and Physical Resources is the subject of Chapter 12 of the Far North District Plan. It has a specific section on renewable energy and energy efficiency which contains extensive provisions (objectives, policies, methods and rules). For example, there are rules permitting domestic scale renewable energy devices located on dwellings; and for rural properties permitting the construction, operation and maintenance of in-stream hydroelectricity generation. The Urban Environment chapter contains provisions for water storage.

Kāpiti Coast District

The Kāpiti Coast District Council (KCDC) has adopted sustainable development as a basic building block of their Long Term Plan (Kāpiti 2038).

The Proposed Kāpiti Coast District Plan\footnote{The DP is, of writing, an appeals version dating from March 2018.} strongly references the requirements under RMA Section 5. It includes a renewable energy section; and in more detail incorporates a policy about efficient resource use for subdivisions / new developments. This policy gives effect to the NPS for Renewable Electricity Generation (and the Wellington RPS).

KCDC also has been CEMARS-certified since 2012. CEMARS\footnote{CEMARS = Certified Emissions Measurement And Reduction Scheme (a scheme developed by Landcare Research).} certification tracks how an organisation measures, manages and reduces their greenhouse gas emissions, something which Kāpiti Coast reports on annually. The general process for achieving certification begins with establishing a carbon footprint which can then lead on to developing a management plan for managing and reducing emissions. Projects in their plan include: reducing sewage sludge emissions, deploying LED streetlights and improving efficiency in vehicles and buildings.

Kaikoura District

In realising two decades ago that growth in visitor numbers was beginning to have effects on the natural environment and the local infrastructure, Kaikoura District Council and its community together adopted a sustainable approach to growth in the district. The Council outlines its commitments in its Environmental and Social Sustainability Policy and produces a periodic Benchmarking Report to assess performance in meeting those commitments.

A programme now known as the Earthcheck Sustainable Destinations programme was implemented to help measure the community’s environmental impacts.

**Nelson City**

Nelson adopted its sustainability strategy Nelson 2060 in 2013. It has a community-led vision directed by the premise that Nelson in 2060 ‘could be very different from the Nelson we know now’. The City is anticipating the challenges and opportunities that e.g. climate change and population change might cause.

---

\textsuperscript{16} In a communication with Cashy Ball from Whakatāne DC, Dunedin has CEMARS but ‘doesn’t find it particularly useful. In contrast, Whangarei DC use a different tool which is proving effective (see above).

\textsuperscript{17} The DP is, of writing, an appeals version dating from March 2018.

\textsuperscript{18} CEMARS = Certified Emissions Measurement And Reduction Scheme (a scheme developed by Landcare Research).
Actions are included in the **Nelson 2060 Implementation Plan 2013/14**. The Council is investing time and resources in building the Nelson 2060 Decision Framework into all plans and activities, so it simply becomes ‘*the way we do things*’.

**New Plymouth District**

New Plymouth’s **draft District Plan** assigns energy as a district wide activity, within which there are provisions (seven policies) for renewable energy generation activities. This council also has a draft **Subdivision Design Guide** (ecology/solar access/water sensitive design) and **Residential Design Guide** (efficient and healthy homes).

**Rotorua District**

The Rotorua District Council has developed its **Rotorua Sustainable Living Strategy** for Council and Community (released in 2016). Work to develop the strategy was led by the Council’s Sustainable Living Portfolio Steering Group, with input from a wide variety of groups and individuals in the community to provide a community view.

**Tauranga City**

Tauranga’s **Corporate Sustainability Strategy** (Sustainable Steps – Caring for Our Future) covered the period 2011 – 2016. This was an internal strategy aimed to help and guide staff to embed sustainability into council operations and was not a strategy for the wider community. It outlined three sustainability goals:

- Staff having a clear understanding of sustainability and the opportunities within their roles.
- Organisational focus on efficiencies around: waste, energy, paper, vehicle fleet and water.
- Sustainability considered in decision-making, planning and implementation processes.

The aim of the strategy had been to provide clarity around what sustainability would mean for Tauranga CC, encouraging sustainable practice to simply become ‘*the way we do things*’ and developing and committing to organisational goals and actions.

Tauranga CC also has adopted in 2018 its **Community Wellbeing Strategic Plan** which is designed to help prioritise investment and resourcing of community wellbeing initiatives. It is also in the process of developing an **Environment Strategy**, due to be adopted and implemented by July 2018. Some early work has included commissioning a Community Carbon Footprint and an assessment of the state of the Tauranga environment.

**Wellington City**

This Council’s focus on **sustainability** is around commitment to developing Wellington as a ‘sustainable eco-city’. One of its priority areas of action is **buildings**.

At subdivision level, the Council’s District Plan includes a **Subdivision Design Guide** which contains sustainability principles and techniques – and is currently being revised as part of a plan change to further strengthen the sustainability components (refer to **Change 46: Subdivision Guide Review**). The **renewable energy chapter** of the District Plan aims at encouraging efficiency in energy use, and the development and use of energy from renewable sources with **rules** applying particularly to wind energy facilities.

Wellington also has an environmental strategy **Towards 2040: Smart Capital** as well as a range of initiatives for businesses and households.
Whakatāne District

The Council's Sustainability Strategy 2010-2015 was developed to provide the basis of actions to reduce the organisation’s carbon footprint, initially, and then the community’s, to provide a starting point for a proposed action plan. The objective of the strategy was to integrate sustainable decision-making and actions into the way the Council does business.

The strategy was adopted in 2010, however, political support for the strategy waned, in part reflecting a change in government priorities. Apart from reducing organisational energy use, formal action plans were never approved, lacking political and senior management buy-in.

Whakatāne is not continuing with its Sustainability Strategy, instead, developing a Climate Change Action Plan. It was announced in late 2017 that Meridian Energy will work in partnership with Whakatāne on a number of projects including incorporating photovoltaic (PV) panels on council facilities. In this example, Council purchases the electricity but Meridian retains ownership of the panels. It is envisaged that such an initiative could be scaled up, e.g. (utilising the high local annual sunshine hours profile) with business and community applications. The Action Plan is expected to be adopted by December 201819.

Whangarei District

Whangarei District Council is developing a two-part climate change strategy. Part 1 is an internal corporate sustainability strategy with a climate change focus (reducing greenhouse gas emissions); and Part 2 is a climate change adaptation strategy for both the Council and the community.

Council staff have no clear idea at this stage what the problem areas are though they suspect waste is one of them. While there is good data for waste management in the district, internally there is no system for tracking waste. Council staff are also using a suite of tools for tracking in-house energy usage, fleet fuel usage and staff air travel (anecdotally, the number of trips taken by staff appears to be significant). When the data is collected, appropriate targets can be set.

The council is also developing a procurement policy. Practical initiatives include recent purchase of 3-4 electric vehicles for the fleet (and installation of charging stations) and a biogas system established at the main waste water treatment plant which can produce electricity. Partnership activities are also being developed with lines company Northpower, and the Northland DHB20.

Other sustainability-related initiatives

Canterbury District Health Board

Community and Public Health serves as the Public Health Unit for the Canterbury District Health Board (CDHB). The CDHB has used Global Green and Healthy Hospitals approach to sustainability as a basis for reducing their environmental footprint and promoting public and environmental health.

In recognising that taking a sustainable development approach would be a financial challenge within a budget-constrained health system, CDHB also audited existing initiatives within the organisation that weren’t explicitly recognised as having a sustainable development component. Many of these were initiatives that had, not surprisingly, improved health and well-being components.

19 Mike spoke with Cashy Ball (Manager Strategy & Community Development, 07 306 0500 x 7569, Cashy.Ball@whakatane.govt.nz) on Friday 18 May 2018. NB Project Champion is former Green Party MP Nandor Tanczos. 
20 Mike spoke with Bernadette Aperahama (Senior Strategic Planner, 09 470 3038; E: bernadette.aperahama@wdc.govt.nz) on Thursday 30 May 2018.
Over the period 2014 to 2016, CDHB began their formal sustainability ‘journey’ starting with a CEMARS analysis of the organisation’s carbon footprint. Elements of CDHB’s approach have been incorporated into this analysis, particularly for WDC’s approach in Stage Two of the project.

Local Government New Zealand

Local Government Leaders’ Climate Change Declaration: in 2015, Mayors and Chairs of New Zealand declared an urgent need for responsive leadership and a holistic approach to climate change. In 2017, Mayors and Chairs reaffirmed wholeheartedly support for that call for action. A core part of the declaration asked the Government to make the development and implementation of a transition plan for a low carbon and resilient country a priority stressing that the benefits of early action moderate the costs of adaptation.

The 2050 challenge: future proofing our communities: (July 2016): this report analyses the notion of ‘shifts’. New Zealand is undergoing a series of major shifts that will have a lasting impact on ‘who we are, where and how we will live and how we will earn our living’. This paper suggests that the most significant of these shifts involve: 1. settlement patterns; 2. economic activity; 3. demographic makeup; and 4. the natural environment.

Climate Change Project: LGNZ’s Climate Change and Natural Hazards Decision Making Legal Toolkit is the first of the deliverables to be released under their Climate Change Project. The toolkit contains legal opinions, guidance and case study materials which are designed to assist councils with climate change adaptation decision-making roles and responsibilities. For example, a brief overview of a legal opinion on councils’ ability to stop or limit the provision of services infrastructure and potential liability consequences is provided for guidance.

Sustainable Business Council

The Sustainable Business Council (SBC) is membership-based organisation which believes the private sector has a leading role to play in addressing climate change, as well as key environmental and social issues. The SBC aims to mainstream sustainability within the New Zealand business community. Members commit to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions and build sustainability into their purchasing decisions. They also are required to introduce annual reporting practices, outlining progress on sustainability and governance issues. A key SBC initiative is the Value Chain Guide.

Sustainable Business Network

The Sustainable Business Network (SBN) is a membership-based social enterprise that helps (small) business succeed through sustainability. SBN believes every business has a role to play in transforming form a business-as-usual system to one where profit benefits communities, employees and the natural environment as well as shareholders. A key SBN initiative is The Circular Economy (Blick and Comendant, 2018), the outlining of an approach how NZ businesses can maximise resource value and eliminate wastage.

Unilever

Unilever has set out to decouple our growth from its environmental footprint while increasing its positive social impact. It has promulgated a Sustainable Living Plan with three goals tied to the UN Sustainable Development Goals: health and well-being, environmental impact and livelihoods. Unilever NZ presented an update on plan progress to 90 business and other leaders in May 2018.
Appendix E: WDC utilisation & fleet review (2018)

Waimakariri District Council (WDC) engaged the services of a fleet lifecycle specialist to audit its vehicle asset register and fleet management practices; carry out a utilisation study based on the GPS data gathered on the fleet in the past year by Trackit; and to identify opportunities for improvement.

Some main points:

- **p.10** - Sustainability rating of the overall fleet is 50%. Fuel efficiency is not an explicit requirement when sourcing vehicles but commitment to running a new fleet means vehicles are fuel efficient for their type. There is no mention of giving preference to electric vehicles in vehicle purchase and replacement policy.

- **p.13** - Vehicle Utilisation Study – the study looked at the movements of the council’s 59 GPS-enabled WDC vehicles. The analysis section indicates whether it is possible to reduce vehicle numbers and whether part of the fleet could be replaced by electric vehicles, by considering the actual use of vehicles over the data collection period (Nov 2016 to Nov 2017).

- **p.30** - The report notes: ‘Having secure, onsite parking for its vehicles would make it easier to introduce electric vehicles to the fleet because vehicles can then be charged overnight by WDC, preventing notional drivers from having to charge work vehicles at home, and there is potential to make these charging facilities available to the public during office hours.’

- **p.31** - GPS data was also analysed to identify candidates for replacement with a battery electric vehicle (BEV). By meeting certain criteria (including travels less than 130km per day), 8 vehicles in the fleet.

- If passenger vehicles or vans that travel under 200km per day are considered (again with criteria), there are 17 of these “possible” vehicles in the WDC fleet.

- **p.32** – It is recommended BEVs by preference to plug-in hybrid electric vehicles (PHEVs) since BEVs have zero emissions and lower maintenance costs than PHEVs (except for infrequent longer travel distances).

- **p.43** - Recommendation - WDC’s average fuel economy and emissions are good compared to similar fleets but introducing electric vehicles to the fleet would lead to big improvements in both metrics, as well as increasing the sustainability of the fleet.

- WDC should ensure its sourcing policy states that electric vehicles are preferred where they are fit for purpose.
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1. PROJECT ORGANISATION

**Project Governance**
*Provides a decision-making framework for the adoption of the initial report and Sustainability Strategy by Council under the umbrella of the Organisational Development Programme*

**Management Team Strategy:**
Jim Palmer, Jeff Millward, Simon Markham, Gerard Cleary, Craig Sargison, Nick Harrison, Liz Ashton and Geoff Meadows

**Project Champion**
*Raisesthe profile and promotes sustainability as a core value for Council business*

Mayor

**Project Sponsor**
*Assumes overall accountability for, and advocates on behalf of the project. Ensures that the project delivers the agreed outcomes.*

Jim Palmer – Chief Executive

**Sustainability Strategy Project Control Group (SSPCG)**
*Responsible for developing the Sustainability Strategy, communicating information requirements to the project sponsor and subject matter experts; and reporting progress to the Project Sponsor, Management Team and Management Team Strategy*

**Sustainability Champions**
*Responsible for ensuring good communication between their Unit and the Project Team, carrying out any tasks assigned by the Project Team and reporting back to the Project Team.*

Champions to be confirmed via an *Expression of Interest* process

**Project Lead**
*Responsible for leading the project from inception to execution.*

Mike O’Connell – Senior Policy Analyst
2. VISION AND PURPOSE

The vision of the Sustainability Strategy 2018 - 2048 is:

- Investing in a sustainable and resilient future for our people, our businesses, our infrastructure and our environment by taking responsibility and showing leadership

Its purpose is to:

- Provide an overarching framework that guides the adoption of economic, social, cultural, environmental sustainability and well-being principles into Council’s strategic planning and day to day operations.

3. SCOPE

**Stage one** of this project involves the preparation of an initial report which defines sustainable development and organisational practice, explains the need for a new approach to the way Council goes about its business, outlines the legislative and regulatory context for the Strategy and describes the best practice of other Councils in New Zealand.

**Stage two** is the development of the 2018-48 Sustainability Strategy which focuses on functions carried out from the Council’s Service Centres at Rangiora, Oxford and Kaiapoi. Specific areas to be addressed include transport (vehicle fleet, commuting, flights), energy (fuel, electricity), water (usage, grey water reuse), building/facilities (service centres), leadership and resources (paper, cleaning products etc). The Strategy will include a 2018 baseline for future performance to be measured against and an action plan which will be monitored on an annual basis.

Two further stages will be undertaken in 2020 and 2021. **Stage three** will be an audit of existing practice for other aspects of Council business such as network infrastructure, community facilities (including libraries and swimming pools), reserves, forestry and procurement, and the development of a related Strategy and Action Plan. **Stage 4** is a Strategy for increasing the sustainability of the District’s communities.

4. PROJECT OBJECTIVES, KEY ASSUMPTIONS AND RISKS

Objectives:

To develop and adopt a 2018-2048 WDC Sustainability Strategy that:

- Is grounded in an understanding of current and forecasted demographic, economic, environmental and social factors unfolding within the Waimakariri District and beyond
- Guides decision-making to maximise benefits and outcomes for future generations by taking a consistent, long-term and strategic approach to the planning and policy framework
- Enables all staff to have a clear understanding of sustainability and the opportunities within their roles to contribute to improving the sustainability of the organisation
- Identifies opportunities which help to create and raise the sustainability profile of the Council
- Includes actions to maximise the efficient use of the resources used to deliver the Council’s business and reduce Council’s carbon footprint and waste streams benchmarked at 2018 levels
- Allows for the procurement of products and services that deliver the best quality projects and services for the Council and its residents
- Improves health and wellbeing outcomes for Council staff
- Provides a strong basis for ongoing development of sustainable practices for the Council and community.
Assumptions:

- There is an understanding across the organisation and with Councillors that the 2018-48 Sustainability Strategy is a key part of the Organisational Development Action Plan undertaken by Council and underpins Council core business.
- The project is a priority and staff resourcing from across the organisation will be made available as and when required.
- That the timeframes agreed for the 2018-2048 Sustainability Strategy will allow co-ordination between the Strategy and other related projects and inclusion of key principles in Council projects such as renewal of the vehicle fleet and refurbishment of the Rangiora Service Centre.
- That Management decisions are made in a timely enough fashion for progress not to be impeded on the 2018-2048 Sustainability Strategy.

Risks:

(to the successful development and implementation of the project)

- Inability to secure cross Council contribution
  
  **Mitigation action** – The Management Team needs to ensure sufficient staff resources are allocated to this project. Sustainability champions will be selected via an organisation-wide expressions of interest process to try and ensure full participation in the project.
- Project creep. It can be difficult to establish clear cut boundaries as sustainability is a wide-ranging and all-encompassing topic.
  
  **Mitigation action** – The Project Control Group is aware of the need to stay within manageable parameters to ensure the project is delivered within the agreed timeframes. The project has been divided and prioritised into four stages to make sure real progress can be achieved over the next financial year. Regular progress reporting to Project Sponsor will also help to ensure the project stays on track.
- Possible partial overlap in project scope. Some examples are the Well-being Strategy and Asset Management Procurement Guide currently being developed; Rangiora Service Centre planned improvements and implementation of recommendations from the Utilisation and Fleet Review.
  
  **Mitigation action** – The Project Control Group will establish good communication with the Project Managers of other projects where there may be some overlap to agree project scope and ensure consistency. In some cases it may be sufficient to just refer to the other project in the Sustainability Strategy.
- Lack of buy-in – The successful implementation of the Sustainability Strategy will require behavioural change at both an organisational and individual level. Factors that could contribute to a reluctance to change include a lack of strong leadership/vision/strategic thinking; lack of awareness of the issues and the need to change; inertia/cynicism/ not wanting to move from the comfort zone; lack of a co-ordinated approach across all Council Units; and lack of budget provision, particularly where there is a higher capital cost with reduced recurrent costs only realised over the longer term.
  
  **Mitigation action** – The Management Team has shown support for the project by adopting it as one of the organisation’s top ten projects for 2018/19 and the Chief Executive has agreed to be the project sponsor. Appointing the Mayor or a Councillor as a Project Champion will also help to ensure sustainability is embedded as a core value in Council business. Council has already made more efficient use of resources in some areas such as the move towards a paperless mail system. Positive trends will be noted in the baseline information and staff may be inspired to see what they are doing is already making a difference. Sustainability champions will be able to represent the views of different departments; and workshops and other activities will provide opportunities for staff
members to become engaged with the project. Some actions may not require additional funding to implement. Others will need to be included in the Council’s normal budgeting and LTP processes.

5. METHODOLOGY

The following methodology will be used to deliver this project:

- Appointment of a Project Champion, Project Sponsor and the Project Control Group (SSPCG) Sustainability Champions and/or Subject Matter Experts will also be seconded as necessary
- The Project Control Group will finalise the project plan, prepare a detailed work plan, manage identified risks including driving the timely input and co-operation of others, achieve key milestones outlined in section 7 and monitor and report on progress to the Project Sponsor
- The Project Sponsor will provide quality control for the project and be the spokesperson for the Project Team to All Teams, Management Team Strategy, Management Team and the Council.

6. RELATED PROJECTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Council Vision/Strategic Direction/Community Outcomes</td>
<td>Legislative requirement</td>
<td>Maria Edgar</td>
<td>Adopted by Council as part of 2018-28 LTP process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Population projections</td>
<td>Best practice</td>
<td>Cameron Woods</td>
<td>Adopted by Council as part of 2018-28 LTP process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 NZ Census</td>
<td>Best Practice</td>
<td>Lynley Beckingsale</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Key Assumptions and Risks</td>
<td>Best Practice</td>
<td>Geoff Meadows, Simon Markham &amp; Jeff Millward</td>
<td>Adopted by Council as part of 2018-28 LTP process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 District Development Strategy 2048 and Implementation Plan</td>
<td>Best Practice</td>
<td>Trevor Ellis</td>
<td>Adopted by Council April 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Risk Management Framework</td>
<td>Best practice</td>
<td>Jim Palmer</td>
<td>Adopted by Council April 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Canterbury Climate Change Group</td>
<td>Best practice</td>
<td>Geoff Meadows</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Natural Hazards, Risk Reduction Working Group</td>
<td>Best practice</td>
<td>Geoff Meadows</td>
<td>Work is ongoing in accordance with a detailed work plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 WDC Rangiora Service Centre upgrade</td>
<td>LTP significant project</td>
<td>Rob Hawthorne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 2018 - 2028 Long Term Plan</td>
<td>Legislative requirement</td>
<td>Maria Edgar</td>
<td>Draft released for public consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Utilisation and Fleet Review</td>
<td>Best practice</td>
<td>Jill Brightwell</td>
<td>Draft to Management Team February 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 WDC Activity Management Plans</td>
<td>Best practice</td>
<td>Simon Collin Yvonne Warnaar Rob Hawthorne Chris Brown Kitty Waghorn</td>
<td>Draft completed December 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Asset Management Steering group – Procedural Guide</td>
<td>Best Practice</td>
<td>Veronica Spittal</td>
<td>Underway and due to be completed in 2018/19 financial year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. KEY DELIVERABLES, TIMING AND APPROVALS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Approval</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Initial report completed</td>
<td>Management Team</td>
<td>22 June 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Initial report received by Council</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>3 July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Draft Strategy completed</td>
<td>Management Team</td>
<td>April 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Internal consultation completed</td>
<td>Management Team Strategy</td>
<td>May 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Final Strategy adopted</td>
<td>Management Team</td>
<td>June 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Distribution to All Teams</td>
<td>Management Team Strategy</td>
<td>June 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Presentation to Council</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>August 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Action Plan implemented</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>August 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Annual monitoring report</td>
<td>Management Team Strategy</td>
<td>June 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY STAKEHOLDERS

Internal:
- All Council staff
- All Teams
- Management Team Strategy
- Management Team
- Communications and Engagement Team
- Development Planning Unit
- Asset Management Steering Group
- Wellbeing Strategy Committee
- Community Board members
- Councillors

External:
- Wider community (stage 4)

8. PROJECT BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Champions and Subject Matter experts</td>
<td>Salaries included in individual unit budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting document</td>
<td>Salary included in Policy and Strategy budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document design and production</td>
<td>Operations included in Policy and Strategy budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal consultation</td>
<td>Salaries included in individual unit Budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications and Engagement Team</td>
<td>Salaries included in Communications and Engagement Team budget</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. HEALTH AND SAFETY

Is a H&S plan required?  Yes ☐  No ☒

Covered by the Working in the Field Procedures

10. REGULAR REPORTING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report From</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Person Responsible</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Strategy Project Control Group (SSPCG)</td>
<td>Advise of progress and provide opportunity for input</td>
<td>Project Administrator</td>
<td>Project Sponsor</td>
<td>Minutes/action plan circulated after every scheduled Project Control Group meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Sponsor</td>
<td>Advise of progress on Sustainability Strategy as a key organisational development priority and provide opportunity for input</td>
<td>Project Lead</td>
<td>Management Team Strategy</td>
<td>10 May 2018, 28 May 2018, Periodically thereafter until adoption of the final Strategy in June 2019, After June 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Lead</td>
<td>Annual monitoring report</td>
<td>Project Administrator</td>
<td>Management Team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Strategy Project Control Group</td>
<td>Approve draft initial report for release to Council Approve draft strategy for internal consultation</td>
<td>Project Lead</td>
<td>Management Team</td>
<td>22 June 2018, April 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Strategy Project Control Group</td>
<td>Receive scoping report</td>
<td>Project Lead</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>3 July 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SIGN-OFF

Prepared By: Senior Policy Analyst – Veronica Spittal

Signed:  
Date:  23 May 2018
1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report seeks Council approval for the following:

   a. Contracting resource recovery park/transfer station operation and maintenance to a private waste business with the option of a community group carrying out the resource recovery activities, which is a departure from the Council’s standard procurement process;

   b. Begin a registration of interest process to identify potential suppliers from the community;

   c. A 7+1+1+1 contract term for the solid waste contracts for kerbside collection and transfer station operations; and

   d. The solid waste services Procurement Strategy.

1.2 The Solid & Hazardous Waste Working Party (SHWWP) has considered the outcomes of the Transfer Station Operations and Maintenance Options review (Report 180607062827) and workshopped the additional matters at their meeting on 21 June 2018, and their recommendations are included in this report.

Attachments:
   i. Staff Report to Solid & Hazardous Waste Working Party: Review of Options for Transfer Station Operations and Maintenance (Trim 180607062827)
   ii. Review of Contract Term by Morrison Low (Trim 180620068374)
   iii. Procurement Strategy by Morrison Low (Trim 180620068377)
   iv. Consultation Materials (Trim 180622069280)
   v. Communications Action Plan (Trim 180622069284)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180620068478.
(b) Approves contracting out the operations and maintenance of Southbrook resource recovery park and Oxford transfer station to a private waste business with the option of the main contractor engaging, managing, and supporting a community group to undertake resource recovery activities.

(c) Approves staff undertaking a registration of interest process to identify potential suppliers from the community in addition to the private sector.

(d) Approves this departure from the Council’s standard procurement process to enable social procurement objectives to be achieved.

(e) Approves the term of the solid waste contracts for kerbside collection and transfer station operations being 7 years plus three one-year rights of renewal (7+1+1+1)

(f) Approves the procurement strategy appended as Attachment iii

(g) Notes that the Solid & Hazardous Waste Working Party has approved the consultation materials and the Communications Action Plan

(h) Notes that letters, feedback cards and Q&A sheets will be posted to ratepayers during the first week of July 2018

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 The Council has approved the implementation of the “Your Choice” kerbside collection service in the Long Term Plan, and tender documents are being prepared for the new solid waste contracts.

3.2 At their meeting on 15 May, the SHWWP instructed staff to review the operations and maintenance of Southbrook resource recovery park and Oxford transfer station based on contracting to a private provider both with and without community-based assistance for resource recovery operations.

3.3 The review was undertaken by Morrison Low, and the outcomes of this review are included in Report 180607062827 (Attachment i).

3.4 A separate review was undertaken into the optimal contract term for the solid waste contracts, and the review document is appended as Attachment ii.

3.5 Morrison Low have completed the procurement strategy and this is appended as Attachment iii.

3.6 These documents were discussed by the SHWWP at their meeting on 21 June 2018.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. The Southbrook resource recovery park and Oxford transfer station operations and maintenance review was undertaken by Morrison Low, and staff presented the outcomes and staff recommendations in Report 180607062827 (Attachment i) to the working party at their meeting on 21 June. Mark Abbott from Morrison Low attended the meeting via teleconference to answer the working party’s questions.

4.2. The SHWWP made minor amendments to recommendations 2(c) and 2(d) in Report 180607062827, after clarifying that their preference would be for the main contractor to partner with a locally-based community group to ensure that any funds raised would benefit the local community. The registration of interest process for community groups would “test the waters” to determine if there were suitable groups available that would be interested in partnering with the contractor and Council to run resource recovery operations.
4.3. The working party’s final recommendations to Council are included in Section 2 above as 2(b), 2(c) and 2(d).

4.4. A separate review was undertaken into the optimal contract term for the solid waste contracts, and the contract term review document is appended as Attachment ii. The options considered are:

4.4.1. 3 year term. While this aligns to the Council’s Long Term Plan (LTP) period and the 6-year Waste Management & Minimisation Plan review period, it does not provide sufficient time for contractors to recover the capital costs of vehicles or plant, and would result in a higher overall cost to both Council and contractors to carry out a procurement process every three years. There is little time for innovation to take place within the contract period, and will affect levels of service with a potential change in service provider every 3 years.

4.4.2. 7 year term. This is closely aligned to contractor capital amortisation period of 10 years, also reasonably aligns with the LTP and WMMP review cycles, and has benefits from the introduction of innovation and sustainability options. However the contractor may require and rely on a renewal period to achieve capital efficiency where the capital payback is greater than 7 years. Procurement activities and costs are reduced for Council and contractors.

4.4.3. 7+1+1+1 term. The full 10 year period is ideally matched to vehicle and plant capital recovery period, is aligned with the LTP cycle, and aligns reasonably well with the WMMP review period. It enables performance review of provided service, and has similar benefits from the introduction of innovation and sustainability options. Procurement activities and costs are reduced for Council and contractors.

4.4.4. 10 year term. The full 10 year period is ideally matched to vehicle and plant capital recovery period, is aligned with the LTP cycle, and aligns reasonably well with the WMMP review period. However unless specified and cost-factored into the contract, the longer term may limit the introduction of innovation options through the contract term. Procurement activities and costs are reduced for Council and contractors.

4.4.5. 15+ year term. Procurement activities and costs are reduced for Council and contractors. There is a difficulty in performance management over such a long term, particularly in relation to staff changes and how this affects service delivery. Does not match the contractor’s vehicle and plant capital recovery period, and this and CPI adjustments for longer-term contracts is likely to escalate costs in the final third of the contract period.

4.5. The contract term review document was workshopped with the working party. They questioned the difference between 7+1+1+1 and 10 year contracts as they both would have the same final term.

4.6. The main differences are:

4.6.1. The renewal periods would be based on performance, and with good KPI’s the Council would have the option to not renew the contract in the event that the contractor is performing less than optimally. This was discussed, and concern raised that to date the opinion has been a contractor has to be performing very poorly for a renewal not to be offered. Mark Abbott reaffirmed that this could be managed through the negotiated KPI’s and terms of the contract.

4.6.2. The renewal periods would mean the contractor would be more likely to adopt new technologies over the life of the contract.

4.6.3. Finally the Council would have the option to negotiate an extension to the contract beyond the 10-year contract term, which could financially benefit the Council as
the contractors would have recovered the capital costs of vehicles or plant by that
time.

4.7. The working party supported the 7+1+1+1 year term. This relates to recommendation 2(e)
above.

4.8. Morrison Low have completed the Procurement Strategy, appended as Attachment iii. This
document sets out the contract objectives, discusses how the approach aligns with
Council’s procurement policy, and recommends that a Price Quality Methodology is used
for the waste procurement proposals (tenders).

4.9. Morrison Low also suggest Council using evaluation criteria that include local impact,
innovation and sustainability in addition to the more usual criteria of methodology &
resources, relevant skills, health & safety as non-price attributes.

4.10. The Procurement Strategy also provides procurement timeframes, and includes
discussion and recommendations around contract processes including:

a. **Contract term:** *this is addressed in a separate options report, as per 3.4 and 4.2 above;*

b. **Contract form:** recommended that NZS3917 be used. This form of contract covers
   works and services performed over a fixed period of time and is considered a more
   appropriate form of contract for the solid waste contracts than NZS3910 or NEC3;

c. **Performance measurement & management:** recommends a collaborative approach to
   encourage innovation and service enhancement, with negotiated Key Performance
   Indicators to ensure the required contractor performance continues into the long-term;

d. **Bin ownership:** *Council has previously approved contractor ownership of bins in the
   contract documents, and signalled it would be open to alternative bids that provide for
   Council ownership of the bins;*

e. **Community group partnerships:** *this is addressed in a separate options report
   (Attachment i) as per 3.3 and 4.1 above;*

f. **Processing and down-stream partners:** this raises the possibility of extending the
   supplier engagement to other stakeholders such as recycling processors and
   composting facilities to engage in "risk and reward" contract(s) for saleable items;

g. **Associated asset, customer and waste data management:** highlights the need for
   Council ensure that they have access to asset, customer and waste data/trend
   information. This includes the ability for our staff to access real-time information
   relating to truck GPS tracking, lift information, contamination reports, etc.; and

h. **Waste monitoring and management:** covers the need for the contractor to actively
   participate in monitoring, reporting and management of contamination in each waste
   stream.

4.11. The Procurement Strategy was workshopped with the SHWWP on 21 June. There was
discussion around processing partners, and the benefits of finding partners who would
provide the Council a good rate of return for the materials.

4.12. The working party supported the recommendations made in this document. This relates to
recommendation 2(f) above.
4.13. At their meeting the SHWW P also formally approved the consultation materials, which are appended as Attachment iv, and the Communications Action Plan (Attachment v).

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

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

The option of a community group being engaged to operate the recovery area has not been consulted on with those groups. To date there has been no approach by a group, organisation or charity to partner with the Council or contractor to operate the recovery area or shop.

The contracts are being publically notified. Should Council approve this step, registrations of interest will be widened to include community groups and organisations who may be interested in carrying out resource recovery operations.

5.2. Wider Community

The option of a community group being engaged to operate the recovery area has not been consulted on in the wider community. There has been an occasional question about whether the Council gets the money from shop sales or gives it to the community in some way.

The contracts are being publically notified and local waste companies and consortiums have been advised that the Council is calling for registrations of interest.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

Report 180607062827 (Attachment i) covers the financial implications of the options considered for resource recovery park/transfer station operations & maintenance contracts.

The benefits and disadvantages (including financial implications) of different contract terms are discussed in Attachment ii Review of Contract Term by Morrison Low (Trim 180620068374). In general a short term contract (3 years) will not allow time for the contractor to recover capital costs, and the high cost and time impact for both Council and contractor to go through more frequent procurement processes.

A 7 or 10 year period reduces the costs and time to undertake the procurement process, but the contractor may require and rely on a renewal period to achieve capital efficiency if the capital payback is longer than 7 or 10 years. The Council could benefit financially from a contract extension beyond the 10-year capital payback period, and a 7+1+1+1 term would allow for this flexibility. A 15+ year term does not match the capital amortisation period, and costs are likely to escalate in the final third of the contract term.

6.2. Community Implications

Report 180607062827 (Attachment i) covers the community implications of the options considered for resource recovery park/transfer station operations & maintenance contracts.

The Procurement Strategy suggests including an evaluation criterion for Local Impact which would consider the different community impacts (positive and negative) of individual bids.
6.3. **Risk Management**

Report 180607062827 (*Attachment i*) covers the risks of the options considered for resource recovery park/transfer station operations & maintenance contracts, and discusses how these could be managed.

The benefits and disadvantages (including risks) of different contract terms are discussed in *Attachment ii* Review of Contract Term by Morrison Low (Trim 180620068374).

A 3 year term aligns with the Long Term Plan (LTP) timelines, and with the 6-yearly review period of the Waste Management & Minimisation Plan (WMMP), but there are service delivery risks from changing solid waste service providers at this frequency.

A 7 year contract has many benefits, and is closely aligned to the capital amortisation period of 10 years. Allowing three one-year renewal periods has the same benefits of a 10-year contract term without the limiting innovation options.

A 10 year contract term is ideally matched with the Council’s LTP and WMMP review cycles but may limit the introduction of innovation options through the contract term.

A 15+ year term can see difficulties arise with contractor performance management and may limit the introduction of innovation options through the contract term.

6.4. **Health and Safety**

Health & safety is an important component in delivery of solid waste services, and this will be an important factor in any review of service delivery whether by Council, contractor, or a community organisation and their volunteers. In any case the Waimakariri District Council as employer or Principal would be responsible for the health & safety of staff, volunteers and customers of our transfer station sites and of kerbside collection staff and the general public.

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

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

The Council’s Procurement Policy requires all major work to be subject to an open and competitive procurement process. Alternative options for delivery of the waste services that align with this policy are limited. Social procurement does not currently align with our procurement policy.

Legislation

Waste Minimisation Act 2008 S52(1): A territorial authority may undertake, or contract for, any waste management and minimisation service, facility, or activity (whether the service, facility, or activity is undertaken in its own district or otherwise).

7.2. **Community Outcomes**

**k. 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. 1,4
- Waste recycling and re-use of solid waste is encouraged and residues are managed so that they minimise harm to the environment. 1,3,4
7.3. Delegations

The Solid & Hazardous Waste Working Party has delegated authority to decide on all matters relating to Solid and Hazardous Waste that do not have affect the Annual Plan and Budget.

Kitty Waghorn
Solid Waste Asset Manager
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT FOR DECISION

FILE NO and TRIM NO: SHW-12 CON201818-01 / 180607062827

REPORT TO: Solid & Hazardous Waste Working Party

DATE OF MEETING: 21 June 2018

FROM: Kitty Waghorn, Solid Waste Asset Manager

SUBJECT: Review of Options for Transfer Station Operations and Maintenance

SIGNER:
Department Manager
Chief Executive

1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report presents the findings of a review of transfer station operations and maintenance, which was undertaken by Morrison Low. It seeks approval from the Solid & Hazardous Waste Working Party (SHWWP) to include provisions in the contract that would encourage a private operator to partner with a community group to run the resource recovery operation, and for staff to seek approval to undertake a registration of interest process to identify potential suppliers.

1.2 The scope of the review was limited to two options, which were to contract out the operations and maintenance of Southbrook resource recovery park (SRRP) and Oxford transfer station (OTS) either without or with support from a community group for resource recovery activities.

1.3 Outsourcing of transfer station and resource recovery operations to a single private operator is a traditional model adopted by councils to efficiently and cost-effectively manage waste facility operations. Performance targets can be factored into a contract to enable delivery of waste minimisation and education initiatives, but these are not necessarily embedded into a commercial sector operation.

1.4 Community group engagement and involvement in the recovery, reuse and application of resources is gaining traction in the New Zealand market. Anecdotally this model improves diversion rates and allows for better engagement with the community around waste minimisation messages.

1.5 Councils are encouraging resource recovery in a number of ways from direct and separate engagement of the community sector to run and manage these operations, often within the footprint of a commercial transfer station (Option 2B), to the contractual engagement of community groups by a commercial operator (Option 2A).

1.6 This latter approach (Option 2A) enables a best-practice operational environment that harnesses the strengths of both the commercial waste operator and the community group, and is the recommended approach.

Attachments:

- Proposal from Morrison Low to Review Options for Transfer Station Operations and Maintenance (Trim 160607062861)
2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Solid and Hazardous Waste Working Party recommends:

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 1506070562627.

(b) Approves Option 2a: contracting out the operations and maintenance of Southbrook resource recovery park (SRRP) and Oxford transfer station (OTS) to a private waste business with the main contractor engaging, managing, and supporting a community group to undertake resource recovery activities.

(c) Approves staff undertaking a registration of interest process to identify potential suppliers from the community and private sector.

(d) Approves this departure from the Council’s standard procurement process to enable social procurement objectives to be achieved.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 Staff undertook a full S17A service delivery review of the solid waste contracts in April/May 2018, and the recommendation from this was adopted by the Council in June 2016. In summary, the staff recommendation was to maintain the status quo and contract out both kerbside collection and transfer station operations and maintenance by a competitive tender process.

3.2 At their workshop on 5 April 2018, the Solid & Hazardous Waste Working Party (SHWWP) proposed the option of Council undertaking the transfer station operations instead of contracting these out. Morrison Low were requested to provide a proposal looking at four options, and the proposal was presented to the SHWWP in the staff report 180502046027, at their meeting on 15 May.

3.3 There were risks of delays posed by undertaking such a review so close to undertaking the tendering process. Additionally, a change in operations and operational costs was not signalled in the Long Term Plan. Staff therefore recommended that the scope of the review be modified to only include the following two options:

a. Option 1: maintaining the status quo i.e. contracting out the operations and maintenance of Southbrook resource recovery park (SRRP) and Oxford transfer station (OTS)

b. Option 2: contracting out the operations and maintenance of the SRRP and OTS supported by a community group for resource recovery activities.

3.4 After receiving approval from the SHWWP, staff requested a second proposal from Morrison Low to review these two options for the operation of our Transfer Stations. Their proposal is appended as Attachment 1. Staff engaged Morrison Low to undertake the review in accordance with their proposal for $2,500 plus cost of disbursements, and their final report is appended as Attachment 2.
4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. The comparative assessment of the two options was completed using an adapted better business case approach and takes into account the consideration of contract terms and their consequences.

4.2. The assessment considered Council’s relevant Waste Management & Minimisation Plan and procurement objectives as well as five critical success factors: potential value for money, supplier capability, supplier capacity, affordability, and potential achievability. The assessment is on page 2 of the **Morrison Low report**. Both Option 1 and Option 2 met these success factors, either partially or fully, and were considered to be achievable.

4.3. **Option 1**: this is the status quo or the current operating model of contracting operations and maintenance to a single commercial contractor.

4.4. **Option 2**: The benefits, key issues and barriers of this are on page 3 of the **Morrison Low report**. A number of benefits are expected from community involvement in recovery operations at SRRP and BBS, from higher waste diversion rates and local job creation and training opportunities, through to greater engagement between business and community sectors, better environmental and waste minimisation education, and re-distribution of low-cost goods throughout the district.

4.5. Any income from shop sales will be retained by the community group. The implications of this are discussed in section 6.2. The procurement process needs to include assessment criteria to reflect fair and equitable evaluation of all proposals received from both community groups and commercial waste companies.

4.6. There are barriers to community groups being involved in the waste industry owing to lack of experience and knowledge of the waste industry and the required level of H&S management in the industry, lack of skills and capacity, and capital funding requirements and difficulty in obtaining finance. This has been changing, with some Councils now encouraging resource recovery through involvement with community groups in a number of ways.

4.7. The two most common procurement methods are outlined on page 4 of the **Morrison Low report** under “Governance and Structure” and are summarised below.

4.8. **Option 2a**: Requiring the main contractor to engage, manage, and support a community group in the day-to-day operation of the resource recovery component of the business. This is the most common procurement method, and is the recommended option.

4.9. This is administratively more efficient and also lower risk for the Council. The lead contractor takes responsibility for the entire site health and safety and contractor management interface, and is also charged with the on-going financial and business viability of the community group.

4.10. **Option 2b**: Directly engaging community groups to undertake the day-to-day operations of resource recovery areas.

4.11. This option requires more Council staffing resources to manage, and makes for a more complex relationship between the Council and two contractors operating on the one site. It is generally favoured where the community group may need ongoing financial support to ensure viability through the life of the contract.
4.12. Council could satisfy its legislative requirements and achieve its corporate procurement and waste minimisation objectives in a cost-effective way through Option 2a, which is the recommended option, and by undertaking a two-step procurement process.

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

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

The option of a community group being engaged to operate the recovery area has not been consulted on with those groups. To date there has been no approach by a group, organisation or charity to partner with the Council or contractor to operate the recovery area or shop.

5.2. Wider Community

The option of a community group being engaged to operate the recovery area has not been consulted on in the wider community. There has been an occasional question about whether the Council gets the money from shop sales or gives it to the community in some way.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

The site is open 8 hours a day, 7 days a week, year round with closures only on 4 days for specific holidays. Second hand sales income in the last 12 month period was approximately $161,000 excluding GST, which is sufficient to cover the costs of two staff for recovery and basic recycling operations. Other staffing, operational and maintenance costs, and the transportation and processing costs of recyclable and hazardous waste, are funded out of the General Waste component in the Disposal Account budget.

Option 1: maintaining the status quo is unlikely to result in a substantive change to the budgeted cost and income structure. Council would continue to receive all of the revenue from gate fees and second hand sales, and pay all costs associated with operations and maintenance of the site.

Option 2: Both costs and income would be affected if a community group were to be engaged to operate the recovery operations. Dependent on the contract structure, the community group could oversee either the recovery area (the shop) or both the recovery and recycling operations. This would reduce the contract costs for these operations. All income from second hand sales would be received by the group, and not by the Council, which would be a drop in Council income.

Generally diversion would be increased when a community group operates a resource recovery area. This has the potential to increase both income for the group, but also increases transportation and processing costs for the Council from an increase in recyclable materials. This would be partially offset by customers being more aware of what is acceptable, and a reduction in contamination and the costs associated with managing that contamination.

There is a risk that the income would be insufficient to cover the community group’s costs and that they may need financial assistance from either the main contractor under Option 2a or the Council under Option 2b.

Under Option 2a there would be an additional cost component for the main contractor to supervise, manage and financially underpin the community group, and to manage H&S across the recovery operations. This additional cost would be offset by a lower Council resourcing cost because there would be a single point of contact for contract administration. Maintenance costs would most likely not be substantially different to current maintenance costs under this scenario.
Under Option 2b, the Council would be required to provide additional resources to manage both contracts, more specifically to administer the community group operations and health & safety management. As noted above, this contractual arrangement is generally favoured where the community group may need ongoing financial support to ensure viability through the life of the contract. Responsibility for maintenance of the recovery area would have to be given consideration for the contract, however it is likely that the Council would still bear those costs under this option.

The increased costs from either sub-option would have to be funded by either the users (an additional charge on gate fees) or through an increase in the general rate.

6.2. Community Implications

These are covered on page 3 of the Morrison Low report: Social procurement and community benefits. In summary, there would be a number of benefits from community involvement in recovery operations at SRRP and OTS. These include but are not limited to local job creation and training opportunities, greater engagement between business and community sectors, better environmental and waste minimisation education, and re-distribution of low-cost goods throughout the district.

6.3. Risk Management

The proposed form of contract would result in both the Council and contractor sharing the risks and gains (gain share/pain share). The gain-share may be limited under Option 2 where the community group would be expected to retain any profits from second-hand sales.

Option 1: The risks and responsibilities of transfer station operations and maintenance are well known in the waste industry, and can be managed via a standard contract with an established provider. With the gate fees set to cover the costs for rubbish, greenwaste and other charged materials and Council receiving all of the income from gate fees and the shop, any profits will result in a reduction in the general rate.

Option 2: There is a risk that local community groups would not want to partner with a commercial business, and also that some commercial entities would not want the responsibility of overseeing a community group’s operation on a shared site.

To manage this risk, a two-step procurement process is preferred. This includes release of an initial Registration of Interest to seek and gauge the interest of appropriate suppliers (both community groups and contractors) to allow Council to identify a range of suitable suppliers prior to going out with a request for proposal document. Council would use this RoI to assess who could be invited to provide proposals.

The risks and responsibilities of full resource recovery operations are not so well known by community groups and organisations. They would also not be familiar with the type of contracting requirements and responsibilities that would be imposed by the Council. There would need to be a certain level of training of the group to enable them to meet their contractual requirements.

Option 2a requires the lead contractor to take responsibility for the entire site’s operations, maintenance, and health and safety management, and the contractor-Council interface. This limits the above risks to the Council.

Option 2b is anticipated to require the Council to take on more oversight and management of the community group, and to bear a greater level of risk than it would under Option 1 or Option 2a.

There is a risk that the income from second hand sales would be insufficient to cover the community group’s costs and that they may need financial assistance. This would be provided either by the main contractor under Option 2a or by the Council under Option 2b.
6.4. Health and Safety

Health & safety is an important component in delivery of solid waste services, and this will be an important factor in any review of service delivery whether by Council, contractor, or a community organisation and their volunteers. In any case the Waimakariri District Council as employer or Principal would be responsible for the health & safety of staff, volunteers and customers of our transfer station sites. Under Option 2b the Council would most likely have to apply more resources to ensure that the community group complies with all health and safety requirements.

7. CONTEXT

7.1. Policy

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

The Council's Procurement Policy requires all major work to be subject to an open and competitive procurement process. Alternative options for delivery of the waste services that align with this policy are limited. Social procurement does align with our procurement policy.

7.2. Legislation

The Local Government Act (S17A) makes it mandatory for Councils to periodically review the "cost effectiveness of current arrangements" for service delivery including 'the governance, funding and delivery of any infrastructure, service or regulatory function'. A review must be undertaken:

- In conjunction with consideration of any significant change to relevant service levels; and
- Within 2 years before the expiry of any contract or other binding agreement relating to the delivery of that infrastructure, service, or regulatory function; and
- At such other times as the local authority considers desirable, but not later than 5 years following the last review under subsection (1).

Waste Minimisation Act 2008 S62(1): A territorial authority may undertake, or contract for, any waste management and minimisation service, facility, or activity (whether the service, facility, or activity is undertaken in its own district or otherwise).

7.3. Community Outcomes

k. 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. 1,4
- Waste recycling and re-use of solid waste is encouraged and residues are managed so that they minimise harm to the environment. 1,3,4

7.4. Delegations

The Solid & Hazardous Waste Working Party has delegated authority to decide on all matters relating to Solid and Hazardous Waste that do not have an affect on the Annual Plan and Budget.

Kitty Waghorn
Solid Waste Asset Manager
Kitty Waghorn

From: Mark Abbot <M.Abbot@morrisonlow.com>
Sent: Wednesday, 23 May 2018 10:38 AM
To: Simon Collin; Kitty Waghorn
Cc: Alice Grace
Subject: TRIM CM: Review of Transfer Station / RRP Operations
Importance: High
Record Number: 180607062853

Dear Simon and Kitty

Please find below a methodology and price to undertake a review of options for transfer station operation and maintenance.

Background
On 15th May 2018 the Solid & Hazardous Waste Working Party agreed Option 5 of Report 180502048027 “Review of Options for Transfer Station Operations and Maintenance”. The approved recommendation is to undertake a review of operations based on:

a) maintaining the status quo, being out-sourced operation and maintenance of Oxford Refuse Transfer Station (RTS) and Southbrook Resource Recovery Park (RRP); and
b) Out-sourced operation and maintenance of Oxford RTS and Southbrook RRP supported by community group for resource recovery activities.

This review is to be undertaken while continuing to prepare tender documentation for these contracts.

Methodology
Morrison Low have significant experience in waste service delivery and have modelled waste facility operating costs for a number of councils including Far North, Auckland, Central Otago, Nelson and Horowhenua.

The assessment of transfer station options will focus on the following options:

1. Status Quo: being the out-sourced operation and maintenance of Oxford RTS and Southbrook RRP; and
2. Out-sourced operation and maintenance of Oxford RTS and Southbrook RRP supported by community group for resource recovery activities.

Consideration of contract terms will also be undertaken for both options 1 and 2 for reporting back to the Solid & Hazardous Waste Working Party.

Our proposed approach to undertaking the comparison of out-sourced transfer station operation options is:

1. Undertake a comparative assessment of the two transfer station options (listed above) using an adapted better business case approach, whereby the options are compared using the following criteria:
   a. Alignment with strategic objectives.
   b. Potential value for money
   c. Supplier capability
   d. Supplier capacity
   e. Affordability
   f. Potential achievability.
2. Review options and consequence of contract terms, as requested by the Working Party.
3. Presentation of the review findings, including the options assessment, in a brief report that can be presented back to the Solid & Hazardous Waste Working Party. The draft report will be provided to you for review and feedback.
4. Teleconference feedback session to discuss your feedback and preparation of the final options report.

Programme
There is a need for this assessment to be completed in time to report back to the meeting of the Solid & Hazardous Waste Working Party in mid-late June. It is estimated that a draft will be completed by 1st June 2018 and, subject to the timing of the review, the final report will be completed by Wednesday 6th June 2018.

Price
Our estimated price to complete this transfer station options assessment is $2,500 (plus GST plus disbursements).

The review of transfer station options supplements the main waste contracts procurement project we are currently undertaking. We have taken this into account when considering the estimated fee for this proposal. We have also factored in the efficiency gained from visiting Southbrook RRP as part of the workshop on 20th April 2018.

We trust this in line with your requirements for the business case, but are happy to discuss and amend as needed.
Review of Options for Transfer Station Operations and Maintenance
Waimakariri District Council, June 2018

Introduction

Council seeks to undertake a review of options for transfer station operations based on the agreed Option 5 of Report 180502048027 to the Solid & Hazardous Waste Working Party meeting on 15th May 2018.

This report covers an assessment on the approved recommendation and focuses on the following options:

1. Maintaining the status quo, being out-sourced operation and maintenance of Oxford Refuse Transfer Station (RTS) and Southbrook Recovery Park (RRP)
2. Out-sourced operation and maintenance of Oxford RTS and Southbrook RRP supported by community group for resource recovery activities

Partnering with a community group is becoming a more common service delivery model in New Zealand. Examples include New Plymouth, Rotorua, WasteNet Southland, Queenstown, Hamilton, Waitaki and Auckland. Typically, tender evaluation criteria are weighted towards community group involvement. The community group could have a social cause (e.g. Salvation Army, Red Cross) or waste minimisation drivers (e.g. Xtreme Zero Waste Raglan, Wanaka Wastebusters) or a partnership between community groups representing these two sectors.

The comparative assessment of the two options is completed using an adapted better business case approach and takes into account the consideration of contract terms and their consequences. In addition, this report contains advice on social procurement processes including assessment criteria and weightings that are often used for the evaluation of proposals that include service delivery elements by community groups.

Assessment of options

This assessment has considered relevant Council WMMP and procurement objectives as well as the following critical success factors:

- Potential value for money
- Supplier capability
- Supplier capacity
- Affordability
- Potential achievability

The options comparison considered the involvement of community group(s) for Council’s RTS and RRP operations, as illustrated below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Description of Option</th>
<th>Option 1 Status Quo</th>
<th>Option 2 Contractor + Community Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option overview</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our community has opportunities for avoiding or reducing waste at source</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Rely solely on Council's effort to communicate waste minimisation initiatives</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Council waste minimisation initiatives enhanced by a community group has is focused on waste minimisation and has strong links to the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our community has the opportunity to maximise the diversion of material for reuse, recycling or recovery</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Limited community group involvement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Requires close collaboration between the contractor and the community group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our community has access to services for effective and efficient management of waste that comply with current environmental and health practices</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Level of service can potentially be further optimised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant WMMP Objectives (Waimakariri Waste Minimisation Plan 2017)</td>
<td>Relevant Procurement Objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To enable a partnership approach between Council, commercial operators and local community suppliers</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Potentially some community involvement, but may be ad hoc</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential value for money: right solution, right time at the right price</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplier capability: is the proposed methodology something suppliers are familiar with? Is it within their skillset?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Extensive industry experience</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extensive industry experience. Community group experience may need building with support from the contractor and Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplier capacity: are there potential suppliers (community groups, private companies) available locally to provide the resource recovery centre operation and management required?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Business as usual</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Early feedback indicated that there was interest from the community sector. This will need to be reconfirmed through the procurement planning phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordability: does Council have the capacity to fund it? No funding constraints</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Business as usual</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Potentially require funding over existing budgets because community groups may require financial assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential achievability: able to be implemented as part of new waste services contracts</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Business as usual</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>But dependent on level of interest from community group(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Social procurement and community benefits

For local government, social procurement utilises procurement procedures and purchasing power to create positive environmental and social outcomes. These procurement processes can strategically be used to address local issues such as unemployment with community group involvement. Community or social enterprises tend to prioritise employment creation when compared to privately owned waste companies. Social enterprises create a multiplier effect, in the case of Auckland Council’s community engagement in its recycling centres, not only has it maximised the diversion of reusable and recyclable materials from landfill, but also generated multiple environmental, social, cultural, and economic benefits.¹

Social procurement in waste issues will allow a community group or groups to participate in waste minimisation and management. By collaborating with private waste businesses, local government can further facilitate and create value adding activities that benefit both organisations through its procurement process. For businesses, the added value is created in a range of areas including; brand development through the integration of corporate social responsibility into the procurement process; staff attraction and retention through values driven activity. For community groups the added value is created by keeping money in the social economy for longer, where it can create more social benefit.²

Benefit of community involvement

The expected benefits of RTS and RRP operations procured through private and community collaboration are:
- Higher waste diversion rates
- Local job creation (low skilled and skilled)
- Training opportunities
- Empowerment of communities, resilient local economies, and reduced dependency
- Investment back into the community (increased options for the community)
- Greater engagement between the business and community sectors, with new market opportunities for both
- Environmental education and waste minimisation
- Redistribution of low cost goods and materials throughout the district.

Key issues and barriers related to community involvement

Community groups are often precluded from being involved in the waste industry because of their lack of experience in a commercial business environment. Managing a recycling facility requires operational skills and an understanding of waste markets and waste issues. The capacity is not always available within community groups, and therefore upskilling is required. The barrier to entry is even higher with the capital funding requirement for leasing commercial facilities and plant to operate RTS and RRP. Social enterprises often have difficulty obtaining finance due to the regulatory environment and market practice, along with access to funding.

Governance and Structure

Council is very familiar with the status quo option as the current operating model.

¹ https://localgovernment.nz.co.nz/lg-magazine/waste-management-pl/proc-waste/ accessed 31/05/2018
² http://socialprocurementaustralia.com/ accessed 31/05/2018
Two choices are presented when seeking community group involvement:

1. Separate contracts for the transfer station operations (private contractor) and for the resource recovery centre operated within Southbrook RRP (community group)

2. A contract with a private operator which requires that party to enter into a contract with a community group for resource recovery operations.

The first option ensures direct control by council throughout the procurement process and into the life of the contract. Resources are required to manage the contract, along with the complexity of the tripartite relationship that is created. This is certainly a viable option where Council requires direct access to and from the community group, and where there is an expectation of on-going financial support to ensure viability throughout the life of the contract. This may be by way of operational grants, reduction in rentals, staff training and upskilling etc. In addition to financial support, support for the community group is often required for operational matters including health and safety; site induction; training and development.

The second option, and one gaining more traction in the New Zealand market, is the specification that the main contractor (private sector) is required to engage, manage, and support a community group in the day-to-day operation of the resource recovery component of the business. All waste minimisation initiatives are factored into the contract leaving council a single point of contract management. As the lead operator and on-site manager, the private contractor also takes responsibility for the entire site health and safety and contractor management interface and is charged with the on-going financial and business viability of the community group in relation to their involvement with the resource recovery operation.

Engagement of a community group operator under the umbrella of a private contractor does not necessarily separate Council from a strategic relationship with the community group; the management of the contract can require engagement with, and amongst, all parties in a collaborative governance approach.

**Procurement**

The procurement process needs to encompass assessment criteria that will reflect fair and equitable evaluation of all proposals received from both community groups and commercial waste companies. Experiences of other councils in New Zealand that have completed the procurement of an RRC using the principles of social procurement are:

- A two-step procurement process is preferred including release of an initial Registration of Interest to seek and gauge the interest of appropriate suppliers and allow Council to identify a range of suitable suppliers. It will also enable Council to find a supplier who is able to deliver both a quality service and a social impact prior to going out with a Request for Proposal document
- An open tender (proposal) process is preferable with less focus on price and more focus on waste diversion, innovation, local jobs, training opportunities
- A partnership approach with an open book policy, profit sharing and ongoing technical support is preferred
- The contract can either set targets for waste streams where Council wishes to drive diversion (however care is needed that this does not limit proposals), or Council can ask submitters to suggest targets (with the risk that these may be conservative)

---

Submitters can either be required to identify the social value that they will create through execution of the contract or achieve targets around specific social objectives set by Council e.g. local economic development.

Consideration that business drivers and processes for commercial waste operators are different to community groups.

Social procurement does not always align with Councils' procurement policies and consideration may need to be given to obtaining approval to depart from a standard procurement process to enable social procurement objectives to be achieved.

Further social procurement considerations, including typical assessment attributes and weightings are included in Appendix A.

Summary

The outsourcing of transfer station and resource recovery operations to a single private operator is a traditional model adopted by councils as a way of efficiently and cost-effectively managing waste facility operations. While performance targets can be factored into a contract to enable waste minimisation and education initiatives to be delivered, these are not necessarily embedded into a commercial sector operation.

Community group engagement and involvement in the recovery, reuse and application of resources is rightfully gaining traction in the New Zealand market. Councils are encouraging resource recovery in a number of ways: from direct and separate engagement of the community sector to run and manage these operations, often within the footprint of a commercial transfer station, to the contractual engagement of community groups by a commercial operator. This approach enables a best-practice operational environment that harnesses the strengths of both the commercial waste operator and the community group.

Council has the ability to achieve its corporate procurement and waste minimisation objectives, by challenging and changing a private operator to partner with a community group in the running of the resource recovery operation, thereby ensuring its legislative, operational and community requirements are satisfied within a well-defined fiscal envelope and without the need to directly manage an independent community-led enterprise.
Review of Contract Term – Waste Procurement
Waimakariri District Council, June 2018

Introduction

At the meeting of the Solid & Hazardous Working Party, 15 May 2018, a recommendation was sought from council officers on the appropriate contract term(s) for the suite of waste procurement contracts to support a 1 July 2019 commencement. These contracts will cover a range of services from kerbside collections of refuse, recyclables and mixed organics; Refuse Transfer Station Operations; processing options for various waste streams; and receptacle supply and maintenance.

This report has been prepared to inform the council decision on preferred contract term, noting a preference for a 7-year base period.

Key considerations

- Contract terms are typically linked to capital requirements associated with the delivery of services. These requirements differ for collection and facility contracts.
- **Collection contracts**: capital requirements relate to the purchase of collection vehicles. A contractor would normally anticipate the serviceable life of a collection vehicle to be 8 to 10 years and therefore refuse and recycling collection contracts are generally in the range of 7 to 10 years with rights of renewal at council discretion for periods of up to three years (e.g. 1+1+1 years). This term allows contract flexibility in its ability to maximise the life of vehicles and therefore minimising cost by ensuring the renewal periods are based on the depreciated asset value. Renewal at council discretion at the 7-year period provides contract exit in the event of unsatisfactory contractor performance.
- **Facility contracts**: capital requirements vary for transfer stations and recycling facilities and contract terms tend to be matched to reasonable depreciation periods for the new assets. For Waimakariri, the refuse transfer stations do not require capital investment from the contractor and therefore the contract term for the operation and maintenance contact is independent of capital investment and can be aligned to the preferred collection contract term. A 7-year term for transfer station operation is appropriate both with and without community sector involvement in the operation of a complementary Resource Recovery Park, as below.
- There is benefit in aligning the collection and facility contract term to enable bundling procurement (and potential contract cost savings) in future.
- A contract term of at least 7 years allows contractors to invest in the latest technology such as low emissions fleet.
- A contract extension period can be matched to the length of the initial contract term (e.g. 7+7 years) or a selection of shorter time periods (e.g. 7+1+1+1 years).
- Community group involvement, where appropriate, is better managed through a contract period that is not too onerous or restrictive time-wise. It should be of a sufficient period to ensure capability development and economic sustainability is achieved, but matched with a realistic end to demonstrate and deliver robust contractor management and contract outcomes. It would not be realistic to expect this to be less than 5-years or longer than 10-years. A 7-year period would therefore be reasonable, with an appropriate extension period.
- Allowing a contract term that is longer than 7-years, through contract extension periods, enables the contractor and council to benefit from the full economic payback of equipment.
- Contracts that include wheelie bin supply as well as collection services typically align the contract term to the collection vehicle life, with a residual payment for the bins (that have a life of at least 15 years).

Summary

A summary of the benefits and disadvantages of varying contract terms for collection services follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Term</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>Enables council to change contract to match changing service requirements, e.g. to introduce new innovations. Aligns with Council’s Long Term Plan review periods and Waste Management and Minimisation Plan cycle (6 years). Could suit operations and maintenance contract(s) not reliant on capital investment by contractor.</td>
<td>Insufficient time for contractor(s) to recover capital costs – vehicles etc. Insufficient time to develop strong collaborative relationship between council and contractor High cost of procurement with processes and functions repeated more frequently by council. High cost and time impact for contractors responding to procurement cycle, potentially limiting their involvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>Closely aligned to contractor capital amortisation period. Benefits in introduction of innovation and sustainability options through the contract. 7+1+1+1 period aligns with WMMP review cycle and enables review of service performance into the next WMMP. Aligned to Council’s Long Term Plan cycle – s17a Review required prior to contract end.</td>
<td>Contractor may require and rely on a renewal period, perhaps equivalent to the original contract term, to achieve capital efficiency where the capital payback is greater than 7 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>Term is ideally matched to vehicle and fleet capital recovery. Totally aligned to Council’s Long Term Plan cycle. Council’s investment in procurement activities is reduced.</td>
<td>Unless otherwise specified and cost factored in the contract, may limit the introduction of innovation options through the contract term. Difficulty in contractor change or performance management over a long period. Contractor investment in fleet and other capital is not matched to contract term (too long for collection fleet) and therefore cost is likely to escalate in the final third of the contract term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+ years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Recommendation**

A 7-year or 10-year base period most closely aligns with council planning cycles and contractor capital recovery periods. Either can be linked with appropriate renewal periods to best optimise amortisation and depreciation rates and to provide for the introduction of innovation or sustainability options where the benefits and opportunities of these could otherwise be precluded from the contract.

It is recommended that:

- A contract term of 7-years, with renewal terms which align the contract period with the economic life of collection equipment of approximately 10-years (e.g. 7+1+1+1), is appropriate for collections contracts.
- The facility contracts can align with the collections term as there is no contractor capital requirement involved.
Waimakariri District Council Waste Services Procurement
Procurement Strategy, June 2018

Background

Waimakariri District Council is seeking quality service providers to deliver rubbish and recycling services to its residents on behalf of Council. The following services are to be covered by a major procurement process to enable contracts for services to be in place for a 1 July 2019 commencement:

- Fortnightly kerbside refuse collection – both prepaid bags and mobile garbage containers (bins).
- Fortnightly kerbside recycling collection – customer selection of bin size with 240litre as default.
- Weekly mixed organic collection – potential varying bin sizes.
- Transport processing and possible sale of recyclables.
- Transport, processing and possible sale of mixed organics.
- Refuse Transfer Station Operation and Maintenance.
- Potential Community group operation of Resource Recovery Operations (Transfer Station based).
- Supply, distribution and servicing / maintenance of refuse and recycling containers.
- Monitoring and education relating to refuse, organics and recycling services as directed by council.

Procurement Contract objectives

The contract objectives will express the key attributes Council is seeking from its selected waste services contractor(s). Ideally the contract objectives will align with the Council values and WMMP objectives. These are presented below and are followed by the proposed contract objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council’s values</th>
<th>Council’s WMMP objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Act with integrity, honesty and trust</td>
<td>1. Improving the efficiency of resource use:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep you informed</td>
<td>• Our community has opportunities for avoiding or reducing waste at source;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do better every day</td>
<td>• Council works with other councils, central government, industry and other parties to improve product stewardship (i.e. aiming to reduce the environmental impact of the life cycle of products);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take responsibility</td>
<td>• Our community has opportunity to maximise the diversion of material for reuse, recycling or recovery;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with you and each other</td>
<td>• The range of diverted material will be improved and the quality of these materials enhanced.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Reducing the harmful effects of waste:

- Our community has access to services for effective and efficient management of waste that comply with current and environmental and health practices;
- The disposal of sewage treatment residuals complies with current environmental and health practices;
- Our community is informed and educated regarding hazardous waste and residual waste.
## Alignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed contract objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost-effective and efficient services</strong> To support efficient delivery of collection, consolidation, processing and disposal through bundling of services and a contract term than supports appropriate capital investment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WMMP objectives:</strong> To deliver services that support the WMMP goals and action plan to divert waste from landfill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do better everyday</strong> To enable innovation in technology, or process, or variable demand for services to be managed through the life of the contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work with you and each other</strong> To enable a partnership approach between Council, commercial operators and local community suppliers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Take responsibility</strong> To ensure service delivery protects workers, the public and property.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Procurement Policy Alignment

Council procurement is governed by the following five principles as specified in the Purchasing (Including Tendering) Policy:

- Planning and managing for results by identifying what is needed, and preparing how to obtain it;
- Being fair to all suppliers by encouraging capable suppliers to respond;
- Securing the right supplier by being clear about what is needed and by being fair about how they are assessed;
- Accounting for all costs and benefits over the lifetime of the goods or services;
- Being accountable, transparent and reasonable.

These principles are designed to ensure purchasing goods and services are an open, selective and transparent process that achieves value for money by delivering the desired outcome at the best possible quality and price. These principles also promote a purchasing process that is impartial, open and ethical, ensuring that all Council purchasing is undertaken in a fair and unbiased way.

Procurement processes should be designed to ensure that purchasing practice is proportionate to the value, risk and complexity of the purchase. This policy provides a context for sound commercial judgement to achieve the best value for money, which isn’t always the cheapest price, to drive innovation and high performance without compromising health and safety.

All waste service procurement processes and market approaches will be aligned with this Policy.

### Procurement Approach

The Council Value Statements signal a relationship-based approach with regards to supplier dealings and engagement. A single stage Request for Proposal (RFP) is therefore recommended across all waste procurement streams. This method allows a high degree of engagement between Council and respondents and enables consideration of service innovation and change in both the pre-release of contract information and proposals; through the negotiation period; and into the contract process itself.
Contract attributes and weightings will be carefully formulated in consultation with Council to ensure values, expectations and outcomes are factored and achieved. This will include how the application of attributes and weightings are presented so as not to disadvantage smaller, local participants.

A review of Council’s Procurement Policy indicates no issues with this approach.

**Evaluation Criteria**

An example of evaluation criteria across all streams is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Weight %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Impact</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology and Resources</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Skills</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Safety</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Local Impact**

A “Local Impact” criterion statement is suggested to encompass both local-based operators who may potentially bid, and also to cover larger operators, potentially out of the region, to signal Council’s interest in employment of local staff and community groups along with the demonstration of a local presence.

**Innovation**

“Innovation” is an opportunity for contractors to demonstrate and showcase areas of technology, systems and processes that have been introduced to other municipal contracts to deliver an optimised service. It is also an opportunity for contractors to propose or comment on future technological impacts during the course of the contract term and how these could be factored. Items could include RFID and bin tracking technology; GPS tracking and other in-cab technology to provide real-time data to council; road network issues relayed to the council call centre as an integrated request for service process; reporting methodology; materials processing opportunities, etc.
Evaluation and Price Quality Methodology

Council is familiar with the Price Quality Methodology (PQM) of assessment evaluation as per the NZTA recognised process and has used this in transport and roading contract evaluations. A full disclosure of the PQM process is available from NZTA.

Under PQM, tenders are first evaluated on non-price attributes, with this process conducted blind to the price proposal. Once the non-price evaluation is completed, the differences in the aggregate non-price score are converted into a "Supplier Quality Premium" (SQP), based on an estimate for the procurement, determined prior to the evaluation process. The SQP is then deducted from the total price for each proposal and the proposals are then ranked lowest net price first.

It is recommended that a Price Quality Methodology is used for the waste procurement proposals.

Evaluation Team

The evaluation team will consist of the following senior officers and will be consistent across all procurement streams:

- Manager: Utilities and Roading;
- Solid Waste Asset Manager:
- Infrastructure Strategy Manager
- Senior Consultant, Morrison Low and Associates Ltd;
- Independent Probity Officer (to be assigned).

The evaluation of all proposals will be led independently with this forming part of the Morrison Low procurement support proposal. This degree of independence supports a robust and transparent approach to a procurement function of this scale that meets all probity requirements.
Procurement Timeframes

Procurement timeframes are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Delivery/Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council Approvals</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement Strategy approval</td>
<td>July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council approval of final LTP and WMMP</td>
<td>June 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council approval of contract terms and documentation (report deadline 25 July)</td>
<td>August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council approval of Contracts</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Procurement process</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop procurement strategy</td>
<td>May – June 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplier engagement sessions ahead of procurement</td>
<td>July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Request for Proposal (RFP) documentation</td>
<td>June-July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for Proposals in market</td>
<td>August-September 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of RFPs</td>
<td>October 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final due diligence and contract finalisation</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award contract</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract mobilisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of mobilisation plan with contractor</td>
<td>January 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place plant and equipment orders, including new bins - contractor</td>
<td>January 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication with community on service changes</td>
<td>April-June 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor staff induction/ familiarisation</td>
<td>June 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New bin deliveries to households</td>
<td>June 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New contract(s) commence</td>
<td>July 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contract Process

**Contract Term**

Council has expressed a preference for contract terms to be based around a 7-year period. A separate paper covers the pros and cons of a 7-year term but it is practical to align collection contracts based on the likely lifespan of critical equipment such as collection trucks.

Refuse Transfer Station operating contracts are not predicated on the supplier or contractor providing capital for construction or development, and therefore a 7-year base contract period is also appropriate.

Supplier briefing sessions, held prior to the release of procurement documentation, will provide a forum where contract term is discussed or proposed so that this can be built into the contract scope. Any alterations to council requirements can be dealt with through supplier proposals as part of the RFP process.
Contract Form

Council has previously used, and has legally reviewed, Contract Form NZ3910:2013, which is typically used in the Building and Civil Engineering Construction field.

NZS3917 is a further development of this contract form and is intended to be used when the contract is for the provision of work or services over a fixed term, as distinct from a fixed scope of work. Standards NZ provide a comprehensive comparison and differences between these contract forms.

It would seem appropriate to extend the legal review to the use of NZS3917 as it will likely be used as the format for other Council contracts wider than this waste procurement.

Council also has experience with the NEC3 Contract form, as does the waste contracting industry, and while this remains a viable option, the flexibility and familiarity around NZS3917 could suggest that the NEC format is now unnecessary in this context. Simpson Grierson provides a simple comparison between NZS3917 and NEC3 as follows:

https://www.simpsongrierson.com/articles/2014/nzs-3917-or-nec3-tsc-which-term-service-contract-to-use

Contract form NZ3917 is recommended for use across all waste services contracts.

Performance Measurement and Management

Council is keen on developing and supporting a relationship-based approach to service delivery and contractor engagement and monitoring. A punitive approach through financial disincentives of contract management for KPI failure alone does not sit comfortably with a relationship-based structure. These disincentives are rarely enforced or, when they are, are difficult and complex to administer. The contract should be administered under a collaborative governance approach but contain appropriate and sufficient Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) which are unambiguous, reliable from a monitoring and reporting perspective, and time-bound.

A Collaborative Contract Governance approach provides a method of contract management that encourages innovation and fosters continuous improvement through the life of the contract. Where established with meaningful and clear terms of reference, a cross-party governance structure (council and contractor) ensures issues are resolved effectively; changes are implemented efficiently; and all stakeholders are informed and aware of what is expected of them to avoid unnecessary escalation.

We would expect that opportunities for innovation and resulting service enhancement would sit within a collaborative governance approach. A recommendation for this collaborative approach should be addressed initially at supplier briefings, and then brought into the contract form.

Asset Ownership - Bins

The Solid and Hazardous Waste Working Party has agreed (May 2018) that the ownership of the bins may sit with the contractor. However, alternative bids are to be allowed for which provide for council ownership of the bins as an option. This is so as not to disadvantage respondents who may have difficulty in financing the cost of bins and their on-going maintenance and distribution.

Alternative bids will therefore be factored into the evaluation assessment.
Community Group Partnerships

Council will be mindful of both the opportunities and challenges of engaging community groups or sectors in, potentially, harmful industrial environments. Direct control and management of community group activity in the Resource Recovery Park, for example, needs to be conscious of the legislative requirements and potential liability of the Health and Safety in Employment Act, and potentially other areas of employment law.

As an example, where the Transfer Station operation is contracted out, an option is to consider and potentially encourage commercial contractor engagement and management of the community sector, providing day to day management, and welfare, of all personnel on site.

A separate report has been provided to cover the Operation and Maintenance of the Refuse Transfer Stations, both with and without community group involvement.

Processing and Down-Stream Partners

Supplier briefings prior to procurement document release can be extended to other stakeholders to gain an understanding of the competitive relevant markets and challenges of these. This could include glass processors; card and paper fibre processors; metal processors; general recyclables processors and traders. This engagement is useful where council seeks to engage in a “Risk and Reward” contract for saleable items in both a domestic and international marketplace.

Both price volatility and market restrictions in the international recyclables market will signal a critical look at the investment and involvement Council wishes to have in terms of waste stream ownership.

A total product stewardship approach would see Council directly involved in ownership so as to influence the placement of product and the processing or on-sale result. The cost of this is the investment required in playing the domestic and international commodities market (metal / plastic / compost etc).

The RFP process can seek market options for product ownership and risk-sharing mechanisms which may further reinforce or secure a position by Council.

Irrespective of this feedback, there are mechanisms within the contract which can allow council to participate, or otherwise, in a Risk and Reward approach.

Associated asset, customer and waste data management

It is important for Council to have access to asset, customer and waste data /trend information. The Contractor will be required to collate and maintain asset and waste related data and make this available to council in as close to “real time” as possible to ensure council is familiar with its customers, and their ongoing needs, and the move towards achieving its Waste Management and Minimisation targets.

Contracts will not directly specify proprietary in-cab, electronic chip, or database technologies, but will require these to be able to interface with Council’s Enterprise Systems.

The ability to access web-based, real-time, information and based on in-cab/vehicle camera footage may also be available.
Waste monitoring and education

A function of the collection contracts will be the monitoring, reporting and management of contamination in each waste stream. Contractors will be required to provide and factor resourcing - both in-cab and separate to the collection vehicle – to reduce bin / bag contamination and to optimise diversion opportunities as per the WMMP objectives.

Approvals

This Procurement Strategy outlines the objectives and notes the intent of the procurement process to achieve a 1 July 2019 commencement of waste services across the region. While there is separation between processes and waste streams, an integrated approach will be taken to contract standardisation, evaluation and assessment in order to factor the advantages of end-to-end handling (collection to disposal for example) or to agree and understand the consequences of a contract action on a down-stream process.

Once Council has approved contract form, term, evaluation and assessment criteria, and requirements of contractors based on draft contract forms, there is not likely to be any significant change to approach given the limited timeframe to go to market. Council is then in a monitoring role until the contract award recommendations are presented in December 2018.
Our Reference: SHW-16-02 / 180618067296

18 June 2018

<Names>
<Address>
<Town & postcode>

Dear <Names>

Kerbside bins are coming!
We’re introducing the ‘Your Choice’ kerbside collection service, and we need you to tell us what service you want for your property at <property address> before Friday 3 August 2018.

We need this information so we’ll be ready to deliver the right bins to the right properties before the new service rolls out on 1 July 2019. We also want to ensure the correct rates are set for your property and the businesses tendering for the kerbside contracts will have an idea of the bin numbers they’ll be dealing with.

You can find more information about the offered services in the enclosed Q&A’s and further information is also available on our website.

You can make your choice in two ways:
Online: Visit waimakariri.govt.nz/yourchoice. Enter this unique code, <unique code>, make your selections and click submit.

Post: We’ve enclosed a freepost card that has your property’s identification details preloaded. Simply make your selection and drop it into the post box or any Council Service Centre.

Landlords
As the ratepayer, you are the only person who can submit choices for the kerbside collection services as the chosen services will directly affect your rates. Your tenants may wish to talk to you about their preferred choice and may be willing to pay extra for a bin service. We encourage you to talk to them before you make the final choice.

If you own several properties or flats inside the kerbside collection area, you’ll have received a card for each individual property or flat. Please tell us what your kerbside collection choice is for each property.

Recycling only collection area
In the extended Ohoka collection area, we currently only collect recycling. A rubbish collection service will be available to properties in this area as part of the new kerbside service. Please let us know if you would like to have a fortnightly rubbish collection.

We’ll be in touch again

<Property ID>
We'll send you a confirmation letter shortly before the service begins next year, so we can ensure that we have recorded your collection service choices correctly and to capture any changes. This letter will most likely be sent with the quarterly rates demand, and we ask that you check it carefully at that time.

Find out more

Q&A's are enclosed to help with any questions you might have about the new kerbside collection service. It covers the process for making your choice and details when the new collection service will start. More information can also be found online at waimakariri.govt.nz/yourchoice

If you have any questions, please visit our website or call us on 0800 965 468.

Yours faithfully

Kitty Waghorn
Solid Waste Asset Manager
Tell us the organics and/or rubbish collection service you would like

You currently pay an annual rate for your recycling collection, and will continue to do so regardless of any additional choices you select. Choose what you want online at waimakariri.govt.nz/yourchoice or make your selection below.

**RUBBISH COLLECTION – Collected Fortnightly (select one)***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Additional Annual Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continue using WDC rubbish bag collection ($3 per bag) or non-Council service for rubbish</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80L rubbish bin</td>
<td>$95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140L rubbish bin</td>
<td>$125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ORGANICS COLLECTION – Collected Weekly (select one)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Additional Annual Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No organics bin</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80L organics bin</td>
<td>$80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140L organics bin</td>
<td>$110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240L organics bin</td>
<td>$160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Solid Waste Asset Manager
Waimakariri District Council
Private Bag 1005
Rangiora 7440

Kerbside Bins are coming...
make your choice
KERBSIDE COLLECTION

Kerbside bins are coming in July 2019.
Want to know more about making your choice? Here's some Q&A's explaining the new service coming to the Waimakariri District.

**Q&A's**

**Why are you asking me this now when you won't be starting the service for another year?**

We want to get a good idea how many properties will be getting bins, and the type and size of the bins, so that when we tender for the new services we can be reasonably clear about the number of properties to be serviced.

**How do I tell you what I want?**

Two ways:
- Online: go to waimakariri.govt.nz/yourchoice. You will need the unique code shown on the enclosed card and letter.
- Post: fill in the enclosed card and post it back to us for free.

**What if I want to make a change to my selection?**

We will be writing to you again in early 2019 to ask if the service choice you have recorded for your property is still correct, and to provide an opportunity for you to make changes. If you want to change your choice earlier than that, you can go online and make your choice again. This will update our records with your most recent choice.

**What will happen if I don't tell you what service I want?**

You won't get any additional bins and you won't be rated for the extra service. We want to hear back from you even if you don't want an additional service, to ensure our records are accurate and so that we don't send you further reminders.

**What can I choose if I have a granny flat on my property?**

If you have filled out a multi dwelling declaration form telling us that the second dwelling or granny flat is not let, you will only get the choice of getting one bin for rubbish and/or one bin for organics. If the second dwelling is rented out, you will be able to choose a bin or bins for one or both dwellings.
If you have any questions that aren’t answered here, visit waimakariri.govt.nz/yourchoice or contact our Customer Service Team on 0800 965 468.
# Communications Action Plan – Your Choice Kerbside Collection Service

During the bin selection phase of the project, communication tools will be adapted as required to meet the project requirements. The below plan is an overview of the tools and tactics that will be used to encourage ratepayers in the kerbside collection area to make their bin choice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community &amp; Stakeholder Engagement:</th>
<th>Mail-out to every ratepayer in the kerbside collection area (approx. 17,000 properties)</th>
<th>Addressed letter DLE selection card with freepost Question and answers info sheet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pop-up stands</td>
<td></td>
<td>Information and bins located outside local supermarkets prompting people to make their choice. Tablets will be available for people to make selections online.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal contact with important stakeholders such as private bin companies, retirement villages, Schools, Grey Power and others</td>
<td></td>
<td>Solid Waste Team to make contact as required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Media & Advertising:                | News articles on Council website                                                       | 1. First article to promote the mail out 'call to action'. Also promote online option by linking to web page.  
2. Second article encouraging people to make their choice before 6 August.  
Include headline in carousel on home page to give visibility. |
|                                    | Regular newspaper adverts throughout selection period. Include 'Bins are Coming' material reaching letterboxes soon and general adverts calling for action. | Northern Outlook alternating with North Canterbury News and Kaiapoi Advocate weekly.  
1x in the following: Woodend Woodepecker Oxford Bulletin Oxford Observer |
|                                    | Posters for Service Centres and Libraries.                                             | Advertise webpage and community drop-in sessions.                                |
|                                    | Video produced for social media                                                        | Animated video produced and boosted at start & end of selection period.           |
|                                    | Regular social media posts                                                             | Once a week and to promote pop ups or as required.                                |
|                                    | Information page & selection form on Council website.                                  | Include rates calculator and link to rates information page.                     |
|                                    | Digital information Screens                                                            | Screen slide promoting Your Choice on Council Service Centre screens              |
### Advertising schedule and budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Detail</th>
<th>Publication Date</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animated Video – Social Media</td>
<td>Boost on Facebook</td>
<td>From early July</td>
<td></td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Outlook (Community Noticeboard) Pre letter-box promo</td>
<td>Approx quarter page advert</td>
<td>Friday 29 June</td>
<td>Tuesday 26 June</td>
<td>$60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Woodpecker</td>
<td>Full page B&amp;W advert</td>
<td>Early July</td>
<td>Thursday 28 June</td>
<td>$80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Bulletin</td>
<td>Full page advert</td>
<td>Thursday 5 July</td>
<td>Friday 29 June</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Outlook (Community Noticeboard) Approx quarter page advert</td>
<td>Friday 6 July</td>
<td>Tuesday 4 July</td>
<td></td>
<td>$60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Advocate</td>
<td>Quarter page advert</td>
<td>Friday 13 July</td>
<td>Monday 9 July</td>
<td>$260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The News</td>
<td>Quarter page advert</td>
<td>Thursday 12 July</td>
<td>Tuesday 10 July</td>
<td>$350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Outlook (Community Noticeboard) Approx quarter page advert</td>
<td>Friday 20 July</td>
<td>Tuesday 17 July</td>
<td></td>
<td>$60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Observer</td>
<td>Quarter page colour advert</td>
<td>Saturday 28 July</td>
<td>20 July</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animated Video</td>
<td>Facebook boost Pre-letter box promo</td>
<td>Wednesday 27 July</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The News</td>
<td>Quarter page advert</td>
<td>Thursday 26 July</td>
<td>Tuesday 23 July</td>
<td>$350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Advocate</td>
<td>Quarter page advert</td>
<td>Friday 27 July</td>
<td>Monday 23 July</td>
<td>$260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Outlook (Community Noticeboard) Final call to action</td>
<td>Approx quarter page advert</td>
<td>Friday 3 August</td>
<td>31 July</td>
<td>$60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL (approx.)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$2090</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Timeline of tasks

18/06/2018
- Final artwork to Caxton
- Animated video launched on Facebook
- Caxton set up and print
- NZ Post receive and collate
- News article for web
- Post arrives in letterboxes
- Community Noticeboard - Northern Outlook
- Community Noticeboard - Northern Outlook
- Community Noticeboard - Northern Outlook
- Kaiapoi Advocate Quarter Page Advert
- The News North Canty Advert
- The News North Canty Advert
- Kaiapoi Advocate Quarter Page Advert
- Woodend Woodpecker Full Page - Early July
- Oxford Bulletin - July 20
- Oxford Observer - July Publication
- Website goes live
- Pop up stand Rangiora New World
- Pop up stand Pak’nSave
- Pop up stand Kaiapoi New World
- Pop up stand Kaiapoi Countdown
- News article - Your Choice generic promotion
- Posters sent to Service Centres
- Digital information screen live
- Community Noticeboard - Northern Outlook
- Social Media Posts pre and during feedback period

24/06/2018

30/06/2018

6/07/2018

12/07/2018

18/07/2018

24/07/2018

30/07/2018

5/08/2018

11/08/2018

17/08/2018
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1 A budget of $100,000 has been allocated for the 2018/19 financial year to carry out improvement works on the Kaiapoi well heads in order to enable them to be re-certified as secure following their 5 yearly assessment which is due in August 2018.

1.2 On 25 June 2018 a report went to Management Team to engage G&T Construction to carry out works on four of the six primary Kaiapoi well heads to the value of $99,933 (refer attached report 180621068869).

1.3 It was identified that in order to complete works on the remaining two well heads, and allow project contingency, an additional $80,000 of funding would be required.

1.4 This report requests that Council allocate the additional funding required, and approve the engagement of G&T Construction to undertake these works without competitively tendering the works.

1.5 The reason for the proposed direct engagement of G&T Construction is due to their expertise, the criticality of the works, the significant consequences if security is not re-certified, the good value presented by their quote, and their availability.

1.6 This will allow upgrades on all six primary wells to be completed by mid-August 2018, such that the secure status of the wells can be maintained.

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council

(a) **Receives** report No. 180621068890.

(b) **Approves** an increase to the Kaiapoi Well Head Improvement capital budget from $100,000 to $180,000 in the 2018/19 financial year to allow for the full required scope to be completed.
Approves staff to engage G&T Construction to undertake well head security works at Darnley Square and Rugby Park to the value of $62,728.

Notes that the reason for not publicly tendering the works is due to the specialised nature of the works, the expertise and availability of the contractor, the competitive price received and the criticality of the works given the likely consequences if security is not maintained for the scheme.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 The background and information presented in the body of this report is the same as the information presented to Management Team in report 180621068869 requesting their approval to engage G&T Construction for the first four well heads (those that could be done within the available budget).

3.2 The Council currently achieves compliance with the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand on the majority of its schemes through having secure groundwater sources (Woodend, Pegasus, Cust, Oxford Urban, Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Ohoka).

3.3 The Woodend, Kaiapoi, Oxford Urban and West Eyreton schemes are all due for reassessments for security in August 2018.

3.4 In recent times a higher level of scrutiny has been placed on reassessments for security. Of particular note is Christchurch City which lost its secure status in early 2018, due to questions about the security of its well heads. In particular concerns were raised regarding the security of the below ground well heads. This resulted in Christchurch chlorinating its water until such time that work can be done to upgrade the well heads and security regained.

3.5 In order to address the risk of one of Council’s schemes losing its secure status due to an underground well head, budget has been allowed for in Woodend and Kaiapoi to carry out improvements to the existing below ground well heads to ensure the secure status can be maintained. The budgets allowed for are $25,000 for the one below ground well head in Woodend, and $100,000 initially identified for the four below ground well heads in Kaiapoi.

3.6 In June 2018 G&T Construction were engaged for $22,509.00 to carry out upgrades to the Gladstone Park No.2 Well. This is due to be completed by the end of June 2018 (refer to report 180530059691).

3.7 G&T Construction were selected for this work as they have the most recent, local experience working with critical infrastructure, underground concrete structures and undertaking well head modifications for Christchurch City Council. They have also confirmed that they have the availability to undertake the works immediately.

3.8 Other contractors who have been selected through an expression of interest process for constructing new above ground well heads were Clemence Drilling Limited, WaterForce and ARC Construction. G&T were selected as the most appropriate of these four contractors for this below ground well head work due to the combination of experience with water supply infrastructure (including wells), but more specifically below ground concrete structures that is of particular relevance to this work.

3.9 The scope of work considered at each site includes a combination of the following items:
a. Raise chamber cover level by adding manhole riser
b. Install new chamber lid with lockable cover and frame
c. Seal joints within concrete structure
d. Enlarge sump and lower sump pump in bottom of chamber
e. Clean well casing and re-coat exterior surfaces of pipework
f. Re-bench manhole floor to convey moisture away from well casing and towards sump
g. Check/re-grout around well casing
h. Replace/re-locate air valves and associated infrastructure to above ground position or high level (under new concrete lid) in chamber
i. Remove and test check valve on well head pipework
j. Replace well head check valve and install pipe bellows for improved earthquake resilience.
k. Replace grass around well head with AC or Concrete pad to shed water away from chamber and eliminate the requirement for mowing and spraying.
l. Install well head chamber breather pipe with vermin and insect proof mesh.
m. Seal electrical and telemetry conduits and cable ducts.

3.10 In addition to the work proposed on the four primary below ground well heads in Kaiapoi, it was identified that work is required on the two above ground well heads as well. This includes reinstating concrete aprons at both Peraki Street and Porter Place, installing security fencing at Porter Place, and testing or replacing non-return valves (among other minor items).

3.11 Since the award of the Gladstone Park improvements to G&T, the contractor has confirmed that they are still on track to meet their original programme for the improvements at this site. This has given staff an increased level of confidence regarding their ability to carry out future works of this nature within a tight timeframe.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. Well heads are critical assets within the Council's portfolio and any works proposed must be undertaken by competent contractors who fully understand and can demonstrate experience with well heads, concrete structures and civil works.

4.2. The consequence of the wells losing their secure status would likely be a requirement to chlorinate the water until security can be regained (based on the precedence set in Christchurch). This would have a significant impact on the public's perception of their water, given the strong opposition to chlorination that has been voiced within this district when the public have been consulted on this, as well as in Christchurch more recently.

4.3. Further, the need to permanently chlorinate the water supplies of Woodend and Kaiapoi would have a significant financial implication. The chlorination systems set up at present are only set up for emergency short term chlorination, and further works would be required to allow for chlorine storage facilities to a standard required if this were to be implemented on a permanent basis.
4.4. It can therefore be concluded that the consequence of losing secure status would be significant both financially, and in terms of implications to the public. It is therefore critical that the most suitably qualified contractor is used to give Council the best chance of avoiding this situation.

4.5. Staff have recently undertaken a formal expression of interest process to identify contractors who are suitable to undertake the construction of new above ground well heads. Four contractors were identified through this process (ARC Construction, Clemence Drilling Limited, G&T Construction and WaterForce).

4.6. Of these four contractors deemed as suitable for works on above ground well heads consideration has been given to the additional skills required to undertake works on below ground well heads, and which of these contractors would be best suited to this work. In particular this requires a contractor with skills and experience with making underground concrete structures water tight, and with undertaking modifications to existing pipework.

4.7. G&T Construction have the most recent, local experience working with critical infrastructure, underground concrete structures and undertaking well head modifications. They have also confirmed that they have the availability to undertake the works immediately.

4.8. G&T were therefore approached to submit a price to undertake works on the six Kaiapoi well heads. This price has then been split into two separable portions of work to allow them to be engaged to commence works on four of the six well heads immediately with the existing budget of $100,000, and then the remaining two more challenging higher cost well heads with an additional $80,000 of budget that is requested.

4.9. The split of works and completion times is outlined below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Price Submitted</th>
<th>Budget Available / to be Requested</th>
<th>Proposed Award Date</th>
<th>Programmed Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Separable Portion A (Porter Place, Peraki Street, Ashley Place, Davies Street)</td>
<td>$99,993</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>25 June (following MT approval)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separable Portion B (Darnley Square and Rugby Park)</td>
<td>$62,728</td>
<td>$80,000 (to be requested at 3 July Council meeting)</td>
<td>4 July (following Council award of budget)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$162,661</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td>17/08/2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.10. It is recommended that approval be given to engage G&T Construction directly to undertake the proposed works on Kaiapoi well heads for the following reasons:

4.10.1. G&T Construction are assessed as the most suitably qualified contractor to complete these works. Given the criticality of the works, and the consequences if the works are not successful, it is considered of highest priority that the works are completed by the most qualified and competent contractor available.

4.10.2. Their price has been assessed as representing good value. As there are no directly applicable tendered rates for work of this nature, the price submitted was assessed from first principles as a sum of plant, labour and materials. The conclusion from this assessment is that the price submitted is a fair reflection of the genuine costs to complete the work.

4.10.3. G&T Construction have provided a programme confirming that they are available to undertake the works immediately and achieve completion of the works within August, when the security assessment is due.
4.10.4. Any alternative option would add time to the programme likely resulting in the works not being completed by the August deadline, and it is considered unlikely that this would result in a better outcome in terms of the balance of quality of work and cost.

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

The Council’s Drinking Water Assessor has been informed of the proposed scope of works and did not raise any concerns. While this does not guarantee the outcome of the final assessment, it does give a greater degree of confidence that the scope will be considered appropriate.

No groups or organisations within the community have been consulted regarding these works, as they just involve carrying out improvements to existing infrastructure.

5.2. Wider Community

While the wider community has not been given the opportunity to provide feedback on these works, strong feedback has been given in the past opposing the chlorination of water, which would likely be the outcome of these works not taking place or the works being unsuccessful.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

Initially a budget of $100,000 was set to undertake these works based on an estimated cost of $25,000 per underground well head in Kaiapoi and four primary underground wells. It is now proposed that the budget be increased to a total budget of $180,000. The reasons for the increased budget are:

- **More Wells Require Work:** Works have been identified as being required on the two above ground well heads in Kaiapoi that were previously not considered when setting the budget, as only the below ground wells were initially considered.

- **Cost per Well Greater than Initial Estimate:** The rate of $25,000 per well head is suitable for some sites, however at some sites the total cost of works required was greater when site specific consideration was given. This included the need for dewatering at some sites, and challenges fitting new valving within existing chambers in some cases. Therefore, on average, the rate of $25,000 per site that was suitable in the case of Woodend, was not suitable for Kaiapoi.

There is currently a budget available from 1 July 2018 of $100,000 to undertake these works (Kaiapoi Well Head Improvements). It is requested that this budget be increased to $180,000 to allow for the full scope of works to be completed (to the value of $162,661) including allowance for contingency.

It is noted that there are other well heads within the district that may require consideration of further work at a later date. In particular, there are underground or partially underground well heads supplying Rangiora and Cust. While these have been signed off as secure recently (prior to when the increased scrutiny of the standards has been applied), there may be additional works that could improve their safety further. Consideration will be given to this meaning that there may be a future request for more budget, however the same urgency is not required for these sites as they are not due for reassessment until 2022.
6.2. Community Implications

The proposed works will increase the safety of the Kaiapoi water supply by increasing the security of the well heads, and will provide the best opportunity for the scheme to retain its secure status following assessment in August 2018.

6.3. Risk Management

It has been assessed that if this project is not successful, there is a risk of the scheme losing its secure status and needing to be chlorinated. In order to mitigate this risk, the most qualified contractor available is proposed to be engaged directly.

There is still a residual risk that the below ground well heads may not retain their secure status. Consideration could have been given to raising all well heads above ground, however this would have come at a significantly higher cost and would not have been achievable by the August deadline.

It is noted that the secure classification section of the current Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand is recommended to be abolished by the Havelock North Drinking-water Inquiry Stage 2 report. As a result Council has budgeted to install UV treatment on all its supplies that currently rely on the secure classification section of the current standards for compliance.

Therefore, it would be considered to be over-investment in the short term to raise all well heads above ground to give an even higher chance of the secure classification being retained given this entire ‘secure’ section of the standards is proposed to be abolished. It is considered a preferable strategy in terms of balancing risk and cost to improve the sealing of the existing well heads at a moderate cost in the short term, with the expectation to implement UV treatment in the medium term.

6.4. Health and Safety

The contractor has visited site and observed the location and infrastructure. The contractor has provided a high level methodology/programme, including procuring all specials (pipe and lid) prior to starting on site, and will provide pre-start deliverables (including SSSP). Council staff propose to monitor works closely and undertake weekly H&S audits.

7. CONTEXT

7.1. Policy

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

Council Policy S-CP 4160 Purchasing (including tendering) Policy requires that contracts are put out to competitive tender or, where practical, three prices are sought where the value of work is greater than $20,000. In this instance multiple prices were not sought for the following reasons:

- The work is of a specialised nature, and an experienced contractor both with water supply infrastructure and underground concrete structures is required. There are limited options for a contractor with such experience and skills
- G&T Construction have provided a price that is very similar to the Engineer’s Estimate, is considered to represent good value, and are available immediately.
- It is considered unlikely that a better outcome would be achieved by tendering the works externally, and this would add time and cost to the project.
7.2. **Legislation**

The Health (Drinking-water) Amendment Act is relevant in this matter, which requires that Council take all practicable steps to comply with the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand.

In accordance with the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand (DWSNZ), the security of all water supply wells needs to be assessed by an expert in well head security assessments every five years.

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

The following community outcomes are relevant:

- There is a safe environment for all
- There is a healthy and sustainable environment for all
- Core utility services are provided in a timely and sustainable manner
- Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality

7.4. **Delegations**

The Council has the delegated authority to increase the budget as recommended.
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Council’s decision to submit in support or opposition to the Trustees proposal to retain 100% of the Distributable Capital of MainPower Trust.

1.2. Under the terms of the Trust Deed of MainPower Trust, Trustees are required every six years to prepare a Report reviewing whether or not it is in the best interest of Beneficiaries for the capital of the Trust to continue to be held in whole or in part in the Trust or to distribute all or some of the capital on behalf of the Trust’s Beneficiaries. Previous reviews have not resulted in any capital distribution and ownership being retained by the Trust on behalf of the Beneficiaries.

1.3. This report recommends that the Council submits in support of the Trustees proposal to retain 100% of the Distributable Capital of MainPower Trust.

**Attachments:**

(i) Summary Capital Distribution Review (Trim 180621069250)

(ii) Detail Capital Distribution Review (Trim 180622069647)

2. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report № 180621069047

(b) **Resolves** to submit to the MainPower Trust in support of the Trustees proposal to retain 100% of the Distributable Capital with the MainPower Trust.

(c) **Authorises** the Chief Executive Officer to sign and submit the submission.
3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1. Under the terms of the Deed of the MainPower Trust, Trustees are required every six years to prepare a Report reviewing whether or not it is in the best interest of Beneficiaries for the capital of the Trust to continue to be held in whole or in part in the Trust, or to distribute all or some of this capital in the best interests of the Trust’s Beneficiaries. The Council has always supported retaining 100% of the Distributable Capital with the MainPower Trust.

3.2. Previous reviews have not resulted in any capital distribution.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. The Directors of MainPower New Zealand Limited, “on the 20 March 2018 resolved unanimously that it is in the best interests of Beneficiaries for the MainPower Trust to continue to hold 100% of the distributable capital of the Trust”.

4.2. In coming to this conclusion the Trustees have stated that they have “reviewed and considered the technological challenges facing the Company going forward the opportunities that these challenges present and the financial and operational performance of the company and its subsidiary”.

4.3. The report examined 4 options:

- 100% Trust Ownership (Status quo);
- Distribution or sale of 24% (retains control over constitution and distribution) or 49% of shares (allows the Trust to retain outright control)
- Distribution of 100% of shares (allows an interested party possible control);
- Sale of 100% of shares (tests the market for interest for sale and passes proceeds to beneficiaries)

PWC have carried out a review of the options and determined the following:

“Given the current performance and current absence of significant drivers for change (such as new investment opportunities unable to be financed from borrowing or an erosion of core business prospects), we consider that the Trust ownership model represents value for the beneficiaries (both present and future) and should, therefore, be continued”.

4.4. The advantages and disadvantages of the capital distribution are outlined in the proposal.

4.5. From the Council’s viewpoint, on balance, it is more favourable to retain the current structure and ownership at this time. The Council would agree with the key reasons the Trustees have identified, particularly the need for stability to ensure that the Company is focused on addressing the growth-related issues in the region. In addition to these reasons, we would observe that:

- MainPower New Zealand Limited is a very good corporate citizen making a very positive contribution to the community in a number of ways. This includes sponsorships, supporting economic development and investigating options for local generation initiatives, as well as advocating on community issues from time to time. A major change in ownership may see a shift in company focus.
• The rebate provides ongoing benefit to consumers while they remain a resident. If the distribution were to occur, with district turnover of the residents of say up to 10% per annum, it would mean that those who are resident at the time of the distribution benefit and those that have just left or are due to arrive miss out.

• Currently, customers in the old Kaiapoi Electricity Limited area receive the equivalent benefit of other MainPower customers, in that their net line charges equate to others in the district. If the distribution occurs the people in the old KEL network area would not be eligible to receive a distribution as they are outside the defined MainPower area. They would then be worse off, as the line charge rebate scheme would be removed.

4.6. If the capital distribution proceeded, the MainPower Foundation would be formed. Potentially funds would be available to apply to the community for charitable purposes. Indirectly this could provide a substantial benefit to the community, albeit the beneficiaries include customers in the Hurunui and Kaikoura districts. This aspect certainly has a lot of appeal, but on balance does not outweigh the benefits of retaining the status quo, at this time.

4.7. Submissions close on 27 July and the trustees will hear submissions on 14 August with a decision to be made by 21 August.

4.8. The Council could:

A  Make a submission and state:
   o  It Supports the proposal; or
   o  It Opposes the proposal

B  Not make a submission on the proposal.

4.9. The Management Team has reviewed this report.

5.  COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

The Council has a role to advocate on community issues where it relates to one of the community’s outcomes. The particular outcome that this proposal relates to is:

There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision making that effects our District
   o  The Council makes known its views on significant proposals by others affecting the District’s wellbeing.
6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

The outcome has little impact on the Council, albeit it is a customer and has similar interests as other customers.

6.2. **Community Implications**

If the MainPower Foundation was formed then potentially funds could be available to apply to the community for charitable purposes. Indirectly this could provide a substantial benefit to the community. However the status quo also provides substantial benefits to the community through grants and support of local events.

6.3. **Risk Management**

Not applicable.

6.4. **Health and Safety**

Not applicable.

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

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

7.2. **Legislation**

Not applicable.

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

There are wide ranging opportunities for people of different ages to participate in community and recreational activities.

7.4. **Delegations**

The Council can make this decision or may delegate this decision to the Mayor and/or Chief Executive.

---

Jeff Millward  
Manager Finance & Business Support
Capital Distribution Review

Under the terms of the Deed of Trust of the MainPower Trust, Trustees are required to prepare a Review Report every six years to consider whether it is in the best interest of Beneficiaries for the capital of the Trust Fund to continue to be held in whole or in part in the Trust or to distribute all or some of this capital to the Trust’s Beneficiaries. Previous reviews have not resulted in any distribution of capital.

Approximately 97% of the capital of the Trust Fund is represented by the Trust’s 100% ownership of MainPower New Zealand Limited, (the “Company”). This is the Trust’s only significant investment. The Company owns and operates the electricity distribution network throughout the North Canterbury and Kaikoura regions.

On 20 March 2018 the Trustees resolved unanimously that it is in the best interests of Beneficiaries for the MainPower Trust to continue to hold 100% of the distributable capital of the Trust.

The Trustees must consult the Trust’s Beneficiaries on the Capital Distribution Review Proposal that they have approved.

Beneficiaries include “Qualifying Customers”, who are the customers of the Company whose premises are connected to the Company’s electricity distribution network and who take line services from the Company, with one main exception. Customers whose premises are located in that part of Kaiapoi that was previously the Kaiapoi Borough are not Beneficiaries of the Trust.

A summary of the Trustees’ Review Report may be viewed at:

- the service centre of the Waimakariri District Council;
- the service centre of the Hurunui District Council;
- the service centre of the Kaikoura District Council;
- the public libraries in Kaikoura, Oxford, Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Amberley, and Hanmer Springs;
- at the head office of MainPower New Zealand Limited, Fernside Road, Rangiora
- at the offices of the Trust Secretary at Koller and Hassall Ltd, 267 High Street, Rangiora; and

Copies of the Review Report will be available at the above offices and libraries and can also be downloaded from the MainPower Trust’s website:

https://www.mainpowertrust.org.nz/capital-distribution-review
The commercial consulting firm, PwC, of Auckland provided Trustees with independent advice in support of their review. The detailed public version of this advice may also be viewed on the MainPower Trust's website noted above.

Submissions: Qualifying Customers can make submissions to the Trustees on the Trustees' Capital Distribution Review Proposal. Qualifying Customers who wish their submissions to be heard in person will be provided the opportunity to do so at a meeting open to the public to be held on 14 August 2018. Submissions must be received no later than 27 July 2018. Submissions should be posted, faxed or emailed to the Secretary, MainPower Trust, PO Box 370, Rangiora; Fax: 03 313 4509; Email: MPT@kellerhassall.co.nz (mailto:MPT@kellerhassall.co.nz). Copies of all written submissions will be available to the public; however, your personal information will be withheld at your request.

If any Qualifying Customers would like further information to assist them with deciding whether to make a submission, please contact the Trust Secretary's office using the contact details above.

The final decision of the Trustees on the proposal, the "Review Decision" will be made at a Trustee meeting to be held on 21 August 2018 that will be open to the public. Notice of the Trustees' Review Decision will be given by:

- Making the Notice available for inspection during normal business hours at the Council service centres and libraries referred to above, the offices of the Trust Secretary, and the office of the Company, Fernside Road, Rangiora; and
- By way of a public notice in newspapers circulating in the region; and

Qualifying Customers Poll: Qualifying Customers who were on the Roll of Qualifying Customers at midnight on 9 June 2018 are provided with the opportunity, if they disagree with the Trustees' Review Decision, to ask Trustees to reconsider their Review Decision by way of a Reconsideration Poll. The Trustees' Reconsideration Decision is final.

Qualifying Customers who would like Trustees to reconsider their decision must give formal notice to the Secretary of the Trust by 11 September 2018. A valid notice will contain:

- A statement that each of the Qualifying Customers signing the notice required the Trustees to reconsider their Review Decision;
- The full name and address of each such Qualifying Customer;
- The ICP number of each such Qualifying Customers as recorded on the Qualifying Customers power account; and
- The signature of each such Qualifying Customer.

For the avoidance of doubt, the formal notice requiring a Poll may include more than one Qualifying Customer as long as each Qualifying Customer provides the above information.

Where the number of Qualifying Customers who give such notices totals at least 5% of all the Qualifying Customers, then a Reconsideration Poll will be held in accordance with the provisions of the Trust Deed.
If a Poll is requisitioned the Trustees would immediately appoint a Returning Officer who would conduct the Poll. The Reconsideration Poll will take place during October 2018 and will close on 29 October 2018. The Returning Officer would declare the result of the Poll on 3 November 2018.

Kathy Hansell
Trust Secretary
To be advertised in newspapers circulating in the North Canterbury and Kaikoura regions on,
Saturday 9 June,
Wednesday 13 June
Thursday 14 June (North Canterbury News only)
Saturday 16 June

Submission Form
This is the submission of:

Full Name *

Address *

Email *

Please select "I support" or "I oppose" for the Trustees proposal to retain 100% of the Distributable Capital of the MainPower Trust.

*  ○  I Support ○  I Oppose

My reasons are *

0/500

Upload your Submission

https://www.mainpowertrust.org.nz/capital-distribution-review
Please select if you wish to attend before the Trustees to speak to this submission.

* ☐ I wish to attend ☐ I do not want to attend

Please note that your submission will be made public – if you wish any contact details to be concealed please check the box below.

☐ Please conceal my contact details

I confirm that I am a Qualifying Customer as defined in the MainPower Trust Deed.

The ICP on my electricity account is: *

---

June 2018

<table>
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<td>14</td>
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</tr>
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</table>
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Are you human? *

I'm not a robot

By clicking the send button I agree that I have sent my submission.

Send

---
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Summary Review Report
MainPowerTrust
Capital Distribution Review
Summary Report

Under the terms of the Deed of Trust of the MainPower Trust, (the “Deed”, the “Trust”), Trustees are required every six years to prepare a Review Report reviewing whether or not it is in the best interest of Beneficiaries for the capital of the Trust Fund to continue to be held whole or in part in the Trust or to distribute all or some of this capital to the Trust’s Beneficiaries. Previous reviews have not resulted in any capital distribution.

Approximately 97% of the capital of the Trust Fund is represented by the Trust’s 100% ownership of MainPower New Zealand Limited (the “Company”). This is also the Trust’s only significant investment. The Company owns and operates the electricity distribution network throughout the North Canterbury and Kaikoura regions. In addition, the Company has a 100% interest in a relatively small meter-serving subsidiary company, Virocom Energy Management Services Limited.

The Trust’s remaining capital is represented by a balanced portfolio of other smaller investments. These total approximately 3% of the Trust Fund and include New Zealand, Australian and other international equities, fixed interest deposits and cash. This portfolio is managed by Forsyth Barr Investment Management Limited of Christchurch.

On 20 March 2018 Trustees resolved unanimously that it is in the best interests of Beneficiaries for the MainPower Trust to continue to hold 100% of the distributable capital of the Trust.

In coming to this conclusion Trustees have reviewed and have considered the technological challenges facing the Company going forward, the opportunities that these challenges present and the financial and operational performance of the Company and its subsidiary.

The Trustees have also considered the advantages and disadvantages to Beneficiaries of Trust ownership of the Trust’s 100% shareholding in the Company and other investments making up the Trust Fund, as compared to a distribution to Beneficiaries of all or part of these investments or their value.

During the Review Trustees took into account the financial and relevant electricity related advice provided by the commercial consulting firm, PricewaterhouseCoopers, (“PwC”). A copy of PwC’s summary report is attached as appendix 1.

PwC concludes at page 4 of the report as follows - “Given current performance and the current absence of significant drivers for change (such as new investment opportunities unable to be financed from borrowings or an erosion of core business prospects), we consider that the Trust ownership model represents value for Beneficiaries (both present and future) and should, therefore, be continued.”

A copy of the more detailed public version of PwC’s Full Report, although not forming part of this Summary Report, is available for inspection on the Trust’s website www.mainpowertrust.org.nz/

Detail relating to the advantages and disadvantages to Beneficiaries of Trust ownership of the Trust Fund as compared to a distribution of the Trust Fund is provided at Section 5, “Ownership Options”, pages 30-42 of PwC’s Full Report.

PwC at pages 33-34 of their Report outline the outlook for the Company and the unprecedented changes facing the Company and the electricity sector generally. A detailed analysis of the performance of the Company is available at pages 13-20 of their Report.
PwC concludes at page 43 as follows:

The Company has demonstrated sound performance through utilisation of the Trust model. Notable achievements over the period evaluated since the last review in 2012 include:

- An increase in operating revenue from $25.9m to $85.5m in the 2017 financial year;
- An increase in equity from $191.5m to $221.4m in the 2017 financial year;
- $53m in Rebates to consumers;
- Reliability of supply and restoration times which outperform other networks in the Company’s peer group, i.e., like companies;
- A gearing ratio of 13% (low for an infrastructure company).

The Company can be expected to continue to perform by the Trust:

- Setting clear direction for the Company;
- Encouraging the Company to seek opportunities for operational excellence, including access to economies of scale through collaboration;
- Establishing a culture of innovation;
- Encouraging the Company to seek out new business ventures which maximise the opportunities, and hence value, which are expected to arise as the industry embraces new technology.

Consultation: The Trustees must consult the Trust’s Beneficiaries on the Capital Distribution Review Proposal if they have approved.

Beneficiaries include “Qualifying Customers”, who are the customers of the Company whose premises are connected to the Company’s electricity distribution network and who take line services from the Company, with one main exception. Customers whose premises are located in that part of Kairaki that was previously the Kairaki Borough are not Beneficiaries of the Trust.

Submissions: Qualifying Customers can make submissions to the Trustees on the Trustees’ Capital Distribution Review Proposal. Qualifying Customers who wish their submissions to be heard in person will be provided the opportunity to do so at a meeting open to the public to be held on 14 August 2018. Submissions must be received no later than 27 July 2018. Submissions should be posted, faxed or emailed to the Secretary, MainPower Trust, PO Box 370, Rangiora; Fax: 03 313 4509; Email: MPT@kollerhassall.co.nz. Copies of all written submissions will be available to the public; however, your personal information will be withheld at your request.

If any Qualifying Customers would like further information to assist them with deciding whether to make a submission, please contact the Trust Secretary’s office using the contact details above.

The final decision of the Trustees on the Proposal, the “Review Decision” will be made at a Trustee meeting to be held on 21 August 2018 that will be open to the public. Notice of the Trustees’ Review Decision will be given by:

- Making the Notice available for inspection during normal business hours at the Council service centres and libraries referred to above, the offices of the Trustee Secretary, and the office of the Company, Fernside Road, Rangiora; and
- By way of a public notice in newspapers circulating in the region; and

Qualifying Customers Poll: Qualifying Customers who were on the Roll of Qualifying Customers at midnight on 9 June 2018 are provided with the opportunity, if they disagree with the Trustees’ Review Decision, to ask Trustees to reconsider their Review Decision by way of a Reconsideration Poll. The Trustees’ Reconsideration Decision is final.

Qualifying Customers who would like Trustees to reconsider their decision must give formal notice to the Secretary of the Trust by 11 September 2018. A valid notice will contain:

- A statement that each of the Qualifying Customers signing the notice required the Trustees to reconsider their Review Decision;
- The full name and address of each such Qualifying Customer;
- The ICP number of each such Qualifying Customer as recorded on the Qualifying Customer’s power account; and
- The signature of each such Qualifying Customer.
For the avoidance of doubt, the formal notice requiring a Poll may include more than one Qualifying Customer as long as each Qualifying Customer provides the above information.

Where the number of Qualifying Customers who give such notices totals at least 5% of all the Qualifying Customers, then a Reconsideration Poll will be held in accordance with the provisions of the Trust Deed.

If a Poll is requisitioned the Trustees would immediately appoint a Returning Officer who would conduct the Poll.

The Reconsideration Poll will take place during October 2018 and will close on 29 October 2018. The Returning Officer would declare the result of the Poll on 3 November 2018.

K W Brockfield
Chair
MainPower Trust,
On behalf of Trustees.

9 June 2018
MainPowerTrust

Appendix One:
PwC Summary Report
MainPower Trust Ownership Review - Summary Report

Dear Catherine,

We are pleased to provide our summary report which considers the performance of the MainPower Group (comprising MainPower New Zealand Limited (MainPower) and VirCom Energy Management Services Limited (VirCom)), and a review of the ownership options in respect of MainPower. This summary report has been developed for inclusion in a MainPower Trust public notice regarding the ownership review. Accompanying this summary report is a full report containing our detailed analysis and findings, the public version of which will be published on the MainPower Trust website.

This report is provided in accordance with the terms of our engagement letter dated 17 October 2017, and is subject to the restrictions set out in Appendix A. This report supersedes any previous drafts.

Yours sincerely,

Craig Rice
Partner
craigrice@nz.pwc.com
09 355 8641

Lynne Taylor
Executive Director
lynnetaylor@nz.pwc.com
09 355 8573

MainPower Trust – Ownership Review – Summary Report
PwC
price increase in the year.

VirCom's financial performance has also improved with gross margin increasing. Revenue has increased since FY12 as a result of increased smart meter volumes and a price renegotiation in FY15.

**Comparative performance**

Benchmarked against a peer group of like EDBs and industry averages, MainPower's electricity lines business has performed well during the 2013-2017 period. In particular:

- Network opex is in line with its peer group first quartile, and below the industry average. Non-network opex is similar to the peer group third quartile and industry average.
- Total opex per connection has remained relatively flat over the review period and although it exceeds the peer group third quartile, it remains below the industry average.
- Network capex was above the peer group and industry averages between 2013 and 2016, and reduced to below the averages in 2017.
- Power outages occur less often and restoration times are shorter on MainPower's network relative to the others in the peer group.
- The regulatory return on investment was in line with the peer group third quartile and above the industry average from 2013 to 2016. A reduction in FY17 reflected the absorption of Transpower's increased charges.
- Average unit prices (after rebates) fall between the first quartile and peer group and industry averages.

**Options assessment**

*Operate as a successful business.*

With **100% Trust ownership**, MainPower has demonstrated it can operate as a successful business, enjoying sustained growth in revenue and continued customer confidence. These outcomes are however dependent on strong leadership and direction, and potentially collaboration, to encourage performance excellence.

Retaining 100% control has minimal administrative costs and enables the Company to avoid heavy-handed price-quality regulation.

With **partial or full distribution or partial sale** of the Trust’s shares, MainPower could be encouraged to focus on short-term shareholder returns at the cost of long-term shareholder value for the benefit of both current and future qualifying customers and the broader community. It also raises questions about inter-generational equity, as current qualifying customers would benefit at the expense of future generations of customers. This is offset somewhat by the establishment of the MainPower Foundation which retains some funding to support the local community in the future.

This model adds administrative complexity, cost and regulatory oversight, with the Trust losing its exempt status under Part 4 of the Commerce Act. However this provides some protection for consumers through enforced price and quality standards.
In the event of a sale of 100% of shares, the Trust’s current beneficiaries crystallise the existing value of MainPower. While the establishment of the MainPower Foundation and increased regulatory oversight would provide some ongoing benefit for the community, future generations will not benefit from the entire shareholding.

**Ability to respond**

With 100% Trust ownership, MainPower has adopted a long-term focus appropriate for a large community utility. The Company’s programme of network investment funded through borrowing also demonstrates the potential to fund business change through debt.

However, with new technologies, evolving regulatory settings and more widespread and active participation in the sector, strong direction is required from the Trust. The Trust may also consider partnering or investing in new ventures to access capability, introduce innovation into the business, and expand beyond traditional services.

With partial distribution or sale of full distribution, implementing change may be harder given the difficulty achieving consensus across a broader shareholder base. There is also the possibility that short-term returns are prioritised over the business evolution required to drive long-term growth.

Under the 100% sale of shares option, this objective is no longer relevant as the Trust has no direct interest in the sector.

**Conclusion**

MainPower has demonstrated sound performance through utilisation of the Trust model. The Company can be expected to continue to perform well by the Trust:

- setting clear direction for the Company
- encouraging the Company to seek opportunities for operational excellence, including economies of scale through collaboration
- establishing a culture of innovation

Given current performance and the current absence of significant drivers for change (such as new investment opportunities unable to be financed from borrowing or an erosion of core business prospects), we consider that the Trust ownership model represents value for beneficiaries (both present and future) and should, therefore, be continued.
Appendix A – Important notice

This summary report provides an overview of the analysis and advice provided in the document ‘MainPower Ownership Review – Full Report’ submitted to MainPower Trust alongside this report. Both reports have been prepared for MainPower Trust to support the Trust’s requirements to carry out an ownership review every six years, consistent with its Trust Deed. The reports have been prepared solely for this purpose and should not be relied upon for any other purpose. We accept no liability to any party should it be used for any purpose other than that for which it was prepared.

This report can be made available for public inspection in accordance with the requirements of the MainPower Trust Deed. Apart from this noted exception, our report is not intended for general circulation, distribution or publication nor is it to be reproduced or used for any purpose without our written permission in each specific instance.

To the fullest extent permitted by law, PwC accepts no duty of care to any third party in connection with the provision of this report and/or any related information or explanation (together, the “Information”). Accordingly, regardless of the form of action, whether in contract, tort (including without limitation, negligence) or otherwise, and to the extent permitted by applicable law, PwC accepts no liability of any kind to any third party and disclaims all responsibility for the consequences of any third party acting or refraining to act in reliance on the Information.

We have not independently verified the accuracy of information provided to us, and have not conducted any form of audit in respect of the MainPower Trust or MainPower New Zealand Limited. Accordingly, we express no opinion on the reliability, accuracy, or completeness of the information provided to us and upon which we have relied.

The statements and opinions expressed herein have been made in good faith, and on the basis that all information relied upon is true and accurate in all material respects, and not misleading by reason of omission or otherwise.

The statements and opinions expressed in this report are based on information available as at the date of the report.

We reserve the right, but will be under no obligation, to review or amend our report, if any additional information, which was in existence on the date of this report, was not brought to our attention, or subsequently comes to light.

We have relied on forecasts and assumptions prepared by MainPower Trust and MainPower New Zealand Limited about future events which, by their nature, are not able to be independently verified. Inevitably, some assumptions may not materialise and unanticipated events and circumstances are likely to occur. Therefore, actual results in the future will vary from the forecasts upon which we have relied. These variations may be material.

This report is issued pursuant to the terms and conditions set out in our engagement letter dated 17 October 2017.
MainPower Trust
Submission on the 2018 Capital Distribution Review

This is the submission of:

Name: __________________________________________
Address: _________________________________________
Email: __________________________________________

I support/oppose (delete one) for the Trustees proposal to retain 100% of the Distributable Capital of the MainPower Trust.

My reasons are:
________________________________________________
________________________________________________
________________________________________________
________________________________________________

I do/do not (delete one) wish to attend before the Trustees to speak to this submission.

Please note that your submission will be made public – if you wish any contact details to be concealed please note below.

I confirm that I am a Qualifying Customer as defined in the MainPower Trust Deed.

The ICP on my electricity account is: ______________________

Signature of submitter:

Date:

PLEASE RETURN TO THE MAINPOWER TRUST SECRETARY BY 27 JULY 2018
Catherine McMillan  
Chair  
MainPower Trust  
PO Box 370  
RANGIORA 7440  

9 February 2018  

Ownership review – full report  

Dear Catherine,  

We are pleased to provide our report which considers the performance of MainPower New Zealand Limited (MainPower) and VirCom Energy Management Services Limited (VirCom), and a review of the ownership options in respect of MainPower.  

This report is provided in accordance with the terms of our engagement letter dated 17 October 2017, and is subject to the restrictions set out in Appendix A. This report supersedes any previous drafts.  

Our key findings are contained in the Executive Summary of the report.  

Yours sincerely,  

Craig Rice  
Partner  
craig.rice@nz.pwc.com  
09 355 8641  

Lynne Taylor  
Executive Director  
lynne.taylor@nz.pwc.com  
09 355 8573
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Section 1
Introduction
Introduction

This report has been prepared for the MainPower Trust ("the Trust") to support the Trust's review of its ownership of MainPower New Zealand Limited ("MainPower") and any other significant assets. The MainPower Trust’s 100% shareholding in MainPower is the only significant asset at this time, with other investments representing approximately 3% of the Trust's total investment portfolio.

Consistent with Clause 6.2 of the Trust Deed, the review report must include:

a) an analysis of the performance of and outlook for MainPower and any other significant Trust investments

b) a summary of the advantages and disadvantages to the beneficiaries of Trust ownership of MainPower's shares and other significant investments as compared to a distribution of those assets (or their value).

This report has been structured into three parts:

1. Review of the MainPower Group's performance over the last six years.

2. Review of MainPower and VirCom Energy Management Services Limited's (VirCom's) individual performance over the same period, including benchmarking performance with comparable companies.

3. Analysis of ownership options available to the Trust and its beneficiaries, including the current Trust ownership structure.

A summary of our findings is included in the Executive Summary, overleaf.

In conducting this review, PwC has relied on financial information supplied by MainPower, published information disclosure documents for electricity distribution businesses including MainPower, PwC databases and interviews with members of the MainPower Trust, MainPower board and MainPower senior management team.

MainPower Trust – Ownership Review – Full Report

PwC

February 2018
Section 2
Executive summary
Executive summary

Company overview

MainPower owns and operates the electricity distribution network which provides electricity services in the North Canterbury and Kaikoura regions.

In addition, MainPower owns VirCom, which provides qualified and registered field services capability throughout New Zealand.

MainPower Group performance

- The Group’s operating revenue increased over the review period, with revenue from both MainPower and VirCom increasing.

- The Group distributed $53m of rebates to consumers over the FY12 to FY17 period while responding to the impacts of the major earthquakes experienced within the region during this period.

- MainPower’s Rangiora offices moved to new premises in June 2014, and the Group has invested further in the Mt Cass wind farm development.

- In FY17, MainPower increased its ownership of VirCom from 77.4% to 100% following the buy-out of the minority shareholder.

VirCom

- VirCom’s financial performance has improved with gross margin increasing.

- Revenue has increased since FY12 as a result of increased smart meter volumes and a price renegotiation in FY15.

MainPower

- MainPower has undertaken a number of projects to expand network capacity, strengthen security of supply and improve the resilience and reliability of the network.

- Line charge revenue has increased over the review period, resulting in an increase in EBITDA of $6m over the period.

- MainPower increased its rebate to over $9m in FY17, after absorbing Transpower’s price increase in the year.

MainPower Trust – Ownership Review – Full Report

PwC
Executive summary (continued)

Comparative performance

Benchmarked against a peer group of like EDBs (Alpine Energy, EA Networks, Eastland Network, Horizon Energy Distribution, Marlborough Lines, Network Tasman and Top Energy) and industry averages, MainPower’s electricity lines business has performed well during the FY13-FY17 period.

Network opex is in line with its peer group first quartile, and below the industry average. Non-network opex has increased since 2013 and is now similar to the peer group third quartile and industry average.

- Total opex per connection has remained relatively flat over the review period and although it exceeds the peer group third quartile, it remains below the industry average.
- Network capex was above the peer group and industry averages between 2013 and 2016, and reduced to below the averages in 2017. This investment has provided MainPower with a network which is well placed to meet its customers’ needs for the foreseeable future.
- Power outages occur less often and restoration times are shorter on MainPower’s network relative to the other networks in the peer group.
- The regulatory ROI was in line with the peer group third quartile and above the industry average from 2013 to 2016. A reduction in RY17 reflected the decision to absorb Transpower’s increased charges in the year.
- Average unit prices (before rebates) are similar to the peer group and industry average. After rebates they fall between the first quartile and peer group and industry averages.

Options assessment

This report evaluates the advantages and disadvantages of the following Trust ownership options, representative of the options available to the Trust:

- 100% Trust ownership
- distribution or sale of 24.9% or 49.9% of shares
- distribution of 100% of shares
- sale of 100% of shares.

Options were evaluated against the following criteria. The criteria reflects MainPower’s company objectives and wider sector opportunities and challenges and is appropriate because it captures both the value of Trust ownership for current beneficiaries and — to the extent possible - future beneficiaries. That is, the criteria evaluates both the immediate merits of Trust ownership and the medium-long term or intergenerational merits. The criteria is as follows:

- **operate as a successful business** providing a safe, secure and financially sustainable electricity supply to the North Canterbury and Kaikoura region
- **ability to respond** to the challenges and opportunities arising from the evolution of the electricity sector.
Executive summary (continued)

The sector is facing unprecedented change

This report discusses the challenges and opportunities facing the sector. For instance, new technologies such as more energy efficient appliances, solar, batteries and electric vehicles are impacting the nature of consumer demand. New business models are enabling a local market place where sector participants are able to more directly engage with customers, for example through peer to peer energy lending. Distribution networks are likely to act as the local market place for these activities, and will need to provide for more complex two-way electrical loads. On the other hand, new business models are also generating competition from alternative service providers.

This has prompted consideration of the role of electricity distributors and other industry participants (for example: retailers) or new entrants, in delivering more customer centric energy solutions. Some advocates have suggested that distributors should be precluded from directly entering these contestable markets, given their monopoly status. To date policy makers and regulators have not endorsed this view.

Government policy, regulation and legislation is also impacting the sector. The new Government has announced a retail electricity pricing review. While the terms of reference for this review have yet to be established, it is expected that the review will examine all components of retail prices, including distribution charges, and by inference the underlying costs of supply and effectiveness of the distribution sector. The Commerce Commission has also recently formalised its forward work programme for electricity distribution regulation, which includes particular focus on the asset management and investment practices of the sector.

This month the Electricity Authority committed to a review which considers whether parties wanting to use electricity networks are treated equally and can compete on a level playing field, noting 'a lack of confidence in existing open or equal access arrangements'.

The Government is also facing pressure from bodies such as the International Energy Agency to consider changes aimed at increasing the effectiveness of the distribution sector such scale economies, extending economic regulation to include exempt trusts, and introducing regulatory incentives for distributor led innovation.

Despite the uncertainty, there are real opportunities for distributors to leverage the relationships they have with their customers, and to maintain and grow value by embracing the opportunities created through innovation and new technology. Actions taken or underway by MainPower demonstrate it is looking to actively embrace these opportunities.
Executive summary (continued)

Summary of options assessment

Operate as a successful business

With 100% Trust ownership, MainPower has demonstrated sustained growth in revenue, continued customer confidence and an ongoing focus on community needs and health and safety. It has undertaken a substantial programme of network investment funded through external borrowing, and responded to both the Christchurch and North Canterbury/Kaikoura earthquakes, as well as a series of other natural events.

These examples indicate that under the Trust’s stewardship MainPower has been able to operate as a successful business for the benefit of the North Canterbury/Kaikoura community.

These outcomes are dependent on strong leadership and direction to encourage performance excellence within the 100% Trust model. While other ownership options may provide more direct incentives for efficiency and innovation, these can also be achieved under the Trust model through collaboration. This may include opportunities to seek scale economies and to access specialist expertise outside the local business footprint.

Retaining 100% control with the Trust is also a simple model, with minimal administrative costs, which also enables the Company to avoid heavy-handed price-quality regulation.

With partial or full distribution or partial sale of the Trust’s shares, it is possible that MainPower will be encouraged to focus on short-term shareholder returns, potentially at the cost of long-term shareholder value and non-financial measures such as reliability of supply, customer services, health and safety and community contribution. This could reduce the benefit of both current and future qualifying customers and the broader community.

This could be expected to drive both efficiency and innovation into the Company’s operations in order to obtain target profit levels.

However, partial distribution or sale or full distribution of the shares raises questions about inter-generational equity, as current qualifying customers would benefit at the expense of future generations of customers. This model would also add administrative complexity and cost, as ownership becomes more dispersed. However, the establishment of the MainPower Foundation would ensure some of the funds are retained to support the local community.

It would also bring additional regulatory oversight as the Trust would lose its exempt status under Part 4 of the Commerce Act. The introduction of price-quality regulation would however provide some protection for consumers, as the Commerce Commission would be responsible for regulating the maximum revenues of MainPower and the quality standards it would be required to meet.

In the event that shares are acquired by an interested party ultimately gaining majority control, new capability may be generated to assist the Company to deliver operating excellence. MainPower will also have the ability to raise additional capital through the sale of shares. Both factors may drive heightened business performance relative to 100% Trust ownership.

In the event of a sale of 100% of shares, the Trust’s beneficiaries crystallise the existing value of MainPower, but this raises intergenerational equity issues. The establishment of the MainPower Foundation and increased regulatory oversight would provide some ongoing benefit and protection for the community.
Executive summary (continued)

Ability to respond

With **100% Trust ownership**, MainPower has adopted a long-term focus as appropriate for a large community utility. While investment required to facilitate business change is limited by MainPower’s borrowing ability and the Trust’s risk appetite (with no ability to raise capital through equity), the Company’s recent significant programme of network investment funded through borrowing indicates that this may not be as restrictive as in other instances.

However, as noted above, strong direction is required from the Trust to assist the Company to establish its strategic objectives and respond to the challenges and opportunities of industry change. A business as usual approach is likely to become increasingly risky as the electricity industry accommodates the impacts of new technologies, evolving regulatory settings and more widespread and active participation in the sector.

The Trust may also consider partnering with or investing in new ventures in order to access new capability, introduce innovation into the business, and expand beyond traditional services. For example, MainPower’s initial investment in Vircom was via a joint venture arrangement. These options can be achieved while retaining 100% Trust ownership of the core business.

With **partial distribution or sale or full distribution** of the Trust’s shares, implementing change may be harder given the difficulty achieving consensus across a broader shareholder base. There is also the possibility that short-term returns are prioritised over the business evolution required to drive long-term sustainability and growth.

However, partial distribution or sale or full distribution which in turn leads to an interested party gaining majority control may generate new capability and/or capital sources which help MainPower innovate and respond to the changes in the sector relative to 100% Trust ownership.

Under the **100% sale of shares** option, this objective is no longer relevant as the Trust has no direct interest in the sector.
Executive summary (continued)

Conclusion

MainPower has demonstrated sound performance through utilisation of the trust model. Notable achievements over the period evaluated include:

- an increase in operating revenue from $25.9m to $85.5m in FY17, representing a compound growth rate of 7% p.a.
- an increase in equity from $191.5m to $221.4m in FY17
- $53m in rebates to consumers
- reliability of supply and restoration times which outperform other networks in the MainPower peer group
- a gearing ratio of 13% (low for an infrastructure company).

The Company can be expected to continue to perform well by the Trust:

- setting clear direction for the Company
- encouraging the Company to seek opportunities for operational excellence, including access to economies of scale through collaboration
- establishing a culture of innovation
- encouraging the Company to seek out new business ventures which maximise the opportunities, and hence value, which are expected to arise as the industry embraces new technology.

Given current performance and the current absence of significant drivers for change (such as new investment opportunities unable to be financed from borrowing or an erosion of core business prospects), we consider that the Trust ownership model represents value for beneficiaries (both present and future) and should, therefore, be continued.
Section 3
MainPower Group
Group overview
MainPower Group consists of MainPower New Zealand Limited and VirCom Energy Management Services Limited

MainPower New Zealand Limited (MainPower)
MainPower owns and operates the electricity distribution network which services the North Canterbury and Kaikoura regions located in the upper South Island.
MainPower’s network spans 11,180 square kilometres, supplies over 37,000 connections and covers a population base of approximately 65,000.
MainPower owns the 0.9 MW Cleardale hydro power station, located at Rakata Gorge. Cleardale was developed in 2010 and generates 4 GWh of electricity a year. MainPower also holds resource consents (valid until 2019) for the Mt Cass Wind Farm in North Canterbury near Waipara.
MainPower has $294m of property, plant and equipment (as at 31 March 2017) and earned $53m in line charge revenue in FY17.

VirCom Energy Management Services Limited (VirCom)
VirCom is a wholly owned subsidiary of MainPower, that provides qualified and registered field services capability throughout New Zealand.
VirCom’s key services include metering, solar, battery and electrical installation and maintenance services.
VirCom uses a combination of permanent technicians and subcontractors, which are supported by in-house developed training, systems and auditing programs.
**Business contribution to the Group**

MainPower contributed 94% of Group EBITDA in FY17 and holds 98% of Group assets

MainPower is the larger of the two businesses based on financial measures (revenue, expenditure, assets etc), and managing the electricity distribution network is the Group’s core business.

Observations
- VirCom contributed 27% of Group revenue and 6% of Group EBITDA in 2017.
- MainPower’s assets made up 98% of Group assets in 2017.
- VirCom’s revenue and EBITDA contribution has increased since the start of the review period. In 2012, VirCom contributed 24% of revenue, 3% of EBITDA and 2% of assets.

The contrast between the contribution of each business to revenue and EBITDA reflects the difference in the underlying business models of MainPower and VirCom.

MainPower is an infrastructure business with a large asset base that recovers its costs over time, whereas VirCom is a contracting business that earns a margin on each contract.

Consequently, VirCom’s share of total revenue is significantly larger than its share of total EBITDA.

Note: The information presented below reflects values reported by each business. The totals do not equal the total Group values as intercompany eliminations are not included.
Financial performance – Group

Over the review period, the Group has demonstrated sustained growth in revenue while EBITDA has fluctuated

This section focuses on the performance of the MainPower Group for the period from FY12-FY17.

The Group’s operating revenue increased over the review period, with revenue from both MainPower and VirCom increasing.

VirCom’s revenue and EBITDA contribution to the Group increased between FY12 and FY17 resulting from increased smart meter installations.

Following recent growth in the irrigation sector, irrigation electricity consumption makes up a large share of MainPower’s total electricity consumption (18% in FY16). Volumetric charging exposes MainPower to variations in weather conditions and customer demand, which impacts the Group’s revenue and cash flow. For example, line charge revenue was lower in FY12 and FY17 due to lower irrigation use following wetter summers.

Observations

- Over the review period, operating revenue increased $25.9m to $85.5m in FY17, representing a compound growth rate of 7% p.a.
- Since 2013, EBITDA has been between $29m and $33m.
- Depreciation and interest costs have both increased, reflecting MainPower's investment in reinforcing the network which was partially debt funded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$'000</th>
<th>31 March 2012</th>
<th>31 March 2013</th>
<th>31 March 2014</th>
<th>31 March 2015</th>
<th>31 March 2016</th>
<th>31 March 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating revenue</td>
<td>59,573</td>
<td>73,651</td>
<td>79,514</td>
<td>84,750</td>
<td>91,218</td>
<td>85,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating expenses</td>
<td>37,199</td>
<td>43,146</td>
<td>50,654</td>
<td>54,627</td>
<td>57,797</td>
<td>55,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBITDA</td>
<td>22,374</td>
<td>30,505</td>
<td>28,860</td>
<td>30,123</td>
<td>33,421</td>
<td>29,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margin %</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>(10,623)</td>
<td>(10,525)</td>
<td>(10,985)</td>
<td>(11,434)</td>
<td>(11,890)</td>
<td>(13,201)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBIT</td>
<td>11,751</td>
<td>19,980</td>
<td>17,875</td>
<td>18,689</td>
<td>21,531</td>
<td>16,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margin %</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest costs</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(277)</td>
<td>(341)</td>
<td>(3,179)</td>
<td>(3,420)</td>
<td>(1,288)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPBT</td>
<td>11,747</td>
<td>19,703</td>
<td>17,714</td>
<td>15,510</td>
<td>18,111</td>
<td>15,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margin %</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebate</td>
<td>(7,579)</td>
<td>(8,251)</td>
<td>(8,447)</td>
<td>(9,257)</td>
<td>(9,827)</td>
<td>(9,206)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax</td>
<td>(1,486)</td>
<td>(3,111)</td>
<td>(1,891)</td>
<td>(1,899)</td>
<td>(2,394)</td>
<td>(1,782)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPAT</td>
<td>2,682</td>
<td>8,341</td>
<td>7,376</td>
<td>4,354</td>
<td>5,889</td>
<td>4,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margin %</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MainPower’s annual reports
Financial position – Group

The Group's equity increased $30m over the review period, after providing $53m in rebates to consumers.

The Group's financial position has improved, ending the review period with positive working capital, increased assets and $221m of equity. MainPower's Rangiora offices moved to new premises in June 2014 and during the review period the Group invested further in the Mt Cass wind farm development.

Fixed assets also increased reflecting MainPower's investment in the electricity network to support growth and reinforce the network. This investment was partially funded by debt.

During the review period, the Group shifted from using overdraft facilities (shown in the table below as a negative cash balance) to term loans.

The Group's balance sheet closely resembles MainPower's balance sheet as VirCom holds minimal assets.

### Observations

- Total assets increased from $245.1m in FY12 to $310.9m in FY17. 83% of the increase in total assets is due to increases in property, plant and equipment reflecting MainPower's investment in the electricity network over the last six years.

- Group net debt increased from $42m in FY12 to $35.7m in FY16. Group net debt was $34.0m at the end of FY17.

- The Group's equity increased at a compound growth rate of 3% p.a. over the review period. We note this is after providing $53m in rebates to consumers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$'000</th>
<th>31 March 2012</th>
<th>31 March 2013</th>
<th>31 March 2014</th>
<th>31 March 2015</th>
<th>31 March 2016</th>
<th>31 March 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current assets</td>
<td>4,172</td>
<td>3,526</td>
<td>22,271</td>
<td>19,213</td>
<td>17,707</td>
<td>16,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property, plant &amp; equipment</td>
<td>236,471</td>
<td>244,805</td>
<td>259,948</td>
<td>274,375</td>
<td>280,477</td>
<td>290,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other non-current assets</td>
<td>5,425</td>
<td>9,011</td>
<td>11,435</td>
<td>10,543</td>
<td>7,695</td>
<td>4,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total assets</strong></td>
<td><strong>246,068</strong></td>
<td><strong>254,142</strong></td>
<td><strong>283,584</strong></td>
<td><strong>303,131</strong></td>
<td><strong>311,869</strong></td>
<td><strong>310,919</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current liabilities</td>
<td>9,670</td>
<td>9,078</td>
<td>12,646</td>
<td>12,457</td>
<td>9,106</td>
<td>8,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-current liabilities</td>
<td>44,948</td>
<td>45,173</td>
<td>72,951</td>
<td>78,263</td>
<td>84,485</td>
<td>81,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total liabilities</strong></td>
<td><strong>54,618</strong></td>
<td><strong>54,241</strong></td>
<td><strong>85,697</strong></td>
<td><strong>90,720</strong></td>
<td><strong>93,691</strong></td>
<td><strong>89,519</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net assets</strong></td>
<td><strong>191,450</strong></td>
<td><strong>199,901</strong></td>
<td><strong>208,087</strong></td>
<td><strong>212,411</strong></td>
<td><strong>218,178</strong></td>
<td><strong>221,408</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total equity</strong></td>
<td><strong>191,560</strong></td>
<td><strong>199,891</strong></td>
<td><strong>208,057</strong></td>
<td><strong>212,411</strong></td>
<td><strong>218,278</strong></td>
<td><strong>221,408</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MainPower's annual reports
**Net debt – Group**

The Group’s gearing ratio is low relative to other infrastructure businesses and the Commerce Commission’s efficient leverage benchmark.

The adjacent chart shows the Group’s cash movements from the start of FY12 to the end of FY17. Since the start of FY12, the Group has used more cash than it generated.

Cash was primarily used to fund rebates and capital expenditure which make up 24% and 66% of cash outflows (excluding operating expenses) respectively.

Accordingly Group net debt has increased by $29.4m since the start of FY12. This largely reflects investment in MainPower’s relocation and new head office building, network reinforcement and connections to support growth. In addition, MainPower increased expenditure following the Canterbury earthquakes to replace damaged assets in Kaipara and connect replacement housing developments. MainPower was also impacted by the November 2016 Kaikoura earthquake.

As these costs are recovered over time from customers who use the network, it is appropriate to fund the initial investment through some external borrowing.

As a result, the Group’s gearing ratio (net debt to net debt plus equity) has increased to 13%.

Overall, the Group’s gearing is low given that it is primarily an infrastructure company. The Commerce Commission uses 42% as its efficient benchmark for the gearing ratio of EDBs.
Performance against SCI targets
The Group achieved fewer than half of its SCI targets during the review period.

MainPower’s Statement of Corporate Intent (SCI) outlines the Group’s aims for the following year. The adjacent table shows how MainPower has performed against its SCI targets over the review period.

Over the FY12-FY17 period, the Group achieved one third of its targets as illustrated below. This is partially due to below budgeted performance in FY12 and FY17 as well as work related injuries and lost days.

We note that the Company experienced unprecedented activity within the region during the review period. This combined with the impact of seasonal variances such as warm/cold winters and dry/wet summers impact on MainPower’s electricity sales and hence revenues which are largely recovered through variable charges.

In addition, network reliability performance (SAIDI and SAIFI) is adversely impacted by extreme events such as the earthquakes and major wind or snow storms.

While MainPower has invested heavily in improving its work practices and establishing a strong health and safety culture, it has been unable to meet its target of nil work related injuries or lost days during the review period.

A more detailed analysis of the targets and performance against them, and the current forecast targets is included in Appendix B.
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Section 4
Overview – MainPower

MainPower has invested in the network to support growth and strengthen network resilience

MainPower provides electricity network services in the North Canterbury and Kaikoura regions. The network is predominantly rural without a major urban centre. However, MainPower’s southern network is becoming more urbanised as a result of population migration to Rangiora and Kaiapoi following the Canterbury earthquakes.

MainPower’s network has grown over the review period with increased connections (8%), capacity (22%) and asset values (29%). MainPower’s customer mix has also changed over the review period with irrigation consuming 14% of all electricity in FY17 (18% in FY16).

To meet these challenges, MainPower has undertaken a number of projects to reinforce the network. The most significant of these is the $23m Waimakiriri West project, which is an upgrade project to expand network capacity, strengthen security of supply and improve the resilience and reliability of the network.

Other projects include:
- MainPower’s Rangiora offices and contracting yard moved to new premises in June 2014
- the Ashley GXP, load plant and feeder cabling work
- further investment in the Mt Cass wind farm development.

Connected customers

\[
\begin{array}{cc}
\text{Residential} & 43\% \\
& (41\% \text{ FY16}) \\
\text{Large users} & 20\% \\
& (20\% \text{ FY16}) \\
\text{Non-residential} & 20\% \\
& (19\% \text{ FY16}) \\
\text{Irrigation} & 14\% \\
& (18\% \text{ FY16}) \\
\text{Other} & 2\% \\
& (2\% \text{ FY16})
\end{array}
\]

Network growth

\[
\begin{array}{cc}
\text{Connections} & 8\% \\
& (37,442 \text{ ICPs FY17}) \\
\text{Consumption} & 10\% \\
& (595 \text{ GWh FY17}) \\
\text{Capacity} & 22\% \\
& (540 \text{ MVA FY17}) \\
\text{Network length} & 7\% \\
& (4,987 \text{ km FY17}) \\
\text{RAB} & 29\% \\
& ($254m \text{ FY17})
\end{array}
\]

Source: MainPower’s information disclosures

FY17 connected customer percentages do not sum to 100% due to rounding.
Financial performance – MainPower

MainPower’s revenue has increased over the review period, but remains sensitive to weather conditions and irrigation.

Over the review period, MainPower’s financial performance has improved with EBITDA increasing by $6m. This has allowed MainPower to increase its rebate to over $9m in FY17.

MainPower’s large irrigation customer base (18% of electricity consumption in FY16) continues to present challenges. In particular, the combination of volumetric charging and unpredictable weather conditions creates uncertainty for line revenue and cash flows. For example, the $3.2m drop in line revenue in FY17 was primarily due to a 24% drop in irrigation electricity use as the droughts receded.

MainPower’s costs have also increased since FY12. Some of this expenditure is outside MainPower’s control (e.g., transmission charges) and some of it reflects MainPower’s recent changes to its corporate structure. This is aimed at the delivery of a more customer-centric focused organisation. In FY17 transmission charges increased $1.2m, which was absorbed by the Company and not passed onto customers.

Observations

- EBITDA was highest in FY16 ($31.3m), reflecting strong irrigation revenues.
- MainPower’s rebate increased from $7.6m in FY12 to $9.2m in FY17, with the largest rebate in FY16 ($9.8m). Over the period, MainPower has returned $52.6m to customers (18% of total line charges and 24% of distribution charges).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ 000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating revenue</td>
<td>45,061</td>
<td>56,533</td>
<td>56,138</td>
<td>61,001</td>
<td>66,156</td>
<td>62,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating expenditure</td>
<td>(23,666)</td>
<td>(27,428)</td>
<td>(29,265)</td>
<td>(33,317)</td>
<td>(34,883)</td>
<td>(35,078)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBITDA</td>
<td>21,404</td>
<td>29,105</td>
<td>26,873</td>
<td>27,684</td>
<td>31,273</td>
<td>27,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margin %</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>(9,846)</td>
<td>(10,135)</td>
<td>(10,958)</td>
<td>(10,614)</td>
<td>(11,290)</td>
<td>(12,659)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margin %</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest costs</td>
<td>(204)</td>
<td>(194)</td>
<td>(101)</td>
<td>(1,714)</td>
<td>(3,222)</td>
<td>(1,157)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPBT</td>
<td>11,555</td>
<td>18,777</td>
<td>16,422</td>
<td>16,057</td>
<td>18,753</td>
<td>13,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margin %</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebate</td>
<td>(7,579)</td>
<td>(8,251)</td>
<td>(8,447)</td>
<td>(9,257)</td>
<td>(9,827)</td>
<td>(9,206)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax</td>
<td>(1,413)</td>
<td>(2,806)</td>
<td>(1,513)</td>
<td>(2,081)</td>
<td>(1,887)</td>
<td>(1,254)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPAT</td>
<td>2,562</td>
<td>7,658</td>
<td>6,462</td>
<td>4,758</td>
<td>5,020</td>
<td>5,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margin %</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Financial position – MainPower

The value of MainPower’s fixed assets and debt has increased reflecting network investments

As discussed above, MainPower has invested in network reinforcement and connections to support growth. This is reflected in the growth in MainPower’s fixed assets. This expenditure has been partially funded through debt.

In June 2014, MainPower moved its Rangiora operations to a new purpose built facility in the Southbrook Business Park. This was partially funded through the sale of the Rangiora High Street and Keir Street sites and insurance payouts.

Although MainPower’s debt level has increased, it remains low relative to the Commerce Commission’s efficient leverage benchmark for electricity distribution businesses (42%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$000</th>
<th>31 March 2012</th>
<th>31 March 2013</th>
<th>31 March 2014</th>
<th>31 March 2015</th>
<th>31 March 2016</th>
<th>31 March 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current assets</td>
<td>3,507</td>
<td>(2,306)</td>
<td>9,819</td>
<td>12,300</td>
<td>10,418</td>
<td>10,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property, plant &amp; equipment</td>
<td>235,903</td>
<td>249,564</td>
<td>270,629</td>
<td>283,355</td>
<td>292,891</td>
<td>283,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other non-current assets</td>
<td>6,636</td>
<td>6,136</td>
<td>4,926</td>
<td>5,426</td>
<td>6,926</td>
<td>5,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total assets</strong></td>
<td><strong>246,047</strong></td>
<td><strong>253,392</strong></td>
<td><strong>291,374</strong></td>
<td><strong>301,081</strong></td>
<td><strong>309,206</strong></td>
<td><strong>309,828</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current liabilities</td>
<td>7,293</td>
<td>7,426</td>
<td>10,278</td>
<td>9,843</td>
<td>8,985</td>
<td>7,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-current liabilities</td>
<td>44,728</td>
<td>45,281</td>
<td>72,911</td>
<td>78,313</td>
<td>81,989</td>
<td>79,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total liabilities</strong></td>
<td><strong>52,022</strong></td>
<td><strong>52,709</strong></td>
<td><strong>83,189</strong></td>
<td><strong>90,366</strong></td>
<td><strong>90,974</strong></td>
<td><strong>87,303</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net assets</strong></td>
<td><strong>193,025</strong></td>
<td><strong>200,683</strong></td>
<td><strong>208,185</strong></td>
<td><strong>210,715</strong></td>
<td><strong>218,341</strong></td>
<td><strong>222,527</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total equity</strong></td>
<td><strong>193,025</strong></td>
<td><strong>200,683</strong></td>
<td><strong>208,185</strong></td>
<td><strong>210,715</strong></td>
<td><strong>218,341</strong></td>
<td><strong>222,527</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MainPower

Observations

- MainPower’s equity increased by 15% between FY12 and FY17, after providing $53m in rebates to beneficiaries.
- The value of MainPower’s fixed assets increased from $235.9m in FY12 to $293.6m in FY17, representing a compound growth rate of 4% p.a.
- Net debt increased from $4.4m in FY12 to $37.1m in FY16 before decreasing to $34.6m in FY17.
Benchmarking – Introduction

MainPower’s relative performance has been evaluated in comparison to the data of EDBs, retrieved from regulatory information disclosures and other sources of information. This benchmarking covers only the regulated electricity lines business activities of MainPower.

We have placed MainPower in a group with seven comparable network businesses. Profits, price, expenditure levels and network reliability have been considered in our performance evaluation. Key performance indicators are expanded upon in the following commentary.

It is important to note that electricity networks are complex and these complexities cannot be fully represented by the information and indicators available through the data published in accordance with the information disclosure framework. Topography, climate, growth rates (past and current), historical design practices and network configuration are all factors which can significantly impact network performance. This analysis therefore provides a high level indication of performance that should be subject to further consideration and investigation.

We have undertaken many exercises comparing the performance of EDBs using disclosure data. It is our experience that when comparing the performance of the EDBs in New Zealand, it is appropriate to group networks for the purpose of assessing relative performance, on the basis of the following indicators:

- network density (indicated by the ratio of customer connections per circuit kilometre)
- total size of the network (indicated by the total number of customer connections served).

For the purpose of this report we have selected the peer group for MainPower set out in the top table opposite.
Benchmarking – Operating expenditure

Although non-network operating expenditure per ICP has increased recently, total operating expenditure per ICP remains below the peer group average.

As illustrated in the adjacent figure, MainPower’s opex per ICP has increased since 2013 but was in line with the peer group first quartile until 2017 when it moved closer to the peer group average. MainPower’s opex now exceeds the industry average opex on an ICP basis. The industry average is lower than the peer group which is expected given the economies of scale associated with the largest networks which influence the industry average.

On a more disaggregated basis, MainPower’s network and non-network opex show contrasting trends:

- Network opex, which includes planned and unplanned network maintenance and fault response, is in line with its peer group first quartile, and below the industry average.
- Non-network opex which includes corporate and business support and asset management planning and operations, has increased since 2013 and is now similar to the peer group third quartile and industry average.
Benchmarking – Capital expenditure

MainPower’s growth capital expenditure was above the peer group and industry averages during the review period, highlighting MainPower’s investment in expanding and reinforcing the network.

Network capital expenditure includes growth capex (connections, system growth and asset relocations) and renewal capex (replacement and reliability) expenditure.

When compared to the peer group:

- Network capex was above the peer group and industry averages between 2013 and 2016, and reduced to below average in 2017.
- Growth capex has been similar to the peer group third quartile and above the industry average whereas renewal capex has been well below the peer group first quartile throughout the review period.

This investment has provided MainPower with a network which is well placed to meet its customers’ needs for the foreseeable future. The reduction in 2017 reflects the opportunity to reassess investment priorities given this outcome.
**Benchmarking – Reliability**

SAIDI and SAIFI are similar to the peer group first quartile, and SAIFI is below the industry average.

The figures below show MainPower’s comparable reliability performance, using the industry standard SAIDI and SAIFI measures.

**SAIDI (System Average Interruption Duration Index):** measures the average duration, in minutes, of power outages on the network.

**SAIFI (System Average Interruption Frequency Index):** measures the average frequency of power outages on the network.

This data is normalised for the impact of extreme events, which assists with comparisons between EDBs, and over time.

When compared to the peer group:

- Normalised SAIDI has been similar to the first quartile of the peer group and the industry average over the review period.
- Normalised SAIFI is also similar to the peer group first quartile and is below the industry average.
- Both SAIDI and SAIFI were higher in 2014 due to outages caused by the significant September 2013 windstorm. High winds caused trees to make contact with power lines causing widespread outages across the North Canterbury region.

This data suggests that outages occur less often and restoration times are shorter on MainPower’s network relative to the other networks in the peer group, delivering better customer service overall.
Benchmarking – Profitability

Pre rebate, MainPower’s profitability was similar to the peer group third quartile between 2013 and 2016

The most common indicator of profit within the electricity network sector is return on investment (ROI). The ‘ROI comparable to a vanilla WACC’ measure is used by the Commerce Commission when setting regulated price caps.

- MainPower’s ROI was in line with the peer group third quartile and above the industry average from 2013 to 2016. During this period, MainPower’s ROI averaged 7.4%.
- The regulatory benchmark for the FY13 to FY15 period was 8.7% and for the FY16 to FY20 period is 7.2%.
- In 2017, MainPower’s ROI decreased to 6.8% reflecting lower line charge revenue and the increase in transmission costs which was not passed on to consumers.

The industry average results are typically lower than the regulatory benchmark, as some networks choose to price below the regulatory target, particularly those which are exempt from price-quality regulation due to their 100% consumer ownership models.

Our adjusted ROI measure deducts discretionary discounts and rebates, and adjusts for the tax effect of these. On this measure, the industry average adjusted ROI is 6.3% in 2017.

MainPower’s adjusted ROI (3.0% in 2017) is similar to the peer group first quartile. This reflects MainPower’s rebate which was $9.2m in FY17 (17.2% of total line charge revenue).
Benchmarking – Prices
After rebate, MainPower’s distribution prices are below the industry and peer group averages

Average unit revenues are a useful benchmark for comparing electricity network prices. However, this does not fully represent the different ways in which networks collect their revenue (eg through different combinations of fixed, capacity and volume charges) or the underlying demand characteristics of a network’s customer base.

- MainPower’s average unit price (before rebates) for electricity network services has been similar to the peer group and industry averages since 2013.

Note that this price information reflects the prices that MainPower charges, via retailers, for its services, not the full cost of electricity charged to consumers.

MainPower’s distribution prices, after accounting for its rebates, reflects the component of electricity prices that results from MainPower’s costs.

- MainPower’s average distribution prices after rebates has been below the peer group and industry averages since 2013, but above the peer group first quartile.

- The comparable data also excludes discounts and rebates paid by other trust owned electricity distribution businesses.
Section 5
Ownership options
Introduction

This section evaluates continued Trust ownership of MainPower shares relative to alternatives

Overview

This section evaluates the advantages and disadvantages to beneficiaries of continued Trust ownership of MainPower shares, relative to the distribution of these shares. This evaluation is required under Clause 6 of the MainPower Trust Deed. The approach to the evaluation is as follows:

- present the ownership options
- specify key considerations in evaluating MainPower’s ownership options, namely:
  - company objectives
  - sector opportunities and challenges.
- develop evaluation criteria to assess ownership options, drawing on insights from (1) and (2)
- evaluate ownership options using evaluation criteria
- make recommendation on the appropriate ownership option.

Each of the above steps is considered through the remainder of this section.

Ownership options

Ownership options available to the Trust range from continued 100% Trust ownership through to full distribution of shares.

This report examines the following options, which comprise the range of alternatives available to MainPower:

- 100% Trust ownership
- distribution or sale of 24.9% or 49.9% of shares
- distribution of 100% of shares
- sale of 100% of shares.

These options are described further below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% Trust ownership of shares (status quo)</td>
<td>Trust ownership is common practice with over 70% of EDBs in New Zealand operating under it to some degree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale or distribution of 24.9% or 49.9% of shares</td>
<td>Distribution or sale of 24.9% allows the Trust to retain control over MainPower’s constitution, and distribution or sale of 49.9% allows the Trust to retain outright control.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of 100% of shares</td>
<td>Where a 100% share distribution occurs, shares are typically sold within a short period, making it possible for an interested party to gain majority control.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of 100% of shares</td>
<td>A sale of 100% of shares would enable the Trust to test the market for interest in the Company and pass the proceeds to beneficiaries.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key considerations

Company objectives focus on operating successfully & embracing future opportunities

In assessing the advantages and disadvantages of retaining 100% Trust ownership relative to alternative options, we have considered MainPower's objectives, as set out in the SCI and agreed with the Trust. The SCI covers the activities of MainPower and its subsidiaries. The most recent SCI covers the financial year commencing 1 April 2017 and the two succeeding financial years. The figure below summarises the key objectives from the SCI.

1. Principal objective

MainPower will provide a safe, secure, reliable and financially sustainable electricity supply to the North Canterbury and Kaikoura region. In keeping with broader objectives outlined in the statement of expectations from the MainPower Trust, and recognising the role of the regulator, MainPower will operate as a successful business in accordance with the requirements of Section 36 of the Energy Companies Act 1992.

2. Ambition

Partnering in our customers' energy future.

3. Values

Safety first: on purpose not by accident.
Progress: best people, best training, best technology.
Attitude: do the right thing even when no one is looking.
Respect: play together, stay together.
Communication: communication is key.
Service: our customers, our community, our commitment.

HSEQ Performance: delivering value without compromising on health, safety, environment and quality.
Customers at the Core: developing our customer vision and aligning with our organisation with the opportunities ahead.
Fighting fit: building organisational strength, productivity and strategic focus.
Operational excellence: driving efficiency and effectiveness; ensuring the right skills and capabilities are in the business.
Embracing innovation: considering the opportunities of emerging technologies and challenging our business model.
Key considerations (continued)

The sector is facing unprecedented change

Though uncertainty has been a constant feature of the electricity distribution sector, the sector now faces this uncertainty on an unprecedented scale. This is due in large part to the following interrelated factors.

New technologies impacting consumer demand

New technologies such as energy efficient homes and businesses, solar photovoltaics (PV), battery storage, electric vehicles (EVs) and energy home automation management systems are expected to have a significant and enduring impact on the market.

While uptake of these technologies in New Zealand is still relatively low, costs are declining and will likely soon reach parity with commonly used alternatives. Improved cost efficiency paired with environmental and energy-independent social preferences means that the uptake of these technologies is growing quickly.

The importance of electricity distribution prevails with these new technologies, but the nature of use is expected to change. For instance, distributors are likely to find additional demand added to peak periods as consumers plug in EVs, offset with lower demand off-peak, when consumers may turn to solar PV. Uptake of batteries will eventually allow consumers to store electricity generated during the day by solar and release this at night. This will act to flatten peak demand. Distributors are also likely to see greater demand responsiveness to pricing enabled by smart meter technologies.

New business models

The network is rapidly evolving to a distributed and digital micro-network that more directly engages customers, for example through schemes such as peer to peer energy trading and distributed generation, as well as demand management policies such as load pricing.

Distribution networks are likely to act as the local market place for these activities, and will need to provide for more complex two-way electrical loads.

This has prompted consideration of the role of electricity distributors and other industry participants (for example: retailers) or new entrants, in delivering more customer centric energy solutions. Some advocates have suggested that distributors should be precluded from directly entering these contestable markets, given their monopoly status. To date policy makers and regulators have not endorsed this view.

0.4% - 1.3%

Average total electricity demand growth projected by MBIE each year to 2050
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Key considerations (continued)

The sector is facing unprecedented change

Government policy, regulation and legislation

The structure, scope and nature of the electricity sector is being considered by lawmakers. For instance, the Labour-New Zealand First-Green coalition government has announced a full-scale review of retail power pricing. NZ First has suggested that the retail prices are too high and that recent studies in Australia and UK, which have similar market structures, support this view. It is expected that the review will examine all components of retail prices, including distribution charges and by inference the underlying costs of supply and effectiveness of the distribution sector.

The Commerce Commission has also recently formalised its forward work programme for electricity distribution regulation, which includes particular focus on the asset management and investment practices of the sector.

Further, this month the Electricity Authority committed to a review which considers whether parties wanting to use electricity networks are treated equally and can compete on a level playing field, noting ‘a lack of confidence in existing open or equal access arrangements’. The review will consider:

- whether the operation of the existing arrangements to use transmission and distribution networks to provide electricity and electricity related services, including network support services, is promoting competition, efficiency and reliability for the long term benefit of consumers
- options to strengthen confidence in the existing arrangements to use transmission and distribution networks to provide electricity and electricity related services, including network support services, for the long term benefit of consumers
- the costs and benefits of each option.

The Government is also facing pressure from bodies such as the International Energy Agency to consider changes that include:

- achieving scale economies through amalgamation of distributors or the use of joint ventures and/or regional service and management agreements
- extending economic regulation to include exempt community trust distributors
- introducing regulatory incentives for innovation, and allowing the use of benchmarking to drive distributor-led innovation.

Further detail on government policy and its potential impact on the electricity sector is set out in Appendix C.

Implications for MainPower

Despite the uncertainty, there are real opportunities for distributors to leverage the relationships they have with their customers, and to maintain and grow value by embracing the opportunities created through innovation and new technology. Actions taken or underway by MainPower demonstrate it is looking to actively embrace these opportunities.

Though not explicitly provided for in the Trust Deed, alternatives such as joint ventures may also allow MainPower to take advantage of the opportunities and/or mitigate the challenges present in the sector currently. As evidenced through MainPower’s initial joint venture with VirCom (now a wholly owned subsidiary), a joint venture provides a mechanism to expand into new business areas without requiring significant capital. This option may provide access to potentially valuable external capabilities and expertise, and may deliver economies of scale while accommodating local objectives and retaining 100% ownership of the core business.
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Options analysis
Options are assessed against criteria that captures company priorities and sector insights

Evaluation criteria
To assess ownership options, we have developed the following evaluation criteria. The criteria draw on insights from analysis into MainPower’s company objectives and wider sector opportunities and challenges, as discussed in the preceding commentary. The criteria captures both the value of Trust ownership for current beneficiaries and – to the extent possible – future beneficiaries. That is, the criteria evaluates both the immediate merits of Trust ownership and the medium-long term or intergenerational merits.

1. Operate as a successful business
Providing a safe, secure, reliable and financially sustainable electricity supply to the North Canterbury and Kaikoura region.
In order to achieve its strategic objectives and to remain resilient in a rapidly evolving sector, it will be important that MainPower continues to deliver a strong network performance and uncompromising focus on health and safety, underpinned by robust fiscal management.

2. Ability to respond
Responding to the challenges and opportunities arising from the evolution of the electricity sector.
It will be important that MainPower is able to proactively respond to the evolution in consumer demand, technology and business models occurring in the sector.

The table on the following page provides a summary of the advantages and disadvantages of each ownership option relative to the above criteria.
## Options analysis (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>100% Trust ownership of shares</th>
<th>Operate as a successful business</th>
<th>Ability to respond</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advantages</strong></td>
<td>The Trust supports MainPower as it seeks to operate as a successful business across a range of measures, in addition to fiscal management and in turn shareholder returns. For example, the Trust supports the provision of safe, secure and reliable electricity supply, sound customer service, an unrelenting focus on health and safety and strong community partnerships. This is likely to enhance long term shareholder value for the benefit of both current and future qualifying customers as well as the wider community.</td>
<td>The Trust supports MainPower as it seeks to respond to the opportunities and challenges in the sector, including through a long-term focus as appropriate for a large community utility in a sector facing significant disruption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Trust, and qualifying customers via Trust representatives, have maximum ability to directly influence the direction and consequently performance of MainPower.</td>
<td>The Trust retains maximum flexibility for future opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A relatively simple and low cost model.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disadvantages</strong></td>
<td>MainPower’s operational success may be restricted with limited access to external capability and influence both in terms of fiscal management and broader network performance (for example rebates, reliability of supply, community contributions and health and safety).</td>
<td>MainPower’s ability to respond may be restricted with limited access to external capability and influence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MainPower’s operational success may be restricted without commercial incentives to innovate and drive excellence.</td>
<td>Investment is limited by MainPower’s borrowing capacity and the Trust’s risk appetite.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disruption and regulatory and policy responses could erode MainPower’s value over time without an appropriate strategic response.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dependent on ability to attract Trustees with necessary skills, and vulnerable to instability as a result of election cycles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Options analysis (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sale or distribution of 24.9% or 49.9% of shares</th>
<th>Operate as a successful business</th>
<th>Ability to respond</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advantages</strong></td>
<td>To a certain degree, the Trust can continue to support MainPower and the interests of beneficiaries and the community as it seeks to operate as a successful business across the range of aforementioned financial and non-financial measures (for example fiscal management, rebates, reliability of supply, community contributions and health and safety).</td>
<td>To a certain degree, the Trust can continue to support the evolution of MaiaPower as it seeks to respond to the opportunities and challenges in the sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MainPower's operational success may be enhanced with commercial incentives to innovate and drive excellence.</td>
<td>May provide access to additional capital if shares are on-sold to active investors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Triggers the establishment of the MainPower Foundation to support community interests.</td>
<td>Potentially provide access to new opportunities if shares are sold to third parties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disadvantages</strong></td>
<td>Raises inter-generational equity issues, with future generations not benefiting from the entire shareholding.</td>
<td>The needs of new shareholders may not support the nature of change required to a community utility in a sector facing significant disruption (eg short-term returns may be prioritised over investment for long-term gain).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A dividend would likely need to replace the rebate mechanism with associated tax consequences.</td>
<td>While the Trust retains some flexibility for future options or changes, this is more limited than under 100% ownership (given a broad shareholder base and difficulty in achieving consensus).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Any impact on consumer prices is likely to be minimal due to the resulting oversight by the regulator.</td>
<td>Investment continues to be limited to MainPower’s borrowing capacity and the new shareholders’ risk appetite.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Trust’s priorities will need to be balanced against the needs of other shareholders, who are likely to have a heightened focus on shareholder returns.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MainPower’s operational success may continue to be limited without access to external capability and influence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A more complex structure, with additional costs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Options analysis (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution of 100% of shares</th>
<th><strong>Operate as a successful business</strong></th>
<th><strong>Ability to respond</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advantages</strong></td>
<td>Over the longer term, on the basis that qualifying customers’ shares are on-sold to an interested party who gains majority control, MainPower may gain access to external capability and influence which supports it operating as a successful business.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Trust’s capital beneficiaries could crystallise the existing value of MainPower before any potential negative impacts from disruption.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MainPower’s operational success may be enhanced with commercial incentives to innovate and drive excellence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Any impact on consumer prices is likely to be minimal due to the resulting oversight by the regulator.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Triggers the establishment of the MainPower Foundation to support community interests.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disadvantages</strong></td>
<td>Shareholders are likely to have a heightened focus on returns relative to other performance metrics, quality of electricity supply, customer service, health and safety and community contributions potentially affecting community benefit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raises inter-generational equity issues, with future generations not benefiting from the shareholding.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A more complex structure, with additional costs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over the longer term, on the basis that qualifying customers’ shares are on-sold to an interested party who gains majority control, MainPower may gain access to external capability and influence which supports it to respond to challenges and opportunities in the sector.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The needs of new shareholders may not support community interests in a sector facing significant disruption (eg. short-term returns may be prioritised over investment for long-term consumer benefit).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Options analysis (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operate as a successful business</th>
<th>Ability to respond</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sale of 100% of shares</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advantages</strong></td>
<td>The Trust's capital beneficiaries could crystallise the existing value of MainPower before any potential negative impacts from disruption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Any impact on consumer prices is likely to be minimal due to the resulting oversight by the regulator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Triggers the establishment of the MainPower Foundation to support community interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disadvantages</strong></td>
<td>Shareholders are likely to have a heightened focus on returns relative to other performance metrics such as quality of electricity supply, customer service, health and safety and community contributions, potentially affecting community benefit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raises inter-generational equity issues, with future generations not benefiting from the shareholding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of options assessment

Operate as a successful business

With 100% Trust ownership, MainPower has demonstrated sustained growth in revenue, continued customer confidence and an ongoing focus on community needs and health and safety. It has undertaken a substantial programme of network investment funded through external borrowing, and responded to both the Christchurch and North Canterbury/Kaikoura earthquakes, as well as a series of other natural events.

These examples indicate that under the Trust’s stewardship MainPower has been able to operate as a successful business for the benefit of the North Canterbury/Kaikoura community.

These outcomes are dependent on strong leadership and direction to encourage performance excellence within the 100% Trust model. While other ownership options may provide more direct incentives for efficiency and innovation, these can also be achieved under the Trust model through collaboration. This may include opportunities to seek scale economies and to access specialist expertise outside the local business footprint.

Retaining 100% control with the Trust is also a simple model, with minimal administrative costs, which also enables the Company to avoid heavy-handed price-quality regulation.

With partial or full distribution or partial sale of the Trust’s shares, it is possible that MainPower will be encouraged to focus on short-term shareholder returns, potentially at the cost of long-term shareholder value and non-financial measures such as reliability of supply, customer services, health and safety and community contributions. This could reduce for the benefit of both current and future qualifying customers and the broader community. This could be expected to drive both efficiency and innovation into the Company’s operations in order to obtain target profit levels.

However, partial distribution or sale or full distribution of the shares raises questions about inter-generational equity, as current qualifying customers would benefit at the expense of future generations of customers. This model would also add administrative complexity and cost, as ownership becomes more dispersed. However, the establishment of the MainPower Foundation would ensure some of the funds are retained to support the local community.

It would also bring additional regulatory oversight as the Trust would lose its exempt status under Part 4 of the Commerce Act. The introduction of price-quality regulation would however provide some protection for consumers, as the Commerce Commission would be responsible for regulating the maximum revenues of MainPower and the quality standards it would be required to meet.

In the event that shares are acquired by an interested party ultimately gaining majority control, new capability may be generated to assist the Company to deliver operating excellence. MainPower will also have the ability to raise additional capital through the sale of shares. Both factors may drive heightened business performance relative to 100% Trust ownership.

In the event of a sale of 100% of shares, the Trust’s beneficiaries crystallise the existing value of MainPower, but this raises intergenerational equity issues. The establishment of the MainPower Foundation and increased regulatory oversight would provide some ongoing benefit and protection for the community.
Summary of options assessment (continued)

Ability to respond

With 100% Trust ownership, MainPower has been supported to respond to the opportunities and challenges in the sector, including through a long-term focus as appropriate for a large community utility in a sector facing significant disruption. While investment required to facilitate business change is limited by MainPower’s borrowing ability and the Trust’s risk appetite (with no ability to raise capital through equity), the Company’s recent significant programme of network investment funded through borrowing indicates that this may not be as restrictive as in other instances.

However, as noted above, strong direction is required from the Trust to assist the Company to establish its strategic direction and respond to the challenges and opportunities of industry change. A business as usual approach is likely to become increasingly risky as the electricity industry accommodates the impacts of new technologies, evolving regulatory settings and more widespread and active participation in the sector.

The Trust may also consider partnering with or investing in new ventures in order to access new capability, introduce innovation into the business, and expand beyond traditional services. For example, MainPower’s initial investment in Vircom was via a joint venture arrangement. These options can be achieved while retaining 100% Trust ownership of the core business.

With partial distribution or sale or full distribution of the Trust’s shares, implementing change may be harder given the difficulty achieving consensus across a broader shareholder base. There is also the possibility that short-term returns are prioritised over the business evolution required to drive long-term sustainability and growth.

However, partial distribution or sale or full distribution which in turn leads to an interested party gaining majority control may generate new capability and/or capital sources which help MainPower innovate and respond to the changes in the sector relative to 100% Trust ownership.

Under the 100% sale of shares option, this objective is no longer relevant as the Trust has no direct interest in the sector.

Impact of drivers for significant change

The options assessment is based on current performance and the current absence of drivers for significant change.

Drivers for change may include:

- where investment opportunities exist but borrowing constraints have been reached
- where there has been an erosion of core business prospects.

Under these circumstances, the Trust may wish to sell or distribute part or all of its shareholding in order to allow the Company to access new capital and/or expertise. This would trigger the establishment of the MainPower Foundation, and additional regulatory oversight by the Commerce Commission.

There is extensive market evidence that the sale of a minority shareholding will attract a discount to the price that could be achieved by selling 100% of the shares. The quantum of discount will reflect the prevailing circumstances, including:

- governance rights (board representation)
- voting and pre-emptive rights
- degree of influence (which may manifest in a shareholders’ agreement)
Summary of options assessment (continued)

- liquidity
- the nature and strategic objectives of the controlling shareholder.

In our experience, the discount for a minority shareholding is typically between 10% and 25%.

The Trust is therefore likely to maximise value by selling 100% of the business and distributing cash to beneficiaries, rather than selling part of the business or distributing shares, some of which are likely to be acquired by third parties seeking majority control.
Conclusion

MainPower has demonstrated sound performance through utilisation of the Trust model. Notable achievements over the period evaluated include:

- an increase in operating revenue from $25.9m to $85.5m in FY17, representing a compound growth rate of 7% p.a.
- an increase in equity from $191.5m to $221.4m in FY17
- $53m in rebates to consumers
- reliability of supply and restoration times which outperform other networks in the MainPower peer group
- a gearing ratio of 13% (low for an infrastructure company).

The Company can be expected to continue to perform by the Trust:

- setting clear direction for the Company
- encouraging the Company to seek opportunities for operational excellence, including access to economies of scale through collaboration
- establishing a culture of innovation
- encouraging the Company to seek out new business ventures which maximise the opportunities, and hence value, which are expected to arise as the industry embraces new technology.

Given current performance and the current absence of drivers for significant change, we consider that the Trust ownership model represents value for beneficiaries (both present and future) and should, therefore, be continued.
Appendices
Appendix A – Important notice

This report has been prepared for MainPower Trust to support the Trust’s requirements to carry out an ownership review every six years, consistent with its Trust Deed. This report has been prepared solely for this purpose and should not be relied upon for any other purpose. We accept no liability to any party should it be used for any purpose other than that for which it was prepared.

This report can be made available for public inspection in accordance with the requirements of the MainPower Trust Deed. Apart from this noted exception, our report is not intended for general circulation, distribution or publication nor is it to be reproduced or used for any purpose without our written permission in each specific instance.

To the fullest extent permitted by law, PwC accepts no duty of care to any third party in connection with the provision of this report and/or any related information or explanation (together, the “Information”). Accordingly, regardless of the form of action, whether in contract, tort (including without limitation, negligence) or otherwise, and to the extent permitted by applicable law, PwC accepts no liability of any kind to any third party and disclaims all responsibility for the consequences of any third party acting or refraining to act in reliance on the Information.

We have not independently verified the accuracy of information provided to us, and have not conducted any form of audit in respect of the MainPower Trust or MainPower New Zealand Limited. Accordingly, we express no opinion on the reliability, accuracy, or completeness of the information provided to us and upon which we have relied.

The statements and opinions expressed herein have been made in good faith, and on the basis that all information relied upon is true and accurate in all material respects, and not misleading by reason of omission or otherwise.

The statements and opinions expressed in this report are based on information available as at the date of the report.

We reserve the right, but will be under no obligation, to review or amend our report, if any additional information, which was in existence on the date of this report, was not brought to our attention, or subsequently comes to light.

We have relied on forecasts and assumptions prepared by MainPower Trust and MainPower New Zealand Limited about future events which, by their nature, are not able to be independently verified. Inevitably, some assumptions may not materialise and unanticipated events and circumstances are likely to occur. Therefore, actual results in the future will vary from the forecasts upon which we have relied. These variations may be material.

This report is issued pursuant to the terms and conditions set out in our engagement letter dated 17 October 2017.
## Appendix B – Performance against SCI targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>FY12</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>FY16</th>
<th>FY17</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Performance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating revenue ($m)</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>81.6</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>66.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit before tax and related items ($m)</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Receivables</strong></td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit before tax as a percentage of net assets (%)</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health and safety</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of employees</td>
<td>(150)</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of work-related injuries resulting in lost time</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of lost days as a result of work-related accidents</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lines utilised</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of supply</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARTI - System Average Interruption Duration Index</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARTI - System Average Interruption Frequency Index</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Network statistics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total line service customers (1000s)</td>
<td>38,400</td>
<td>36,746</td>
<td>56,804</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>56,832</td>
<td>56,622</td>
<td>37,609</td>
<td>37,897</td>
<td>37,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giga-kilowatt-hours delivered to customers (GW)</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total transformer capacity (MW)</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total length lines (km)</td>
<td>1,905</td>
<td>1,397</td>
<td>1,476</td>
<td>1,375</td>
<td>1,412</td>
<td>1,457</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,420</td>
<td>1,501</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- Exceeds target
- Within 10% of target
- Does not meet target
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Appendix C – Labour-NZ First-Green coalition government proposed policies impacting sector

Summary of key policies and impacts on MainPower

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Impact on Prices</th>
<th>Materiality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ban on thermal baseload electricity generation and 100% renewables target</td>
<td>Policy doesn’t directly impact MainPower but it does accelerate the impact of disruption (eg solar uptake, higher EV uptake).</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ban/restriction/royalties on oil and gas exploration</td>
<td>Policy doesn’t directly impact MainPower but it does accelerate the impact of disruption (eg solar uptake, higher EV uptake).</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture being included in ETS</td>
<td>Policy doesn’t directly impact MainPower but it does accelerate the impact of disruption (eg solar uptake, higher EV uptake).</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting forestry industry</td>
<td>Policy doesn’t directly impact MainPower but it does accelerate the impact of disruption (eg solar uptake, higher EV uptake).</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrification of government vehicle fleet and new light rail</td>
<td>Building a light rail network and conversion of the government vehicle fleet will have a limited impact on demand. However, such policies may accelerate the impacts of disruption.</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulation and heating in rental homes</td>
<td>Improvements in energy efficiency could limit demand growth in the medium term. This could flatten prices. However, impact may be lower as these policies are currently already in place.</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 100,000 new homes</td>
<td>This could increase electricity demand but would be offset by a more energy efficient housing stock. Impact on North: Canterbury likely to be negligible.</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration cuts</td>
<td>Lower population growth could reduce electricity demand and thereby wholesale electricity prices. Impact on North: Canterbury likely to be low.</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Impact on Prices</th>
<th>Materiality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Winter fuel payments to household</td>
<td>Providing a winter fuel subsidy to low income households could increase winter peak demand and volumes. May replace low user fixed charge regulations allowing more innovative pricing structures. The impact on prices as well as potential funding mechanism is not known, but may be recycled through the sector.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of retail electricity prices</td>
<td>The scope of the review is unknown but may extend to wholesale inputs.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate impact analysis on new regulation</td>
<td>Introducing climate impact analysis on all new legislation could impact energy policies going forward. This move is likely to impact thermal generation.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have examined the proposed policies of the new Labour-NZ First-Green coalition government to determine implications for the electricity sector. The commentary overleaf focuses on policies which may have a direct or indirect impact on electricity distribution.
Appendix C – Labour-NZ First-Green coalition government proposed policies impacting sector

Energy

The new government has stated it wants to increase electricity generation from renewable sources to 90% by 2025, mirroring the previous government’s aspirational target. Electricity generated from renewable sources in the year to June 2017 was 85%. Labour and the Greens have also signalled an intent to adopt a target of 100% electricity generation from renewable sources by the year 2035 (in a normal hydrological year). While not directly impacting MainPower, these policies may accelerate uptake of solar bringing forward the effects of disruption.

NZ First and Labour have agreed to conduct a full-scale review of retail electricity prices which could include consideration of distribution network inputs. NZ First has suggested that retail prices are too high and that recent studies in Australia and UK, which have similar market structures, support this view. MainPower could face more onerous regulations or pressure to reduce prices.

The coalition has discussed providing winter fuel payments to households during the peak winter months. Without other supporting levers, this policy could increase winter peak demand and volumes. The coalition has also supported the removal of low-fixed user charges in the electricity sector. This could be replaced by the proposed winter fuel payments subsidy. These changes could impact electricity demand and distribution policy.

Climate Change

The new government plans to move towards zero greenhouse gas emissions (net) by 2050, and establish a Climate Commission. It is unclear what the role and agenda of the Climate Commission will be. New Zealand’s Paris Agreement commitments, target emissions reduction of 30% below 2005 levels by 2030. New Zealand’s current long-term target, set in 2011 under section 224 of the Climate Change Response Act 2002, aims to reduce emissions to 50% below 1990 levels by 2050. The new net zero target would require an additional reduction of approximately 18 Mt CO2 equivalent, which is approximately 20% of total gross emissions.

Nearly half of total emissions (48%) comes from agriculture with sheep and cattle farming responsible for nearly all these emissions. Labour and the Greens plan to “provide assistance to the agricultural sector to reduce biological emissions”. NZ First and the Labour party have also agreed that if the Climate Commission determines that agriculture is to be included in the ETS then upon entry, the free allocation to agriculture will be 95%. Furthermore, any funds recovered from agriculture would be recycled back into the sector to encourage innovation, mitigation and planting of forestry.

The Greens and Labour have formalised plans to stimulate up to $1 billion of new investment in low carbon industries by 2020. They have also agreed to include a climate impact assessment analysis on all new legislation. This could impact energy policies going forward.

These climate change policies may not impact MainPower directly but could, as a second effect, accelerate disruption from solar, batteries and EVs.
Appendix C – Labour-NZ First-Green coalition government proposed policies impacting sector

Housing
As part of the coalition agreement the government plans to enforce minimum standards for heating and insulation in every rental home. The agreement between Labour and the Green’s includes a budget provision to substantially increase the number of homes insulated. Labour’s Healthy Homes Bill that is in parliament will set minimum standards on landlords for heating and insulation in every rental home if enacted.

The current Warm Up New Zealand: Healthy Homes programme pays 50% of the insulation costs for houses built before the year 2000. This will come to an end in 2019 at which point it will become mandatory to meet insulation requirements set out by current regulations. The programme exceeded its original target of 46,000 rental homes with 53,600 insulated by June 2016. In the 2016 budget, this program was extended another two years to insulate 20,000 homes. As of May 2017, there were 3,700 homes insulated under this programme. It is unclear as to how much additional impact the new government policy will have given the existing policies.

Energy efficiency initiatives, particularly in the residential sector have suppressed electricity demand growth in recent years. If the government is successful in significantly improving energy efficiency, it would contribute to lower electricity demand growth in the medium term. As part of its KiwiBuild programme, Labour also aims to build 100,000 homes across the country.

Immigration
The government plans to cut immigration from its current levels. Labour’s manifesto aimed to reduce migration by 20,000-30,000 per year. Most of these reductions will come through limiting student visas and work visas to incentivise employers to hire New Zealanders. Population growth has been an important driver for New Zealand’s strong economic growth in the recent past. Restrictions in immigration could reduce population growth which in turn could impact electricity demand. However, the impact on MainPower is likely to be low given North Canterbury is not a primary destination for migrants.

Transport
The government plans to build an electric light rail to connect Auckland’s central suburbs to Auckland airport, West Auckland, and later, the North Shore. Other projects in Hamilton, Palmerston North, Wellington and Christchurch have also been mentioned as projects that could use light rail.

Labour and NZ First have agreed to adopt an emissions free government vehicle fleet by 2025. The previous National government set a target of 64,000 EVs with one in three cars in the Government fleet to be electric by 2021. The Government fleet is relatively small at approximately 15,500 cars7. The impact of these policies on MainPower is likely to be low, however the electrification of transportation is expected to drive a material increase in electricity demand which may support prices going forward.

---

7Government to take part in electric vehicle initiative – NZ Herald 14/08/2017
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1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report presents the final 2018 Greenspace Activity Management Plan to Council for adoption.

1.2 During 2017, in preparation for the 2018 Long Term Plan (LTP), the Greenspace Activity Management Plan was reviewed and updated. This work formed the basis for the draft 2018-2028 LTP budgets.

1.3 Activity Management Plans (AMPs) are important documents that state how the Council will manage its assets and activities in the future and provide the supporting information for the LTP and 30 Year Infrastructure Strategy. The plan outlines the significant issues associated with Greenspace and Aquatic activities and assets. They identify future funding requirements and upgrades to maintain levels of service, and manage growth and renewals.

1.4 The draft AMP was presented to the Community and Recreation Committee in November 2017, (TRIM 171107120943) and subsequently reported to Council at the January 2018 draft LTP Budget meeting at which it was adopted.

1.5 There were no changes required to the Greenspace AMP as a result of the LTP submissions hearings.

1.6 Minor amendments have been made based on the recommendations from a peer review of the Greenspace AMP carried out by David Jeffrey of Infrastructure Associates.

Attachments:

i. Greenspace Activity Management Plan (171110122373) (circulated separately)


iii. Audit NZ report to Council on the audit of the consultation document for the WDC 2018-28 LTP (180504048622)
2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180614066068
(b) Adopts the final 2018 Activity Management Plan for Greenspace
(c) Notes that reports will be presented to the Community and Recreation Committee on the implementation of the Asset Management Improvement Plan.
(c) Circulates a copy of this report to all Community Boards for their information.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1. The Greenspace Activity Management Plan covers the following activities:
- Parks and Reserves (including Public Toilets, Play Spaces and Sports Facilities)
- Community Facilities
- Aquatic Facilities
- Airfield

3.2. Activity Management Plans (AMPs) are important documents that state how the Council will manage its assets and activities in the future. They provide the supporting information for the LTP and 30 Year Infrastructure Strategy, and accordingly are reviewed on a three yearly cycle. The plans outline the significant issues associated with the activities and assets. They summarise the various components of the schemes and identify future funding requirements and upgrades to maintain levels of service and manage growth and renewals.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. While the Local Government Act 2002 does not specifically require councils to produce Activity or Asset Management Plans, it does require councils to provide robust and well documented planning for their assets. Audit New Zealand specifically seeks this information as part of their audit of the LTP process. For the 2018-2028 LTP they focussed on 3 Waters, mostly on water supply.

4.2. To meet the requirements of sound asset management and of Audit NZ, there is no workable alternative than to produce Activity Management Plans

4.3. Waimakariri District Council’s AMPs have been developing and improving over a number of LTP cycles, and have been peer reviewed regularly since 2009. The Greenspace AMP has been peer reviewed by David Jeffrey of Infrastructure Associates, and a workshop was held to permit a full understanding of the improvements recommended.

4.4. The peer reviewer gave the Greenspace AMP a score of 0.61 out of a maximum score of 1.00, with a target score for this sized organisation of 0.75. A number of the areas where the AMP scored low on the review is where improvement had already been identified within the AMP.

4.5. The recommendations from the peer review ranged from minor (complete the document control table) through to more significant (further investigate through a sensitivity analysis the impact of population growth on the budgets). Some of the recommendations have already been incorporated into the 2018 AMP, whereas others will be taken into account at the next AMP rewrite.
4.6. Greenspace propose that a report is prepared on an annual basis to track the progress made on the recommendations from the peer review as well as the improvement plan contained within the AMP.

4.7. The following table sets out the recommendations made in the peer review along with the priority:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process of Development</strong></td>
<td>Complete the cover page that details who was involved in the preparation. The document control should also show who will approve the plan.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure that processes are put in place to ensure that the AMP is continually updated.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide greater assurance to the reader on the robustness of AMP development process by demonstrating how the plan utilised sound project management techniques (could add as an appendix so that it doesn’t detract from the body of the plans).</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>This will be considered as part of the next AMP rewrite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Add references to any external input into the AMP or any reference to current or previous LTP consultation processes</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>This will be considered as part of the next AMP rewrite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Add reference in the AMP to the steps the local authority intends to take to foster the development of Maori capacity to contribute to the decision-making processes of the local authority over the period covered by the plan</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>This will be considered as part of the next AMP rewrite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Links to Other Planning Documents</strong></td>
<td>Add a diagram or table in the Community Greenspace AMP to show how the documents relate to other planning or technical documents</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>To be completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Add references to any other Community Greenspace related strategies or plans</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reference the District Plan within relevant sections of the Community Greenspace AMP</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>This is currently being reviewed. Will be included as part of the next AMP process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reference the Council Procurement Policies or Plans in the Community Greenspace AMP</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Add benefits of the other activities to the plan. Parks and Aquatic activities are already covered.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Growth and Demand Management</strong></td>
<td>Show the specific demand related investments planned for the next ten years in the &quot;Future Demand and Growth&quot; section</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Complete. This information is covered within the relevant strategies. This may be expanded on further within the next AMP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Add a section of the demand for the airfield over the next ten years</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>To consider as part of the next AMP planning process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comment on any non-asset demand solutions that are being considered</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>To consider as part of the next AMP planning process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undertake a sensitivity analysis to consider the impact of differing levels of growth on the funding requirements, however this may not be achievable in time for the final plans</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>To consider as part of the next AMP planning process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOS &amp; Performance Measurement</strong></td>
<td>Describe how the levels of services measures were developed</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>This will be considered as part of the next AMP rewrite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Document the outcomes from consultation from the previous LTP process</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>This will be considered as part of the next AMP rewrite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstrate an understanding of the differing requirement of customer groups for the activities, and how Council is catering for different needs.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Complete. This is covered within the AMP as well as the relevant strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve the linkage between customer and technical measures</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>This will be considered as part of the next AMP rewrite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Show performance targets in detail for the first 3 years and in outline for subsequent years</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>To consider as part of the next AMP planning process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Add a list of the actions required to close the gap in Section 3 of the Community Greenspace AMP</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>This is part of our continuous monitoring of Community Greenspace performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Describe the stakeholder engagement and how this and the customer feedback influences the capital and operating programmes. For example the 2015 Customer Satisfaction Survey on the Council website is not reference in the AMP Documents</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Complete. This was included within the current AMP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incorporate discussion into the document on options to increase or decrease service levels, and costs and risks associated with differing levels of investment. This may not</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Even though this may be considered best practise this is not something planned to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be achievable in the time before the final plan, but is a focus for audit in this round of LTP review.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>be completed by Greenspace at this stage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset Systems and Data</td>
<td>Focus on asset data improvements that improve decision making capabilities</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>This will be undertaken as part of the next AMP process. Staff have identified that improvement are required on the level of information held on certain asset types.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and include in the AMP, GIS maps showing the network of community and greenspace assets</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>This may be considered as an appendix in the next AMP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show the data confidence for difference classes of assets, and note how confidence will be improved.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>The peer review of the asset revaluation has not been broken down to asset types. However improving asset information will ensure greater confidence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Information</td>
<td>Clearly show the split of OPEX costs into maintenance costs, depreciation, staff costs, rather than the current direct and indirect split</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include in the financial section graphs showing the capital split into activities and also split by growth/LOS/renewals</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>This will be considered as part of the next AMP rewrite</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus more of the analysis in the AMP on supporting the proposed investment over the ten years. The connection between text and budgets is difficult to ascertain and the depth of analysis is limited.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>This will be part of the improvement of asset information over the next AMP planning process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include analysis of options for managing assets to support the IS which identifies the principal options for managing significant infrastructure issues (Local Government Act 2002 Amendment Bill (No 3))</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>This will be part of the improvement of asset information over the next AMP planning process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add a table of the base useful lives as an appendix to the Community Greenspace AMP</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Complete. This was already included within the AMP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lifecycle Mgmt. &amp; Asset Mgmt. Practises</strong></td>
<td>Add commentary and supporting data into the lifecycle section, to discuss the performance of assets other than parks</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>This will be part of the improvement of asset information over the next AMP planning process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Determine the extent of deferred maintenance or renewals and describe any issues that may be causing</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>This will be part of the improvement of asset information over the next AMP planning process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As the financial section recommendation, focus more of the analysis in the AMP on supporting the proposed investment over the ten years. The connection between text and budgets is difficult to ascertain and the depth of analysis is limited.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>This will be part of the improvement of asset information over the next AMP planning process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Describe in greater detail the maintenance practices and strategies used. This should include the maintenance standards of specifications that relate to the maintenance of the Community Greenspace activity. A list of applicable standards and guidelines should be listed in the Appendices.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>This is not included within the AMP but readers are referred back to the specific contract documentation or specifications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop processes for optimising maintenance spend</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>This will be further developed as part of the next AMP planning process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Include a table showing the relative priority of capital projects and how they were prioritised.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Complete. These projects have been included within the AMP and the process around the prioritisation is covered within the specific strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review the effect of new capital growth, and other factors, on maintenance costs.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>This is ongoing. As more detailed information is known about the capital development it will allow more accurate forecasting of maintenance expenditure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Risk Management</strong></td>
<td>The risk tables should be improved by adding the timeframes for completion, cost to mitigate and persons specifically responsible for each risk. Alternatively, a separate risk action plan could be included that shows the high priority risks, ‘residual risk’ after existing mitigation measures, future treatment actions required, costs, priorities and timelines for completion</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>This will be further developed as part of the next AMP process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add maps of critical assets and demonstrate that criticality is being used to make informed decisions</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>To be considered as part of the next AMP planning process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the definitions of risk consequence, to more clearly define levels of risk</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>To be considered as part of the next AMP planning process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that the AMP shows what the treatment projects are and whether they are included in financial forecasts.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>To be considered as part of the next AMP planning process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimised Decision Making</td>
<td>Explain the options considered in the development of optimal solutions. Explain how the favoured option was chosen, including any tools used in the process, in particular any cost-benefit or multi-criteria analysis</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>To consider as part of the next AMP planning process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop prioritisation processes to assist in decision making for capital projects and maintenance</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>To consider as part of the next AMP planning process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain any processes in place to undertake cross-infrastructure planning within Council to improve operation efficiency</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>To consider as part of the next AMP planning process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement Programme</td>
<td>Add responses to the Audit NZ key questions (these are listed in Appendix 1 to this report) to the Improvement Plan section</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>These are answered within the AMP document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show whether the asset management maturity review was assessed internally or externally</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate into the improvement plan the timeframes, cost, responsibility and priority</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>This will be reassessed as part of the Greenspace operations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.8. Audit NZ’s work in preparing their report of the 2018-28 LTP consultation document, examined WDC asset management practices, and the report contains the following statement:

“We are satisfied that the District Council’s asset management practices, and planning for the core infrastructure activities (including 3 waters and transport) and community facilities, are sufficiently robust, and there is sound knowledge of asset condition. The
asset management practices provide a reasonable basis for the information and strategies to be included in the LTP CD and LTP.”

4.9. Audit NZ noted that at the time of their review of the 2018-2028 LTP consultation document that the Greenspace AMP had not yet been peer reviewed and as such was not included in their review. This is currently being reviewed as part of the adoption of the 2018-28 LTP.

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

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Wider Community
Draft AMPs have been available to the public during the LTP consultation period, but as part of the wider feedback on the LTP, submissions have been received on a number of issues, consideration of which will be included in future AMP reviews, if they have not been dealt with by that time.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications
There are no additional financial implications from adopting the Greenspace AMP. The financial implications contained therein are already incorporated in the 2018-28 LTP budgets.

6.2. Community Implications
The AMP is a source document for information that is included in the LTP documents. There are no community implications beyond those that arise from the LTP.

6.3. Risk Management
The Greenspace AMP contains a risk assessment section. This was undertaken by Greenspace staff as part of the preparation for the update of this AMP.

6.4. Health and Safety
Health and safety is an important consideration in the design, construction and operation of Greenspace and Aquatic assets such as parks and reserves, community facilities and aquatic facilities.

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
Activity Management Plans are required for compliance with requirements of the Local Government Act 2002 Schedule 10.

7.3. Community Outcomes
The Greenspace Activity Management Plan contributes to the following community outcomes:
- There is a safe environment for all
• There is a healthy and sustainable environment for all
• There are areas of significant vegetation and habitats for indigenous fauna
• The communities cultures, arts and heritage are conserved and celebrated
• People are friendly and caring, creating a strong sense of community in our District
• Public Spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality
• Businesses in the district are diverse adaptable and growing
• The communities need for health and social services are met
• The distinctive character of our takiwā - towns, villages and rural areas is maintained

7.4. **Delegations**

Council approval is required for the adoption of the Greenspace Activity Management Plan.
Waimakariri District Council

Desktop Review of the Community Greenspace Activity Management Plan

Prepared by David Jeffrey
Infrastructure Associates Ltd

February 2018
Executive Summary

Waimakariri District Council (WDC) has requested a desktop review to be undertaken of the Community Greenspace Activity Management Plan (AMP) to ensure legal requirements are met, to identify and prioritise any gaps in the AMP document and focus asset management efforts over the next period. WDC has an overall goal of improving asset management to an advanced level over time.

This review is of the Community Greenspace AMP document prepared in 2017 for the Long Term Plan (LTP) period commencing in June 2018. The reviewed documents were:

- 1. The Draft Community Greenspace Activity Management Plan 2017

Key Findings

Ten assessment areas have been reviewed to assess the overall completeness and depth of the Community Greenspace AMP. The overall score was 0.61 out of a maximum score of 1.00 which is at the lower intermediate level of AMP development. For an infrastructure-based organisation such as WDC, it would be reasonable to aim for an AMP for the Community Greenspace activity of a score level of 0.75 (upper intermediate level) or better. However, the quality of analysis appears robust and supports the LTP.

The AMP showed strengths and weaknesses in different assessment areas as demonstrated in Figure 1.

Figure 1: Overall Score

It is evident that a lot of effort has gone into preparation of AMP document. The plan covers most of the requirements of an AMP, which is reflected in score for this review. However, at over 300 pages the Activity Management Plan becomes a long and unwieldy document. Council needs to consider what the audience is looking for and how to make structure the document to the audience. There is quite a lot of generic text that describes asset management, but does not necessarily focus on key issues that are
important to the activity, nor provide an in-depth analysis of the available information. There is very little use of maps and graphs which can help tell the story.

The plan also jumps between different activities within a section, which makes it difficult to follow the investment logic for an activity through the plan. It is suggested that WDC consider restructuring the plan for the next LTP. A similar structure to the Waters AMPs could be adopted with an introductory document that covers the common information for all activities and separate (and shorter) AMP documents for each major activity. This would enable the reader to see all the analysis on an activity and understand the rationale for the investments proposed. The Executive Summary should then focus on the key issues, providing conclusions and recommendations.

It is also recommended that some of the more detailed information (such as the 20 pages of toilet provision standards) be moved to appendices.

With regards to Audit NZ requirements, they have noted that they will “be looking for 2018 infrastructure strategies to be based on sound information from robust underlying asset management plans and well supported by financial strategies. These plans should be clear about the extent of any uncertainty in the reliability of underlying asset information and the implications of that uncertainty.

There has been a lot of comment in recent years about “the renewals gap” – the difference between depreciation and the level of renewals work being undertaken. Where significant gaps are identified, the infrastructure strategy should explain why the gap exists, its implications, and the council’s planned response.” It is essential that the Community Greenspace AMP supports the Infrastructure Strategy and in particular shows the options for managing and investments in core infrastructure.

The AMP is strongest in the links to other planning documents, asset systems and data and the growth and demand management areas.

This report provides ten high priority actions that WDC should review immediately. The remaining recommendations have been prioritised as medium or low and should be considered for implementation over a period of time.
1. Introduction

1.1 Background

Waimakariri District Council (WDC) engaged Infrastructure Associates Ltd to undertake a desktop review of the Community Greenspace Activity Management Plan (AMP). The objective of this assessment is to focus on the overall structure of the AMP and to highlight the improvements required to meet statutory and best practice requirements.

1.2 Asset Management

Asset Management is the means of planning at a strategic and tactical level for infrastructure. Traditional management of infrastructure has separated capital expenditure on new assets from operation, maintenance and renewal/rehabilitation of existing assets. This creates a situation where capital expenditure decisions are made with no consideration of “Consequential Opex”. This most often occurs in a reactive way with little regard to levels of service, working knowledge of what customers actually expect, and little knowledge of what assets exist, what condition they are in, or how they may fail.

One of the main challenges is to ensure that financial resources are available to adequately fund new works, whilst funding the appropriate level of maintenance on existing assets. The major tool to assist WDC is the AMP, which assists in forward planning so that informed decisions can be made in the face of these competing priorities.

The application of Asset Management principles encourages a holistic, integrated approach inevitably affecting where and how finances and resources are allocated. Most infrastructure organisations utilise guidance material produced by NAMS (in particular the International Infrastructure Management Manual 2015) which includes Local Government Act and Office of the Auditor General requirements. This review has used a checklist and scoring framework developed from good practice as outlined in the International Infrastructure Management Manual (IIMM).

1.3 Desktop Review

A desktop review was undertaken on the following AMP document:

- The Draft Community Greenspace Activity Management Plan 2017

1.4 Weighting for Overall Score

The AMP has been reviewed against a range of criteria under ten aspects of the asset management framework. Each of these aspects listed on the review form was used to assess and score the AMP with a weighting used to obtain the overall score.
Each asset management aspect is weighted as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Areas</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process of Development</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Links to Other Planning Documents</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth and Demand Management</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels of Service and Performance Measurement</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset Systems and Data</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Information</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Cycle Management Practices</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Management</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimised Decision Making</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement Programme</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following report sections outline the summary and detailed results for each assessment area noting strengths and areas for potential improvement. Key recommended improvement areas have been summarised in each section to assist WDC in focusing on those areas which will provide the greatest benefit.
2. Community Greenspace AMP Results

2.1 Summary Results

The Community Greenspace AMP have gained an overall score of 0.61 out of a maximum score of 1.00, which is at the lower intermediate level of AMP development. For an infrastructure-based organisation such as WDC, it would be reasonable to aim for an AMP for the Community Greenspace activity of a score level of 0.75 (upper intermediate).

Ten assessment areas have been developed to assess the overall completeness and depth of the AMP and a summary of the results are illustrated in Figure 2 below.

**Figure 2: Summary Results for Waimakariri District Council Community Greenspace AMP**

![Graph showing assessment areas and weighted scores for AMP results.]

**Table 1: Key to Scoring Crossbar for Overall Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00 - 0.40</td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>AMP is considered to be poorly developed and at a Minimum level of maturity. The AMP doesn’t outline the basic asset management practices, systems or information necessary to manage the assets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.41 - 0.60</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>AMP is considered to be at a Core level. Although the AMP outlines asset management practice systems and information it does so in a perfunctory way indicating there is no depth to the analysis. There is limited confidence in the robustness of long term financial forecasts and the decision-making analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.61 - 0.80</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>AMP is considered to be at an Intermediate level. There is a clear articulation of most asset management practices. There is reasonable confidence that long term financial forecasts are robust and decision making is sound.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.81 - 1.00</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>AMP is considered to be Advanced. The AMP information is strong and convincing in all aspects. There is high confidence in long term financial forecasts and the way options are analysed and decisions made.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2 Detailed Results

Outlined below is a summary of each of the assessed areas of the AMP.

2.2.1 Process of Development

This aspect of the AMP review is to assess the process of development of the AMP.

Good practice around the AMP development includes:

- Multi-disciplinary involvement in preparing the plan (i.e. engineers, planners, finance personnel).
- Sound internal QA of the AMP development.
- Sound external QA of the AMP development.
- Approval of the AMP at executive management level and at council level.
- Regular refreshment of the AMP so that it is up to date, preferably at least annually.

Table 2: Key to Scoring Crossbar for Process of Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score Ranges</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00 - 0.40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum process of AMP development. Ad hoc method of preparation with narrow input and little QA. AMP likely to be very old and not properly approved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.41 - 0.60</td>
<td></td>
<td>Core process used to develop AMP. Evidence of some QA and formality in planning. AMP has been approved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.61 - 0.80</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>Intermediate AMP development process. Sound processes used to prepare, QA and approve AMP. Involvement by a wide range of disciplines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.81 - 1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Advanced development process. Clear and convincing evidence of formal development, effective internal and external QA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Process of Development Observations

- This review is of the Community Greenspace Activity Management Plan 2017 prepared in October 2017 for the LTP period commencing in June 2018. It is noted that the previous AMP was updated in 2012, a gap of five years. At a minimum AMPs should be updated every three years to support the LTP.
- The AMP has not yet been approved. However, the document notes that the plan will be approved by Council.
- The AMP document includes a table to note who prepared, and reviewed the plans, but this is currently blank.
The AMP documents adopt a framework that is based on the International Infrastructure Management Manual (IIMM), however there is no consistency of format with other council AMPS such as the three waters plans.

There is a cover page detailing who was involved in the preparation, but it has not yet been completed.

The AMP covers the types of customers in Table 3.1 which lists groups of customers who use facilities. There is little evidence of external input into the plan other than through surveys and customer complaint feedback. There is no specific reference in the AMP of the steps the local authority intends to take to foster the development of Maori capacity to contribute to the decision – making processes of the local authority over the period covered by the plan. LGA 2002 Schedule 10 – 8

There is no mention of external technical input

The AMP is reviewed by external independent consultant.

### Process of Development Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete the cover page that details who was involved in the preparation. The document control should also show who will approve the plan.</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that processes are put in place to ensure that the AMP is continually updated.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide greater assurance to the reader on the robustness of AMP development process by demonstrating how the plan utilised sound project management techniques (could add as an appendix so that it doesn’t detract from the body of the plans).</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add references to any external input into the AMP or any reference to current or previous LTP consultation processes.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add reference in the AMP to the steps the local authority intends to take to foster the development of Maori capacity to contribute to the decision – making processes of the local authority over the period covered by the plan.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.2 Link to Other Planning Documents

This aspect of the review is to assess how well the AMP references and shows the connections with other plans. AMP do not sit in a planning vacuum. There will be overarching plans (such as the Long-Term Plan (LTP) and District Plan) and other plans (e.g. Infrastructure Strategy, and Procurement Policies/Plans).

AMP good practice in this respect will include:

- Wiring diagrams of plan relationship and hierarchies.
- A brief description of the linked plans.
- The nature of the relationship or the major connection features.
- How those other plans can be accessed.
- What gaps or omissions need to be rectified in future plans.

Table 3: Key to Scoring Crossbar for Links to Other Planning Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score Ranges</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00 - 0.40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum links or non-identification of links for both external and internal plans. No perception given on relationships and the issues that arise from the various plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.41 - 0.60</td>
<td></td>
<td>Core explanations of the various plans and their linkages, but not very clear, or the issues not explained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.61 - 0.80</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>Intermediate explanation of other plans, both external and internal and how they relate to the AMP. Linkage issues are explained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.81 - 1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Advanced narratives and wiring flowchart descriptions of all the plans connected with the AMP.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Link to Other Planning Documents Observations

- The AMP outlines the Community Outcomes that are relevant to the Community Greenspace activity and describes how the AMP contributes to them. Community Outcomes are also linked to performance measures.
- Section 2.7 (and supported in more detail by Appendix 1A) of the AMP outlines the significant negative effects of the activity on social, economic, environmental or cultural well-being of the local community as per LGA 2002 Schedule 10 – 2 (1) (c)*
- There is limited reference in the AMP to the District Plan which demonstrates poor linkage between the planning documents.
- There are references to a number of other strategies throughout the AMP.
- The Community Greenspace does not demonstrate any linkages to other infrastructure AMPs.
- There appears to be no direct linkage or reference to Council Procurement Policies or Plans.
- The funding section refers to the Revenue and Funding Policy and to Development Contributions, and discusses the implications for green spaces.
Section 2.8 refers to and discusses the Significance Policy in accordance with LGA 2002 Schedule 10 – 11. The AMP provides the benefits of the parks and aquatic activities. The public benefit of the other activities covered by this plan should also be covered.

### Link to Other Planning Documents Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Add a diagram or table in the Community Greenspace AMP to show how the documents relate to other planning or technical documents.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add references to any other Community Greenspace related strategies or plans.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference the District Plan within relevant sections of Community Greenspace AMP.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference the Council Procurement Policies or Plans in the Community Greenspace AMP.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add benefits of the other activities to the plan. Parks and Aquatic activities are already covered.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.3 Growth and Demand Management

Good practice in demand management for Community Greenspace AMP will include:

- Comprehensively listing the factors that influence demand (demand drivers).
- Identifying the models & analysis used to assess the impact of the above factors on future demand.
- Demand management options via asset solutions (e.g. building or extending assets).
- Demand management options via non-asset solutions (e.g. shifting demand at peak times).
- Implementation of demand management strategies.

Table 4: Key to Scoring Crossbar for Growth and Demand Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score Ranges</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00 - 0.40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum demand management information. Few factors listed, little in the way of analysis and no clear way ahead signalled as to how to handle future demand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.41 - 0.60</td>
<td></td>
<td>Core demand management information. Reasonable listing of demand factors. Some analysis. Potential asset/non-asset solutions identified but only in a general way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.61 - 0.80</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>Intermediate demand management information. Broad spectrum of factors listed with good basic analysis. Specific asset and non-asset solutions listed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.81 - 1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Advanced demand management. Thorough and convincing listing and analysis of demand factors and specific solutions are detailed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Growth and Demand Observations

- The AMP provides a good overview of the population and demographic trends impacting on the activities. Other demand factors are also discussed.
- The AMP documents contains a good discussion on current demand and the performance of the asset groups, noting where the issues lie. The AMP should also include the airfield demand.
- The demand is primarily driven by population, with the council improving on this by considering asset capacity. Further analysis is included in Community Facilities, Public Toilets, Sports Facilities and Play Spaces Strategies, however these documents not included in this AMP review.
- The analysis of demand trends is very clearly articulated and general implications for the activities are noted. The demand section stops short of presenting the specific investments that will meet demand. The investments are shown in the lifecycle section 60 pages later. It is recommended that the investments to meet demand be included in the demand section.
- There is little mention of non-asset solutions, such as partnerships, grants or private provision
- There appears to be a consistent approach between the AMP and LTP
- One improvement would be to undertake a sensitivity analysis to consider the impact of differing levels of growth on the funding requirements."
Growth and Demand Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Show the specific demand related investments planned for the next ten years in the “Future Demand and Growth” section.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add a section of the demand for the airfield over the next ten years</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment on any non-asset demand solutions that are being considered</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undertake a sensitivity analysis to consider the impact of differing levels of growth on the funding requirements, however this may not be achievable in time for the final plans.</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.4 Levels of Service

Levels of Service (LoS) statements are defined as: “Levels of Service statements describe the outputs or objectives an organisation or activity intends to deliver to customers.” (Source IIMM, International Edition 2011).

Service attributes (service criteria) often relate to: “Aspects or characteristics of a service such as accessibility, affordability/cost, efficiency, quality, quantity, reliability, responsiveness, safety”. (Source IIMM, International Edition 2011).

Good practice in relation to LoS include:

- Showing how LoS fit into WDC’s performance reporting.
- Indicating how LoS are developed and agreed with customers (users) and stakeholders e.g. critical customers such as hospitals.
- Categorising LoS into quality, safety, affordability, etc (Core Values in the IIMM).
- Ensuring there are current and future targets for each LoS category.
- Ensuring there are systems to measure, monitor and report actual LoS in comparison with targets.
- Analysing LoS targets into both customer language and technical management language.

Table 5: Key to Scoring Crossbar for Levels of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score Ranges</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00 - 0.40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum LoS information. No indication of how LoS arrived at. LoS characteristics lacking depth. Targets poorly stated with unclear measurement systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.41 - 0.60</td>
<td></td>
<td>Core LoS information. LoS development is indicated in a general way. The LoS categories are reasonable but not well developed. Targets and measures are stated in a basic fashion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.61 - 0.80</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>Intermediate LoS information. AMP explains how LoS have been developed and how they fit into the LoS hierarchy. There is consistency between high level plans and AMP. Gaps in LoS information and process outlined with measures to close gaps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.81 - 1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Advanced LoS information. Clear and transparent framework. Targets and measures exist for all LoS categories and are well explained in both customer speak and technical speak.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Levels of Service Observations

- Section 3 of the AMP describes the performance measures and targets. The AMP does not describe how the measures were created or whether any consultation internally or externally was undertaken.
- There is limited reference to any consultation with customers other than through the LTP.
- The stakeholders and customers are noted in section 3, although the analysis of customer needs is somewhat limited.
- The levels of service are clear and well defined. It is recommended that the 22 pages of toilet levels of service be summarised with the detail included in the appendices (if required).
- The level of service statements are linked to community outcomes and service attributes. They cover the broad spectrum of likely values.
- Measures are for all asset types. The linkage between customer and technical measures could be improved. In addition, it is recommended that targets be shown in detail for the first 3 years and in outline for subsequent years.

- The AMP shows whether performance targets are being met. Further historic data could be shown to determine the trend.

- Yardstick and provision targets are used as benchmarks for demand related performance measures. Benchmarks are more widely available for parks assets and are used in the AMP.

- The gap between current and target levels of service is shown and improvement actions are identified for how to measure service levels. Section 3.8 analyses the gap between demand, LOS and performance. It would be useful to include investments to close the gap in this section.

Levels of Service Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Describe how the levels of service measures were developed.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document the outcomes from consultation from the previous LTP process.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate an understanding of the differing requirement of customer groups for the activities, and how council is catering for different needs.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the linkage between customer and technical measures.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show performance targets in detail for the first 3 years and in outline for subsequent years.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add a list of the actions required to close the gap in Section 3 of the Community Greenspace AMP.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe the stakeholder engagement and how this and the customer feedback influences the capital and operating programmes. For example, the 2015 Customer Satisfaction Survey on the council website is not referenced in the AMP documents.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate discussion into the document on options to increase or decrease service levels, and costs and risks associated with differing levels of investment. This may not be achievable in the time before the final plan, but is a focus for audit in this round of LTP review.</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.5 Assets Systems and Data

An asset management information system is defined as:

“A combination of processes, data, software and hardware applied to provide the essential outputs for effective AM” (Source: IIMM International Edition 2011).

Good practice surrounding AM information systems include:

- The focus on meeting identified business needs.
- Integration of AM systems and corporate information systems.
- Knowing what the assets are, where they are, their condition and the financial values.
- Identifying the time costs of operation and maintenance.
- Predicting asset decay, and failure to meet desired LoS.
- Indicating the capital investment required to maintain, replace and upgrade assets.

Table 6: Key to Scoring Crossbar for Asset Systems and Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score Ranges</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00 - 0.40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum. AMP does not clearly disclose the systems use or how they interrelate. Nor does it provide a good picture of the standard of data and the information gaps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.41 - 0.60</td>
<td></td>
<td>Core Information. The AMP provides reasonable information on AMP systems and the completeness / reliability of data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.61 - 0.80</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>Intermediate articulation of systems and data. The reader of the AMP can readily ascertain a snapshot of the quality of systems and data, the information ‘gaps’ and how they are being addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.81 - 1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Advanced information presented on all systems used, their interrelationships, weaknesses, strengths etc. A similar picture is provided for data.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Asset Systems and Data Observations

- Section 8 of the AMP outlines the asset management systems being used and includes commentary on the functionality of the AMS system.
- The AMP describes the use of the GIS system. The AMP could be improved by more use of GIS maps of assets and planned projects.
- Other information systems relevant to the activity are listed.
- The breadth of asset information appears sufficient, however there are some noted gaps in the quality of asset data. It is important to ensure that any data improvement efforts enable better quality decision making.
- The AMP notes that data confidence was at a B rating. Some graphs showing data confidence and where any gaps lie would be useful.
## Assets Systems and Data Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus on asset data improvements that improve decision making capabilities.</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and include in the AMP, GIS maps showing the network of community and greenspace assets.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show the data confidence for different classes of assets, and note how confidence will be improved.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.6 Financial Information

One of the most vital outputs of asset management is a robust financial forecast, over a long forecast period, for every recognised expenditure category (Operations, Maintenance, Renewals, Capital, Depreciation, and Funding etc.). Good practice in AMP for financial management include:

- Robust long-term budgets in correct categories.
- Assumptions listed.
- Latest valuation information used in the AMP.
- Understanding of funding requirements.

Table 7: Key to Scoring Crossbar for Financial Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score Ranges</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00 - 0.40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum financial information. Financial information not clearly set out. There are uncertainties as to basis of expenditure and fundamental questions about the funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.41 - 0.60</td>
<td></td>
<td>Core financial information. Financial forecasts are clearly set out and reflect the management practices in the AMP. There are fewer uncertainties as to the basis of renewals, new capital forecasts and funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.61 - 0.80</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>Intermediate financial information. Financial information is well analysed and uses graphs or other illustrations. Detailed assumptions and rationale provided. Few uncertainties as to basis of all expenditure categories or funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.81 - 1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Advanced analysis and presentation of valuations, forecasts and assumptions. Provides the reader comfort and certainty.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Financial Information Observations

- Section six provides financial forecasts, split into operational and capital costs. Operational costs are further split into direct and indirect. It is suggested that the AMP include separately maintenance costs, depreciation, staff costs. The financial section could be improved by showing the capital split into activities and also split by growth/LOS/renewals.
- It is difficult to connect the analysis in the AMP to the budgets proposed.
- The depreciation forecast over the next ten years is shown in the AMP and is compared to forecast renewals.
- The AMP shows the renewals requirements over the next 100 year period for each activity. It is not clear whether the level of forecasted expenditure is sufficient.
- The long term (100 year) forecasts cover a longer timeframe than is required for the Infrastructure Strategy (IS). It is a requirement in the IS to identify the principal options for managing significant infrastructure issues (Local Government Act 2002 Amendment Bill (No 3)). The AMP does not include analysis of options for managing assets over the IS period.
- The AMP briefly mentions assumptions in several sections but is light on detail. The assumptions noted appear to be reasonable.
- The AMP shows the values by asset group for the parks assets. The community centres and aquatic facilities valuation is not shown in the AMP, and there is no mention of the airfield valuation. The base useful lives would be useful to include as an appendix to the AMP.
• Reliability/confidence in the valuation is stated, and the valuation was peer reviewed.

• The AMP shows a good understanding of sources of funding, and does provide good analysis of the difference between funding requirements and the availability of funds.

### Financial Information Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clearly show the split of opex costs into maintenance costs, depreciation, staff costs, rather than the current direct and indirect split.</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include in the financial section graphs showing the capital split into activities and also split by growth/LOS/renewals</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus more of the analysis in the AMP on supporting the proposed investment over the ten years. The connection between text and budgets is difficult to ascertain and the depth of analysis is limited.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include analysis of options for managing assets to support the IS which identifies the principal options for managing significant infrastructure issues (Local Government Act 2002 Amendment Bill (No 3)).</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add a table of the base useful lives as an appendix to the Community Greenspace AMP.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.7 Lifecycle Management

This aspect of the AMP review looks at how well the AMP describes the ongoing tasks of asset management. Does it present a convincing picture that WDC is proactively managing the Community Greenspace assets and doing so in an integrated ‘far sighted’ way?

The elements considered include:

- The breadth and depth of coverage of the network in the AMP.
- How condition and performance data is gathered and monitored.
- Maintenance strategies.
- Asset renewals and rehabilitation strategies.
- New capital works strategies.
- How services are delivered.

**Table 8: Key to Scoring Crossbar for Lifecycle Management Practices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score Ranges</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00 - 0.40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum definition and description of asset management strategies. No coherent overall approach. Tendency to dwell on past practices. AMP doesn’t adequately cover all network Assets; condition assessments not robust.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.41 - 0.60</td>
<td></td>
<td>Core lifecycle practices. Fairly general descriptions of strategies; reasonably reliable data and condition assessments that provide some basis for projecting future strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.61 - 0.80</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>Intermediate lifecycle practices. Indications of proactive and integrated approach based on solid data and monitoring. Answers the ‘why’ questions e.g. why are future rehabilitations at this level?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.81 - 1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent and convincing strategies are articulated based on reliable data, regular monitoring and up skilled resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lifecycle Management Observations**

- A good level of asset information is presented to explain the assets within the scope of the AMP, however the level of analysis to support the ten year budgets is somewhat limited compared to the WDC three waters plans."

- The AMP summarises the asset performance for the parks assets. There is little mention of other activities condition information, other than community facilities which have yet to be loaded into the asset management system. The AMP notes that limited condition data is available and is an area for improvement.

- The AMP explains the maintenance contracts and shows an understanding of maintenance strategies. The AMP acknowledges that there is no process for optimising maintenance spend.

- A list of applicable maintenance standards and summary level specifications would be useful to include in the Appendices.
The AMP explains how the operational asset management is undertaken, but notes that prioritisation of activities is ad hoc. The AMP also lists some key capital projects but does not explain how these were prioritised.

The AMP demonstrates how renewals have been smoothed over the ten year period, but does not explain how decisions on priority are made and whether there any scandalised criteria. There is no discussion on the levels of deferred maintenance or renewals.

Effect of population growth, or other factors, on maintenance costs is not noted in the AMP.

The linkage of capital projects to growth factors is not particularly clear.

### Lifecycle Management Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Add commentary and supporting data into the lifecycle section, to discuss the performance of assets other than parks.</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine the extent of deferred maintenance or renewals and describe any issues that may be causing.</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As the financial section recommendation, focus more of the analysis in the AMP on supporting the proposed investment over the ten years. The connection between text and budgets is difficult to ascertain and the depth of analysis is limited.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe in greater detail the maintenance practices and strategies used. This should include the maintenance standards or specifications that relate to the maintenance of the Community Greenspace activity. A list of applicable standards and guidelines should be listed in the Appendices.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop processes for optimising maintenance spend.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include a table showing the relative priority of capital projects and how they were prioritised.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review the effect of new capital growth, and other factors, on maintenance costs.</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.8 Risk Management

The purpose of Risk Management is to identify the risks associated with the Community Greenspace activity and assets. This requires approaching the risks from many perspectives including financial, operational, and organisational, as well as public health and safety. In general terms ISO31000:2009 provides the foundation for the risk framework.

The key elements included are:

- The framework that is in place.
- The level of analysis undertaken.
- Risk is a key component in the decision-making process.
- The identification and implementation of risk management strategies.

Table 9: Key to Scoring Crossbar for Risk Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score Ranges</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00 - 0.40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum definition and description of risk management strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.41 - 0.60</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>Core Risk Management practices. Fairly general descriptions of risks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.61 - 0.80</td>
<td></td>
<td>Intermediate Risk Management practices. Risk register is populated and risk levels are identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.81 - 1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Advanced and convincing Risk Management strategies are provided based on robust weighting system with management strategies in place. Risk links to overall Corporate Policy and is integrated into the decision-making process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Risk Management Observations

- The AMP outlines processes for organisational, activity and critical asset risks in general terms. It provides some detail about the greenspace risks, but not for other activities. Include key risks for community centres, the airfield etc.
- The AMP risk matrix and processes are well defined, although council should consider a more well defined table showing the definitions of risk consequence levels.
- The risk assessment in the AMP appears to follow the overall Council process and links to the Councils Risk Policy. The breadth of risks is considered to be comprehensive and the level of risk is evaluated in line with the Risk Management Framework.
- A relatively comprehensive risk register is included in the plans. The table could be improved by adding the level of risk, timeframes for completion, cost to mitigate and persons specifically responsible for each risk. It is not clear from the AMPs how risks are used to develop a risk action plan to further reduce the level of risk.
- A risk monitoring programme is provided to ensure implementation carried out and any changes in risk exposure identified.
- Critical assets are defined in theory but there are no maps to show which assets are critical nor any evidence that criticality is used to make better informed decisions.
## Risk Management Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The risk tables should be improved by adding the timeframes for completion, cost to mitigate and persons specifically responsible for each risk. Alternatively, a separate risk action plan could be included that shows the high priority risks, ‘residual risk’ after existing mitigation measures, future treatment actions required, costs, priorities and timelines for completion.</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add maps of critical assets and demonstrate that criticality is being used to make informed decisions.</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the definitions of risk consequence, to more clearly define levels of risk.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that the AMP show what the treatment projects are and whether they are included in financial forecasts.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.9 Optimised Decision Making

There are two definitions given in the IIMM for Optimised Decision Making (ODM):

“Two definitions are: 1. A formal process to identify and prioritise all potential solutions with consideration of financial viability, social and environmental responsibility and cultural outcomes. 2. An optimisation process for considering and prioritising all options to rectify existing or potential performance failure of assets. The process encompasses NPV analysis and risk assessment.” (Source: IIMM International Edition 2011).

ODM can be seen as the end result or pinnacle of asset management practices i.e. does all the information on service levels, risks, finances and all practices lead to the ‘best’ decision. In reality, formal ODM processes in infrastructure management are more pronounced in the water area when compared to utilities or recreation assets. Good practice in ODM includes:

- Properly defining the problem, issues or opportunity.
- Identifying and short listing potential options.
- Assessing information requirements and using appropriate support tools.
- Identifying benefits and costs.
- Using the best evaluation techniques to determine the optimal solution.

Table 10: Key to Scoring Crossbar for ODM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score Ranges</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00 - 0.40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum ODM information. There is very little in the way of ODM tools analysis and techniques, and this does not appear to be applied in future treatment decisions little in the way of convincing analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.41 - 0.60</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>Core ODM information. Other equivalent tools but rather perfunctory and minimalist – doing what they have to do to get by.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.61 - 0.80</td>
<td></td>
<td>Intermediate ODM information. An array of tools and techniques used, and these are well explained. Tools are balanced with ‘wise head’ experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.81 - 1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent ODM information. Sophisticated use of ODM tools and techniques. Augmented by excellent base data and analysis. “What if” scenario and sensitivity analysis used. Leads to convincing and robust future treatment decisions across all areas of network.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ODM Observations

- Section 5.7 describes how optimisation can be applied, but notes that the assets in this plan are too diverse. There is no clear indication through this AMP as to whether any prioritisation processes have been applied and what decisions have been made to provide an efficient and effective service.
- The AMP displays a good understanding of the assets and current practice, however the discussion of options is not explored
- There is little evidence in the AMP of cross infrastructure planning with Utilities and Roading.
- There is no process for optimising maintenance decisions other than informal staff actions.
- Renewal decision making is based on a number of factors, primarily being useful life and condition. The AMP notes that there is an improvement action to embed a process to review useful lives by operational staff during the validation programme.
- The AMP clearly explains the growth and demand factors and their impact on service provision. The AMP also explains the level of service, but the investments to close level of service gaps are not prominent in the plan.

**ODM Recommendations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explain the options considered in the development of optimal solutions. Explain how the favoured option was chosen, including any tools used in the process, in particular any cost-benefit or multi-criteria analysis.</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop prioritisation processes to assist in decision making for capital projects and maintenance.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain any processes in place to undertake cross-infrastructure planning within Council to improve operational efficiency.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.10 Improvement Planning

An AMP is merely a snapshot of a particular point of the asset management practices being carried out. It is very important that each AMP contain an improvement section, which details the weak areas in asset planning, and what is intended to be done to improve asset management practices.

Good practice for AMP Improvement Programmes includes:

- Honestly stating the weak points in AM planning and AM practices.
- Tracking where AM is at now and where each aspect of the AM aspires to be (noting it may not be cost effective to be ‘perfect’ in everything).
- Stating what improvement projects need to be implemented, in what priority and when.
- Providing an indication of the resources (human and dollars) needed to implement improvements.
- Where possible, gaining approval for the spending of those resources.

### Table 11: Key to Scoring Crossbar for Improvement Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score Ranges</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00 - 0.40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum improvement information. No detail. Little confidence that there is investing in better asset management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.41 - 0.60</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>Core improvement information. States existing weaknesses and has a generalised programme for addressing weaknesses – but lacking in detail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.61 - 0.80</td>
<td></td>
<td>Intermediate improvement information. All aspects of AM addressed as to weaknesses and what level of sophistication they want to achieve. Good detail on improvement projects, their priority, and the resources involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.81 - 1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent improvement information. Very comprehensive information on all aspects of existing AM weaknesses, not only the improvement projects listed in detail, they are prioritised and the interrelationships between projects noted. There is approval for the resources needed to improve AM.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Improvement Planning Observations

- The AMP shows the scores for the asset management maturity review. It would be useful to note in the plan whether this review was an internal self-assessment or by an external consultant.
- The AMP shows the actions required to improve the plan. This review suggests some other improvements, not already noted.
- Table 10-1 provides a very brief description of actions to improve asset management practices. Further detail on these actions would be useful, including timeframes, cost, responsibility and priority. It is not clear whether budgetary approval has been secured for any or all of the improvement actions.
- The results of previous Audit NZ reviews are not included, and the AMP does not specifically address the key questions being asked by Audit as shown in Appendix 1 of this review.
## Improvement Planning Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Add responses to the Audit NZ key questions (these are listed in Appendix 1 to this report) to the Improvement Plan section.</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show whether the asset management maturity review was assessed internally or externally.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate into the improvement plan the timeframes, cost, responsibility and priority.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix One

Audit NZ questions

Ten questions that every senior manager and member of a governing body needs to know the answer to from the Audit NZ publication: "Asset management and long-term planning: Learning from audit findings 2015 to 2017"

1. Have you got a strategy for the long-term sustainability of your assets?
2. Have you set an asset management policy?
3. Do you have good quality up-to-date asset management plans for achieving your strategy?
4. Does your organisation have appropriate asset management skills and experience?
5. Do you know the reliability of your asset information?
6. Do you have a structured approach to assessing the condition and performance of your assets?
7. Have you defined a clear and comprehensive set of service levels to be delivered or supported by the assets?
8. How well do you forecast future demand for the services that are delivered or supported by your assets?
9. Do you report, and get reports, on achievement of your asset management plan(s)?
10. Do you have a backlog of repairs, maintenance, and asset renewals? And what are you doing about it?
Report to the Council

on the audit of the consultation document of

Waimakariri District Council

for the 2018-28 long-term plan
Key messages

We have completed the audit of Waimakariri District Council’s (the District Council’s) Consultation Document (the LTP CD) for its 10 year Long-Term Plan (LTP) covering the period 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2028. Council will adopt its LTP in June 2018. This report sets out our findings from the audit of the LTP CD stage of the LTP. We will issue a further report following our audit of the final LTP.

Unmodified opinion

We issued an unmodified opinion on the District Council’s LTP CD on 20 February 2018. This means that we are of the opinion that the CD provides an effective basis for public participation in the District Council’s decision making processes relating to the content of the 2018-28 LTP.

Areas of audit emphasis

Content of the consultation document

The key areas of the consultation document are focused on earthquake regeneration projects, and spending on infrastructure, needed to support the anticipated further growth of the district. With the District Council’s population expected to rise from 59,000 currently, up to 97,000 by 2048, there is a need to ensure this growth is well planned, integrated and financially sustainable.

Preparation of the Consultation Document and underlying information

The development of the LTP CD and required underlying information, is a significant and complex project, requiring the input of the Mayor and Councillors and a large number of Council staff.

Throughout the process, we worked with Council staff to complete the audit within a tight deadline. We identified areas of improvement in the preparation process for the LTP CD and underlying information. These are outlined in section 3.3 of this report.

Audit of the final LTP

As well as the opinion issued on the LTP CD, we will also issue an opinion on the final LTP that will be adopted by 30 June 2018, following Council’s consideration of public submissions. To ensure our audit of the final LTP is efficient, we expect Council to prepare and provide us with a schedule of changes to the financial forecasts and other underlying information that were the basis for the CD.

Thank you

We would like to thank the Council, management and staff for their assistance during the audit.

John Mackey
Audit Director
27 April 2018
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1  Our audit opinion

1.1  We issued an unmodified audit opinion on the LTP CD

We issued an unmodified audit opinion on 20 February 2018.

This meant we were satisfied the LTP CD meets the statutory purpose and provides an effective basis for public participation in Council’s decisions about the proposed content of the 2018-28 LTP.

We found that the underlying information and assumptions used to prepare the LTP CD, provided a reasonable and supportable basis for preparation of the LTP.

1.2  Uncorrected misstatements

The LTP CD, and supporting forecast financial statements are free from material misstatements, including omissions. During the audit, we have discussed with management the misstatements that we found, other than those which were clearly trivial.

There were no audit differences or uncorrected disclosure misstatements other than those which were clearly trivial.

2  Audit scope and objective

The scope of the audit engagement and our respective responsibilities are contained in our audit engagement letter dated 14 December 2017.

3  Control environment

Our approach to the audit is to identify, confirm and assess the District Council’s key processes and controls over the underlying information, and ultimate production of both the LTP CD and the LTP. The purpose of this assessment was to enable us to plan the most effective and efficient approach to the audit work needed to provide our two opinions. Our review of the control environment focused on two key areas; planning and budgeting processes, and asset management practices. We also comment on areas of the Council’s process that could be improved in 3.3 below.

3.1  Planning and budgeting process

We obtained an understanding of the District Council’s budgeting process through discussions with the relevant staff members, and appropriate corroboration of verbal representations to supporting documentation.

Overall, we found that the District Council had sound budgetary controls in place which provided an appropriate basis to prepare the underlying information and ultimately the production of both the LTP CD and the LTP.
3.2 **Asset management practices**

We are satisfied that the District Council’s asset management practices, and planning for the core infrastructure activities (including 3 waters and transport) and community facilities, are sufficiently robust, and there is sound knowledge of asset condition. The asset management practices provide a reasonable basis for the information and strategies to be included in the LTP CD and LTP.

The water supply asset management plan has been peer reviewed by Infrastructure Associates Limited. The key recommendation focused on improvement to the document links to other planning documents. We have confirmed that this has been addressed in the revised version. The sewerage, drainage, greenspace and transport peer reviews have not been finalised. We plan to review them before the adoption of the final Long Term Plan.

The Council has modelled its infrastructure, and developed a renewal programme, that stretches over the next 150 years. The renewal profile and funding strategies have been developed together to ensure that planned asset renewal, and its funding are well aligned.

3.3 **Process to develop the CD and underlying information**

The development of the LTP CD and LTP is a significant and complex project and a comprehensive project plan is required for a successful LTP process.

The District Council had a robust project plan for the LTP CD which detailed the tasks, due dates, responsibilities and status. The plan was prepared to ensure that all milestones were identified and to facilitate their achievement.

We recognise that putting together the underlying information for a LTP audit is a challenging task. However, we did find issues that caused significant delays and re-work at our end. Some examples of these have been included below:

- A lack of co-ordination in the communication of decisions. This resulted in us performing audit work based on information that we were subsequently advised was incorrect, or had been updated.

- The process to ensure that the deadlines for delivery of information were not as effective as planned. Key information, for example, asset planning information for the 3-waters infrastructure was received late putting pressure on the timetable.

- The level of errors, and omissions of information required by the Local Government Act 2002, which resulted in us needing to review ten versions of the CD.

We would encourage teams responsible for corporate planning, finance, and asset management planning to work more effectively together. This would ensure everyone is “on the same page” and reduce the number of inconsistencies between documents before they are sent to us to be audited.
We would also encourage the District Council to strengthen the LTP project accountability processes.

4 Areas of audit emphasis

During the planning stage of the audit, and our review of the content of the LTP CD, we identified the following key risks and issues which were areas of emphasis during our audit. In this section of the report, we comment on our findings on those matters.

4.1 Growth

Growth in the Waimakariri district is a significant assumption underlying the Long Term Plan. This provides the rationale for the significant capital investment in projects proposed over the ten year period of the plan, including the multi-use sports facility, and other community facilities.

We reviewed how the growth assumption is derived and applied across the major business activities and forecasts. We have also compared the growth assumptions to Statistics New Zealand estimates, and we are satisfied that they are consistent.

Overall, we are satisfied that the District Council’s growth assumptions are reasonable and supportable, are appropriately reflected in its financial and infrastructure strategies as well as the financial forecasts, and the implications are appropriately discussed in the LTP CD.

4.2 Multi-use sports facility

To meet the growing community’s needs, the District Council proposes to build a multi-use sports facility of approximately 6,000m2, with four indoor courts. The proposed facility will be located on land that the District Council owns in Rangiora and is estimated to cost $27.85 million.

The District Council’s preferred option is to begin construction now. The other options are to either defer construction until 2028, or not build a facility.

Under the preferred option, the project is to be debt funded, with repayment to be funded through an annual rate of approximately $91 per property. If the project is deferred, the total cost is expected to increase to $34.7 million and the annual rate, per property, would be approximately $103.

The District Council completed a needs assessment and a functional design brief. They detail the spaces required to meet the needs of the community based on future growth projections. The area required for the sports facility has been determined using guidance from Sport New Zealand’s allocation model and based on comparable facilities throughout New Zealand. Aecom was engaged, as the Quantity Surveyor, to determine the high level preliminary cost estimates for this development.
We have reviewed the costs estimates for the construction of the sports facility and the escalation estimates. We are satisfied that the information, provided in the LTP CD, including disclosure of issues, options and implications, is sufficient.

We are satisfied, for all the proposals, that the information provided in the CD is reasonable and supportable, reflects the draft financial forecasts and other underlying information, and provides an effective basis for public participation in the District Council’s decisions on the proposed content of the 2018-28 LTP.

4.3 Kerbside collection

The District Council’s preferred option is to offer a “Your Choice” kerbside collection service from 1 July 2019. The minimum service for people, in a collection area, is a standard 240 litre recycling bin, which costs $86 per property. The ratepayer can also choose, on a user-pays basis, what other service they would like. Rates may vary from $86 up to $371 per property depending on which service a ratepayer chooses.

The preferred option has also been partially aligned to the District Council’s waste management and minimisation plan. This option compared to the “no change to existing service” option is expected to reduce waste to landfill by 4,200 tonnes over ten years. However, it does not provide a green bin to all those who receive a kerbside collection service. This is an optional service although greenwaste represents 50% of the waste stream collected.

We have reviewed the calculation of the cost per ratepayer, and the calculation for the reduction in waste. We are satisfied, that the information provided in the CD is reasonable and supportable, reflects the draft financial forecasts and other underlying information, and provides an effective basis for public participation in the District Council’s decisions on the proposed content of the 2018-28 LTP.

4.4 District Regeneration

The 2010/11 Canterbury earthquakes caused unprecedented and widespread damage to greater Christchurch. In Kaiapoi, Pines Beach and Kairaki, approximately 100 hectares, over one fifth of the total residential area, was classified as “residential red zone”.

In 2015, by direction of the Minister supporting Greater Christchurch Regeneration, the District Council prepared a Draft Recovery Plan to identify the long-term uses for the five residential red zone areas, now referred to as “regeneration areas”. The agreed uses, per the Recovery Plan, for the five regeneration areas, include greenspace, mixed use business, rural and private lease.

The preparation of the Recovery Plan identified that the budget, included in the 2015–25 LTP, was not sufficient to fund the programme.
The District Council proposes to increase its budget by $20 million to deliver this work programme over the next 10 years, at a rate of $40 per property per year. The rate includes construction costs and debt servicing.

The other option is to defer the work programme, by completing $10 million of the proposed works during 2018-28, with the balance of the programme to be completed from 2028 onwards. This option would not meet the community’s expected level of service in the short term. However, this option would lower the cost to $20 per property per year over the next 10 years.

The financial forecasts, to deliver the programme, are based on high level cost estimates. These estimates were produced based on studies and reports compiled during the production of the Recovery Plan. Through our discussions with management, we confirmed that contingencies have been included in the estimates, and estimates are based on delivering the programme to existing levels of service provision contained within the existing Activity Management Plans. Therefore, we have assessed that the budget has a reasonable and supportable basis for inclusion in the LTP CD, for consultation with the district.

4.5 Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry

The recent report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry: Stage 2 recommends that Drinking Water Standards be improved. The inquiry takes a view that there are significant failures/weaknesses in the existing systems for the supply of drinking water. If the recommendations are implemented, it will mean that all “secure” deep groundwater will need to have ultra-violet treatment, and all on-demand supplies in the District Council’s urban communities will need to be chlorinated. Restricted supplies, mainly in the District Council’s rural communities, are already chlorinated. Chlorination equipment is also in place for all these supplies. However, only the Mandeville/Fernside and Waikuku Beach supplies have ultra-violet (UV) treatment installed.

Over the first four years of this Long Term Plan, the District Council has included approximately $3 million for the installation of ultra-violet treatment systems to meet future (higher) standards.

While it is likely that chlorination of all schemes will be required and budget provisions have been made for this, the Council has decided it will not start chlorination of its schemes in advance of any revised Drinking Water Standards. Results of recent community consultation have been strongly in favour of having unchlorinated water, even though the community was made aware of the risks. At the moment, there is still some uncertainty as to what the actual requirements of the revised Drinking Water Standards will be and their timing. However, statements from the Government have been supportive of the recommendations so it is probable that most, if not all, of the Inquiry’s recommendations will be adopted.
The rate for water scheme chlorination, which includes operational costs, is estimated to be $9 per property per year and rates could range from less than $30 to $200 per property per year for the capital cost of UV treatment installation.

We have reviewed the assumptions applied to prepare the cost estimates for the projects and we are satisfied that the information, included in the draft CD and LTP, provides a reasonable and a supportable basis for consultation with the community.

4.6 Quality of asset-related forecasting information

Based on the work completed to date, we are satisfied that the asset management practices, and planning for the core infrastructure activities (including three waters and transport), are sufficiently robust, and there is sound knowledge of asset condition. As a result, we have concluded that the asset management practices provide a reasonable basis for the information and strategies to be included in the LTP CD and LTP.

The water supply asset management plan has been peer reviewed by Infrastructure Associates Limited. The key recommendation focused on improvement of the document’s links to other planning documents. We have confirmed that this has been addressed in the revised version.

The sewerage, drainage, greenspace and transport peer reviews have not been finalised. We plan to review them before the adoption of the final LTP.

5 Adopting and auditing the underlying information

The District Council prepared and adopted the underlying information necessary to support the LTP CD. We did not audit the full content of the draft Long Term Plan, only the aspects relevant to the CD. This was because it was provided to us shortly before signing the CD audit report. We will review the full LTP document as part of the final LTP audit.

5.1 Financial strategy and infrastructure strategy

We evaluated and confirmed the District Council’s compliance with the requirements of the relevant sections of the Local Government Authority 2002, including the balanced budget requirements.

There are no fundamental changes to the District Council’s financial and infrastructure structure strategies. These strategies build on the previous strategies, and take into account progress on projects, subsequent developments and separate public consultations undertaken.

The District Council is clear about its priorities in the financial strategy. The District Council’s financial strategy is considered prudent and appropriate. The District Council seeks to maintain its sound financial position, and plans to be within its rates and borrowing limits throughout the LTP period.
The linkages between the financial strategy, asset management plans, infrastructure strategy, and consultation document are clear with consistent messages in all documents.

5.2 Performance framework

The District Council is not proposing significant changes to its performance framework. From our review of the proposed performance framework, we are satisfied, with the exception detailed below, that it includes all mandatory performance measures and appropriately reflects proposed changes in levels of services.

5.2.1 Performance measure for unsealed roads

Recommendation

Include a performance measure that demonstrates whether the District Council is providing the agreed level of service for the condition of its unsealed roads.

Findings

Unsealed roads represent approximately 38% of the district’s roading network. Currently the performance framework includes the following performance measure:

“The percentage of unsealed roads carrying 200 or more vehicle movements per day”.

Given the district’s size of its unsealed road network, we believe that the District Council should have at least one performance measure that enables its community to meaningfully assess whether it is providing the agreed level of service for the condition of its unsealed roads. The current measure only provides the reader with an understanding of the volume of their use.

Management Comment

5.3 Assumptions and underlying information

The underlying information and assumptions, used to prepare the LTP CD, and LTP, provide a reasonable and supportable basis for the preparation of the forecast information.

We reviewed the forecast financial information against the assumptions outlined. We confirmed that the assumptions have been appropriately applied, excluding the assumption relating to Crown divestment of regeneration area land to the District Council.

In the Recovery Plan, the Crown has agreed, in principle, to divest the Crown-owned land within the five regeneration areas to the District Council and Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust. This is on the understanding that the land uses and activities, in the Recovery Plan, will be implemented.
The land associated with this agreement has not been included in the opening balance sheet in the financial forecasts. We determined that the misstatement was not material for the purpose of the CD, as it has no impact on the level of rates collected, or proposals contained in the CD. We expect it will be included in the final LTP.

5.4 Liability Management Policy

Recommendation

Either revise the liquidity ratio limit so that it is not breached, or provide an explanation in the policy, as to why it is appropriate that the limit is breached.

Findings

Per the District Council’s Liability Management policy, the liquidity ratio should not drop below 1:1. The liquidity ratio is the sum of cash, marketable securities, short term notes and receivables, divided by current liabilities.

The District Council forecasts to breach this benchmark for the first seven years of the draft LTP.

Management Comment

6 Audit of the Final LTP

The last step in the LTP audit process will be the audit of the final LTP document. This audit is scheduled to commence on 28 May 2018.

To ensure our audit of the LTP is efficient, we expect the District Council to prepare and provide us with a schedule of changes to the financial forecasts and other underlying information that were the basis of the CD. This will enable us to assess the extent of changes and tailor our audit work accordingly. We expect that in addition to any changes arising from the consultation process, there will be some management initiated changes.

In respect of these changes, we will gain assurance that appropriate consequential changes and disclosures have been made.

Under section 94(1) of the Act, our audit report on the final LTP forms part of the LTP, which the District Council is required to adopt by 30 June 2018 (section 93(3)). Our agreed timeframes will enable us to issue our audit report in time for the Council meeting scheduled, at which time the 2018-28 LTP will be formally adopted.

We are responsible for reporting on whether the LTP meets the statutory purpose and provides a reasonable basis for integrated decision making by the District Council and accountability to the community. We also provide an opinion on whether the information
and assumptions underlying the financial forecasts are reasonable. Finally, we will provide our opinion on whether the disclosures in the LTP meet the requirements of Part 2 of the Local Government (Financial Reporting and Prudence) Regulations 2014 and accurately reflect the information drawn from the plan.

At the conclusion of the LTP audit, we will ask Council to provide us with a signed management representation letter on the LTP. We will provide the letter template during the LTP audit.
## Appendix 1: Mandatory disclosures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Key messages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our responsibilities in conducting the audit</td>
<td>We carried out this audit on behalf of the Controller and Auditor-General. We are responsible for expressing an independent opinion on the consultation document and reporting that opinion to you. This responsibility arises from section 93C(4) of the Local Government Act 2002. The audit of the consultation document does not relieve management or the Council of their responsibilities. Our audit engagement letter contains a detailed explanation of the respective responsibilities of the auditor and the District Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditing standards</td>
<td>We carry out our audit in accordance with the International Standard on Assurance Engagements (New Zealand) 3000 (Revised): Assurance Engagements Other Than Audits or Reviews of Historical Financial Information, the International Standard on Assurance Engagements 3400: The Examination of Prospective Financial Information, and the Auditor-General’s auditing standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditor independence</td>
<td>We are independent of the District Council in accordance with the independence requirements of the Auditor-General’s Auditing Standards, which incorporate the independence requirements of Professional and Ethical Standard 1 (Revised): Code of Ethics for Assurance Practitioners, issued by New Zealand Auditing and Assurance Standards Board. In addition to our audit of the District Council’s consultation document and all legally required external audits, we have provided an assurance report on certain matters in respect of the District Council’s Debenture Trust Deed. These assignments are compatible with those independence requirements. Other than these assignments, we have no relationship with or interests in the District Council or any of its subsidiaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other relationships</td>
<td>We are not aware of any situations where a spouse or close relative of a staff member involved in the audit occupies a position with the District Council that is significant to the audit. We are not aware of any situations where a staff member of Audit New Zealand has accepted a position of employment with the District Council during or since the audit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1 This report recommends the Council submits in support of Canterbury Regional Council's (Ecan) proposal for representation arrangements to be implemented for the 2019 Triennium Local Body Elections.

**Attachments:**

i. Environment Canterbury’s Representation Review Resolution of 21 June 2018 and ward map (Trim 180625069788)

ii. Environment Canterbury’s Report 21 June 2018 (Trim 180625069795)

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180624069683.

(b) **Notes** the Canterbury Regional Council proposal is for two members to represent the North Canterbury constituency that would come into existence for the 2019 Local Body Elections.

(c) **Submits** in support of the representation arrangements proposed by the Canterbury Regional Council (Ecan) for implementation for the 2019 Local Body Elections, with the submission to be approved by the Mayor.

(d) **Notes** a copy of the final submission will be circulated to all Councillors and Community Boards.

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 For the 2016 local body elections the Environment Canterbury (Transitional Governance Arrangements) Act 2016 (ECTGA Act) was in place for Ecan which enabled seven elected members and six government appointed members to the decision making function of Environment Canterbury.

3.2 In preparation of the October 2019 Local Body Elections, and in accordance with the ECTGA Act 2016, Ecan has undertaken a Representation Review to return Ecan to a fully democratically elected Council. The review considers the representation arrangements for the number of electoral constituencies, their boundaries, names, and number of members (councillors).
3.3 In May 2017 Ecan resolved to retain First Past the Post as its electoral system and not establish Maori constituencies.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. At the Ecan meeting of 21 June 2018 the Council determined a total of 13 elected members.

4.2. Ecan seeks to maintain the three Canterbury constituencies of North, Mid and South Canterbury and allocate Christchurch City into four constituencies of Christchurch North, West, Central and South.

4.3. All the proposed boundaries align with territorial authority boundaries, and the membership make up from the total of 13 members is that each constituency will comprise of two members except for South Canterbury that has one member.

4.4. Ecan have determined under section 19V of the Local Electoral Act 2001 that the number of members to be elected by the electors of the proposed constituencies will ensure that the electors of the constituencies receive fair and effective representation having regard to the population of each constituency in the region.

4.5. Ecan recognised that like most regional councils, it was faced with the challenge of applying the Local Electoral Act 2001 population rules across its geographically large region that includes sizable rural areas with small populations. Whilst the option clearly aligns with territorial authority and ward boundaries, there are three constituencies that do not comply with the +/-10% rule (North and South Canterbury, and Christchurch South), and this was done to align with communities of interest and to follow territorial authority and ward boundaries.

4.6. The proposal recommended by Ecan does not comply with section 19V(2) of the Local Electoral Act 2001 because of the +/-10% rule and therefore must be referred directly to the Local Government Commission for its determination.

4.7. Public notification of the proposal and responsibilities in relation to submissions will occur from 28 June 2018. The submission period will be one month followed by a subsequent Ecan Council meeting to adopt the final proposal which will then be forwarded to the Local Government Commission for any appeal and determination. The final outcome will be known by mid-April 2019.

4.8. The Chief Executive has reviewed this report and supports the recommendations.

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

5.1.1. The Waimakariri District Council was advised on 22 June 2018 of the proposal. As an effected party, it has the right to submit on the proposal.

5.2. **Wider Community**

5.2.1. Public consultation of the proposal will be published on the Ecan website and publically notified from 28 June 2018 and will be open for comment for one month. Following another Ecan Council meeting the final proposal will be adopted and forwarded to the Local Government Commission for determination of the final outcome, before implementation for the 2019 Local Body Elections.
6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

6.1.1. Costs associated with the running of the Triennium Local Body Elections is a pro-rata cost share basis between the Regional Council, Canterbury District Health Board and the Waimakariri District Council. This cost share arrangement will have appropriate legally binding agreements and arrangements in place for the 2019 Local Body Elections, and arrangements will be similar to the October 2016 elections. The majority of costs associated with the local body elections involve public notifications, printing, mailing and counting of vote papers.

6.2. **Community Implications**

6.2.1. Local democracy is fully restored to the Canterbury Regional Council. It is proposed that North Canterbury constituency be represented by two publicly elected Councillors in October 2019.

6.3. **Risk Management**

6.3.1. Local democracy is fully restored to the Canterbury Regional Council.

6.4. **Health and Safety**

6.4.1. Nil.

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

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

7.2. **Legislation**

Local Electoral Act 2001
Environment Canterbury (Transitional Governance Arrangements) Act 2016

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

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

Opportunities for collaboration and partnerships are actively pursued.
Canterbury Regional Council Representation Review 2018

On 21 June 2018 the Canterbury Regional Council determined by resolution the proposed number of constituencies, the proposed name and proposed boundaries of each constituency and the number of members proposed to be elected by the electors of each constituency for the 2019 elections, as set out below.

Resolved

That the Council:

1. receives the report ‘Representation Review’

2. determines under section 191 of the Local Electoral Act 2001 the proposed number of constituencies, proposed names of each constituency, the number of members proposed to be elected by the electors of each constituency, and the proposed boundaries (as set out in the maps appended to this report) are:

   - North Canterbury-Ōpukaipuke: 2 members
   - Mid-Canterbury-Ōpākīhi: 2 members
   - South Canterbury-Ōtuhituhi: 1 member
   - Christchurch North-Ōrei: 2 members
   - Christchurch West-Ōpuna: 2 members
   - Christchurch Central-Ōhoko: 2 members
   - Christchurch South-Ōwhanga: 2 members

   Total: 13 members
3. notes that under the Environment Canterbury (Transitional Governance Arrangements) Act 2016 the membership which applied at the last triennial general election of members (2016) was 7 elected members 6 appointed members

4. under section 19K of the Local Electoral Act 2001 advises the proposed changes to the number of members and the constituency boundaries that applied at the last triennial general election are

   a) that the total number of members elected increases from 7 to 13 in accordance with the Environment Canterbury (Transitional Governance Arrangements) Act 2016

   b) that the Christchurch Constituency is allocated into four constituencies, and this proposed allocation aligns with current territorial authority ward boundaries, and reflects the communities of interest served in the Christchurch City area

5. under section 19U of the Local Electoral Act 2001 determines that:

   a) the proposed number and boundaries of constituencies will provide effective representation of communities of interest within the region;

   b) the proposed constituency boundaries coincide with the boundaries of the current statistical meshblock areas determined by Statistics New Zealand and used for parliamentary electoral purposes;

   c) constituency boundaries coincide with the boundaries of 1 or more territorial authority districts or the boundaries of wards

6. under section 19V of the Local Electoral Act 2001 has determined that the number of members to be elected by the electors of the proposed constituencies will ensure that the electors of the constituencies receive fair and effective representation having regard to the population of each constituency in the region

7. the Council considers that effective representation of communities of interest requires that constituencies be defined and membership distributed between them in a way that does not comply with section 19V(2) of the Local Electoral Act 2001

8. notes that the Council's recommended representation option does not comply with section 19V(2) of the Local Electoral Act 2001 and therefore must be referred directly to the Local Government Commission for its determination

9. delegates to the Chief Executive whatever is necessary for the Council to meet its obligations under the Local Electoral Act 2001 to
a) distribute copies of the resolution (section 19L)

b) give public notice of the proposal and responsibilities in relation to submissions (section 19M)

c) give public notice following consideration of public submissions (section 19N)

d) forward appeals and objections as well as Councils decisions under section 19V(4) to the Commission (section 19Q).
PROPOSAL FOR 13 MEMBERS FROM 7 CONSTITUENCIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituency</th>
<th>Population*</th>
<th>Site of Constituency</th>
<th>Population per Constituency</th>
<th>Deviation from Region Average ($)</th>
<th>Percentage of Regional Average (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Canterbury</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Canterbury</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Canterbury</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26,666</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Island</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33,333</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Rarawa</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Canterbury</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>62,500</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Hill</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-10.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.3. Representation Review

Council report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of meeting</th>
<th>Thursday 21st June 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Cindy Butt, Team Leader Governance Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endorsed by</td>
<td>Miles McConway, Director Finance and Corporate Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Purpose

1. To recommend Council resolves its initial representation arrangements proposal for public consultation.

Value proposition

2. Representation reviews determine detailed arrangements for the number of electoral constituencies, their boundaries, names and number of members.

Recommendations

That the Council:

1. receives the report ‘Representation Review’

2. determines under section 19I of the Local Electoral Act 2001 the proposed number of constituencies, proposed names of each constituency, the number of members proposed to be elected by the electors of each constituency, and the proposed boundaries (as set out in the maps appended to this report) are:

   North Canterbury [insert Maori name] 2 members
   Mid Canterbury [insert Maori name] 2 members
   South Canterbury [insert Maori name] 1 member
   Christchurch North [insert Maori name] 2 members
   Christchurch West [insert Maori name] 2 members
   Christchurch Central [insert Maori name] 2 members
   Christchurch South [insert Maori name] 2 members
   Total 13 members

3. notes that under the Environment Canterbury (Transitional Governance Arrangements) Act 2016 the membership which applied at the last triennial general election of members (2016) was 7 elected members 6 appointed members

4. under section 19K of the Local Electoral Act 2001 advises the proposed change to the number of members and the constituency boundaries that applied at the last triennial general election are
a) that the total number of members elected increases from 7 to 13 in accordance with the Environment Canterbury (Transitional Governance Arrangements) Act 2016

(b) that the Christchurch Constituency is allocated into four constituencies, and this proposed allocation aligns with current territorial authority ward boundaries, and reflects the communities of interest served in the Christchurch City area

5. under section 19U of the Local Electoral Act 2001 determines that:

a) the proposed number and boundaries of constituencies will provide effective representation of communities of interest within the region;

b) the proposed constituency boundaries coincide with the boundaries of the current statistical meshblock areas determined by Statistics New Zealand and used for parliamentary electoral purposes;

c) constituency boundaries coincide with the boundaries of 1 or more territorial authority districts or the boundaries of wards

6. under section 19V of the Local Electoral Act 2001 has determined that the number of members to be elected by the electors of the proposed constituencies will ensure that the electors of the constituencies receive fair and effective representation having regard to the population of each constituency in the region

7. the Council considers that effective representation of communities of interest requires that constituencies be defined and membership distributed between them in a way that does not comply with section 19V(2) of the Local Electoral Act 2001

8. notes that the Council’s recommended representation option does not comply with section 19V(2) of the Local Electoral Act 2001 and therefore must be referred directly to the Local Government Commission for its determination

9. delegates to the Chief Executive whatever is necessary for the Council to meet its obligations under the Local Electoral Act 2001 to

a) distribute copies of the resolution (section 19L)
b) give public notice of the proposal and responsibilities in relation to submissions (section 19M)
c) give public notice following consideration of public submissions (section 19N)
d) forward appeals and objections as well as Council’s decisions under section 19V(4) to the Commission (section 19Q).
Key points

3. At least once every 6 years councils are required to undertake a representation review. In the case of Environment Canterbury, the Environment Canterbury (Transitional Governance Arrangements) Act 2016 requires Council to review its representation arrangements before the next local authority elections in 2019.

4. Representation reviews determine the detailed arrangements for the number of electoral constituencies, their boundaries, names and number of members, and the Local Electoral Act 2001 sets the parameters within which the representation review process must be undertaken.

5. Under the Environment Canterbury (Transitional Governance Arrangements) Act 2016 Council is currently represented by a transitional governing body comprising seven elected councillors and five appointed councillors. These arrangements were made to transition Environment Canterbury to a fully-elected council in 2019.

Background

6. In March 2017 Council was advised about the representation review process, and considered preliminary election matters about its electoral system options and establishing Māori constituencies.

7. In May 2017 Council resolved to retain First Past the Post as its electoral system and to not establish Māori constituencies (however Council agreed to work with Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu to seek further discussion with Government on how to continue with the current Māori representation model that ensures mana whenua are represented).

8. In April and May 2018 four workshops were held with Council that explored a number of representation options available to it under the Local Electoral Act 2001, and resulted in a preferred option for a 13 member council elected from 7 constituencies.

9. It is this option Council wishes to now formally consider, and if approved, consult with the community.

The preferred option

10. The option seeks to increase the number of elected members from 7 to 13.

11. The option seeks to maintain the 3 Canterbury constituencies of North, Mid and South Canterbury and allocate Christchurch City into 4 constituencies of Christchurch North, West, Central and South.

12. The option includes dual English / Māori names for each constituency (the English name first followed by the Māori name). Māori names are being developed with Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu and Papatipu Rūnanga, and will be tabled at the meeting.
13. All the proposed boundaries align with territorial authority boundaries, and the membership make up from the total of 13 members is that each constituency will comprise 2 members except for South Canterbury that has 1 member.

14. Council recognised that like most regional councils, it was faced with the challenge of applying the Local Electoral Act 2001 population rules across its geographically large region that includes sizeable rural areas with small populations. Whilst the option clearly aligns with territorial authority and ward boundaries, there are 3 constituencies that don’t comply with the +/-10% rule (North and South Canterbury, and Christchurch South), and this was done to align with communities of interest and to follow territorial authority and ward boundaries.

15. Council notes the proposal does not comply with the Local Electoral Act 2001 and must be referred directly to the Local Government Commission for its determination.

**Considering Māori representation**

16. Council acknowledges the value and benefit of having 2 Ngāi Tahu representatives at the council table (since 2011), and wishes to consider how the representation review could support continued mana whenua representation at ECan.

17. The Local Electoral Act 2001 provides for councils to establish Māori Constituencies if they so choose. However, investigations concluded that applying the Local Electoral Act for Māori representation at ECan would result in a single member Māori constituency with a representative that need not be Ngāi Tahu. This is because any eligible elector can stand as a candidate in a Māori constituency and therefore Ngāi Tahu – mana whenua in Canterbury – would not be guaranteed to be represented at the Council table.

18. Council therefore confirmed its position that Māori constituencies are not appropriate for the Canterbury rohe and this view was shared by Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu who supported Council’s decision to not establish Māori Constituencies and said “Acknowledging the rights of mana whenua within their region is a fundamental feature of Māori law and Māori political organisation. Although Māori wards would provide for a Māori representative, this representative would not necessarily be someone of Ngāi Tahu whakapapa. More importantly, even if the representative was someone with Ngāi Tahu whakapapa, they would not necessarily be answerable to Ngāi Tahu whānui in the manner and extent that is required to bring through the kaupapa, priorities, rights and interests of Ngāi Tahu as the Treaty partner.”

19. Further, Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu recommended that “all future local body representation arrangements within our tribal area ensure that the Ngāi Tahu voice is provided for through a Ngāi Tahu representative that is answerable to the Ngāi Tahu whānui. We endorse the current arrangements that provide for that voice, and we look forward to working with Councillors to explore other options for the future.”
Legislative requirements

20. The legal considerations for a regional council representation review are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership (including Chairperson)</th>
<th>To be not less than six nor more then 14 Councillors</th>
<th>s19D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basis of election</td>
<td>The region must be divided into constituencies. Councillors may not be elected partly by the electors of the region and partly by the electors of constituencies. Councillors must be elected by the electors of each constituency of the region. Each constituency must elect at least one councillor</td>
<td>s19E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>Arrangements must:</td>
<td>s19U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• provide effective representation of communities of interest within the region</td>
<td>s19V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ensure electors receive fair representation having regard to the +/-10% population rule provided in section 19V(2)</td>
<td>s19X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ensure that constituency boundaries coincide with current statistical mesh block areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ensure that constituency boundaries, as far as practicable, coincide with the boundaries of one or more territorial authorities or the boundaries of wards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section 10V(3)(b) provides a ground for not complying with the +/-10% rule as set out in section 10V(2). Constituencies may be defined in such a way that does not comply with the +/-10% rule if this is required to ensure effective representation of communities of interest.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All exceptions to the +/-10% rule must be approved by the Local Government Commission. The approval of the Commission is required whether or not appeals or objections are lodged against a regional council's decision.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. The three key principles to consider when undertaking a representation review are:

Communities of interest

22. Communities of interest are not defined in the legislation, and are an essential part of the review process. Communities of interest can mean different things to different people. A community of interest is: an area where one feels a sense of belonging; an area where one looks for social, service and economic support. Sense of belonging can be influenced by geographical features such as rivers, catchments and roads etc. A community of interest can be identified by: access to goods and services needed every day; rohe and takiwa of tangata whenua may also be factors; similarities in demographic, socio-economic and/or ethnic characteristics; similarities in economic activities; dependence on shared facilities (schools, recreational, retail, cultural); physical and topographical features; history of an area; and transport and communication links.
23. In the circumstances of regional council representation reviews the boundaries of territorial authorities are also recognised as communities of interest.

24. Communities of interest may change over time, and must be able to be defined as a single geographical area i.e. a physical boundary.

Effective representation

25. The Local Electoral Act 2001 determines that for a regional council the number of members must be between 6-14. Regional councils must also be elected on a constituency basis, and consideration given for how communities are most effectively represented. Constituency boundaries, so far as practicable, should coincide with neighbouring territorial authority boundaries.

Fair representation

26. The Local Electoral Act 2001 determines each councillor represents approximately the same number of people. And as such the Local Electoral Act 2001 applies a formula to ensure population equity, the plus/minus 10% average representation. This is called the +/-10% rule.

27. If a regional council does not comply with the +/-10% criteria, this is permissible, but the matter is automatically referred to the Local Government Commission for determination.

Legislative application

Identifying communities of interest

28. Council identified its regional communities of interest as being:

i. commercial hubs of:
   • Kaikōura
   • Rangiora
   • Rolleston
   • Lincoln
   • Christchurch
   • Ashburton
   • Timaru

ii. Canterbury Water Management Strategy Zones

iii. papatipu rūnanga

iv. rural/farming

v. forestry/conservation

vi. coastal/lifestyle/horticulture

29. It is noted that the regional communities also need to follow, so far as is practicable, territorial authority or territorial authority ward boundaries.
Applying effective representation

30. Council discussed the number of constituencies, number of councillors, the size of the region (manageable areas), councillor workload; including operational demands in attendance at meetings, and councillors being able to adequately respond to the interests and demands of their constituents.

Fair representation (±/-10% rule)

31. The ±/-10% rule was applied to each of the options presented, and are outlined below.

Options investigated

32. Each representation option has had regard to legal compliance under the Local Electoral Act 2001 and fair elector and community of interest representation. Current population data (June 2017) was used in each option evaluation.

33. **14 councillors from 4 constituencies (3 Canterbury, 1 Christchurch (2-2-2-8)**

Total estimated population (June 2017) 612,280 / 14 Councillors = 43,734
Range ±/- 10% = 39,361 to 48,107

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4 Constituencies</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>No. of Councillors per constituency</th>
<th>Population per councillor</th>
<th>Deviation from region average (43,734)</th>
<th>Percentage deviation from region average</th>
<th>±/-10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Canterbury</td>
<td>75,800</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37,900</td>
<td>-5,834</td>
<td>-13.34</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Canterbury</td>
<td>93,440</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46,720</td>
<td>+2,996</td>
<td>+6.83</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Canterbury</td>
<td>61,320</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30,660</td>
<td>-13,074</td>
<td>-28.90</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch</td>
<td>381,720</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47,715</td>
<td>+3,981</td>
<td>+9.10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>612,280</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This option creates two constituencies that do not comply with the ±/- 10% rule, namely North and South Canterbury Constituencies are over represented.

34. **13 Councillors from 4 constituencies (3 Canterbury, 1 Christchurch (2-2-1-8)**

Total estimated population (June 2017) 612,280 / 13 Councillors = 47,098
Range ±/- 10% = 42,389 to 51,807

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4 Constituencies</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>No. of Councillors per constituency</th>
<th>Population per councillor</th>
<th>Deviation from region average (47,098)</th>
<th>Percentage deviation from region average</th>
<th>±/-10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Canterbury</td>
<td>75,800</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37,000</td>
<td>-9,108</td>
<td>-19.53</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Canterbury</td>
<td>83,440</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46,720</td>
<td>-378</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Canterbury</td>
<td>61,320</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61,320</td>
<td>+14,222</td>
<td>+30.20</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch</td>
<td>381,720</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47,715</td>
<td>+617</td>
<td>+1.31</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>612,280</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This option creates two constituencies that do not comply with the +/- 10% rule, namely North Canterbury Constituency is over represented, and the South Canterbury Constituency is under represented.

35. **12 Councillors from 4 constituencies (3 Canterbury, 1 Christchurch (1-2-1-8)***

Total estimated population (June 2017) 612,280 / 12 Councillors = 51,023
Range +/- 10% = 45,921 to 56,125

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4 Constituencies</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>No. of Councillors per constituency</th>
<th>Population per councillor</th>
<th>Deviation from region average (51,023)</th>
<th>Percentage deviation from region average</th>
<th>+/-10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Canterbury</td>
<td>75,800</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75,800</td>
<td>+24,777</td>
<td>+48.56</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Canterbury</td>
<td>93,440</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46,720</td>
<td>-4,303</td>
<td>-8.43</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Canterbury</td>
<td>61,320</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61,320</td>
<td>+10,297</td>
<td>+20.18</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch</td>
<td>381,720</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47,715</td>
<td>-3,306</td>
<td>-9.48</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>612,280</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This option creates two constituencies that do not comply with the +/-10% rule, namely North and South Canterbury Constituencies are under represented.

36. **12 Councillors from 6 constituencies (2 Canterbury, 4 Christchurch constituencies (2-2-2-2-2)**

Total Canterbury population: 612,280 / 12 = 51,023,
Range +/- 10% = 45,921 to 56,125

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6 Constituencies</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>No. of Councillors per constituency</th>
<th>Population per councillor</th>
<th>Deviation from region average (51,023)</th>
<th>Percentage deviation from region average</th>
<th>+/-10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Canterbury</td>
<td>135,100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67,550</td>
<td>+16,527</td>
<td>+32.30</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Canterbury</td>
<td>95,460</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47,730</td>
<td>-3,293</td>
<td>-6.45</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch North</td>
<td>100,400</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50,200</td>
<td>-523</td>
<td>-1.61</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch West</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47,500</td>
<td>-3,523</td>
<td>-6.90</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituency</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>No. of Councillors per constituency</td>
<td>Population per councillor</td>
<td>Deviation from region average (51,023)</td>
<td>Percentage deviation from region average</td>
<td>+/-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch Central</td>
<td>104,400</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52,200</td>
<td>+1,177</td>
<td>+2.30</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch South</td>
<td>61,920</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40,960</td>
<td>-10,053</td>
<td>-19.72</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>612,280</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This option creates two constituencies that do not comply with the +/-10% rule, namely North Canterbury Constituency is under represented and Christchurch South Constituency is over represented.

37. **12 Councillors from 6 constituencies (2 Canterbury, 4 Christchurch constituencies (3-2-2-2-1)**

Total Canterbury population: 612,280 / 12 = 51,023

Range +/-10% = 45,921 to 56,125

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6 Constituencies</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>No. of Councillors per constituency</th>
<th>Population per councillor</th>
<th>Deviation from region average (51,023)</th>
<th>Percentage deviation from region average</th>
<th>+/-10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Canterbury</td>
<td>135,100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45,033</td>
<td>-5,990</td>
<td>-11.74</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Canterbury</td>
<td>95,460</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47,730</td>
<td>-3,293</td>
<td>-6.45</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch North</td>
<td>100,400</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50,200</td>
<td>-823</td>
<td>-1.61</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch West</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47,500</td>
<td>-3,523</td>
<td>-6.90</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch Central</td>
<td>104,400</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52,200</td>
<td>+1,177</td>
<td>+2.30</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch South</td>
<td>61,920</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61,920</td>
<td>+30,897</td>
<td>+60.55</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>612,280</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This option creates two constituencies that do not comply with the +/-10% rule, namely North Canterbury Constituency is over represented and Christchurch South Constituency is under represented.

38. **13 Councillors from 6 constituencies (2 Canterbury, 4 Christchurch constituencies (3-2-2-2-2)**

Total estimated population (June 2017) 612,280 / 13 = 47,098

Range +/- 10% = 42,389 to 51,807

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6 Constituencies</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>No. of Councillors per constituency</th>
<th>Population per councillor</th>
<th>Deviation from region average (47,098)</th>
<th>Percentage deviation from region average</th>
<th>+/-10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Canterbury</td>
<td>135,100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45,033</td>
<td>-2,065</td>
<td>-4.38</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_Council Meeting 2018-06-21_
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituency</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>No. of Councillors per constituency</th>
<th>Population per councillor</th>
<th>Deviation from region average (47,098)</th>
<th>Percentage deviation from region average</th>
<th>+/-10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Canterbury</td>
<td>95,460</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47,730</td>
<td>+632</td>
<td>+1.34</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch North</td>
<td>100,400</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50,200</td>
<td>+3,102</td>
<td>+6.59</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch West</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47,500</td>
<td>+402</td>
<td>+0.65</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch Central</td>
<td>104,400</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52,200</td>
<td>+5,102</td>
<td>+10.83</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch South</td>
<td>81,020</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40,660</td>
<td>-8,138</td>
<td>-13.03</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>612,280</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This option creates two constituencies that do not comply with the +/-10% rule, namely Christchurch Central that is slightly under represented and Christchurch South Constituency that is over represented.

39. **13 Councillors from 5 constituencies (3 Canterbury, 2 Christchurch (North/South) (2-2-1-4-4)**

Total Canterbury population: 612,280 / 13 = 47,098
Range +/- 10% = 42,389 to 51,807

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituency</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>No. of Councillors per constituency</th>
<th>Population per councillor</th>
<th>Deviation from region average (47,098)</th>
<th>Percentage deviation from region average</th>
<th>+/-10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Canterbury</td>
<td>75,800</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37,900</td>
<td>-9,198</td>
<td>-10.53</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Canterbury</td>
<td>93,440</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46,720</td>
<td>-378</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Canterbury</td>
<td>61,320</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61,320</td>
<td>+14,222</td>
<td>+30.20</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch North</td>
<td>195,400</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>48,850</td>
<td>+1,762</td>
<td>+3.72</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch South</td>
<td>186,320</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>49,580</td>
<td>-518</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>612,280</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This option creates two constituencies that do not comply with the +/-10% rule, namely North Canterbury that is over represented and South Canterbury that is under represented.

40. **13 Councillors from 5 constituencies (3 Canterbury, 2 Christchurch (East/West) (2-2-1-4-4)**

Total Canterbury population: 612,280 / 13 = 47,098
Range +/- 10% = 42,389 to 51,807
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 Constituencies</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>No. of Councillors per constituency</th>
<th>Population per councillor</th>
<th>Deviation from region average (47,098)</th>
<th>Percentage deviation from region average</th>
<th>+/-10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Canterbury</td>
<td>75,800</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37,900</td>
<td>-9,196</td>
<td>-19.53</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Canterbury</td>
<td>93,440</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46,720</td>
<td>-378</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Canterbury</td>
<td>61,320</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61,320</td>
<td>+14,222</td>
<td>+30.20</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch East</td>
<td>183,120</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45,780</td>
<td>-1,318</td>
<td>-2.80</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch West</td>
<td>168,600</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>49,650</td>
<td>+2,552</td>
<td>+5.42</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>612,280</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This option creates two constituencies that do not comply with the +/-10% rule, namely North Canterbury that is over represented and South Canterbury that is under represented.

41. **13 Councillors from 7 constituencies (3 Canterbury, 4 Christchurch (2-2-1-2-2-2-2))**

Total Canterbury population: 612,280 / 13 = 47,098
Range +/-10% = 42,399 to 51,807

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7 Constituences</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>No. of Councillors per constituency</th>
<th>Population per councillor</th>
<th>Deviation from region average (47,098)</th>
<th>Percentage deviation from region average</th>
<th>+/-10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Canterbury</td>
<td>75,600</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37,900</td>
<td>-9,196</td>
<td>-19.53</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Canterbury</td>
<td>93,440</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46,720</td>
<td>-378</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Canterbury</td>
<td>61,320</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61,320</td>
<td>+14,222</td>
<td>+30.20</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch North</td>
<td>100,400</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50,200</td>
<td>+3,102</td>
<td>+6.59</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch West</td>
<td>95,600</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47,500</td>
<td>+402</td>
<td>+0.85</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch Central</td>
<td>104,400</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52,200</td>
<td>+5,102</td>
<td>+10.83</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch South</td>
<td>81,920</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40,960</td>
<td>-6,138</td>
<td>-13.03</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>612,280</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This option creates four constituencies that do not comply with the +/-10% rule, namely North Canterbury and Christchurch South Constituencies that are over represented and Christchurch Central and South Canterbury Constituencies that are under represented.

*Council Meeting 2018-06-21*
42. Council also initially discussed member numbers being below 12 i.e. 11 to the minimum of 6. These were discarded early as they presented significant challenges for maintaining fair and effective representation across the region.

The preferred option

43. After considering the options, Council asked staff to prepare a preferred option for a 13 member council elected from 7 constituencies based on the following structure:

a) 3 Canterbury constituencies of North, Mid and South Canterbury that comprises:
   i. 2 members in North Canterbury based on constituency boundaries that align with the territorial authority boundaries of Kaikōura, Hurunui and Waimakariri districts
   ii. 2 members in Mid Canterbury based on constituency boundaries that align with the territorial authority boundaries of Selwyn and Ashburton districts
   iii. 1 member in South Canterbury based on constituency boundaries that align with the territorial authority boundaries of Timaru, Mackenzie, Waimate and the part of the Waitaki district that is within the Canterbury region.

The 3 Canterbury constituency model provides for fair and effective representation. Canterbury is the largest region in New Zealand and given the size and population of the region, diversity of land use patterns and geography, and the rural/urban balance between the Christchurch metropolitan area and the remainder of the region, the 3 Canterbury constituency model would not unreasonably compromise fair and effective representation across the balance of the region.

b) 4 Christchurch City constituencies of North, West, Central and South Christchurch that comprises:
   i. 2 members in Christchurch North that includes the 4 Christchurch City Council wards of Coastal, Innes, Papanui and Burwood, and that the constituency boundaries align with these ward boundaries
   ii. 2 members in Christchurch West that includes the 4 Christchurch City Council wards of Harewood, Waimairi, Hornby and Halswell, and that the constituency boundaries align with these ward boundaries
   iii. 2 members in Christchurch Central that includes the 4 Christchurch City Council wards of Fendalton, Riccarton, Central and Linwood, and that the constituency boundaries align with these ward boundaries
   iv. 2 members in Christchurch South that includes the 4 Christchurch City Council wards of Cashmere, Heathcote, Spreydon and Banks Peninsula, and that the constituency boundaries align with these ward boundaries.
The 4 City constituency model reflects distinct and identifiable communities of interest that align to city ward boundaries, provides the ability for members to be recognisable and effectively represent the views of their electoral area, and creates a balance of representation across the region (apart from South Canterbury) by each constituency being represented with two councillors each. The 4 City constituency model would not unreasonably compromise fair and effective representation across the city, nor compromise the balance of representation across the region.

c) It is recommended the names for each constituency be dual English / Māori (English first, followed by the Māori name).

44. Assessment of the preferred option of 13 members from 7 constituencies (2-2-1-2-2-2-2)

Total Canterbury population: 612,280 / 13 = 47,098
Range +/- 10% = 42,389 to 51,807

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituencies</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>No. of Councilors per constituency</th>
<th>Population per councillor</th>
<th>Deviation from region average (47,098)</th>
<th>Percentage deviation from region average</th>
<th>+/-10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Canterbury</td>
<td>75,800</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37,900</td>
<td>-9,158</td>
<td>-19.53</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Canterbury</td>
<td>93,440</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46,720</td>
<td>-378</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Canterbury</td>
<td>61,320</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61,320</td>
<td>+14,222</td>
<td>+30.20</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch North</td>
<td>100,400</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50,200</td>
<td>+3,102</td>
<td>+6.59</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch West</td>
<td>95,700</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47,850</td>
<td>+762</td>
<td>+1.60</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch Central</td>
<td>103,300</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51,650</td>
<td>+4,552</td>
<td>+9.67</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch South</td>
<td>82,320</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41,160</td>
<td>-5,938</td>
<td>-12.61</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>812,280</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

45. In accordance with section 19V(2) of the Local Electoral Act 2001 the population that each member represents in the Mid-Canterbury, Christchurch North, Christchurch West and Christchurch Central constituencies falls within the range of 47,098 +/-10% (42,389 to 51,807).

46. The proposal for 2 members in North Canterbury does not comply with section 19V(2) (+/-10% rule) and would result in over representation (a -19.53% deviation from the regional average councillor to elector ratio). The degree of over representation in this case would not unreasonably compromise fair and effective representation across the balance of the region and is done to align with territorial authority boundaries and reflect the communities of interest in the North Canterbury area (reliant on section 19U(c) of the Local Electoral Act 2001 that requires regional council constituency
boundaries, so far as practicable to coincide with territorial authority districts or the boundaries of wards).

47. The proposal for 4 constituencies in Christchurch City results in over representation in Christchurch South (a -12.61% deviation from the regional average councillor to elector ratio). The degree of over representation in this case would not unreasonably compromise fair and effective representation across the city, nor compromise the balance of representation across the region, and is done to align with territorial authority boundaries (reliant on section 19U(c) of the Local Electoral Act 2001 that requires regional council constituency boundaries, so far as practicable to coincide with territorial authority districts or the boundaries of wards).

48. The proposal for 1 member in South Canterbury does not comply with section 19V(2) (+/-10% rule) and would result in under representation (a +30.20% deviation from the regional average councillor to elector ratio). Based on a 13 member Council and 3 Canterbury constituencies it was not possible to achieve compliance and in this case the principles of fair and effective representation are balanced between one area and the remainder of the region. The proposed constituency boundaries reflect the communities of interest in South Canterbury and align with territorial authority boundaries (reliant on section 19U(c) of the Local Electoral Act 2001 that requires regional council constituency boundaries, so far as practicable to coincide with territorial authority districts or the boundaries of wards). The under representation in South Canterbury reflects the geography of the Canterbury region.

Summary of the Canterbury region population*

| North Canterbury      | Kaikōura   | 3,720   |
|                       | Hurunui    | 12,820  |
|                       | Waimakariri| 59,280  |
|                       |            | 75,800  |

| Mid-Canterbury        | Salisbury  | 59,300  |
|                       | Ashburton  | 34,140  |
|                       |            | 93,440  |

| South Canterbury      | Timaru     | 47,090  |
|                       | Mackenzie  | 4,000   |
|                       | Waimate    | 7,900   |
|                       | part of Waitaki district that is within the Canterbury region | 1,730 |
|                       |            | 61,320  |

<p>| Christchurch North    | Coastal    | 24,800  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suburb</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Innes</td>
<td>24,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papanui</td>
<td>25,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burwood</td>
<td>26,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Christchurch West</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harewood</td>
<td>22,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimairi</td>
<td>23,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornby</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halswell</td>
<td>25,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Christchurch Central</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferryn</td>
<td>24,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riccarton</td>
<td>27,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>25,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linwood</td>
<td>26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>103,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Christchurch South</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spreydon</td>
<td>25,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cashmere</td>
<td>22,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathcote</td>
<td>25,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banks Peninsula</td>
<td>8,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Canterbury Population</strong></td>
<td><strong>612,280</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Estimated resident population as at 30 June 2017 provided by Statistics NZ*

**Cost, compliance and communication**

**Financial implications**

49. The cost of the representation review is provided for in the governance services budget. Costs to date include staff time to develop the proposal including internal GIS mapping services and internet communications/web services.

**Risk assessment and legal compliance**

50. Legal compliance is outlined in the report.
51. The report has been reviewed by General Counsel.

Significance and engagement

52. The representation review has a high degree of significance and we will consult as required by the Local Electoral Act 2001.

53. While we have not yet consulted on the extensive constituency framework we have consulted with Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu on the matter of Māori representation.

Consistency with council policy

54. The representation review is required under the Environment Canterbury (Transitional Governance Arrangements) Act 2016.

Communication

55. Engagement and communication are included in next steps.

Next steps

Representation review timetable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thursday 14 December 2017</th>
<th>Council briefing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early-February 2018</td>
<td>Meet with the project team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 12 February 2018</td>
<td>Chief Executive Forum (present timetable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 23 February 2018</td>
<td>Mayoral Forum (present timetable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 5 April 2018</td>
<td>Council Workshop 1 (present factors that will influence representation options such as population, TA boundaries and consider communities of interest)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 19 April 2018</td>
<td>Council Workshop 2 (use feedback from the first workshop to develop option(s))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 3 May 2018</td>
<td>Council Workshop 3 (present options developed from the workshops)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 10 May 2018</td>
<td>Council Workshop 4 (present a draft initial proposal developed from the workshops)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-June 2018</td>
<td>Pre-review engagement with key stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Friday 26 May, Chair briefing to the Mayoral Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Friday 8 June, email and fact sheet sent to key stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 14 June</td>
<td>A representation review information page will go live on Council’s website (the day the council report on the initial proposal is publicly available)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 21 June 2018</td>
<td>Council meeting (resolve initial proposal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 27 June 2018</td>
<td>Public notice of initial proposal and invite submissions (within 14 days of resolution, and not later than 8 September 2018 (LEA, section 19M)). The community will be invited to make submissions by; writing to us, emailing us, and using an on-line submission tool from Council’s website. On-line submission portal will go live on Council’s website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurs 28 June to Mon 30 July (close)</td>
<td>Submission period (close not less than one month after public notice (LEA, section 19M))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 August</td>
<td>Hearing of submissions (within 6 weeks of closing of submissions (LEA, sections 19M and 19N))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 August</td>
<td>Council meeting (adopt final proposal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 29 August</td>
<td>Public notice of final proposal (within 6 weeks of closing date of submissions). If the proposal does not comply with the +/-10% requirement it must be forwarded to the LGC for determination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not later than 8 September</td>
<td>Council must resolve its final proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon 10 September to Mon 8 October 2018</td>
<td>Objection/appeal period (close not less than one month after the date of public notice of the final proposal (LEA, section 18O))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By 31 October 2018</td>
<td>Forward objections/appeals to LGC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By 11 April</td>
<td>LGC decision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Attachments**

a) Map of proposed Christchurch City constituencies

b) Map of the region, 3 proposed Canterbury constituencies (and the 4 proposed Christchurch City constituencies)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal review</th>
<th>Catherine Schache, General Counsel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer reviewers</td>
<td>Miles McConway, David Perenara-O’Connell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1. The purpose of this report is to update the Council on Health and Safety matters for the month of May.

**Attachments:**
1. Discharging Officer Health and Safety Duties
2. May 2018 Health and Safety Dashboard Report

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) Receives report No 180524057333

2. **BACKGROUND**

3.1. 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.

3.2. 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 four work-related accidents in this report, three of which are pending investigation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Occurrence</th>
<th>Event description</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18/04/2018</td>
<td>Accident</td>
<td>Slipped over walking outside main door, and hurt right knee, thigh and bottom.</td>
<td>Pending Investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/04/2018</td>
<td>Accident</td>
<td>During staff bonding exercise slipped over on the wet grass, did the splits and twisted knee.</td>
<td>Activity was outside on the damp grass completing a team bonding activity. Worker went to bend down</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2. The dashboard review shows:

- The WDC Risk Register Review has been presented to the Audit and Risk Committee on Tuesday 22nd May. It included an amended Action Plan (see below). The Action Plan will be reviewed on a monthly basis by the Management Team and Health, Safety & Quality Manager.
- A new Confined Space Entry procedure has been finalised. Confined Space entry is one of the high-risk activities that some WDC staff are engaged in, particularly those from the Water Unit and Aquatic Facilities. This procedure was created in consultation with both internal and external stakeholders.
- A new Asbestos Management Policy and Procedure have been developed, are currently being reviewed in draft form by relevant teams. They will be submitted to Management Team for final review and approval after 25th May.
- A serious harm incident occurred on a developer worksite (Townsend subdivision), in which a concrete cutting subcontractor removed 3 fingers from his hand. WorkSafe were notified, the incident was investigated internally, and WorkSafe have notified all parties that they will also be investigating the incident. WDC has sought legal opinion regarding responsibility in this incident, which has indicated that there is very little likelihood that WDC would hold any liability in this incident.

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

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. Groups and Organisations

4.2. Wider Community

5. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. Financial Implications

N/A

5.2. Community Implications

N/A

5.3. Risk Management

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 Appendix 2).

5.4. Health and Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/05/18</td>
<td>Accident</td>
<td>Went to get off Reception chair, foot slipped on a piece of paper on the floor as chair turned. Left knee twisted, sharp pain.</td>
<td>Pending Investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/05/18</td>
<td>Accident</td>
<td>Slipped on walkway. Lower back injured. Slipped and landed on my bottom aggravating an injury which worker is already on light duties for.</td>
<td>Pending Investigation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Continuous improvement, monitoring, and reporting of Health and Safety activities are a key focus of the health and safety management system. Appendix 1 indicates the health and safety monitoring and improvement activities that are in progress at WDC.

6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. **Policy**

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

6.2. **Legislation**

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**

N/A

6.4. **Delegations**

N/A
## 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>KNOW</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>UNDERSTAND</td>
<td>Induction of new Council through tour of District and ongoing site visits.</td>
<td>Start of each new term and as required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H&amp;S Risk register to Audit Committee</td>
<td>Six monthly, or where major change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training on H&amp;S legislation and best practices updates</td>
<td>At least annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCO activities reported to the Audit Committee</td>
<td>At least annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESOURCES</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>MONITOR</td>
<td>Report to every Council meeting – standing agenda item to include Dashboard Update and any major developments</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Risk register review by Audit Committee</td>
<td>Six monthly, or where major change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPLY</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>VERIFY</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>
</tbody>
</table>
Objective 1: Improve Health and Safety data management, and encourage all staff to report incidents and hazards.

**Action 1:** Safety Management System investigation and procurement project (includes carry-over of 'Reporting Improvement' project from 2016/17).

- **Current Progress:** No change to prior month. Meeting was held with 4 other Councils in the region during to investigate the potential to embark on a shared services' procurement project, as each of those Councils are in varying stages either procuring, reviewing or replacing their Safety Management System software. However this shared services project has now been placed on hold due to differing priorities and workload levels across the Councils.

- **Comment:** In the meantime, WDC is pursuing the following potential option for improving Safety Management:
  - Incident management in Technology One (with mobility interface, and bespoke reporting developed by Technology One team)
  - Risk Management via Promapp (yet to be implemented)
  - Training Management via Promapp (yet to be trialed and approved)
  - Auditing schedule as per SafePlus requirements (see below), and continue with current inspection schedules for regular site audits
  - Documentation management via TRIM and new intranet portal (see below)
  - Procedure management via Promapp (yet to be implemented) and linked to new intranet portal (see below)

**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.

**Action 2:** Implementation of Tech1/Mobile Hazard, Incident and Take-5 systems (carry-over project).

- **Current Progress:** COMPLETE Hazards and Incidents: Both hazard forms and incident forms have 'gone live' online. All staff can lodge hazards or incidents via intranet link or mobile device. Link has been established to Technology 1, which is now the database for hazard and incident data. IT staff are developing workflows for any actions to be assigned to relevant staff. Completion of the workflows in Technology 1 is imminent, with IT currently working to finalise.

- **Comment:** Take-5 Forms: Take-5 forms have been developed for mobile devices, and are in use in the Water Unit. The forms have been demonstrated to Audit & Risk Committee, Health and Safety Committee, and key users throughout the organisation. Roll-out of Take-5 form has been completed with field staff from Property, Redzone Regeneration, Greenspace, and Utilities and Roadside during early April.

**Objective 3:** Ensure that all contractors are managed according to health and safety procedural requirements, and improve staff knowledge of those requirements.

**Action 6:** Contractor management process improvement project.

- **Current Progress:** Project is now in implementation phase. Stage 3: Complete

- **Comment:** Stage 2 Steps:
  - Creation of interim contract register
  - Process mapping of Contract Management processes
  - Implementation of a Contract Management software system (e.g. TechnologyOne Contract Management module).
  - Creation of a contract management training module.
  - Review and re-develop internal health and safety auditing system, aligned with best practice.

**Objective 4:** Improve the Health and Wellbeing of staff, and create measures to ensure success.

**Action 7:** Wellbeing strategy development and implementation project.

- **Current Progress:** TO 2018/19

**Objective 5:** Improve traceability and of staff working alone outside of hours, and appropriate response in the event of an incident.

**Action 8:** Lone working equipment procurement project.

- **Current Progress:** COMPLETE

**Legend:**
- On track
- Slightly behind schedule (less than one month)
- Behind schedule (greater than one month)
Incidents/Accidents - May 2018 (**as at 21st May 2018)

May 2017 to Current: Worker Incident Reporting

[Graph showing incident reporting trends from May 2017 to current, with categories for accidents, incidents, notifiable injuries/illnesses, near misses, property damage, and fatalities.]
| Lost Time Injuries: | 2016/17 | 3 Accidents - total 110 hours  
Causes of LTIs are:  
- Being hit by objects (6hrs)  
- Slips trips and falls (24hrs)  
- Body stressing (manual handling) (80hrs) |
|---------------------|---------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                     | 2017/18 | 4 Accidents - total 79 hours (one pending)  
Causes of LTIs are:  
- Body stressing x2 (manual handling) (63hrs)  
- Falls, trips, slips x2 (one pending) (16hrs) |

**LEAD INDICATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety Inspections Completed (Workplace Walkarounds)</th>
<th>Q2 2018</th>
<th>10 out of 16 areas completed and submitted. Hazards raised in Tech1 for any non-compliances.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Training Delivered                                  | 2016/17 | People Trained: 412  
Total Spend: $54,820 |
| Training Delivered                                  | 2017/18 | Year end update next month |
## Health and Safety Prequalified Contractor Dashboard (drawn from SiteWise database)

### Hazards Reported 2017-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractor Pipeline</th>
<th>Hazard Score</th>
<th>Alerts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graph: Hazards Reported 2017-18**

- July: 0
- August: 1
- September: 2
- October: 4
- November: 2
- December: 1
- January: 6
- February: 3
- March: 1
- April: 0
<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>30/06/2018</td>
<td>In progress</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>Not started</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></td>
<td>In progress</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></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>Not started</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>In progress</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>Not started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Adverse weather</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>High Risk</td>
<td>Adverse weather</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>In progress</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).*
1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to update the Council on Health and Safety matters for the month of June.

Attachments:
1. Discharging Officer Health and Safety Duties
2. June 2018 Health and Safety Dashboard Report

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives report No 180618067368

2. BACKGROUND

3.1 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.

3.2 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 six work-related accidents in this report, four of which are pending investigation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Occurrence</th>
<th>Event description</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24/05/2018</td>
<td>Accident</td>
<td>Was holding a child on their back in streamline position. The child's body was</td>
<td>Worker went to the doctor and was given some medication for the injury, this has not prevented her from being able to work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fighting the hold the worker was applying and as a result over extended her Left</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shoulder, causing instant pain.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2. In addition:

∑ The WDC Health and Safety Committee meeting was held on Friday 15th June, including both workgroup (worker) and management representatives. The Committee discussed policy development, incident reviews, training, risk register and other business.

∑ The focus for this month’s Health and Safety Risk Register Action Plan meeting was adverse weather response. A team of staff are developing a briefing for all staff that are required to work in response to adverse weather events, to ensure that all safety requirements are considered.

∑ The Health and Safety team, with the assistance of a staff workgroup have revised and re-issued Permit to Work procedures, which prescribe requirements for specific high-risk work (in particular confined space entry, working at heights and hot works).

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

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. Groups and Organisations

N/A

4.2. Wider Community

N/A

5. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. Financial Implications
5.2. Community Implications

N/A

5.3. Risk Management

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

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

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

N/A

6.4. Delegations

N/A
## 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>(To acquire, and keep up to date, knowledge of work health and safety matters)</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><strong>UNDERSTAND</strong></td>
<td>Induction of new Council through tour of District and ongoing site visits.</td>
<td>Start of each new term and as required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(To gain an understanding of the nature of the operations of the business or undertaking of the PCBU and generally of the hazards and risks associated with those operations)</td>
<td>H&amp;S Risk register to Audit Committee</td>
<td>Six monthly, or where major change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training on H&amp;S legislation and best practices updates</td>
<td>At least annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCO activities reported to the Audit Committee</td>
<td>At least annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESOURCES</strong></td>
<td>LTP or Annual Plan to have a specific report on H&amp;S resources</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(To ensure that the PCBU has available for use, and uses, appropriate resources and processes to eliminate or minimise risks to health and safety from work carried out as part of the conduct of the business or undertaking)</td>
<td>Reports to Committees will outline H&amp;S issues and resourcing, as appropriate</td>
<td>As required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MONITOR</strong></td>
<td>Report to every Council meeting – standing agenda item to include Dashboard Update and any major developments</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(To ensure that the PCBU has appropriate processes for receiving and considering information regarding incidents, hazards, and risks and for responding in a timely way to that information)</td>
<td>Risk register review by Audit Committee</td>
<td>Six monthly, or where major change</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>(To ensure that the PCBU has, and implements, processes for complying with any duty or obligation of the PCBU under this Act)</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>(To verify the provision and use of the resources and processes)</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>
</tbody>
</table>
### Objective 1: Improve Health and Safety data management, and encourage all staff to report incidents and hazards.

**Action 1:** Safety Management System investigation and procurement project (includes carry-over of ‘Reporting Improvement’ project from 2016/17).

**Current Progress:** COMPLETE

Meeting was held with 4 other Councils in the region during 2018 during to investigate the potential to embark on a ‘shared services’ procurement project, as each of those Councils are in varying stages either procuring, reviewing or replacing their Safety Management System software. However this shared services project has now been placed on hold due to differing priorities and workload levels across the Councils.

In the meantime, WDC is pursuing the following potential option for improving Safety Management:

- Incident management in Technology One (with mobility interface, and bespoke reporting developed by Technology One team)
- Risk Management via Promapp (yet to be implemented)
- Training Management via Promapp (yet to be trialed and approved)
- Auditing schedule as per SafePlus requirements (see below), and continue with current inspection schedules for regular site audits
- Documentation management via TRIM and new intranet portal (see below)
- Procedure management via Promapp (yet to be implemented) and linked to new intranet portal (see below)

The above approach was approved by Management Team on Monday 5th June 2018.

**Action 2:** Implementation of Tech1/Mobile Hazard, Incident and Take-5 systems (carry-over project).

**Current Progress:** COMPLETE

Hazards and Incidents: Hazard forms and incident forms have ‘gone live’ online. All staff can lodge hazards or incidents via intranet link or mobile device. Link has been established to Technology 1, which is now the database for hazard and incident data. IT staff are developing workflows for any actions to be assigned to relevant staff. Completion of the workflows in Technology 1 is imminent, with IT currently working to finalise.

Take-5 Forms: Take-5 forms have been developed for mobile devices, and are in use in the Water Unit. The forms have been demonstrated to Audit & Risk Committee, Health and Safety Committee, and key users throughout the organisation. Roll-out of Take-5 form to all field staff from Property, Redzone Regeneration, Greenspace, and Utilities and Roadng occurred during early April.

**Action 4:** Improvement of Due Diligence Health and Safety reporting.

**Current Progress:** COMPLETE

Linked with Action 2, the finalisation of the Technology 1 Hazard and Incident database allowed for improved due diligence reporting of both hazards and incidents. In addition, the Information Services team are developing bespoke reporting program to be able to draw the required information from Technology 1. This activity has been delayed and will carry over to the following year (2018/19).

In the interim, a suite of leading indicators have been developed for submission to Management Team and Council on a monthly basis, including training delivered, workplace walkarounds (inspections) completed, contractor compliance, hazards reported, and progress against WDC risk register action plan. The first round of these indicators was submitted in June 2018.

### 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.

**Action 5:** Review and re-develop internal health and safety auditing system, aligned with best practice.

**Current Progress:** CARRY OVER TO 2018/19

Initial investigation has lead to reviewing WorkSafe’s proposed “SafePlus” as a model. SafePlus has not been designed to replace WSMP. It has a different approach from a purely compliance audit. SafePlus is a business improvement tool that uses a behaviour-based assessment approach, and also offers independent guidance and advice on how to improve health and safety performance in a business.

The toolkit will be available as three separate products:
- Resources and guidance from WorkSafe website (available September 2017).
- An independent onsite assessment (available September 2017).
- A free online self-assessment (available mid 2018).

Delay to project due to requirement to align with SafePlus requirements and resources (above) which are not available unit mid-2018. Project will carry-over to 2018/19.

In the interim, the health and safety team have continued with quarterly Workplace Walkaround inspections and annual Hazardous Substances audits. Contract managers have continued with random Site Safety audits of contract sites.

### Objective 3: Ensure that all contractors are managed according to health and safety procedural requirements, and improve staff knowledge of those requirements.
Action 6: Contractor management process improvement project.

CARRY OVER TO 2018/19

Project is close to completion, having achieved the following:
- Creation of interim contract register
- Process mapping of Contract Management processes (including H&S requirements)
- Implementation of a Contract Management software system (e.g. TechnologyOne Contract Management module).
- Creation of a contract management training module.

1. Interim contract register has been created, introduced to key contract managers and handed over to Organisation (business as usual).
2. Contract Management process mapping (in Promapp) is complete. Handed over the process to the WDC Contract Documentation Review Group for the business as usual use of continuous improvement of processes.
3. Recommendation was made to Management Team that TechnologyOne Contract Management should be the software system of choice, however to delay implementation until after other key projects (Asset Management module in particular) are complete. Management Team have approved this decision.

Carry over activities are as below:
4. Training module is under development. Training will be delivered once the single-sign on for all staff to Promapp has been confirmed, and the Contract Documentation Review Group has had the opportunity to finalise all process maps. Proposed delivery: September 2018.
5. Audit function is still in development.

In addition, contract health and safety management systems are introduced to all staff at the time of their induction, and a short workshop was held on 6th June for all Utilities and Roading, Greenspace, Redzone Regeneration and some Water Unit staff to remind them of current procedures in place.

Objective 4: Improve the Health and Wellbeing of staff, and create measures to ensure success.

Action 7: Wellbeing strategy development and implementation project.

CARRY OVER TO 2018/19

- A Wellbeing Survey was distributed to all staff in mid-September 2017.
- Report was submitted to Management Team to present the findings of the Survey in November 2017.
- A 'Wellbeing Committee/Workgroup' which will include members of HR/H&S, MAD Committee, Social Club, and other interested staff was created in early 2018. Strategy development is now currently in progress, with a goal of creating an inclusive, diverse and easily accessed range of wellbeing offerings. Strategy submission to Management Team is projected to be complete by end June 2018. At this point the wellbeing strategy will move to implementation phase.

Objective 5: Improve traceability and of staff working alone outside of hours, and appropriate response in the event of an incident.

Action 8: Lone working equipment procurement project.

COMPLETE

Work is complete on this project. SmarTrak devices have been procured for the Water Unit on-call team, which are satellite capable and externally monitored by ADT. They act as panic alarms and communication devices, even when the staff are out of cell-phone coverage range. A panic alarm has been purchased in the Environmental Services Unit, after a successful trial. This will in particular be used in the Dog Pound, but can also be used in other environments such as when entering private property or doing compliance work.

Additionally, other departments are considering whether to use these types of tracking units for use during out-of-hours work in response to adverse weather events.
June 2017 to Current: Worker Incident Reporting

Incidents/Accidents - June 2018 (**as at 18th June 2018)

- Incident
- Notifiable Injury/Illness/Incident
- Near Miss
- Property Damage
- Fatality
- Total

Sum of Incidents/Accidents: 329

Data as of 18th June 2018.
| Lost Time Injuries: | 2016/17 | 3 Accidents - total 110 hours  
| Causes of LTIs are: |  | - Being hit by objects (6hrs)  
|  |  | - Slips trips and falls (24hrs)  
|  |  | - Body stressing (manual handling) (80hrs)  
| 2017/18 | 4 Accidents - total 74 hours (one pending)  
| Causes of LTIs are: |  | - Body stressing x2 (manual handling) (63hrs)  
|  |  | - Falls, trips, slips x2 (one pending) (11hrs)  

![June 2017 to Current: Worker Incident Reporting](image1)

![June 2017 to Current: Worker - Cause of Incident](image2)
**LEAD INDICATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety Inspections Completed (Workplace Walkarounds)</td>
<td>Q2 2018</td>
<td>10 out of 16 areas completed and submitted. Hazards raised in Tech1 for any non-compliances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Delivered</td>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>People Trained: 412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Delivered</td>
<td>2017/18</td>
<td>People Trained: 460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Health and Safety Prequalified Contractor Dashboard (drawn from SiteWise database)**

**Hazards Reported 2017-18**

![Graph showing contractor pipeline and assessment scores with detailed data analysis](image-url)
<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>30/06/2018</td>
<td>In progress</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>Not started</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></td>
<td>In progress</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>Not started</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>In progress</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>Not started</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>*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>High Risk</td>
<td>Adverse weather</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>In progress</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-D1/180521055764

REPORT TO: Regeneration Steering Group

DATE OF MEETING: 11 June 2018

FROM: Cathy Batchelor, Communications Adviser – District Regeneration
               Michelle Flanagan, Landscape Planner – District Regeneration

SUBJECT: Proposed Permanent Rowing Base in Murphy Park, Kaiapoi

SIGNED BY: (for Reports to Council, Committees or Boards)

1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report seeks a decision from the Regeneration Steering Group to approve the draft concept plan for a permanent rowing base in Murphy Park, Kaiapoi.

1.2 Community consultation was undertaken on the proposed permanent rowing base from 18 April – 4 May 2016. Forty-three pieces of feedback were received, mostly in support of the proposal. Feedback that did not support the proposal raised issues relating to providing facilities for non-Waimakariri based clubs, alternative locations for the rowing base, and the overall use of Murphy Park.

Attachments:
1. Murphy Park Rowing Base Consultation Feedback (180515053505)
2. Draft Concept Plan, Murphy Park Rowing Base. (180328033578)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Regeneration Steering Group:

(a) Receives report No. 180521055764.

(b) Approves staff progressing the draft concept plan for the permanent rowing base at Murphy Park.

(c) Approves staff working with the St Margaret's Rowing Club and Union Rowing Club on the key terms for licences to occupy (including confirming the club contribution to the proposed rowing base) for approval by the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board.

(d) Approves staff working with the Kaiapoi Croquet Club on the key terms for a licence to occupy for the additional area for approval by the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board.

(e) Notes that staff will present a developed design and updated cost estimate of the proposed rowing base for consideration in a later report.

(f) Notes that expenditure by Council on the proposed rowing base will require Council approval.
(g) **Notes** that a future concept plan will be required for Murphy Park, primarily addressing parking and access issues, once the Northern Bulldogs Rugby League Club have confirmed their future plans.

(h) **Circulates** this report to Council.

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 Council is proposing to develop a permanent rowing base at Murphy Park. The current rowing area at Murphy Park is not considered suitable for long-term occupancy due to a lack of manoeuvring space for vehicles (with large trailers), and difficult launch access at the 'beach' area. The current rowing area was always intended as a post-earthquake, temporary solution. Both the St Margarets Rowing Club and Union Rowing Club have confirmed that they wish to continue to use the Kaiapoi River for training, and to do this both clubs require sheds to store their skiffs and appropriate launching facilities.

3.2 A preliminary draft concept plan was developed for a proposed permanent rowing base, upstream of its current location, on land previously occupied by the Riverside Bowling Club. The proposed rowing base includes (refer plan included as Attachment ii):

- A floating pontoon (approx. 30m x 3m located approximately 6m into the river)
- A fixed boat ramp for the launch of support craft
- Space for storage sheds (relocated and future)
- A central compound (hardstand area) for rigging and wash down purposes
- Access to a power supply and water; and
- Car parking

3.3 At the 9 April 2018 Regeneration Steering Group meeting, approvals were given for:

- Consulting with the community and directly affected groups for the preliminary draft concept plan for the proposed permanent rowing base at Murphy Park, Kaiapoi.

- Seeking feedback from the Northern Bulldogs Rugby League Club and Kaiapoi Croquet Club.

3.4 The following public communications were undertaken from 16 April to 4 May 2018 to seek community feedback:

- Emails were sent on 16 April 2018 to; St Margarets Rowing Club, Northern Bulldogs Rugby League Club, KORE – Kiwi Outdoors Resilience Education and Union Rowing Club
- A letter was sent on 16 April 2018 to the Kaiapoi Croquet Club
- Signage was installed at Murphy Park
- Project web page on waimakariri.govt.nz/regeneration
- Latest news item on home page of Council’s website
- Advertisements in the Kaiapoi Advocate and Northern Outlook
- Faceb ook posts
- Flyers in the Ruatanuiwa Kaiapoi Civic Centre
- Digital slide on the Regeneration display in the Ruatanuiwa Kaiapoi Civic Centre
- Article in the April 2018 Regeneration e-newsletter

In addition, three editorials were published in the Kaiapoi Advocate, Northern Outlook and North Canterbury News.
3.5 This report presents the feedback received 16 April to 28 May 2018, from:
- Community - including people who identified themselves as river users and fisher-peole
- St Margarets Rowing Club
- Union Rowing Club
- Northern Bulldogs Rugby League Club
- KORE - Kiwi Outdoor Resilience Education
- Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga (via Mahaanui Kuraataiao Ltd)
- Cure Boating Club
- Kaitaipoi Croquet Club

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1 Overall, the consultation feedback supports, in principle, the establishment of a permanent rowing base at Murphy Park. However, through this consultation a number of wider issues have been raised including providing for non-Waimakariri based clubs, alternative locations for the rowing base, and the overall use of Murphy Park. Formal submissions in the negative were focused on these issues.

Providing for non-Waimakariri based clubs

4.2 While outside the scope of this public consultation, the Cure Boating Club have identified issues relevant to their future development; support for the rebuild of their facility, their relationship with the Union Rowing Club and their current lease of Union's storage shed. The redevelopment of the Cure Boating Club facility, and whether Council contributes to this, is subject to the Long Term Plan process currently underway. The Club expressed an interest in retaining the Union shed in its current location as it is currently leasing this for additional storage and repairs. This is not considered feasible in the long-term as the Union shed is partially located on Kaitaipoi Croquet Club land, and the Club seeks to have this land returned for their use.

4.3 Seven comments raised issues with Council contributing funding to a facility for a school and club from outside the District. The Council funding for the proposed rowing base at Murphy Park would largely be used for the floating pontoon and fixed boat ramp as these facilities will be available for public use. Council are not proposing to fund the storage sheds (other than assisting with gaining consents); these would be the responsibility of the rowing clubs.

4.4 Councils decision to accommodate the St Margarets Rowing Club and Union Rowing Club is considered to be supporting Kaitaipoi in that the proposed rowing base will bring people into the township, and provides a sense of activity and vibrancy on the river. The floating pontoon would also provide a river facility that the community can use.

Alternative locations

4.5 Five comments suggested alternative locations for the proposed rowing base as follows:
- Downstream of the bridges
- Further towards the mouth of the Kaitaipoi River
- Further east with access through the Regeneration Areas (previous red zone)
- Off Raven Quay in the Courtenay Drive area; and
- At the Cure Boating Club facility
4.6. Consideration of alternative locations for a permanent rowing base was outside the scope of this project. A resolution at the 4 December 2017 Regeneration Steering Group meeting, directed staff to develop "a draft concept plan for the redevelopment of Murphy Park to provide a permanent base for St Margarets and Union Rowing Clubs on the land formerly occupied by the Riverside Bowling Club at Murphy Park, which is now owned by Council" (Resolution D, 171127128285).

4.7. When the temporary rowing base was established at Murphy Park (post-earthquake), there were no feasible alternative sites due to the level of damage around the riverbanks area. In addition, the rowing clubs also identified Murphy Park as suitable for their needs. The alternative locations listed in paragraph 4.5, while practical as they are on the river, are not considered feasible for the following reasons:

- Further east (downstream) there is insufficient space on the river-side of the stopbank to locate the storage sheds. The exception to this would be Askeaton Park (west of Hall Street); however, this area is not considered suitable due to the swampy ground conditions and the lack of amenities (e.g. toilet facilities).
- Similarly, in the Regeneration Areas, whilst there is sufficient room for storage sheds, it is not practical for the rowers to carry their skiffs over the stopbank. Nor is it feasible to drive over the current stopbank with a large trailer.
- There is insufficient room adjacent to the Cure Boating Club to locate two additional storage sheds.

Use of Murphy Park

4.8. Two comments raised concerns about whether the use of Murphy Park would be affected by the proposed rowing base. One commenter wanted to continue to use the existing fixed boat ramp by the bridge and the other wanted access along the riverbank to remain. The proposed rowing base does not affect use of the boat ramp and access along the river is retained.

4.9. The Northern Bulldogs Rugby League Club also did not support the proposed rowing base as they believed that other clubs could benefit from the use of the area, and that Waimakariri constituents should benefit from the regeneration of Kaiapoi. As far as staff are aware, no other sporting clubs have approached Council for use of Murphy Park. Staff are aware that the Kaiapoi Croquet Club may wish to build an additional green in the future, and this has been accommodated in the draft concept plan.

4.10. The Rugby League Club also indicated that it needed more information on the requirements of the rowing clubs, their season duration, park usage and a general idea of how the two activities could co-exist. The proposed rowing base has been designed to not affect the use of Murphy Park by the Rugby League Club, or Croquet Club.

4.11. At a meeting on the 18 April 2018, members of the Rugby League Club indicated to staff that they used the proposed rowing base area for parking, and that they had concerns over the rowers using the public toilets at Murphy Park. With respect to parking, the area immediately adjacent to the Kaiapoi Croquet Club would still be available until the additional green is constructed. In addition should the draft concept plan for the proposed rowing base proceed, and the Rugby League Club commit to remaining at Murphy Park, staff would consider overflow car parking on the adjacent Kaiapoi West Regeneration Area (if necessary). With respect to use of the toilets, given that rugby league and rowing training typically occurs at different times, the use of the toilets by the rowers is not considered a conflict.

4.12. The Management Team have reviewed this report and support the recommendations.
5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Council received 42 pieces of feedback on the proposed permanent rowing base at Murphy Park. These consisted of 14 pieces of online feedback, and seven pieces of feedback received via email or letter and 21 comments on the Council’s Facebook page. Of this feedback in general 30 comments were supportive of the proposed rowing base and five were in opposition. Seven comments were considered to be neutral.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2. Attachment i (160515053005) includes in detail the feedback received and staff consideration of this feedback.

5.3. Groups and Organisations

5.3.1. St Margarets Rowing Club: Confirms the Club’s commitment to Kaiapoi as the home for their rowing programme moving forward, providing the investment for construction of their rowing shed and supports the fixed boat ramp as an essential item.

5.3.2. Union Rowing Club: Appreciates the opportunity for having a rowing base at Murphy Park. The Club states that they would need to fundraise to facilitate the relocation of their current storage shed.

5.3.3. Waka Ama and Dragon Boating: No formal responses were received from these clubs but an individual lobbyist referred to this facility being available for all water sports; waka ama, dragon boating and kayaking. Advise the waka ama and dragon boats are stored outside and they often use the river to train. Queries the equity of providing facilities for a Christchurch based private school.

In response, the proposed floating pontoon and fixed boat ramp would be open to the public to use, and this includes dragon boating, waka ama and kayaking. The rowing clubs are responsible for the construction of their own storage facilities.

5.3.4. KORE: Supports the proposed development for reasons of enhancing the area, opportunity to use as a business operator and the economic benefit to the Kaiapoi businesses.

5.3.5. Cure Boating Club: Conditionally supports the proposed rowing base as an interested party, but seeks to address the inequity of Council expenditure on a facility for a Christchurch based private school and rowing club who may not be committed to Kaiapoi, when their own Club, who have been based on the river for 150 years, is undertaking a major rebuild of their existing facility.

In response, the proposal is not ‘at the expense’ of the Cure Boating Club. Council would be funding the proposed floating pontoon and fixed boat ramp, both being accessible for public use, along with use by rowing clubs and other water sport groups. Council’s potential commitment to Cure Boating Club, and the rebuild of their existing facility by the Kaiapoi River, is subject to the Long Term Plan 2018 – 2028 process.

5.3.6. Kaiapoi Croquet Club: Reiterates their decision to remain at Murphy Park with access to additional land (that formerly occupied by the bowling club) for the creation of an additional full sized lay and potentially another clubhouse. Agrees with the draft concept plan.
5.3.7. Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga The Rūnanga Kaiwhakai Committee support the proposal going ahead and acknowledge benefit for Kaiapoi and the wider community.

5.3.8. Northern Bulldogs Rugby League Club: Unable to support the proposal for rowing clubs and considers that existing Kaiapoi sports clubs could benefit from the use of the area. Request more time to consider the proposal and seek further information from the rowing clubs to gain a better understanding of their requirements, including season duration, park usage and how the two sports could co-exist at Murphy Park.

In response, with respect to other sports clubs, no other clubs have approached Council for use of Murphy Park, apart from additional space required by Kaiapoi Croquet Club and this can be accommodated for in this proposal. Staff believe we have a good understanding of two rowing clubs' requirements and all users can adequately co-exist due to these codes generally operating at different months of the year; rowing - September to April, rugby league - April to August.

5.3.9. Environment Canterbury: Staff met with a representative in February 2018 at Murphy Park in to seek preliminary feedback on the proposed permanent rowing base. No major issues were raised, however it was noted that the proposal would be subject to the standard resource consenting process.

5.4. Wider Community

5.4.1. Fifteen community submissions (fourteen online, one email) were received. In summary,

- One submitter queries the cost to ratepayers (neutral feedback).
- One submitter conditionally supports the concept of proposed rowing base and provides their overview of the rowing community including; Union, St Margaret's, Cure, and the students of Rangiora and Kaiapoi High Schools who use the Kaiapoi River and requests to have a public meeting.
- One submitter conditionally supports the proposal if the facility is provided for all water sports (this submitter is noted above in ‘Groups and Organisations’ as representing the interests of waka ama and dragon boating)
- Eight submitters fully support the proposal, with additional comments;
  - One submitter notes this facility would be more user friendly than the boat ramp further downstream.
  - One submitter also notes he uses the current boat ramp adjacent to the swing bridge. In response, there are no current plans to remove the existing boat ramp in Murphy Park and this will still be available to launch boats.
  - One submitter supports the proposal with full waterfront access and unrestricted movement around the facility to be maintained. In response, there is full unrestricted access around the facility and alongside the river.
  - One submitter also suggests an alternative location further downstream. In response, staff were not authorised to consider alternate riverside locations.
- Four submitters do not support the proposal and refer directly and indirectly to the Cure Boating Club in their comments;
  - The proposal supports clubs from outside the district. Support needed for the development of the Cure Boating Club facility.
  - The rowing base is not for Waimakariri ratepayers.
  - Cure Boating Club has rowed on the Kaiapoi River for 160 years and St Margaret's and Union for less than 10 years. If there is to be Council
funding for these projects then the true base of rowing in Kaiapoi is at the Cure site.

5.4.2. Two Facebook posts generated comments ranging from; supporting the proposal for the public good and as an asset for Kaiapoi, suggesting alternative locations, seeking support for Cure Boating Club and raising the issue of the facility being provided for a private Christchurch based school. In summary;

- Fifteen commenters support the proposal.
- Six comments considered to be neutral and four of these commenters suggest alternative locations further downstream.
- Three commenters also made submissions. This feedback is included above in ‘Wider Community’ and not duplicated in analysis of Facebook comments.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

6.1.1. The Council budget for the permanent rowing base at Murphy Park is $283,000. This would be used to fund the proposed floating pontoon and fixed boat ramp (as these are to be available for use by the community). The rowing clubs would fund the proposed storage sheds. Council would assist the clubs in the gaining of the necessary resource and/or building consents (in accordance with Policy S-CP 0725).

6.1.2. Should the draft concept plan be approved, staff will present a developed design and updated cost estimate for approval in a later report.

6.2. **Community Implications**

6.2.1. The primary purpose of this consultation was to inform the community and seek their feedback to understand the implications of the proposed permanent rowing base.

6.2.2. As a result of this consultation, a number of wider issues have been raised by the three rowing clubs, one of the sports clubs based at Murphy Park and the community; sharing space and facilities, equitable use of resources and interest in Kaiapoi’s attraction as a water-based and recreational sporting destination (as noted in Section 4.1). These issues are wider than this project.

6.2.3. The proposed floating pontoon and boat ramp will be available for public use and will therefore benefit the local community.

6.2.4. The proposed permanent rowing base will not affect use of Murphy Park by the Kaiapoi Croquet Club. In the preliminary draft concept plan, space along the northern boundary of the Club has been retained for an additional green (should the Club wish to build this in the future). Relocation of the Union Rowing Club building will also enable the Club to have full use of the small section of their site previously occupied by the rowing shed.

6.2.5. The St Margarets Rowing Club have committed to having a training base on the Kaiapoi River at Murphy Park and will fund their new rowing shed, along with a contribution to the hardstand area.

6.2.6. The Union Rowing Club have advised that they are investigating the costs of relocating their current storage shed, and that they would likely need to fundraise to meet these costs.

6.2.7. As noted in Report No. 180326032473[v1], the proposed permanent rowing base will not affect the Northern Bulldogs Rugby League Club use of Murphy Park, however their submission seeks for more time to consider the proposal, obtain
more information and engage with the rowing clubs to gain a better understanding of their requirements.

6.3. Risk Management

6.3.1. The consultation identified issues raised by the community and interested parties regarding the use of shared public space. These issues (providing for non-Waimakariri based clubs, alternative locations, and the use of Murphy Park are wider than the scope of this project. These issues may continue to affect the progress of this project.

6.4. Health and Safety

6.4.1. The project will seek to minimise risk to river users including rowing club members, and Murphy Park users on the riverbank near the proposed rowing base facility.

6.4.2. The Union Rowing Club have raised some health and safety issues about vegetation on the riverbank near the proposed floating pontoon. It is acknowledged that there will need to be some tree removals along the riverbank area to facilitate the proposed floating pontoon and fixed boat ramp. The extent of these removals will be determined during the detailed design of these facilities.

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:
- The proposed permanent rowing base is consistent with the anticipated use of Recreation Reserves under the Act (Section 17).
- The proposed permanent rowing base is consistent with the Sport and Recreation Reserves Management Plan (Section 41).

Resource Management Act, 1991:

The proposed floating pontoon, fixed boat ramp, storage sheds and storage compound will likely require resource consent from Environment Canterbury and the Waimakariri District Council for works in or near a river.

Building Act, 2004:

The proposed storage sheds will likely require building consent.

7.3. Community Outcomes

Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality
- People enjoy clean water at our beaches, rivers and lakes.
- There is a wide variety of public places and spaces to meet people’s needs.
- There are wide-ranging opportunities for people to enjoy the outdoors.
- The accessibility of community and recreation facilities meets the changing needs of our community.

7.4. Delegations

Under the Terms of Reference, the Regeneration Steering Group shall “recommend approval of master plans, concept plans and strategies” (refer Terms of Reference at 1611291203269).
ATTACHMENT I - Murphy Park Rowing Base Consultation Feedback

Proposed Permanent Rowing Base at Murphy Park, Kaiapoi – Analysis of Consultation Feedback 16 April to 28 May 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook*</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Neutral feedback - did not indicate direct support or opposition to the proposal, and comments ranged from providing facilities for non-based Waimakariri based clubs, alternative locations for the rowing base and the overall use of Murphy Park.

* Three online submitters commented on Facebook (two oppose, one support) – not duplicated in Facebook stats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Date received</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
<th>Feedback analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online (Facebook)</td>
<td>16 April 2018</td>
<td>Yes, so long as full access to the waterfront remains. i.e. boat shed and club rooms set back from the edge by, for example 10 mtrs (or the room a crew needs to prepare for launch) and 360 degree walking access around the rooms is maintained.</td>
<td>The area proposed for the storage sheds is set back from the Kaiapoi river edge and the current informal walkway along the river bank will remain open for use. It is not intended to fence the rowing base area so public access through the area will be maintained.</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>16 April 2018</td>
<td>Brilliant! We need more recreational facilities like this. There is not enough available now for many sports inc recreational off ride cycling.</td>
<td>Support noted.</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Support/Oppose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 April 2018</td>
<td>Rowing base only? it should be for all water sports! I dragonboat, waka ama and kayak. We have no bases for these clubs and often use the river to train. I would only support if these sports groups who also use the river got space too. St Marg's is a Chch based private school who row on the river. I strongly believe they need to pay for their facilities as they are Chch based private school and not Waimak rate payers. We have to store our dragon boats and waka outside while the private school from Chch gets undercover storage at the Waimak rate payers expense. Please open your eyes and make this fair.</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 April 2018</td>
<td>This is being reported as ratepayer based. What is going to be the cost to ratepayers please?</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 April 2018</td>
<td>This rowing base is not for Waimakariri rate payers, or children and should therefore not receive any funds from the council. There is already a local rowing club further down the river. I am not sure why the council is even considering this when there are so many other projects that would help Waimakariri residents.</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The proposed floating pontoon and fixed boat ramp would be available for use for dragon boat, waka ama and kayak paddlers. The pontoon and ramp will be open to the public to use. The rowing clubs built their current sheds at Murphy Park, and they will be responsible for the construction of their own storage facilities at the proposed rowing base.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council has currently allocated $283,000 to the creation of a permanent rowing base at Murphy Park. Council would be responsible for the design and construction of the proposed floating pontoon and fixed boat ramp as these facilities would be available for public use, as well as rowing club use. The rowing clubs would be responsible for the construction of their storage sheds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The proposed floating pontoon and fixed boat ramp at the rowing base would be available for public use. Council are not providing the storage sheds for the two clubs, they will be relocating their existing sheds (or building new sheds) at their cost. While the rowing clubs who will have sheds at the proposed rowing base may be based outside of the District they are committed to using the Kaiapoi River for training. This increases the use of the river and brings people into the District.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>1 May 2018</td>
<td>It's a great idea. Support noted.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>1 May 2018</td>
<td>I think it sounds great. I think there needs to be more room for it to expand in the future though. There is a lot of room around the Courtenev Place area down Raven Quay maybe there could be a better option? Consideration of alternative locations for a permanent rowing base was outside the scope of this project.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>1 May 2018</td>
<td>How ludicrous. Cure Boating Club has rowed on the Kaipoi River for 150 years and Union and St Margaret's less than 10 years. If there is to be council funding for these projects then the true base of rowing in Kaipoi is at the Cure site. Council are not funding the relocation or construction of the rowing club storage sheds at the proposed rowing base; the Clubs will fund these. Council would fund the proposed floating pontoon and fixed boat ramp, as these are available for public use.</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>1 May 2018</td>
<td>Good idea...I have used my kayak on the river and launched from the public boat ramp closer to the Waimea...additional facilities, such as those proposed, would certainly make boating on the river easier and more enjoyable. Support noted.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>1 May 2018</td>
<td>As long as public use of the facilities, such as the pontoon and boat ramp as mentioned, are guaranteed, then I fully support such a development. Go for it! The proposed pontoon and fixed boat ramp will be available for public use.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>1 May 2018</td>
<td>I think it sounds like a good idea. I often paddle down the river and return, and this facility would be more user friendly than the boat ramp further downstream. Support noted.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>1 May 2018</td>
<td>As a member of the Cure Rowing Club, I am not in favour of this proposal to support rowing clubs from outside the district. The Cure Boating Club has been rowing on the Kaipoi for more than 150 years &amp; we need your support for the development of our building &amp; the surroundings. Council are not funding the relocation or construction of the rowing club storage sheds at the proposed rowing base; the Clubs will fund these. Council would fund the proposed floating pontoon.</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
around it. Do you know that we are actually leasing the Union Rowing Shed at the moment? Thank you and fixed boat ramp, as these are available for public use. Staff are aware that the Cure Club are currently leasing the Union Rowing Club shed. If possible, the relocation of the Union shed could be timed to be after the Union lease has finished. This would be dependent on a number of factors such as the length of the Union lease and the desire expressed by the Kāpiti Croquet Club to have their land returned for their use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 May 2018</td>
<td>As the person who recommended to the Union Rowing Club, that the area where the former Cure Boating Club operated from until October 1956, as the most suitable place to erect a temporary Boat shed, but unfortunately while they were a bit long in making a decision St Margaret's College jumped in ahead of them. So I do support the concept of a proposed rowing base, except that I feel that the original Cure Boating Club (not Rangiora High School which has been gifted sole use of said Club for some 20+ years) should be re-sited and restored back to the Kāpiti Community who were responsible for funding it and rebuilding the replacement Boat Shed downstream after the tragic fire Oct 1956. If the Rangiora High School and Kāpiti High School wish to continue their involvement in the sport they should be encouraged to generate support from their own governing bodies and maybe offered the opportunity to erect on a reduced scale twin boatsheds on the site the Cure Boating Club currently operates from. They don’t need to increase the overall size and like St Margaret's College they have their own Gymnasiums so no need for that expense. The other option is allow Kāpiti High School controlled use of a re-sited Cure Club and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>3 May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email St Margarets Rowing Club</td>
<td>3 April 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With respect to power, at this stage Council would look to bring power to the proposed rowing base boundary with Revell Street, and should the clubs
- (with respect to the fixed boat ramp) – The Club sees this as an essential item in the relocation as getting the coaches safety boats onto the water in an expedient manner is necessary to safeguard the students.
- Consideration of power to the site would also be appreciated.
- The Club understands and appreciates the support for this project, as discussed we have been exploring fundraising for the facility with the proposal to replace the existing make shift facility with a new rowing shed this will absorb all of our available and proposed funds. We would also look to contribute to the hardstand area.

Our rowing programme commences in the Spring and we wish to relocate in the winter of 2018. As discussed even with the proposed lake on the Avon we see Kaiapoi as the home for the SMC rowing programme moving forward and the construction of a substantial asset in the construction of a new rowing shed facility is a demonstration of our commitment to the site and the community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email Private</th>
<th>What is going to happen to the old and current boat ramp adjacent to the swing bridge when the proposed new development for the rowing base goes ahead. As a white baiter and fisherman I regularly use that boat to launch my boat to enter the Kaiapoi and Waimakariri rivers to carry out my chosen activities. I have no complaints about the proposed new development as I think it's a good idea.</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are no current plans to remove the existing boat ramp in Murphy Park. This will still be able to be used to launch boats.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KORE</td>
<td>4 May 2018</td>
<td>As a user of Murphy Park with our KORE hire business activity, I am very interested in the proposed development of a new rowing base at Murphy Park. The current location of the rowing facilities has no doubt been a good short term solution but it is clearly in the wrong place for the medium to long term. The proposed plan is excellent and allows appropriate parking and sufficient space for moving the rowing skiffs and shells. Providing facilities for schools and groups with a Christchurch base is a good investment for our community as the people using the facility regularly spend money in the town. I have observed the rowers retuning with drinks and snacks frequently - having spent cash in Kaiapoi businesses. I also believe we will find occasion to use the facility - when not being used by the rowing groups - for groups and schools attending our KORE water activity days on the river. This development will also mean that the area where the sheds are currently can be tidied which will enhance the area around the croquet club, although there is the issue of high tide levels in this area. Well done for a well prepared plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Te Ngāi Tūīhurī Ruātanga (via Mahaanui Kuratao) | 10 May 2018 | The Murphy Park project was considered at the Kaitiaki Committee meeting on 5 April. The following comments were made:  
- The Kaitiaki committee agreed that there are no concerns in regards to what is being proposed by WDC. This |
| Email | Cure Boating Club | 11 May 2018 | The following is the initial feedback from the Cure Boating Club Inc. The Club conditionally supports the proposed rowing base as we encourage the sport of rowing. Our support is conditional though because we are the established rowing club in North Canterbury (based on the Kalapoi River for the last 150 years) and while we would not seek to stymie the proposed rowing base outright we would if it went ahead at the expense of our club. It is worth noting that while Union Rowing Club does have a shed near the proposed rowing area it is actually leased to our Club and we use it for additional storage and repairs – it should be noted that until just after the earthquakes we had a lease from the WDC for the Kalapoi Wharf shed until it was demolished on account of earthquake damage. Should the proposed rowing area go ahead we would be interested in retaining the use of this shed as it is and where it is and continue to use it as we do now. St Margaret's have a temporary container set up and we can fully understand why they would want/need something more permanent but are they really committed to staying in Kalapoi?

|  |  |  | The proposed rowing base at Murphy Park is not ‘at the expense’ of the Cure Boating Club. Council would be funding the proposed floating pontoon and fixed boat ramp. It would not be funding the storage sheds for the rowing clubs.

It is not feasible for the Union Rowing Club shed to remain in its current location. The building was always intended to be a temporary building and is partially constructed on Kalapoi Croquet Club land. The Croquet Club have identified that they wish to have this land returned for their use. Council staff understand that the Cure Boating Club are currently leasing the Union shed for storage and we would need to work with both clubs regarding the relocation of the Union shed.

With respect to St Margaret’s commitment to staying in Kalapoi, the club have advised staff that they wish to continue to have a presence on the Kalapoi River.

The Council’s potential financial commitment to the Cure Boating Club, and the rebuild of their facility on the Kalapoi River, is subject to the Long Term Plan 2018 – 2028 process. | Support – with conditions |
Until the earthquakes neither of the above clubs had any connection with or intention to move to Kaiapoi and as stated above Union RC hasn’t.

I outlined to your Council on Tuesday as part of the Annual Plan submission process the predicament our Club finds itself in that we have a major rebuild planned for our badly damaged boat storage building and this rebuild involves a 32m replacement structure (10m longer than the existing single storey part of the building - the two storeyed part will remain) and there is a current funding short fall of $500k which we have asked the Council for assisting in bridging.

I’ve attached draft plans and costings.

We would totally object to any WDC money being spent to assist a Christchurch based club and a Christchurch based private school if this was at the expense of our Club’s plans.

There is already a rowing base in Kaiapoi and that is where we currently operate from and have done so for 70 years with no assistance from the Council.

Interestingly prior to the 1950’s we were based near where the proposed rowing base area.

As I said above we are not totally opposed to the proposed rowing base as we are keen for as many young people and adults as possible to enjoy the many benefits of rowing but we are adamant that the interests of our Club must be acknowledged and supported.

We’d be interested in exploring the possibility of spreading the funding for the proposed rowing base to cover both that area and our building for instance.
That would really be seriously supporting rowing in Kaipoli. We’d welcome the opportunity to talk through the details of both our and your plans. There is lots to discuss and we look forward to exploring the possibilities with you in more detail.

| Email Union Rowing Club | 16 May 2018 | The Union Rowing Club appreciates the opportunity of having a base at Kaipoli and the support it has received to date from WDC. We would like to make the following comments:

1. While we have no estimates at this stage we are investigating the cost involved in the relocation to the new site of our existing boathed including construction of new foundations. It is likely that the Club will have to embark on some form of fundraising to meet the cost of this. We appreciate that WDC will cover the cost of resource and building consents; construction and installation of the pontoon and some ground preparation and some provision towards the hard stand. However it will be important for the Club to have a clear understanding of any other costs associated with the project before we can commit by way of an indication as to when we will be able to relocate the shed.

2. We also have serious Health and Safety concerns regarding the extensive overgrowth of trees on the river banks and in the river itself, along with large | it is acknowledged that there will need to be some tree removals along the riverbank area to facilitate the proposed floating pontoon and fixed boat ramp. The extent of these removals will be determined during the detailed design of these facilities. | Support |
clumps of flax that will obstruct safe access to the proposed pontoon.
A number of the trees appear to be dead or have dead branches which may pose a risk of them falling directly onto boats or further obstructing the river and the approaches to the pontoon. This did actually happen on the Avon River earlier this year when a tree on the riverbank fell without warning onto a school crew, fortunately no injuries resulted.
We would expect that significant pruning of trees on the riverbank on both sides and removal of flax in the middle of the river will be required to reduce the Health and Safety risk they pose. The row of trees in the middle of the river, if deemed to be in a healthy state probably need not be removed and if retained could form a useful 'median strip' thereby regulating traffic flow to and from the pontoons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email</th>
<th>28 May 2018</th>
<th>Apologies for no formal reply as we were waiting confirmation from our Annual General Meeting.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Croquet Club</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agreement with the draft concept plan noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This meeting confirmed our earlier decision to accept Option 1 and stay at Murphy Park with access to more land (formally occupied by the Bowling club) for the creation of a full-sized lawn and potentially another club house.
One reason we decided to stay at Murphy Park is the free draining nature of the lawns enabling us to play when no other clubs in Canterbury can.
Members agreed with the Draft Concept Plan and will be present at the Regeneration Steering Meeting on June 11th at the Library.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter Northern Bulldogs Rugby League Club</th>
<th>2 May 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With regard to the proposed permanent rowing base at Murphy Park, the Northern Bulldogs Rugby, League Club welcomes any discussions with council and are open to potential development at the park.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>However with the information the club has at present we are unable to support the St Margarets Rowing Club/Union Rowing Club venture. The Northern Bulldogs Rugby League Club believes existing Kaiapoi sports clubs could benefit from the use of the area and that Waimakariri constituents should be the main benefactors from the regeneration of Kaiapoi.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therefore, we are asking for more time to consider the proposal which will allow us to obtain more information and to engage with the Rowing Clubs to gain a better understanding of their requirements, including their season duration, park usage and a general idea of how the two sports could co-exist at Murphy Park. We will revisit the proposal once we are fully informed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a club, we are determined to build a positive future in Kaiapoi and look forward to being part of exciting times ahead for the Waimakariri District.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With respect to other sports clubs, no other clubs have approached Council for use of Murphy Park. The only club that staff are aware of wanting additional space at Murphy Park is the Kaiapoi Croquet Club. The proposed concept for the permanent rowing base retains sufficient space for an additional croquet green should the Kaiapoi Croquet Club wish to build this in the future.

The proposed concept plan for the permanent rowing base was developed in consultation with the two rowing clubs already existing at Murphy Park and staff feel that we have a good understanding of their requirements.

The proposed concept plan for the rowing base does not appear to affect use of the park by the Rugby League Club. The site of the proposed base would not be suitable for any additional sports fields given the presence of Revell Street and the close proximity to the river on two sides. Staff have been advised that the Rugby League Club uses the site of the old bowling club for parking on busy game days. Some of this area could still be used for parking until the construction of the additional croquet green by the Croquet Club. Council would also consider providing some overflow parking in the Kaiapoi West Regeneration.
| Facebook      | 16 April 2018 | 1 person agrees  
1 person comments about facilities for waka ama, dragon boating and kayaking, and St Margarets being a Chch based school. *(submits online)*  
1 person comments about facilities being built for a private Christchurch school and refer to Cure Boating Club. *(submit online)*  
1 person supports as long as full waterfront access is provided. *(submit online)*  
2 people refer to the league grounds and awareness for Cure Boating Club. | Support noted.  
The proposed floating pontoon and fixed boat ramp at the rowing base would be available for public use. Council are not providing the storage sheds for the two clubs, they will be relocating their existing sheds (or building new sheds) at their cost. Full public access maintained. | 1 support  
2 neutral  
3 people submit online |
|---------------|---------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Facebook      | 1 May 2018    | 14 people agree, with 1 person asking how much this will cost Council.  
4 people offer alternative venues:  
- Downstream of the bridges – focal point for Kaiapoi  
- Further towards the mouth  
- Further east and access through the red zone areas  
- Towards the mouth by the main bridge | Council has currently allocated $283,000 to the creation of a permanent rowing base at Murphy Park.  
Consideration of alternative locations for a permanent rowing base was outside the scope of this project. | 16 support  
4 neutral |
| 1 person makes similar comments as previously on 16 April Facebook post and prefers this facility to be based at the Cure Boating Club facility (submits online - as noted above) |   |
Proposed Permanent Rowing Base at Murphy Park Consultation - Facebook comments

Facebook post published 16 April 2018

Waimakariri District Council

Published 16 April at 12:02

An area of Murphy Park in Kaiapoi is being considered for a permanent rowing base. We're currently seeking feedback about this proposal. Let us know your comments by 5pm Friday 4 May 2018. Learn more...

Proposed Rowing Base for Murphy Park
An area of Murphy Park in Kaiapoi is being considered for a permanent rowing base. We're currently seeking feedback about this proposal. Let us know your comments by 5pm Friday 4 May 2018.
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RGN-05-10 / 180515053005 Rowing Base Consultation Feedback for RSG Report 11 June 2018
Peter Fitt: Yes, so long as full access to the waterfront remains: i.e. boat shed and club rooms set back from the edge by, for example 10 mtrs (or the room a crew needs to prepare for lunch) and 360 degree walking access around the rooms is maintained.

Waimakariri District Council: Thanks for your feedback Peter. It would be great if you could submit your feedback via our online survey https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/FSGMPDN

Mark Ball: This would be great for kaiapoi

David McDonald: What about the Waimak ratepayers who are dragon boaters, wake ama and kayak paddlers who also use the river, do they get a secure spot to store their boats and equipment at the facility like St Margaret's rowers? Also remind me aren't St Margaret's a Chch based school?

Mark Woods: Agree totally, and why would the WDC want to build a facility for a private school to boot?
Carol Bisseker: people in kaiapoi row don't be so narrow minded.

Mark Woods: Carol Bisseker, yes, Carol, they're based at Cure that have been rowing on the Kaiapoi river for 150 years.

Mark Woods: Gendie Woods, I'm sure the Waimakariri District Council would have been in contact with Cure Boating Club.

Sarah Wyath: Hayden Jones, is this where the League grounds are??

Anne Wylie: Gendie Woods, Lisa Johnstone would be good if all Cure Boating Club members were aware of this 😊.
Jackie Watson: Yes it is a public area so available for the public to use, adding to the facilities for boating and other river users.

Al Blackie: We are not providing storage for the two rowing clubs—they are relocating their sheds at their expense. Any requests from other river users would be considered by the Regen group.

Facebook post published 1 May 2018

Umakariri District Council

Published 1 May at 17:12

We’re currently asking for feedback on a proposed rowing base at Murphy Park in Keaipo. The proposed base includes a floating pontoon and fixed boat ramp. These would be open for public use. That means you could launch your kayak from here to paddle up and down the river. The proposed base also includes storage sheds for the rowing club boats. Just like the current sheds at Murphy Park, these would be built and maintained by the clubs. Let us know your feedback by 5pm this Friday 4th May.

Rowing Base at Murphy Park

RGN-0510 / 180515053005 Rowing Base Consultation Feedback for RSG Report 11 June 2018
It is proposed to create a permanent rowing base upstream, on land previously used by the bowling club. Access to the proposed rowing base would be from Revell Street. Council is keen to hear your feedback on the concept design for the...
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Christine Johnston Yes please.
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Caleb Ward As long as it's available for public use as you suggested, then yes absolutely.

Manage
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· Reply · Message · Tw

RGN-05-10 / 180515053005 Rowing Base Consultation Feedback for RSG Report 11 June 2018
Hugh Simels Sounds great, facilities such as this creative prosperous communities

Like

Like

Bridget Watts Ben McNab

Manage

Like

Like

Olya Muskerova O'Brien Excellent, please do it, could not back you up further

Manage

Like

Like

Mark Woods Were Prudence and Penelope's daddy having problems turning round the Range Rover in front of their sheds? The Cure kids that row out of Cure Boating Club deserve just as much Waimakariri District Council attention and especially so given the fact Cure has rowed in the Kaiapoi River for 150 years the other two for less than 70. Shouldn't the rowing base be situated at Cure?
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RGN-05-10 / 130515053005 Rowing Base Consultation Feedback for RSG Report 11 June 2018
Paul Abbott It would be a welcome addition... however would it be better to have it downstream of the bridges? Would be a great focal point for Kaiapoi.

Manage
Like
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Natalie Leary As a whitebaiter, I find that there is no consideration given to us during whitebait season. If it’s not the rowers, it’s their motor boats that cause the problem. I believe in sharing the river but hard to support any rowing club when they think they have more of a right to the river than anyone else. I think further towards the mouth would be great.
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Nick Young Don’t have a problem with it in general but what will it actually cost the council?

Manage
Like
- Reply · Message · Tw

Waimakariri District Council Hi Nick, Council has currently allocated $283,000 to the creation of a permanent rowing base at Murphy Park. Council would be responsible for the design and construction of the proposed floating pontoon and fixed boat ramp as these facilities would be available for public use, as well as rowing club use. The rowing clubs would be responsible for the construction of their storage sheds.
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Briony McLaughlin Bringing more sporting facilities into the area couldn't possibly be a bad thing, think this is a wonderful idea.
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Nicky Gibson Yes sounds great for public use it hope.
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Gina Anson Wonderful idea.

Like

- Reply: Message · 1w

Natasha Lee O'Hara Sounds awesome but why not further east, accessing through the red zone areas either side of the river? Less congestion around the league club and school area, less disruption to fisherpeople that use that end.

Like

- Reply: Message · 1w
Paul Starling Great idea
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Glenn Packy McCabe i agree with nat i think moving the base towards the mouth by the main bridge would help promote the sport to the public and also allow people to whitebait it is nice to see a clean up of the river to allow these things to happen and hopefully one day be able to swim and enjoy the river as we did when i grew up in kaitaia:
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Clive Ryan Great idea

Manage
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Tania McKenzie What a good idea
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Christine Moorhead Awesome river is such an asset it was lovely watching kids jump off main bridge in kaitaia a few weeks ago kids being kids like we used to
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Gary Marie yes please Jonty Cartwright this is your thing
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WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF THE AUDIT AND RISK COMMITTEE HELD IN THE WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA ON TUESDAY 22 MAY 2018 COMMENCING AT 3.30PM.

PRESENT

Councillor N Atkinson (Chairperson), Deputy Mayor K Felstead, Mayor D Ayers, Councillors A Blackie, S Stewart and P Williams

IN ATTENDANCE

Councillors D Gordon, J Meyer, W Doody, and S Stewart (from 3.35pm) Messrs J Palmer (Chief Executive), J Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support), S Markham (Manager Strategy and Engagement), L Ashton (Organisational Development and HR), Mr S Hart (Business and Centres Manager), M Harris (Customer Services Manager), P Christensen (Finance Manager), and Mrs A Smith (Committee Advisor)

1 APOLOGIES

There were no apologies.

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

No conflicts of interest were noted.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

3.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Audit and Risk Committee held on Tuesday 27 March 2018

Moved Councillor Barnett seconded Councillor Williams

THAT the Audit Committee

(a) Confirms the circulated minutes of a meeting of the Audit and Risk Committee, held on the 27 March 2018, as a true and accurate record.

CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING

There were no matters arising.

5 PRESENTATION/DEPUTATION

There was no presentations.
6 REPORTS


Mr John MacKey Director from Audit New Zealand, was present for consideration of this report and to present the Audit New Zealand’s Management Report on the Consultation Document (CD) for the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan and the Audit Plan for the Annual Report for the year ended 30 June 2018. Audit New Zealand issued an unmodified audit opinion on the CD.

The two recommendations from the Auditors are to include a performance measure that demonstrates whether the Council is providing the agreed level of service for the condition of its unsealed roads. As noted in the report, the unsealed roading network is 38% of road length in the district, but carries just 3% of traffic. The Council would like to consider alternatives and it was noted that any alternative needs to be measurable.

The second recommendation relates to the liquidity ratio limit so that it is not breached, or for an explanation to be provided as to why it is appropriate that it is breached. The report notes this will be corrected within the final LTP.

Moved Councillor Felstead seconded Councillor Williams

THAT the Audit and Risk Committee

(a) Receives report No. 180504048623
(b) Receives Audit New Zealand’s Management Report on the Consultation Document for the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan;
(c) Receives the Audit Plan for the Annual Report for the year ended 30 June 2018;
(d) Notes there are no significant matters arising from the management letter for the Consultation Document. Staff have provided responses to the Auditors comments and recommendations.

CARRIED

Deputy Mayor Felstead commented on the variables for measuring what is considered a “good” unsealed road.

Mr McKay noted the audit arrangements letter has been replaced by the Audit Plan, to highlight the areas of audit focus to set out responsibilities of Audit New Zealand.

There has been additional work undertaken by the Auditors, and assisted through Deloittes on the issue of detecting fraud.

Mayor Ayers noted that several Councillors have recently attended an Audit and Risk workshop, noting that there seems to be a higher importance placed on Risk. Mr Mackey said risk is important and it is up to each Council to identify risk and how to deal with it.
6.2 Mobile Plant Review and Update of Plant Purchase and Replacement Policy- Jill Brightwell (Asset Information Management Team Leader) and Jeff Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support)

Mr Millward presented this report, which provided a review of the fleet replacement process. The previous review was undertaken in 2013. The review was undertaken in February 2018 by fleet utilisation specialists, OptiFleet. It is recommended to extend the period to replace vehicles and plant as identified in the report and the Plant Purchase and Replacement Policy has been amended to reflect the findings of the review.

Deputy Mayor asked if the $800,000 that is recommended be used to offset debt, could be used to reduce rates instead?. Mr Millward said this could be an option, but this would be a one off reduction, and rates would increase again the following year.

Mr Palmer added that it is the discretion of the Council what it does with this funding and could be left to be decided as part of the LTP deliberations at Council meeting on 29 May.

Councillor Gordon asked if there had been any consideration given to the Council having electric vehicles as part of its pool of vehicles. Mr Millward said this has been considered, but there are matters that need to be taken into account, including having a charging station, who takes responsibility for charging fleet vehicles and who pays for it, if staff are taking vehicles home each night.

Moved Deputy Mayor Felstead seconded Councillor Blackie

THAT the Audit and Risk Committee

(a) Receives report No. 170915100061

(b) Approves the recommendation of the amendment of Plant Purchase and Replacement Policy to a frequency basis as outlined below with a staged implementation programme of items not previously identified:

   i. Sedans/SUV: 3 years/75,000Km;
   ii. Utilities/Van not as part of Water Unit Department: 4 Years/100,000km;
   iii. Water Unit Utilities: 3 years/100,000km;
   iv. Water Unit Reticulation Division Service Bodies: 9 years;
   v. Trailers: 7 years;
   vi. Trucks (excluding Rural Fire): 10 years;
   vii. Other mobile Plant: as per agreement with relevant department manager and fleet manager pending additional funding approval through Annual Plan budget planning;
   viii. Exceptions to this replacement frequency policy are: NZRT12 vehicles, Community Watch vehicle and any vehicles under an employment contract;

(c) Approves $800,000 to be transferred from the Plant account to the General account, with the allocation to be decided at the Council LTP deliberations meeting on May 29 2018.

(d) Notes that documentation of all non-standard items on vehicles will be recorded and linked to the appropriate asset within Council Asset Register e.g. Civil Defence special equipment;
(e) **Notes** that further investigation will be undertaken that addresses onsite parking and further rationalising of the fleet.

**CARRIED**

### 6.3 Outcomes of the WDC Health and Safety Risk Register Review March 2018 – Liz Ashton (Manager Organisation Development and HR)

C Browne presented this report to show the outcomes of the March 2018 WDC Health and Safety Risk Register review, and associated plan for high-risk and/or high consequence activities. The Risk Register is reviewed twice-yearly and the most recent review is the fourth review undertaken. There was no significant change in either the number of risks or risk ratings. Any changes made to the register have been included in the Risk Register Action Plan.

Councillor Williams asked what the high risks are and these were noted as contractors, volunteers, staff working in adverse weather events and airfield operations.

Moved Councillor Williams seconded Deputy Mayor Felstead

**THAT** the Audit and Risk Committee

(a) **Receives** report No 180508050220,

(b) **Reviews** the outcomes of the WDC Health and Safety Risk Register Review March 2018,

(c) **Notes** the format for the associated action plan for high risk/high consequence activities, and

(d) **Notes** next steps for implementation of actions.

(e) **Notes** the intention to implement a Risk Management system (Promapp) to manage Health and Safety Risk for WDC in the second half of 2018.

**CARRIED**

### 6.4 Capital Projects Report for the period ended 31 March 2018 – Paul Christensen (Finance Manager)

Mr Christensen presented this report, which was taken as read. There were no questions.

Moved Councillor Blackie seconded Deputy Mayor Felstead

**THAT** the Audit and Risk Committee

(a) **Receives** report No. 180424044711.

(b) **Circulates** the report to the Boards

(c) **Notes** that progress of the capital projects with 185 (77%) of the 239 projects on time or completed

**CARRIED**

### 6.5 Financial Report for the period ended 31 March 2018 – Paul Christensen (Finance Manager)
P Christenson presented this report to the committee advising of the financial result for the quarter ended 31 March 2018 and highlighted some of the financial figures from the report. The Councils operating surplus of $5.6m is slightly less than the budget of $6.0m, due to expenditure being slightly over budget. This is still a small percentage, and by the end of the year it is anticipated that this figure will come back closer to budget.

The Councils financial position remains sound and is within all Policy limits. The Councils credit rating was confirmed in March at Standard & Poors to be AA with a negative outlook. The negative outlook based on a large programme of capital work and a quickly rising debt burden.

Moved Deputy Mayor Felstead seconded Councillor Atkinson

**THAT** the Audit and Risk Committee

(a) **Receives** report No. 180423044242.
(b) **Notes** that progress is tracking slightly unfavourably in comparison to budget but is expected to be close to budget for the financial year.

**CARRIED**

7 **PORTFOLIO UPDATES**

7.1 **Audit, Risk, Long Term Plan and Excellence Programme** – Deputy Mayor Kevin Felstead

Nothing to report.

7.2 **Communications** – Councillor Neville Atkinson

Nothing to report.

8 **QUESTIONS**

There were no questions.

9 **URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS**

There was no urgent general business.

10 **MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED**

*Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987*

Moved Deputy Mayor Felstead seconded Councillor Blackie

**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:
Item No | Minutes/Report of: | General subject of each matter to be considered | Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter | Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
---|---|---|---|---
10.1 | Minutes of the Public Excluded Portion of the Audit and Risk Committee meeting of 27 March 2018 | Confirmation of Minutes | Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7 | Section 48(1)(a)
10.2 | Report of Lee Palmer (Credit Controller) | Approval to write off Debtor account | Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7 | Section 48(1)(a)

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Reason for protection of interests</th>
<th>Ref NZS 9202:2003 Appendix A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.1 – 10.2</td>
<td>Protection of privacy of natural persons To carry out commercial activities without prejudice</td>
<td>A2(a) A2(b)ii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CARRIED

CLOSED MEETING

Resolution to resume in Open Meeting

Moved Councillor Atkinson seconded Councillor Blackie

THAT open meeting resumes and the business discussed with the public excluded in Item 10.1 remains public excluded and the recommendation in Item 10.2 be made public

CARRIED

10.2 Approval to write off Debtor account Mr Joshua Morgan – Lee Palmer (Credit Controller)

Moved Councillor Atkinson seconded Councillor Blackie

THAT the Audit and Risk Committee

(a) Receives report no. 180503048320.

(b) Approves a write off to bad debt in the sum of $6,667.13.

CARRIED
OPEN MEETING

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 4.13pm.

CONFIRMED

_________________________
Chairperson

__________________________
Date

WORKSHOP

At the conclusion of the meeting, a workshop was held to discuss the following District Promotions matters:

∑ Events Grant Funding

∑ Kaiapoi i-SITE evaluation
**MINUTES OF YOUTH COUNCIL (YC) MEETING**  
Held in the Committee Rooms, Rangiora Service Centre, WDC,  
High Street, Rangiora at 7pm Tuesday 29 May 2018

| 1. | **Present:**  
|    | Sam Redman (WDC), Arabella Jarman (Co-chair), Caitlin Tipping, Jacob Harford, Dan Gordon (WDC Councillor), Kirstyn Barnett (WDC Councillor), David Ayers (WDC Mayor), Olivia Silby, Alex Jackson, Katie Lange, Aurora Melville, Alex Tindall (WaiYouth) |
| 2. | **In Attendance:** Nicola Trolove (WDC), Peter Cooper (Police), Nick Harrison (WDC) |
| 3. | **Apologies:** Benya Ickenroth, Andrew Besuyen (Co-Chair), Ellie Tizzard, Lynley Beckingsale (WDC), David Hill (North Canterbury News) |
| 4. | **Walking Festival Proposal**  
|    | Nicola Trolove  
|    | Nicola joined us to present her proposal for a combined event, collaborating to create a mental health awareness walk to add to the Breeze Walking Festival on 14th October during mental health awareness week.  
|    | The plan would be to create a walk somewhere in the district modelled on the AllRight? Amble, a walk created by Uni students in Christchurch. The walk would have a number of stations, each focusing on one aspect of maintaining good mental/emotional wellbeing.  
|    | There was some discussion around where the walk could take place, with suggestions such as the Kaiapoi stop-bank, Kaiapoi domain, Oxford millennial walk, Kaiapoi Williams St bridge walk and the Ohoka stream walk.  
|    | Youth Council agreed by general consensus that this would be a valuable project to get behind, and it was suggested that it could work well in collaboration with WaiYouth.  
| 5. | **Youth Crime, what can we do?**  
|    | Peter Cooper  
|    | Peter joined us, introducing himself and what he does. He emphasised that the Waimakariri is one of the safest communities in New Zealand with only 3% youth crime.  
|    | Peter brought up the issue of mental health and how significant it is for young people. There followed a discussion around mental health and suicide, especially around rural mental health in terms of isolation, depression and family harm.  
|    | After this the group discussed the Rangiora skate park, talking around how this area could become more of a community hub, welcoming all young people and families. There was discussion about “washing machine music”, drive-in movies and how the area could be transformed to be more welcoming. | **ACTIONS:**  
|    | Nicola & Sam to discuss further and decide on a location and to submit the walk by 18th June.  
|    | Sam to invite Chris Brown from Greenspace to come and talk to the group about a potential Development plan for the skate park area.  
|    | Sam to talk to Sue Bagshaw about youth hubs/centres. |
There was some more discussion about what a youth centre could look like, and whether a youth worker presence could be helpful in the area.

Arabella asked a question about youth temporary accommodation, with Peter explaining that finding places for young people to go in the middle of the night can be a real issue.

Peter also mentioned that there’s not really much going on for young people in the Waimakariri after hours.

Peter finished by emphasising once more the importance of mental health, of talking to people if you’re struggling or if you think someone else is struggling. He also talked about driving and the increase in people refusing to stop for police.

Dan Gordon suggested some action points arising from the discussion.

6. Alcohol Policy and Bylaw Submission

| Nick Harrison |

Nick came to answer any further questions on the Alcohol policy/bylaw and to encourage Youth Council to make a submission.

The team agreed and committed to making a submission.

**ACTIONS:**

- Each YC member to read through the policy and bylaw and give their thoughts to Sam
- Sam to submit on behalf of YC

7. Reports for Discussion

**Mayor David Ayers, Councillor Dan Gordon and Councillor Kirstyn Barnett:**

Talked about the LTP deliberations which were currently in progress at Council, including the approval of the Multi-Use Sports Facility, going through the rest of the budgets and discussion about waste, in particular recycling.

Updated Youth Council on the sister city exchange trip to China. Also mentioned the regeneration areas in Kaiapoi which are about to be handed over to Council. Following this there were some questions and discussion on roads in Kaiapoi.

Dan Gordon wanted to officially endorse the Kaiapoi mural project and the Youth Development Strategy logo and promotional materials.

**ACTIONS:**

- xxx

8. Youth Development Strategy

Sam updated the team on the progress of the branding and wider engagement process, advising that promotion would start on 1 June along with the release of the survey.

**ACTIONS:**

- Sam to keep the group updated and organise days/times
| 9.  | **Team Building Weekend**  
Sam advised that he would send out options to the group. | Sam to send out options to the group. |
| 10. | **General Business**  
Website Profiles.  
A reminder was given about website profiles for each of the youth councillors.  
ECAN - Regional Youth Voices Hui.  
Olivia, Aurora and Katie all expressed an interest in attending the ECAN - Regional Youth Voices Hui.  
Emma’s Resignation.  
Was announced, and the team agreed that a card and chocolates should be arranged for Emma.  
Farewell to Thomas, Bradley & Emma – Date 23rd or 30th June.  
Sam advised two options as 23rd or 30th June. | ACTIONS:  
Sam to send out reminder about website profiles to the group on Facebook.  
Sam to follow up with interested parties  
Sam to message Thomas, Bradley and Emma to choose a preferred date, and then to organise with the rest of the team. |

**Meeting closed at 9.15 pm**

**Next meeting** on Tuesday 26 June 2018 in the Rakahuri Room, at the Rangiora Service Centre.

| Chair | Date |
MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE REGENERATION STEERING GROUP HELD IN THE RUATANIWHA KIAIPOI CIVIC CENTRE ON MONDAY 11 JUNE 2018 AT 4.00PM

PRESENT:
Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust C McMillan, D Ayers (Mayor), J Palmer (Chief Executive), C Sargison (Manager Community and Recreation), D Roxborough (Implementation Project Manager - District Regeneration).

IN ATTENDANCE:
M Flanagan, WDC
C Batchelor, WDC

1. APOLOGIES
An apology was received and sustained from C McKay and S Stewart for absence.
An apology was received and sustained from N Atkinson, C Greengrass, C McMillan, and J Watson for lateness.

Moved: J Meyer
Seconded: J Palmer
CARRIED

2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Moved: P Redmond
Seconded: J Palmer

THAT the Regeneration Steering Group:
Confirms as a true and correct record the minutes of a meeting held on Monday 9 April 2018.
CARRIED
3. **MATTERS ARISING**

There was no matters arising.

4. **DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS**

There was no deputations and presentations.

5. **TE KŌHAKA O TŪHAITARA TRUST UPDATE**

C McMillan noted they are looking forward to the event on Friday for the formal handover from the Crown. C McMillan advised they signed the documents from their side on Wednesday. They have been through a process of consultation on the concept plan and have made a few modifications based on the feedback that came back from the consultation. A copy of the concept plan will be sent out to everyone in the next few days. The next piece of work is to change the Reserve Management Plan. The only areas that will need to change is in the list of land that is part of the Tūhaitara Coastal Park.

6. **KAIAPOI TOWN CENTRE 2028 PLAN UPDATE**

This item will be covered as a Staff Briefing at the close of the meeting.

7. **REPORTS**

7.1 **Proposed Permanent Rowing Base in Murphy Park, Kaiapoi** – Michelle Flanagan, Landscape Planner – District Regeneration and Cathy Batchelor, Communications Advisor – District Regeneration

M Flanagan advised that the purpose of the report is to seek the Steering Groups approval of the draft concept plan for the permanent rowing base at Murphy Park. The preliminary draft plan was presented to the Regeneration Steering Group in April, and was taken out for community consultation through April and May. There were 43 pieces of feedback received. The majority of the feedback supported the proposed rowing base for its benefits to Kaiapoi, and its recreational access to the river. The feedback received that is not in support of the rowing base generally focused on issues wider than the rowing base. Some commenters felt it was inappropriate for Council to be providing infrastructure for non-Waimakariri based clubs. Some commenters suggested other locations for the rowing base, generally downstream of the proposed location. In regard to the comments around providing non-Waimakariri based clubs, the Council are looking to provide assets that are full public use. The Council is not looking to fund the storage units for the rowing clubs. In terms of alternative locations, the downstream site is not considered feasible for a number of reasons. Primarily the lack of space on the river side of the stop bank, limited space for storage sheds, and poor ground conditions.

As part of the consultation we also sought feedback from the key users of Murphy Park. Both St Margaret’s Rowing Club and the Union Rowing Club support the proposed rowing base and confirmed a commitment of keeping a training presence at the river. Similarly, the Croquet Club support the concept plan and the availability of land for an additional green. In their submission, the Croquet Club also reiterated their decision to remain at Murphy Park. The core operation at the Murphy Park also supported the plan for its benefits to the park and the use of the river. The Northern Bulldogs Rugby League Club indicated they were unable to support the draft concept plan. The club considered that existing sport clubs could benefit from the use of the area and required additional time to seek information from the rowing clubs about how they could use the park. At this stage staff are unaware of any other clubs other than the Croquet Club that are looking for use of the area and the park. It is felt that the two activities, rowing and rugby league, could co-exist at the park given their different seasons and operating times. At a meeting with the Rugby League Club, some members expressed concerns that the rowing base took up space that could be used by the club for parking. Staff are currently awaiting feedback from the Rugby League Club on their plans for the future. Should the club wish to remain at Murphy Park we would need to look at the parking.

Based on the consultation feedback staff have not made changes to the draft concept plan. Design details such as the amount of vegetation to be removed and the orientation of the boat ramp are to be addressed during the next phase.
Should approval be given for staff to progress the draft concept plan there are a number of key next steps. These involve the development of the detailed design, cost estimates, seeking building and resource consents, and to work with St Margarets and the Union Rowing Clubs of the terms of the licence to occupy for their storage sheds at the park.

M Pinkham noted that a number of submitters raised their concerns that both the Union and St Margarets rowing clubs came to Kaiapoi after the earthquakes and asked would they still stay if there were other facilities built in the Christchurch area, and do we know if both of these clubs have signalled their long-term commitment to Kaiapoi.

M Flanagan replied that both clubs have expressed their commitment to keep a training presence on the Kaiapoi River. Both clubs will required to re-locate their storage sheds at their costs, and at this stage they have agreed to that in principle.

J Palmer asked if there was any feedback received about the boat ramp.

M Flanagan replied that St Margarets confirmed they see this as an integral part of the development of the rowing base development. They came at it from a safety perspective as well as getting coaching boats into the river.

J Meyer asked about the angle of the boat ramp.

M Flanagan replied that this will be worked through in the detailed design phase.

Moved: A Blackie Seconded: M Pinkham

THAT the Regeneration Steering Group:
(a) Receives report No. 180521055764.
(b) Approves staff progressing the draft concept plan for the permanent rowing base at Murphy Park.
(c) Approves staff working with the St Margarets Rowing Club and Union Rowing Club on the key terms for licences to occupy (including confirming the club contribution to the proposed rowing base) for approval by the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board.
(d) Approves staff working with the Kaiapoi Croquet Club on the key terms for a licence to occupy for the additional area for approval by the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board.
(e) Notes that staff will present a developed design and updated cost estimate of the proposed rowing base for consideration in a later report.
(f) Notes that expenditure by Council on the proposed rowing base will require Council approval.
(g) Notes that a future concept plan will be required for Murphy Park, primarily addressing parking and access issues, once the Northern Bulldogs Rugby League Club have confirmed their future plans.
(h) Circulates this report to Council.

CARRIED
7.2 Jones Street Repair Options (Kaiapoi East Regeneration Area) – Michelle Flanagan, Landscape Planner – District Regeneration

M Flanagan advised that the purpose of the report is to seek a recommendation from the Steering Group on the proposed repair strategy for Jones Street in Kaiapoi East. Jones Street is the last remaining roading project in the Infrastructure Repair Programme. The future of Jones Street is linked to adjacent mixed-use business areas. It is a key link to the town centre and provides access to the mixed-use business area. Given that the future development of the mixed-use business areas are not yet confirmed there is a potential that the rebuild works now in Jones Street will not support the mixed-use business activities and may need future re-work. There is also the potential that any future land or flood remediation work will require reworking in permanent repairs.

Six options for the rebuild of Jones Street where considered. Four of the options delayed the rebuild works and two options looked to rebuild Jones Street in the short-term. Staff preference is for Option four which is rebuilding Jones Street to a similar standard as the new Feldwick link. Option four would resolve the current condition and drainage issues associated with Jones Street and would likely meet community expectations for a repair network and link Kaiapoi East to the town centre.

There is currently $580K available for permanent repairs to Jones Street in the Earthquake Infrastructure Repair budget and this includes funding from NZTA under the emergency works category. Any interim repair works such as those in options one, two and three would also come from this budget. There are a number of key risks associated with the rebuild strategy for Jones Street. Options one, two and three are unlikely to meet community expectations for an urban road network and in addition now that the new Feldwick link is almost complete, an unrepaired Jones Street will not meet community expectations. Permanent repair options four and five do not fully take into account further development of the mixed-use business areas to varying degrees. Both options may require rework as a result of future land and flood remediation work which may require the level of the road to be raised. Option four would be the cheaper permanent repair option but would potentially need rework to support the mixed-use business activities in the future. Option five being the option to rebuild to a business standard to support the land uses in the recovery plan but may require future rework as a result of the master plan.

D Ayers asked if staff have considered the natural pedestrian walkway and is it possible that the footpath could be on the wrong side.

M Flanagan replied that it is possible. When we are looking through this we are also looking at the Reserve Master Plan that brings another connection through the park which would come down through the centre of the sport and recreation reserve, and down through the dog park area and come out at Charles Street as well.

M Pinkham noted he struggles to support recommendation four, given that the relatively small area of the mixed-use business between Jones Street and the existing business areas. To rebuild to a business standard would be quite feasible and this could actively encourage development between Jones Street and the existing business area.

Moved: A Blackie Seconded: D Ayers

THAT the Regeneration Steering Group recommends that the Utilities and Roading Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 180426045143.

(b) Approves staff progressing with the concept design of permanent repairs to Jones Street to standard similar to the new Kaiapoi East road link (between Feldwick Drive and Cass Street.) (Option 4).

(c) Notes that there is currently a budget of $580,000 available for these permanent repairs.

(d) Notes that there is the potential for future rework on Jones Street to support the development of the of the mixed-use business area in Kaiapoi East.

(e) Notes that New Zealand Transport Agency funding for the preferred option (Option 4) would need to be confirmed.
(f) Notes that access will be maintained to the private residential property on Jones Street in any repair strategy.

Motion Amendment

(b) Approves staff progressing with the concept design of permanent repairs to Jones Street to a business standard on the west side consisting of kerb and channel and for the eastern side to be rebuilt with a swale to a standard similar to the new Kaiapoi East road link (between Feldwick Drive and Cass Street).

Moved: J Meyer Seconded: M Pinkham

THAT the Regeneration Steering Group recommends that the Utilities and Roading Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 180426045143.

(b) Approves staff progressing with the concept design of permanent repairs to Jones Street to a business standard on the west side consisting of kerb and channel and for the eastern side to be rebuilt with a swale to a standard similar to the new Kaiapoi East road link (between Feldwick Drive and Cass Street).

(c) Notes that there is currently a budget of $580,000 available for these permanent repairs.

(d) Notes that there is the potential for future rework on Jones Street to support the development of the of the mixed-use business area in Kaiapoi East.

(e) Notes that New Zealand Transport Agency funding for the preferred option (Option 4) would need to be confirmed.

(f) Notes that access will be maintained to the private residential property on Jones Street in any repair strategy.

CARRIED

8. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

8.1 District Regeneration Communications Report – May 2018 – Cathy Batchelor, Communications Advisor – District Regeneration & Duncan Roxborough – Implementation Manager – District Regeneration

D Roxborough noted that the purpose of this report is provide a monthly update on the Comm’s activities.

Clause 4.1 - The new Kaiapoi East road link is due to be complete at the end of the month. There will be further repairs to Bracebridge Street consisting of kerb and channel and a turning head at Moore Street. There will be a road opening event for the Feldwick Drive opening.

Clause 4.3 - We have been meeting with the private property owners within the Regeneration area. The owners from Jones Street have now made contact and we will be meeting with them on Tuesday 12th June.

Clause 4.6 - A reminder of the LINZ event this Friday for the Ministerial Ceremonial Event for the handover of the land from the Crown.

Moved: D Ayers Seconded: P Redmond

THAT the Regeneration Steering Group

(a) Receives report No. 180529059405.

CARRIED
9. MINUTES FROM PCG MEETINGS

9.1 Kaiapoi River Marine Precinct Project Control Group (PCG) Meeting Minutes – Thursday 19 April 2018

M Pinkham suggested that staff may want to contact the Coromandel District Council and the Northland District Council as they have both installed a number of pontoons and it could be worthwhile getting some feedback from them.

**THAT** the Regeneration Steering Group receives the information in items 9.1 – 9.2.

Moved: A Blackie
Seconded: P Redmond

CARRIED

9.2 District Regeneration Project Control Group (PCG) Meeting Minutes – Thursday 19 April 2018

10. CORRESPONDENCE

There was no correspondence.

11. GENERAL

11.1 Dredging Pontoon Update – Duncan Roxborough, Implementation Project Manager – District Regeneration

D Roxborough noted that progress is being made on the rebuild of the river wall. Unfortunately we have not obtained our resource consents for the proposed dredging of the river for the marina basin dredging as well as the separate consent application for the dredging for navigability of the river channel. We are clearly not going to make this timeframe to have completed before 15 August. We are looking at a possible fall back option where we might be able to do an interim amount of dredging either using a long-reach excavator or a clamshell while the stop bank is temporarily removed to take out around a metre depth of the existing silts to get enough water depth to be able to install the pontoons and float them into position. The pontoons would be usable, not by the design depth of boat that we are aiming for but certainly a shallow draft vessel. This would mean that we would have to come back and do the dredging in the winter next year.

If we can get everything finished by the end of this year, and get the pontoons in place we would have a six month period where we would not have minimal depth to come back and dredge that area as well as the rest of the river in the June to August period. The fall back option is subject to getting a price from the contractor for the interim dredging work who is currently building the river wall, and we also still need a resource consent. We have applied for this resource consent and are hoping that this might get turned around by the end of this week. If it doesn’t we can’t stall for too long as the contractor needs to keep moving on to finish the river wall.

12. MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED

There were no matters to be considered with the public excluded.

13. NEXT MEETING

The next scheduled meeting of the Regeneration Steering Group commences at 4.00pm on Monday 2 July 2018 at the Ruataniwha Centre, Kaiapoi.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS THE MEETING CLOSED AT 5.01PM.
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE WOODEND-SEFTON COMMUNITY BOARD
HELD IN THE WOODEND COMMUNITY CENTRE, SCHOOL ROAD, WOODEND ON
MONDAY 14 MAY 2018 AT 7.00PM.

PRESENT
S Powell (Chairperson), A Thompson (Deputy Chair), A Allen, J Archer, A Blackie, R Mather and J Meyer.

IN ATTENDANCE
C Sargison (Community and Recreation Manager), Kathy Graham (Journey Planner/Road Safety Co-ordinator), Mike O’Connell (Senior Policy Analyst) and E Stubbs (Minutes Secretary).

1 APOLOGIES
Nil.

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
Nil.

3 CONFIRMATION MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board – 9 April 2018
Moved A Allen Seconded J Archer
THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:
(a) Confirms the circulated minutes of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting, held 9 April 2018, as a true and accurate record.
CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
Nil.

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS FROM THE COMMUNITY
5.1 Heather Warwick - Enterprise North Canterbury (ENC) provided an update on ENC projects, support and training for businesses. She spoke to a tabled handout (Trim 180515052906). The purpose of ENC was to help businesses thrive and attract new investment. It was a Council Controlled Organisation (CCO) set up in 2002 and contracted by WDC to promote the Waimakariri District since 2005. The ENC Board comprises: the Mayors of the Waimakariri District Council and Hurunui District Council, the two Council CEOs and seven local business owners.

H Warwick outlined the two ENC work streams - Business Support and District Promotion and explained the funding models for those. Business Support funding from WDC was $196,000. This was seed funding that generated another $368,000. District Promotion funding was $400,000 with another $180,000 from operators and sponsors.

H Warwick showed that employee growth in the District was up from 7,500 since 2000 to 13,500 in 2015. She noted that following the earthquakes ENC had a proactive leadership role.

H Warwick outlined the role of business support highlighting that ENC has worked with over 3,000 businesses to date. ENC provided:
- Capability assessments to local businesses
- Online resources for businesses
- Start up support
∑ Research and development grants through Callaghan Innovation and
∑ Business confidence surveys including local businesses every six
months.

H Warwick outlined the training and networking programme including the
training courses being run in 2018. Annually ENC holds three networking
functions each year to bring like-minded business together. Business centre
highlights included achieving $30,000 annually in bookings, new sponsorship
and the provision of a professional meeting and training space for the
business community.

The Business Awards showcased the District’s businesses. The gala dinner
for the previous awards had sold out in 48 hours. This year there was a new
award – Community Enterprise and H Warwick encouraged board members
to encourage entrants for that award. She commented that entering for the
awards acted as a planning tool for businesses. ENC was able to assist with
entries, as they were not judges for the awards.

The Business Attraction programme worked with businesses looking to
relocate or expand and provide start-up advice. She highlighted BrewPub as
a success of that process. ENC made introductions and linkages with existing
developers and developers were all given equal opportunity. H Warwick
explained the partnering for ENC and WDC for business development and
support.

In regards to tourism, H Warwick referred to statistics in the handout showing
the increase in Waimakariri tourism spend. International spend had doubled
in the last 5 years. Development of an off road cycle trail in the district, with
the first night in Kaiapoi, was a highlight. ENC had the official i-SITE for the
district with over $120,000 in sales through the i-SITE.

S Powell asked what the Community Board could do to assist ENC. H
Warwick said that she would leave business cards for members to give to
businesses to make sure they could get hold of ENC. They helped with
entry/exit plans and growing or struggling businesses. Their purpose was to
serve the business community.

A Blackie noted that the Board’s submission to the LTP had expressed
concern with the perception of ENC serving Rangiora and Kaiapoi and not
assisting the rest of the district. H Warwick did not agree with that perception.
They were owned by both WDC and HDC and they wanted to see businesses
in North Canterbury rather than across the river. Each area had its own
benefits and they worked with developers.

A Allen noted the doubling in international tourists and asked for H Warwick’s
views on Easter trading. H Warwick advised that ENC was neutral on the
matter due to its relationship with Council. On a personal level as a previous
business owner, she saw the benefits of Easter trading as well as Sunday
trading in general to provide a destination for shoppers.

A Thompson referred to Hanmer and asked if Waimakariri had a distinctive
tourism message. H Warwick commented that Waimakariri did not have an
icon like the Hanmer Pools. It was important to tell a story with specific
message and branding to create a sense of place. Waimakariri was good at
playing on the strength of events. With the potential cycle trail through the
district that would allow a spine with vertebrae to different areas and a story
for each. In 2020, once there was a clip-on to the bridge, Waimakariri would
be accessible by bike from Christchurch. They needed to maximise the
potential for cyclists to stop, eat and shop.

S Powell asked if ENC was promoted to small, home based business owners
and H Warwick replied yes. A number of small businesses’ first step out from
‘home-base’ was into shared office space above ENC and in Conway Lane.
J Archer referred to the rich cultural heritage of Te Ngāi Tūhuriri Rūnanga and asked if there was tourism potential. H Warwick advised that there could be, in conjunction with the cycle trail. While the Rūnanga did not wish to promote the Kaiapoi Pa there was a Tuahiwi Marae education day or experience that could be incorporated. The Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust was to take over guardianship of the wetland in the area and was also a huge asset to the location. H Warwick noted that when the Enshi, China delegates had been hosted they had been most appreciative of the ocean.

A Thompson commented that cycle trails were generally a dedicated, continuous trail however the trail in Waimakariri was patchy. H Warwick outlined the location of the trail and advised that while the trails varied in widths and surfaces, there were not a lot of gaps. Work was occurring to collaborate and connect the trails. In the future, the Waimakariri Walk and Cycle guide and Visit Waimakariri brochure would be combined and would have the cycle trail included. 30,000 would be distributed around New Zealand.

S Powell noted there were some errors on the Visit Waimakariri website, she would email H Warwick separately. She thanked H Warwick for attending.

5.1 Kathy Graham (Journey Planner/Road Safety Co-ordinator) introduced Mike Seabourne (NZTA). M Seabourne noted that there were currently three projects related to Woodend - the Bypass, the Ashley to Belfast safety improvements either side of the township, and the project within the township.

M Seabourne noted that the township consultation should have started a month and a half ago, however the new draft Government Policy Statement on Land Transport (GPS) had delayed that process due to re-prioritising projects. Funding had been approved for the planning phase. M Seabourne asked for questions and feedback from the board members.

A Thompson advised that the concern was the conflict between the large transport thoroughfare and the use of the thoroughfare in a normal way for the daily activity of residents.

M Seabourne outlined the phases of the project noting that the current phase was to understand the problem. The concern was access across the state highway; it was a safety risk that required management. In terms of design, if it required better pedestrian control, where was the best place to concentrate that activity? M Seabourne commented that tonight was the start of that process. He did not want to raise expectations, as at the completion of this phase funding would still require approval. There was a balance between the community that lived in and around the State Highway and the need to keep traffic flowing on the highway. He noted that the Woodend Bypass was in the distant future and there was a need to do something in the interim. M Seabourne commented that the designation of land was a good sign. It had been required due to the growth of the district.

S Powell asked about consultation and M Seabourne advised that it was not a full consultation phase, the board was a central part and would be used as a starting point. The project scale was $1-5 million at this stage.

A Thompson asked if there was an example of SH1 town improvements that M Seabourne could refer to and M Seabourne replied that every small town on SH1 experienced the same issue. SH1 was economically vital and from that respect was ‘guarded jealously’. At the same time, the community view needed to be respected. M Seabourne noted that Woodend had a wide corridor, which meant that traffic flowed well however it also meant it was difficult to slow down traffic.

A Allen commented that the project was a ‘bandaid’ until the bypass was completed and asked from a ratepayer perspective was there any feasible date or deadline to work to.

M Seabourne replied no. It was in the 10 year plus horizon. He noted the WDC submission and Board submission to the GPS regarding the bypass.
R Mather noted the reference to speed through Woodend and commented the issue was bigger than speed. The bigger issue was the division of the community due to traffic volume and the inability to turn right whether by car, bike or pedestrian.

M Seabourne commented it was good feedback. There needed to be changes to traffic flow to create gaps. Traffic signals for a pedestrian crossing could create that gap.

J Archer noted that the designations had been completed 40 years ago, however the bypass had been continually pushed out and he asked why that was.

M Seabourne replied that it was because there was not enough money to do everything. Priorities were set by central government. S Powell commented that the board needed to set the bypass to the side, the purpose tonight was to look at road safety improvements through Woodend. They would continue to advocate for the bypass. R Mather made the comment that the bypass met the GPS criteria under safety, accessibility and the environment.

S Powell commented that in Woodend there was a lack of right turn bays and a lack of, or inadequate pedestrian refuges. Cycle access particularly related to the Pegasus roundabout was also inadequate. J Archer reiterated S Powell’s comments regarding pedestrian refuges and provided examples.

M Seabourne commented that part of the process was to look at options around where activities were centred. J Archer suggested the bus stop should be located near a safe crossing.

S Powell commented that the Woodend Beach / Rangiora Woodend Road / SH1 intersection was an issue. It was difficult to turn right onto SH1 and the speed limit into Woodend was too close for cars to have adequately slowed down.

R Mather commented that another difficult intersection was Chinnerys Road, which many used to travel to Rangiora. There was no right turn bay into Chinnerys Road. It was a site of many ‘nose to tails’ and turning at Woodend Road was a safer option. R Mather also commented that there appears to be sufficient room at this intersection for a right turning bay to be created.

M Seabourne advised that they would work with WDC engineers. R Mather asked about the Ravenswood ‘spine’ road as that would take a lot of Rangiora traffic out of Woodend. M Seabourne commented they would work with developers where they could and K Graham noted that road would have a local impact on the Rangiora Woodend Road.

J Archer commented on the reduced speed signs coming into Woodend from the south. They were too close to the town so traffic was still coming in at 100km/hr rather than 50km/hr.

M Seabourne suggested that creating a threshold to the town so that traffic were aware of the need to slow would help.

S Powell commented that a right turn on the roundabout into Pegasus was a concern as traffic, including trucks, going straight through did not slow down. There is also no safe pedestrian or cycle access between the Ravenswood commercial area and Pegasus or Woodend.

J Meyer referred to when the motorway to the west of Kaiapoi had been formed. He commented that peak time through Woodend was most of the day and there were serious concerns. He was still confident NZTA and the Government would take those concerns seriously.

R Mather requested that consultation included the Woodend Community Association (WCA) and the Pegasus Residents Group (PRG) as both these groups have been involved in previous discussions with NZTA regarding road safety in this area.
M Seabourne advised that consultation would be underway next month in a workshop type environment. He outlined the process,

- Design (would be a 6-9 month process)
- Design to agency for funding approval
- Get resource consent (if required)
- Construction

S Powell asked about consultation around the project as there was the expectation in the community for consultation and had been signalled as part of the Safer Roads Project.

M Seabourne was not afraid of that. The process could be iterative and the consultation needed to be at such a time that it was early enough to influence design, however did not start with a blank sheet. He noted that both the Safe Roads projects and the in-town project could consult at the same time rather than as disparate projects.

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS
Nil.

7 REPORTS
7.1 **Woodend – Pegasus Area Strategy (Implementation Update) – Mike O’Connell (Senior Policy Analyst)**

M O’Connell spoke to the report noting that the strategy had been adopted in 2013. Included in the report was a table of updates and a previous report showing the status at that time. The framework included four themes:

- Connectivity
- Business
- Community
- Open Spaces

There were 44 projects across these four themes in various degrees of completion. Many of the projects related to the SH1 and the Woodend Bypass and he noted the previous discussion with the NZTA representative. There was the mention of other strategies including the Community Development Strategy and the District Development Strategy.

R Mather commented that the strategy was now five years old and there had been a lot done. Is there a point where there should be a review of what was left? M O’Connell agreed it was probably getting to the point where that was required.

C Sargison commented that the District Development Strategy (DDS) would overtake quite a lot of what was in the strategy. In addition, the Long Term Plan (LTP) would also have an effect and it would be September before NZTA would give indication of their intention for the bypass.

A Thompson asked if there was an answer to the question ‘have we made good progress with deliverables on the 2013 Strategy?’ C Sargison replied yes, for example Gladstone Park redevelopment. The work had spread into different departments particularly Utilities and Roading with a lot of work in roading, cycling, walking and Greenspace. The strategy had also fed into other pieces of work for example the Community Development Strategy.
S Powell referred to funding in the LTP for cycle facilities in Woodend and asked what they were. C Sargison advised that he would check that and advise.

S Powell referred to wording regarding the emergency access out of Pegasus ‘on hold until bypass complete’. It sounded like it had been decided however S Powell thought it would be consulted on at that point. She referred to a previous example at Gladstone Park where the wording suggested a decision had been made prior to consultation. C Sargison commented that the wording could be cryptic and no decision had been made.

Moved R Mather seconded J Archer

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180502047733.
(b) Notes the progress made in implementing the short to medium term actions as signalled in Attachment ii, Trim No. 180503048170.

R Mather was happy to move the report with assurance that there would be an update in the future. C Sargison advised there could be a workshop with the board following the DDS, LTP and NZTA decision.

J Archer found the strategy to be a complete document however some parts needed to be updated and/or corrected.

7.2 Memorial Seat: Janice Healey – Chris Brown (Community and Greenspace Manager)

C Sargison spoke to the report commenting that the family was working with staff and were funding the seat. The proposed location was a good place for a seat.

A Thompson noted that had been a few requests for these types of memorials recently and asked if there was a need for a plan of how to manage the requests, for example how many seats, tables or parks and how to prioritise?

C Sargison commented that across the district when staff got these requests a landscape architect would look at it with the family. There were not a large number of requests and many wished to plant trees. Family members were willing to work with staff to find a good location. It was not relevant to have detailed plans as the nature of the requests required staff to work on a case-by-case basis and have flexibility. There had not been a problem yet.

Moved A Allen seconded R Mather

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180501047361.
(b) Approves the installation of a seat to be located on the north eastern side of the Waikuku Ashley Estuary Car Park (as shown on the plan in section 4.1) as a memorial location of seat for Greg Healey.
(c) Approves the design of the seat as per attachment.

CARRIED

A Allen commented that the design was aesthetically pleasing. She congratulated staff for dealing with a sensitive subject respectfully.

R Mather agreed that Council handled tricky and emotional requests well, she was pleased staff could accommodate family wishes.
7.3 Ratification of the Board’s Submission to the Waimakariri District Council’s Long Term Plan 2018-2028 – Edwina Cordwell (Governance Adviser)

S Nichols spoke briefly to the report.

Moved R Mather seconded A Allen

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No.180328033654.

(b) Retrospectively ratifies the Board’s submission to the Waimakariri District Council’s Long Term Plan 2018-2028 (Trim No.18032803375).

CARRIED

R Mather, A Allen and J Archer congratulated S Powell on the submission.

7.4 Ratification of the Board’s Submission to the draft Government Policy Statement on Land Transport 2018/19 – 2027/28 – Sarah Nichols (Governance Manager)

S Nichols spoke briefly to the report. They would hope to hear from the Government at the end of August, start of September.

Moved A Thompson seconded A Blackie

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180504048653.

(b) Retrospectively ratifies the Board’s submission to the NZTA on the draft Government Policy Statement on Land Transport 2018/19 – 2027/28. (Trim No. 180504048654).

CARRIED

A Thompson and A Blackie congratulated S Powell on the submission.

S Powell thanked board members for their input and noted the board would continue to advocate for the bypass.

8 CORRESPONDENCE

Moved R Mather seconded J Archer

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives the acknowledgement of submission to NZTA regarding the draft Government Position Statement on Land Transport 2018/19-2027/28 (Trim 180508049948).

CARRIED

9 CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT

9.1 Chairperson’s Report for April-2018

Moved S Powell seconded J Meyer

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180508049953.

CARRIED
10 MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

10.1 Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting minutes – 5 April 2018 (Trim No. 180328033515).

10.2 Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting minutes – 11 April 2018 (Trim No. 180404035432).

10.3 Rangiora-Ashley Road and Reserve Naming Committee meeting minutes – 4 April 2018 (Trim No. 1801409037877).

10.4 Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting minutes – 19 March 2018 (Trim No. 180315027985).

10.5 Youth Council meeting minutes – 27 March 2018


10.10 Register of Interests Policy Report to Council 1 May 2018 (Trim No. 180419042965).

Moved J Meyer seconded A Allen

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board receives the information in items 10.1-10.10.

CARRIED

11 MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE

11.1 March Diary for R Mather, A Allen, J Archer and A Thompson (Trim No. 180508049969)

11.2 A Blackie

∑ Attended the Woodend ANZAC service as Council representative. Around 180 had attended and looked like it would be a permanent event.

∑ Provided an update on a horse / dog incident on the beach, which may get media coverage. There had been injuries to both the dog and horse, and vet bills were about the same. Responsibility had been admitted on both sides and there had been some resolution. Horse trainers would wear high visibility. The bylaw allowed horse-training on 3.1km of beach and was a compromise. J Archer raised the topic of the effect on pipi and tuatua.

11.3 J Meyer

∑ Thanked the board for the submission to the LTP. He noted there were some difficult decisions to make.

11.4 R Mather

∑ Pegasus Residents Group

o Attended AGM – excellent guest speakers.
After learning bypass not in 10 year plan, WCA and PRG were speaking to Matt Docey and North Canterbury News. S Nichols asked if PRG submitted to the GPS and R Mather commented that they had only learnt about it the previous week.

Were strongly advocating for a permanent Community Centre at Pegasus. Referred to the Sue Sutherland report which recommended a centre in three years.

12 CONSULTATION PROJECTS
Rangiora Woodend Road Speed Limits –
Consultation closes Monday 28 May 2018.

S Nichols advised that B Rice would be attending the All Boards meeting at the end of June to discuss speed limits on Rangiora Woodend Road and feeder roads.

S Nichols advised that the other consultation was the Local Alcohol Policy and Alcohol Control Bylaw. Submissions closed on 11 June. The board would need to decide if they wished to submit on those matters.

13 FOSTERING COMMUNITIES
NIL

14 REGENERATION PROJECTS
14.1 Town Centres, Woodend-Pegasus
Updates on the Woodend-Pegasus area projects are emailed regularly to Board members. These updates can be located using the link below:

15 BOARD FUNDING UPDATE
15.1 Board Discretionary Grant
Balance as at 14 May 2018: $1,635.97.

15.2 General Landscaping Fund
Balance as at 14 May 2018 $10,533.
A report had been requested.

16 MEDIA ITEMS
General update.

17 QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS
None
18 **URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**

None

**NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board is scheduled for 7pm, Monday 11 June 2018 at the Pegasus Community Centre.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 9.00pm

CONFIRMED

__________________________
Chairperson

__________________________
Date

*Workshop held from 9pm – 9.10pm.*

1. *Holiday trading.*
MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF THE OXFORD-OHOKA COMMUNITY BOARD HELD IN THE OHOKA COMMUNITY HALL, MILL ROAD, OHOKA ON THURSDAY 7 JUNE 2018 AT 7.00PM.

PRESENT
D Nicholl (Chair), M Brown, W Doody, J Ensor, S Farrell, K Felstead, J Lynn and T Robson.

IN ATTENDANCE
S Nichols (Governance Manager), S Markham (Manager Strategy & Engagement), G Wilson (Earthquake Prone Buildings), M Harris (Customer Services Manager), Mayor D Ayers and E Stubbs (Minute Secretary).

The meeting adjourned for a workshop from 7.08pm to 7.14pm.
The meeting adjourned for a briefing from 7.25pm to 7.35pm.

1 APOLOGIES
Nil.

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
Item 8.4a - T Robson.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board – 3 May 2018
Moved W Doody seconded T Robson
(a) THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:
  Confirms the circulated minutes of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting, held 3 May 2018, as a true and accurate record.
  CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
J Lynn requested an update on the Butchers Road Resource Consent process. S Nichols advised the process had been put on hold by the land owner and staff were awaiting further information.

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS
Nil.

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS
6.1 Mandeville Sports Club facility as a venue for Community Board meetings – E Cordwell (Governance Adviser)
S Nichols spoke to the report, which had not changed in the intervening time. In April, S Nichols had written formally to the Mandeville Sports Club Board (MSCB) asking about availability, indicating that October could be a month of interest based on previous discussions. S Nichols noted the reply from the MSCB was included in the
agenda. The Club advised 4 October 2018 was not available as there was already a scheduled meeting. To enable the facility to be used for a Community Board meeting the Board could consider changing the October meeting to another date or leave the meetings as scheduled. The Club had provided two potential available dates, Wednesday 3 October and Monday 15 October.

The meeting adjourned for a workshop from 7.08pm to 7.14pm.

Moved K Felstead seconded J Ensor

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Notes the reply from the Mandeville Sports Club Board (Trim No.180529059313).

(b) Receives report No. 180320029482.

(c) Resolves to hold its future 2018 Board meetings at the following venues commencing at 7.00pm on the following dates.

- Thursday 5 July – West Eyreton Hall
- Thursday 9 August – Ohoka
- Thursday 6 September – Oxford Town Hall (A&P Room)
- Wednesday 3 October – Mandeville Sports Club
- Thursday 8 November – Ohoka
- Thursday 6 December – Oxford Town Hall (A&P Room)

CARRIED

S Nichols confirmed that staff would make the necessary arrangements for the meeting with the Mandeville Sports Club.

7 MATTERS REFERRED

7.1 Road Naming – Waimakariri District Council – S Morrow (Land Information Officer)

M Harris spoke to the report noting that it was in regards to naming of the new arterial road near Silverstream subdivision, which was on the Community Board ward boundary. At the May meeting of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board the Board had resolved to name the road Ohoka Road and change the name to Skewbridge at the bridge. Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board recognised that the affected roads were on the ward boundary of the Oxford-Ohoka and so had referred the recommendations to the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board for confirmation.

There was some confusion over the changes to be made and further detail was provided. It was noted that not having the changes recommended by Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board displayed on an alternative map was confusing.

D Nicholl asked how the changes would fit in with house numbers. M Harris replied that there was not a lot of property access from the roads in question. There was no need to change addresses. S Nichols commented the recommendation created the least disruption.

Moved K Felstead seconded S Farrell

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180509050654.

(b) Notes extract from the unconfirmed Minutes of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board 21 May 2018 Meeting (Trim No. 180529059332).
(c) **Confirms** the recommendations from the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting 21 May 2018:

- **Approves** the road name for the New Arterial Road in west Kaiapoi from the Ohoka Road off-ramp to the centre of Mill Road intersection to be Ohoka Road.
- **Approves** the name of the road from Mill Road intersection west to the Skewbridge, to be known as Skewbridge Road.

**CARRIED**
Against W Doody

K Felstead commented that the changes had been raised by the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board and they made sense.

S Farrell concurred with K Felstead.

J Lynn believed that having a road changing from Ohoka Road to Skewbridge Road to Flaxton Road along different sections was not ideal.

W Doody did not like the timing, and believed that the report should have gone to both Board’s before the recommendation from Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board so that there could have been more ‘to and fro’ discussion.

*The meeting adjourned for a briefing from 7.25pm to 7.35pm.*

8 **REPORTS**

8.1 **Approval to install cattle stops in Carleton Road – A Petrie (Road Compliance Engineer) and J McBride (Roading and Transport Manager)**

S Nichols took the report as read. It was noted that there was no cost to the Council, the proposal created greater road safety, and with the presence of Mycoplasma Bovis it was important to prevent cattle straying.

Moved M Brown seconded W Doody

**THAT** the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180517054232.

(b) **Approves** the construction of two cattle stops and associated fences and gates on Carleton Road at the locations shown on the attached plan (Doc. 180517054315) for the purpose of enabling the safe and efficient movement of cows across Carleton Road while at the same time keeping the road accessible and safe for road users.

(c) **Approves** the attached Draft Licence to Occupy Agreement (Doc. 180517054320).

(d) **Notes** that all costs associated with the construction and the maintenance of the cattle stops, fences and gates will be met by the property owner.

(e) **Notes** that the property owner will be required to remove the cattle stops, fences and gates if and when they cease dairy farming operations or if they change their method of operation that does not require the regular movement of cows across Carleton Road.

(f) **Circulates** this report to the Utilities & Roading Committee.

**CARRIED**
8.2 Building (Earthquake Prone Buildings) Amendment Act 2016 – G Wilson (Building Inspector) and L Beckingsale (Policy Analyst)

G Wilson spoke to a handout 'Earthquake Prone and Priority Buildings' (Trim No 180620068323) and provided an overview of where the process was going. He commented on the new legislation - The Building (Earthquake Prone Buildings) Amendment Bill 2016. Waimakariri was included in areas classified as ‘High Risk’ (with a seismic Hazard co-efficient >0.30).

Building owners within Waimakariri had 15 years to get their building up to a minimum of 34% of the new building code or demolish. A change with the new legislation was identifying individual elements rather than the building as a whole.

G Wilson commented on the process for effected business owners, which involved one on one discussions with effected business owners to allow engagement, discussion and hear concerns. Property owners would then receive a formal letter with the Council’s position.

G Wilson outlined requirements around ‘priority buildings’. Public consultation was required to identify priority buildings. The length of time for those buildings to be strengthened was less. There were very few unreinforced masonry (URM) buildings in the District that met the criteria, in particular there were none in the Oxford-Ohoka Ward. G Wilson noted the three plans included in the report showing priority routes in Rangiora and Kaiapoi. There would be public consultation on those routes in August/September 2018. The routes did not limit emergency access however, they were high volume pedestrian areas.

In the district there were nine URM buildings meeting criteria and G Wilson believed seven of those would be made above code within the next few years and noted that building owners had been outstanding in making the financial commitment. A building consent had been issued for strengthening of the old Kaiapoi BNZ building.

G Wilson commented that the Waimakariri District was significantly further ahead than most other Councils in New Zealand in relation to the new legislation as they had committed to carrying out assessments, including for every hall in the district. Any building identified as earthquake prone had to have a plaque to allow an informed decision for people to enter.

J Lynn referred to the Kaiapoi Mill noting it had Category 1 heritage. G Wilson advised that it had been well constructed in the 1880’s and there was a proposed plan to strengthen it to 67% of code.

S Farrell asked about the Jaycee Rooms in Oxford which were low use. G Wilson advised there was a paper going to the Council shortly. Elements of the rooms were below 34%. There was provision in the legislation for low use buildings to not require strengthening. The Council had made a commitment for all community buildings to be 67% of code or better.

J Ensor asked about the old hospital in Rangiora. G Wilson noted it was not a priority building and it was well above 34%. He noted that while the threshold was 34%, there were commercial factors including insurance and tenant confidence that was driving building owners to increase strengthening to over 67%.

J Ensor asked if any schools were in the low range. G Wilson advised that there were none that were URM and less than 34%. The Ministry of Education were going through Canterbury on a building by building case.

G Wilson noted that the Council was going through its own buildings with engineers to ensure the ‘little’ things were completed such as proper securing of lights and heaters.

K Felstead asked about Oxford Hospital and G Wilson advised that it was not earthquake prone. G Wilson noted that he believed the Cust Bell required addressing and was working with engineers.
S Farrell asked about churches in the district. G Wilson commented that timber churches were fine. There were only a couple of missing detailed engineering reports for churches in Rangiora.

S Markham approved of the approach outlined in the report commenting it had been an extraordinary commitment from G Wilson over a number of years working with building owners to get the district to the shape it was in. Small communities around New Zealand were challenged by their stock of older buildings. While there was a long lead time to requirements, tenants would not move into buildings less than 90% of code.

Moved K Felstead seconded W Doody

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No: 180514052613.

(b) Notes consultation with affected property owners is being undertaken.

CARRIED

8.3 Application to the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board’s Discretionary Grant Fund 2017/2018 - Oxford RSA – E Cordwell (Governance Adviser)

S Nichols spoke briefly to the report.

Moved W Doody seconded M Brown

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No.180418042006.

(b) Approves a grant of $449 to Oxford RSA towards the costs of a bronze cap/plaque to seal the Oxford Cenotaph time capsule.

CARRIED

8.4 Applications to the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board’s Discretionary Grant Fund 2017/2018 – E Cordwell (Governance Adviser)

S Nichols spoke to the report drawing attention to the $326 that would be left in the Discretionary Grant balance if both applications were approved. Options for that funding was to carry over unspent funds to the following year or to split the funds between both groups to spend the full allocation this financial year.

The application from the Christchurch Western Riding Association would also benefit other clubs who used the Mandeville Sports Centre.

J Lynn commented that the funds requested by both groups would not cover the costs of what they were trying to do and asked if the groups would be covering some of the funds as well. S Nichols commented that it was not unusual for projects to exceed the $500 funding cap and that grants from the Board were a contribution. There would be other fundraising.

J Lynn asked how did the Board know the job would be completed if there was still funds to raise. S Nichols explained that groups were required to complete an accountability form, reporting back to Council staff, who updated the Board six monthly. If the project could not be completed funds were returned. The requirements were laid out in the grant criteria.

J Lynn asked about the driveway repairs as it had not been completed with the sealing of North Eyre Road. S Nichols was not sure why that area had not been completed. J Ensor commented on the survey at the location.

Moved S Farrell seconded K Felstead
THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:
(a) Receives report No. 180517054235.
(b) Approves a grant of $663.27 to Oxford Community Trust towards the costs of a heat pump for the Oxford A & P building.
(c) Approves a grant of $663.27 to Christchurch Western Riding Association towards the cost of shingle to improve the driveway entrance to Mandeville Sports Centre.

CARRIED

S Farrell commented that the Oxford A&P building was the only community building in Oxford with a wooden floor and needed further improvements.

8.5 Allocation of the balance of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board’s 2017/18 Discretionary Grant Fund – E Cordwell (Governance Adviser)

S Nichols noted the zero-balance remaining in the Discretionary Grant Fund following the previous reports.

Moved J Ensor seconded T Robson

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:
(a) Receives report No. 180522056319.

CARRIED

9 CORRESPONDENCE

Nil.

10 CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT

10.1 Chairperson’s Report for May 2018

Moved W Doody seconded M Brown

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:
(b) Receives report No 180524057199.

CARRIED

W Doody thanked D Nicholl for the voluntary work he undertook to complete the fencing around the Gate Keepers Lodge in the Ohoka Domain.

11 MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

11.1 Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting minutes – 11 April 2018 (Trim No. 180404035432).

11.2 Rangiora-Ashley Road and Reserve Naming Committee meeting minutes – 4 April 2018 (Trim No. 18041409037877).

11.3 Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting minutes – 16 May 2018 (Trim No. 180515052911).

11.4 Kaiapoi Tuahiwi Community Board meeting minutes – 16 April 2018 (Trim No. 180410038481).

11.5 Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting minutes – 9 April 2018 (Trim No. 1803320732677).
11.6 **Youth Council meeting minutes** – 1 May 2018


11.9 **Register of Interests Policy** Report to Council 1 May 2018 (Trim No. 180419042965).

11.10 **Capital Projects Report for the period ended 31 March 2018** Report to Audit and Risk Committee 22 May 2018 (Trim No. 180424044711).

11.11 **Libraries Update** Report to Community and Recreation Committee 22 May 2018 (Trim No. 180511051846).


11.14 **Funding and Budget Options Kaiapoi River Dredging Proposals** Report to Council 29 May 2018 (Trim No. 180514052211).


11.16 **Siena/Sillano Drainage Works** Report to Council 1 May 2018 (Trim No. 180419042535).

Moved J Ensor seconded M Brown

**THAT** the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board receives the information in items 11.1-11.16.

**CARRIED**

12 **MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE**

**J Ensor**

∑ Attended a portion of the Long Term Plan Council meetings and was impressed with the staff reports and debate. Noted approved work to relive serious flooding issues.

**J Lynn**

∑ Attended annual Drainage Board session at the Council.

∑ Attended Neighbourhood Support Meeting.

∑ Gatekeepers Lodge – were receiving advice from Historic Places Trust in terms of renovation, including how to approach Health and Safety.

**T Robson**


∑ Ashley Gorge Reserve Advisory Group – contractor selected for the Log Cabin. Trapping had slowed over winter, a number of possums, stoats, rats and hedgehogs had been trapped.

∑ Council approved the Youth Development Grant in the Long Term Plan.

∑ The Youth Development Strategy was under review and the Youth Council had developed a survey as part of that. T Robson encouraged responses.
S Farrell
∑ Attended the annual Drainage meeting.
∑ Attended Oxford Museum meeting and was pleased to see the new entrance going ahead.

M Brown
∑ Attended Mandeville Sports Centre Board meeting.
∑ Noted new well head at West Eyreton was unfenced and requested staff follow up.

D Nicholl noted that the Board was well represented at the annual Drainage meeting.

K Felstead
Commented on the Council meeting
∑ Disposal of Lots remaining after realignment at Ashley Street/Red Lion corner, Rangiora.
∑ Settlement pattern for Greater Christchurch Partnership. Spread of Rangiora and Kaiapoi population – was the start of a long process.
∑ Draft Business 1&2 Public Spaces – set out where signage/concessions food, smokefree outside dining etc.
∑ Submission to Productivity Commissioner low emissions economy.
∑ Bin ownership – there will be a choice. Recommend that the Contractor own bins initially and at the end of the contract the ownership goes to the Council.
∑ Transfer Stations – operation and maintenance up for renewal.

S Farrell asked how the Board submission had been received in the Long Term Plan process. K Felstead noted the minutes would be available shortly. All the drainage work in Mandeville had been approved, with some early works in the 10-year plan and some later. Decisions would be formally signed off by the Council on 19 June.
J Ensor noted the Siena/Sillano Drainage Works report and commented there had been good progress.
D Ayers commented that there was money in the budget some time ago for Mandeville drainage in a 10 year program which was ongoing.

K Felstead noted there was funding to address flooding issues in Station Road, Oxford.
S Nichols advised that K Simpson would be attending the August Board meeting to provide an update on water related matters including where they were at with the flooding program.
K Felstead noted the 4.7% average rate increase across the district.

W Doody
Tabled her Councilor’s Report (Trim No 180620068322). Points noted were
∑ Recent refurbishment of Carleton Historic Railway Sign.
∑ Improvements at Swannanoa Domain.
∑ North Canterbury Swim Club success.
∑ Continued improvements to accessibility.
∑ The Papers Past website.
∑ Driver licensing for migrants.
∑ Tender approved for Heritage Pavilion at Ashley Gorge.
∑ Retirement of Ken Stevenson, Roading Manager.

13 CONSULTATION PROJECTS

Alcohol in our District
Consultation closes Monday 11 June 2018.

S Nichols noted that based on feedback the Board would not be making a formal submission however that did not preclude members making their own submission.

14 REGENERATION PROJECTS
14.1 Town Centre, Oxford

Updates on the Oxford Town Centre projects are emailed regularly to Board members. These updates can be located using the link below:


15 BOARD FUNDING UPDATE
15.1 Board Discretionary Grant

Balance as at 7 June 2018: $0.

15.2 General Landscaping Fund

Balance as at 7 June 2018 - $0.
New allocation from the Council 1 July 2018.

S Nichols noted that both funds now had a zero balance. The allocations would be confirmed with a report to the Board in July.

16 MEDIA ITEMS

Funding grants to groups to be celebrated.

17 QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS
Nil.

18 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS
Nil.

NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board is scheduled for Thursday 5 July 2018 commencing at 7.00pm, at the West Eyreton Hall.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 8.47pm.

CONFIRMED

________________
Chairperson

________________
Date
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE WOODEND-SEFTON COMMUNITY BOARD
HELD IN THE PEGASUS COMMUNITY CENTRE, MAIN STREET, PEGASUS ON
MONDAY 11 JUNE 2018 AT 7.06PM.

PRESENT
S Powell (Chairperson), A Thompson (Deputy Chair), A Allen, J Archer, R Mather and
J Meyer.

IN ATTENDANCE
C Sargison (Community and Recreation Manager), S Nichols (Governance Manager),
G Wilson (Building Inspector), Mayor D Ayers and E Stubbs (Minutes Secretary).

1 APOLOGIES
Moved J Archer seconded A Allen
An apology was received and sustained from A Blackie for absence. CARRIED

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
Nil.

3 CONFIRMATION MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board – 14 May 2018
Moved S Powell seconded A Thompson
THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:
(a) Confirms the circulated minutes of the Woodend-Sefton Community
Board meeting, held 14 May 2018, as a true and accurate record.
CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
Nil.

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS FROM THE COMMUNITY
Nil.

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS
Nil.

Note: Item 7.3 was taken at this time, the minutes have been set out as per Agenda.

7 REPORTS
7.1 General Landscaping Budget — G Stephens (Green Space Community
Engagement Officer)
C Sargison spoke to the report noting there had been some Board workshop
discussion with G Stephens (Greenspace Community Engagement Officer)
regarding how they would like to see the funding spent. The report formalised
the result of those discussions. C Sargison referred to the layout plan of
Sefton Domain in the report. He suggested that the remaining $59 be added to the $8,000 allocated for native planting in the south-east of the domain.

C Sargison noted that some information on roadside signage had been included in the report. He suggested that the Board could nominate two members to work with G Stephens on signage or the whole Board be involved in a workshop prior to him bringing a future report on signage to the Board.

J Archer asked if the Sefton Domain Advisory Group would be involved in sign design and C Sargison commented the Domain would have the standard Reserve sign. Members of the Sefton Domain Advisory Group were happy to meet with staff at the Domain to discuss. C Sargison explained that, as he was referring to a broader idea of signs when he suggested members work with staff on signage. For example the Board could decide a priority area to have a sign and once that was decided they could then engage with the local advisory group. There had been a report to Kaiapoi-Tuhaiwi Community Board regarding establishing a signage working group. He suggested allowing Kaiapoi-Tuhaiwi Community Board to be a test case which could be potentially rolled out to other Community Boards. The work needed to be staggered with the Boards for resourcing purposes. A Allen reiterated the importance of Sefton residents being involved as there was not a resident on the Board.

J Meyer asked if there was funding available for a Rangiora Woodend Path name signs. S Nichols did not believe there was, as the Passchendaele Trust was looking at funding for the Passchendaele Memorial Path signs.

J Archer referred to an unallocated area of land on the Sefton Domain Plan and asked if there were funds for planting in that area. C Sargison advised that the planting on the plan was what the Advisory Group had requested and staff had followed their direction.

Moved J Archer seconded R Mather

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180530060111.

(b) Notes the information provided regarding the process to provide road signage.

(c) Notes the board currently has $11,259 available to allocate to general landscape projects within the Woodend Sefton ward.

(d) Approves the allocation of $8,059 towards a native planting in the south eastern corner of Sefton Domain.

(e) Approves the allocation of $1,500 towards the installation of three concrete pads on which the donated concrete seats from the Sefton Library will be placed – final location to be determined in conjunction with the Sefton Domain Advisory Group and Green Space Staff.

(f) Approves the remaining allocation of $1,700 towards the installation of a sign at the entrance to Sefton Domain. Design to be in keeping with standard Council signage.

CARRIED

J Archer believed it was a worthwhile project.

R Mather and S Powell commented positively on the report.

A Thompson commented that the signage was not urgent however he would like to see the Board have a goal of completing a sign each year throughout the Board’s area.
7.2 **Woodend Sefton Community Board Representation on the Forestry Project Control Group — J Millward (Manager, Finance and Business Support)**

C Sargison spoke briefly to the report noting that it was a significantly high profile project that it required a Project Control Group. The people included in the group were J Millward (Manager, Finance and Business Support), Contractor representative, Te Kohaka o Tuhaitara Trust Manager, Project Manager, Communications and Community Board Representatives (Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi and Woodend-Sefton). C Sargison noted that the Chair of Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi would be their representative.

J Archer expressed an interest in the position. S Nichols advised the meetings were likely to be during the day.

A Thompson asked if the contract had been signed. S Nichols advised that details were being finalised after which it would go back through the Management Team. There were changes to proposed truck movements. Houses that would be effected would be liaised with.

Moved R Mather seconded A Thompson

**THAT** the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) *Receives* report No. 180511051693

(b) *Appoints* S Powell and J Archer as the Woodend-Sefton Community Board’s representatives to the Forestry Harvest Project Control Group;

(c) *Notes* the terms of reference provides for a representative from the Woodend-Sefton and Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Boards.

**CARRIED**

R Mather noted that as it was a significant project and the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board had nominated their chair as representative that it was appropriate that the chair of the Woodend-Sefton Board was also on the Project Control Group.

A Thompson noted the work of S Powell trying to advance communications around the project.

7.3 **Building (Earthquake Prone Buildings) Amendment Act 2016 – G Wilson (Building Inspector) and L Beckingsale (Policy Analyst)**

G Wilson referred to information circulated earlier (Trim No 180620068323) which provided background to the report. The greater Christchurch/Canterbury area was classified as a high seismic hazard area. The hazard rating coincided with proximity to the Alpine Fault.

Following the Canterbury Earthquakes, the Building Amendment Act 2016 replaced all Council Earthquake Buildings Policy throughout New Zealand. It set mandatory timelines for remediation. In addition, it changed the way buildings were looked at so that individual elements below threshold were identified rather than the buildings as a whole.

G Wilson outlined the process; the building owner would be advised in writing that their building was earthquake prone and they had one year for a detailed evaluation/report. Then if the building was still deemed to be earthquake prone the mandatory timeline for Waimakariri was 15 years to fix or demolish the building. The Ministry of Business Innovation and Employment required an annual report on how many earthquake buildings were still to be remediated.

G Wilson advised that post earthquake the Council Management team had made funds available for assessment of buildings in the district. When looking
at the legislation, Waimakariri was at the forefront of building assessment in New Zealand.

Another aspect of the legislation was priority buildings and priority routes, these included unreinforced masonry buildings (URM). In July/August there would be consultation with the community regarding identifying priority routes.

G Wilson noted the plans in the report that included URM buildings.

J Archer asked what was happening with the Kaiapoi bank building. G Wilson advised that a Building Consent had been submitted and issued for strengthening work. Heritage New Zealand was supportive with funding. Work was being progressed to allow reinstatement of the footpath.

S Powell referred to an earthquake on the Alpine Fault. G Wilson commented the district was in an enviable stage with the recent strengthening work and a lack of tall buildings. They were aware of what buildings would need to be looked at first.

G Wilson advised that they would continue the relationship with earthquake prone building owners that had begun following the earthquakes including engaging on a one on one basis with discussion. Other drivers to upgrade included affordable insurance and tenant confidence. Many companies wanted 67% earthquake standards as a minimum and banks wanted near 100%.

A Thompson referred to the High Street/Kippenberger Avenue earthquake prone buildings and G Wilson outlined which buildings they were.

Moved J Archer seconded R Mather

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No: 180530059664.

(b) Notes consultation with affected property owners is being undertaken.

CARRIED

7.4 Application to the Woodend-Sefton Community Board’s Discretionary Grant Fund 2017/2018 Sefton Community Newsletter – E Cordwell (Governance Adviser)

S Nichols noted the update of information from E Cordwell, the rural mail cost was $35 per month, (not $350 as included in the funding application).

Moved A Allen seconded R Mather

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180522056084.

(b) Approves a grant of $500 to Sefton Community Newsletter towards the cost of printing and distribution of the newsletter.

CARRIED

A Allen commented that C Stewart did a wonderful job with the Newsletter and it was good to support it.

R Mather noted the Newsletter was running at a loss. She supported the newsletter getting out to the community and noted it was used by the Community Board.

J Archer reiterated that it was worthwhile to support the newsletter.
7.5 **Allocation of the balance of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board’s Discretionary Grant Fund: E Cordwell (Governance Adviser)**

S Nichols noted the adjustment to the funds carried forward from the previous report. The Council had allowed Discretionary Grant Fund to be carried forward this year but did not always. Board members should continue to encourage community groups to apply.

Moved R Mather    seconded A Allen

**THAT** the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180529059377.

(b) **Notes** that as of 10 June 2018 there is currently $1,635.97 remaining in the Board’s Discretionary Grant Fund.

(c) **Notes** the Council has approved any unallocated funds to be carried over to the Woodend-Sefton Community Board’s 2018/19 Discretionary Grant.

*CARRIED*

S Powell thanked the Council for allowing unallocated funds to be carried forward to the new financial year.

8 **CORRESPONDENCE**

Nil.

9 **CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT**

9.1 **Chairperson’s Report for May - 2018**

Moved S Powell    seconded J Meyer

**THAT** the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(d) **Receives** report No. 180605061728.

*CARRIED*

S Powell noted the upcoming opening of the Rangiora Woodend Path.

10 **MATTERS FOR INFORMATION**

10.1 **Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting minutes – 3 May 2018** (Trim No. 180426045233).

10.2 **Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting minutes – 16 May 2018** (Trim No. 180515052911).

10.3 **Kaiapoi Tuahiwi Community Board meeting minutes – 16 April 2018** (Trim No. 180410038481).

10.4 **Youth Council meeting minutes – 1 May 2018**

10.5 **Fees and Charges for Community Facilities** Report to Council 29 May 2018 (Trim No. 180514052641).

10.6 **Funding and Budget Options Kaiapoi River Dredging Proposals** Report to Council 29 May 2018 (Trim No. 180514052211).

10.7 **Multi Use Sports Facility** Report to Council 29 May 2018 (Trim No. 180430046651).

10.8 **Capital Projects Report for the period ended 31 March 2018** Report to Audit and Risk Committee 22 May 2018 (Trim No. 180424044711).
10.9 **Libraries Update** Report to Community and Recreation Committee 22 May 2018 (Trim No. 180511051846).


Moved J Meyer seconded A Thompson

**THAT** the Woodend-Sefton Community Board receives the information in items 10.1-10.10.

**CARRIED**

11 **MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE**

11.1 **March Diary for A Allen, A Thompson and R Mather** (Trim No. 180605061742)

A Allen

∑ Noted that Medical Corner Doctors’ was being transferred to Pegasus Health, not the Pegasus locality as reported in the diary.

A Thompson

∑ Assisted with planting at Taranaki Stream and passed on appreciation for the work of Council staff in the preparing planting area.

R Mather

∑ Completed an individual submission to the Alcohol Bylaw consultation.

∑ Pegasus Residents Group – upcoming meeting with Council regarding community facilities.

J Meyer

∑ Noted the work of the Finance Team to keep rates as low as possible with the 10 year plan ‘wish list’.

∑ Roading – poor weather was not helping with repairs and the roundabout in Williams/Beach Road, Kaiapoi.

∑ Noted it was positive to have the cycleway opening.

∑ Attended Water Zone Committee meeting and noted the challenges to look after water for the future.

J Archer

∑ Attended Woodend Community Association meeting. They were looking at promotion and development with the website and membership drive.

12 **CONSULTATION PROJECTS**

**Alcohol in our District** –

Consultation closes Monday 11 June 2018.


S Nichols advised that Trevor Ellis (Development Planning Manager) in charge of the District Development Strategy and the District Plan would speak to the Board about issues leading into the next big stage of work in July.

13 **FOSTERING COMMUNITIES**

C Sargison advised that the Town Centre Plan for Kaiapoi was coming out for consultation in a few weeks time. A staff member could attend to do a presentation if that was the desire of the Board, although there would be public drop-in session
members could attend. S Nichols advised that Rangiora was looking at a Town Centre Strategy before Christmas.

14 REGENERATION PROJECTS

14.1 Town Centres, Woodend-Pegasus

Updates on the Woodend-Pegasus area projects are emailed regularly to Board members. These updates can be located using the link below:


15 BOARD FUNDING UPDATE

15.1 Board Discretionary Grant

Balance as at 11 June 2018: $1,135.97 to be carried forward to 2018/19 fund following allocation at this meeting.

15.2 General Landscaping Fund

Balance as at 11 June 2018 $0 all spent at this meeting.

16 MEDIA ITEMS

The decisions relating to the Sefton Domain improvements and the Sefton newsletter funding.

There was some discussion around forestry harvest communications. S Nichols noted that matters needed to be finalised before information went out to the public and the working group would be meeting later in the week.

17 QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

Nil.

18 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

Nil.

NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board is scheduled for 7pm, Monday 9 July 2018 at the Woodend Community Centre.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 8.14pm

CONFIRMED

__________________________
Chairperson

__________________________
Date

Workshop held from – 8.14pm – 8.30pm.

1. S Nichols (Governance Manager) Community Board Discretionary Grant Criteria and Form
2. S Nichols (Governance Manager) Community Board Plan Document.
MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF THE RANGIORA-ASHLEY COMMUNITY BOARD
HELD IN THE WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL CHAMBERS, RANGIORA SERVICE
CENTRE, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA ON WEDNESDAY 13 JUNE 2018 AT 7PM.

PRESENT
J Gerard QSO (Chair), D Lundy (Deputy Chair), K Barnett, M Clarke, D Gordon, J Hoult, S
Lewis, G Miller, C Prickett and P Williams.

IN ATTENDANCE
J Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support), G Wilson (Building Inspector), E
Cordwell (Governance Adviser) and E Stubbs (Minute Secretary).

1 APOLOGIES
Moved C Prickett seconded P Williams
Apologies were received and sustained from K Galloway and R Brine.

CARRIED

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
Item 7.3 b and c J Gerard
Item 7.2 h, 7.3 b and c D Gordon

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board – 16 May 2018
Moved M Clarke seconded P Williams
THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:
(a) Confirms the circulated minutes of the Rangiora-Ashley Community
Board meeting, held on 16 May 2018, as a true and accurate record.

CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
D Gordon requested on update on the Crayfish (Koura) Creek Pedestrian
Footbridge. E Cordwell advised that staff were currently obtaining costs and that it
was anticipated that a report would be presented to the Board in July. She would
advise the Board if this was not to be the case.

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS
Nil.

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS
Nil.

7 REPORTS
7.1 Building (Earthquake Prone Buildings) Amendment Act 2016 – Greig
Wilson (Building Inspector) and Lynley Beckingsale (Policy Analyst)

G Wilson spoke to a PowerPoint presentation (Trim No 180620068323) and
provided an update on Earthquake prone buildings in the District. The
Earthquake Prone Buildings Amendment Act 2016 was new legislation that
changed the way Councils were required to look at earthquake prone buildings and specific legislative requirements.

G Wilson advised that Waimakariri had a ‘Z’ hazard factor >3 so was categorised as ‘high risk’. The seismic risk zones provided timelines in which Councils needed to identify earthquake prone buildings and ensure remediation. It also changed the way buildings were assessed so that individual elements below threshold were identified rather than the buildings as a whole classed as earthquake prone. As part of these new requirements the Council was required to supply a report to the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment annually regarding earthquake prone buildings.

Councils were required to identify Priority Buildings and Priority Routes and engage with the community on those. In Waimakariri these were related to unreinforced masonry brick (URM) buildings. G Miller referred to the three plans provided in the report of Priority Routes and noted consultation would be undertaken in August to see if the community agreed with the priority pedestrian areas and/or suggested additional areas. The three areas identified were: Kaiapoi BNZ, Kaiapoi Mill and eight URM buildings along High Street/Kippenberger Avenue in Rangiora.

C Prickett asked if the road corridor was a risk as indicated by the red hatching in the priority route plans. G Wilson advised that there were alternative routes available. The barriers on Williams Street, Kaiapoi were a CERA compromise.

C Prickett asked about the definition of URM buildings was it only brick or solid concrete? G Wilson advised that under the legislation there were different categories.

P Williams referred to the High Street/Kippenberger Avenue Priority Route and asked if all business owners within that strip would be contacted whether or not their buildings were earthquake prone. Some building owners may not know if their buildings were earthquake prone and may be confused by the plan but unwilling to contact the Council. D Gordon reiterated P Williams concerns and the need to be proactive. G Wilson advised that he had undertaken extensive work with affected property owners over recent years and that he would also be very comfortable to speaking to all remaining building owners as part of the on-going process.

K Barnett asked if there were concerns in any other parts of the Ward. G Wilson noted the Church Bell in Cust. It was URM and had been assessed by an engineer who advised that the top was separated. Staff would actively engage with the Church regarding effective barriers to encapsulate until it could be remediated.

K Barnett referred to communications around the business areas needing to outline the steps taken and highlighting public safety was being addressed. G Wilson commented that Invercargill was a good example. The community were invited to public meetings with general information and there was the opportunity to provide reassurance and answer questions.

M Clarke referred to examples of internal building issues and G Wilson advised the whole building design was looked at.

Moved D Gordon seconded C Prickett

THAT the Rangiora–Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives report No: 180530059673.

(b) Notes consultation with affected property owners is being undertaken.  

CARRIED
D Gordon commented that G Wilson had great engagement with earthquake prone building owners who liked his proactive approach and pragmatism. It was also important to communicate the issues via the consultation effectively and that this was part of an ongoing, extensive and well managed process.

7.2 Applications to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board’s Discretionary Grant Fund 2017/2018 – Edwina Cordwell (Governance Adviser)

J Gerard advised that items 7.2 and 7.3 would be taken together.

D Gordon asked what funds were available. E Cordwell advised there was currently $6,264 and if all applications were approved there would be $1917 remaining.

D Gordon asked with respect to the McAlpines Pipe Band, given that the flashes on the uniforms cost over $500 he queried if the Board could approve more. J Gerard advised that in principle they could, however in the past they had not exceeded that $500 limit nor had the band sought a higher amount.

Moved P Williams seconded G Miller

THAT the Rangiora–Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180521055776.

(b) Approves a grant of $500 to Rangiora and Districts Early Records Society Inc. towards the cost of a replacement photographic scanner to ensure historical records can be maintained.

(c) Approves a grant of $500 to Ashley Playcentre towards the cost of ink cartridges to support the printing of individual children’s profile books.

(d) Approves a grant of $500 to Okuku Pony Club Inc. towards the cost of training for two new club coaches.

(e) Approves a grant of $500 to McAlpines North Canterbury Pipe Band Inc. towards the cost of new 'flashes' for the band’s uniform.

(f) Approves a grant of $426.50 to North Canterbury Athletics Club towards the cost of club singlets for children aged 7 to 14 years.

(g) Approves a grant of $500 to Rangiora Playcentre towards the cost of sensory and touch based play materials

(h) Approves a grant of $500 to The North Canterbury Academy of Music towards the costs of an end of year Concert, in particular the hiring of the Rangiora Town Hall Auditorium for both rehearsals and concert.

CARRIED

Note: D Gordon sat back from the table and took no part in the voting for 7.2h.

7.3 Further Applications to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board’s Discretionary Grant Fund 2017/2018 – Edwina Cordwell (Governance Adviser)

This item was taken with item 7.2.

Moved P Williams seconded G Miller

THAT the Rangiora–Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180605061843.

(b) Approves a grant of $500 to The Friends of Rangiora Town Hall towards the cost of Auditorium CCTV and back stage screen to assist fly, props and run crew as well as performers waiting to go on stage.
(c) Approves a grant of $420 to The North Canterbury Academy of Music towards the cost of replacement of damaged drum kit items.

CARRIED

Note: D Gordon and J Gerard sat back from the table and took no part in the voting for 7.2b and c.

7.4 Allocation of the balance of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board’s 2017/18 Discretionary Grant Fund – Edwina Cordwell (Governance Adviser)

E Cordwell spoke to the report noting that it was a report for information and that Council had approved to carry forward any unallocated funds to the 2018/19 year. She commented that it was good to get the nine applications through in the last month.

Moved J Hoult seconded S Lewis

THAT the Rangiora–Ashley Community Board:
(a) Receives report No. 180529059409.
(b) Notes that as of 12 June 2018 there is currently $6,264 remaining in the Board’s Discretionary Grant Fund.
(c) Notes there are nine applications for Discretionary Grant Funding totalling $4,347 to be considered at the 13 June 2018 Board meeting.
(d) Notes there will be a minimum balance of at least $1,917 remaining in the fund should these applications be approved.
(e) Notes the Council has approved to carry forward any unallocated funds to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board’s 2018/19 Discretionary Grant.

CARRIED

8 CORRESPONDENCE

Nil.

9 CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT

9.1 Chair’s Diary for May 2018

Moved J Gerard seconded D Lundy

THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:
(a) Receives report No. 180605061766.

CARRIED

J Gerard commented that he wanted to commend Councillor Brine’s effort to attend the LTP meeting and put his vote for the multi-use stadium, despite being extremely unwell.

D Lundy queried the context for the “17 May 2018 debrief” and J Gerard explained that prior to, and following Board meetings he had regular meetings with E Cordwell and additionally with N Hunt (Communications Coordinator) after meetings to discuss possible media items.
10 MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

10.1 Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting minutes – 3 May 2018 (Trim No. 180426045233).

10.2 Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting minutes – 14 May 2018 (Trim No. 180510051232).

10.3 Kaiapoi Tuahiwi Community Board meeting minutes – 16 April 2018 (Trim No. 180410038481).

10.4 Youth Council meeting minutes – 1 May 2018 (Trim No. 180612065288).

10.5 Capital Projects Report for the period ended 31 March 2018 Report to Audit and Risk Committee 22 May 2018 (Trim No. 180424044711).

10.6 Libraries Update Report to Community and Recreation Committee 22 May 2018 (Trim No. 180511051846).

10.7 Fees and Charges for Community Facilities Report to Council 29 May 2018 (Trim No. 180514052641).

10.8 Funding and Budget Options Kaiapoi River Dredging Proposals Report to Council 29 May 2018 (Trim No. 180514052211).


Moved D Lundy seconded D Gordon

THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board receives the information in items 10.1-10.10.

CARRIED

D Lundy recommended reading item 10.9 regarding the multi-use stadium. He asked with reference to the $91 per year was that for 25 years? J Millward replied that the $91 paid for the loan repayments. After 25 years it could continue to provide for depreciation and half fund cost of the next stadium and reduce payment on future facility, but that this would be a decision for the Council at that time.

11 MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE

11.1 D Lundy

∑ Represented the Board at ANZAC day services and noted the large turnout.

∑ Attended Civil Defence training in hazardous waste.

∑ Attended well-attended joint Drainage Advisory Groups’ meeting. Discussion around use of drones to measure waterways, depth etc. Asked if Council used that technology now and how public could be protected from inappropriate information collection.

J Millward advised that an aerial flyover policy was currently being developed. There was money in the budget for drone purchase. There were also health and safety requirements around such operations. A drone could collect valuable flooding data however the issue of protection was a good question. In other areas there had been legal challenges to Councils. There was a meeting next month to discuss issues around permissions and information collection as well as information available through service requests. J Millward noted that the Council collected contact details and that these could
11.2 **D Gordon**
- Commented that the Communications team had disseminated the main decision points of the LTP decision well. The average rate increase was 4.5%. Some areas including Cust were higher due to water related matters. In the past there had been discussion around joining Cust/West Eyreton/Summerhill and it may be timely to revisit that discussion due to the steep rate rises.
- Police Inspector Peter Cooper had attended the Youth Council meeting. Tangible items were discussed and there may be initiatives to come out of that.
- Continued concern with roading issues.
- Ryman's intersection – concerns around the number of traffic movements and pedestrians and access for a significant body of individuals. In addition there was a preschool planned for the corner which would increase traffic movements.
- Attended Rangiora Promotions Association AGM. Ross Ditmer was re-elected as Chair. The association was in a strong position and now ran seven events in town. They applied for funding outside of Council and were not purely reliant on Council funds.
- Was now chair of District Planning and Regulation Committee.

11.3 **K Barnett**
- Noted the Youth Council online survey was currently out, it was aimed at people between 12 and 24.
- Noted vesting of land at Ashley/High Street corner to a Local Purpose Reserve.
- Noted upcoming debrief meeting following her China/Enshi visit. Opportunities in education would be progressed.

11.4 **P Williams**
- Attended Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust ‘drive around’ and commented positively on the vision for the community.
- Attended Hurunui water meeting.
- Attended meeting with Swannanoa Fire Service.
- Commented that the LTP deliberations were well organised.
- Attended Rangiora Airfield meeting, they were progressing an open day for the public. Commented that the airport had the right designation and issues had settled down.

11.5 **C Prickett**
- Attended Hurunui water meeting – they were progressing backflow prevention, as far as Waimakariri ratepayers, there were no real concerns in terms of the financial situation.
- Attended Milton Dog Park meeting and there had been an agreement on shelter placement.

11.6 **S Lewis**
- Learner Driver mentor programme – in week three of a five week course held at Tuahiwi Marae with nine students from young to mature age.
- Talking to K Graham (Journey Planner) regarding reflectors for Passchendaele Memorial Path.
- Attended opening of Biota Node at Woodend Beach in memory of the late Councillor Peter Allen.

11.7 **J Hoult**
∑ Timebank – had nearly completed constitution and were looking to make an application to become an incorporated society which required fifteen signatories.
∑ Encouraged groups to apply for Discretionary Funding.
∑ Attended retirement function for Ken Stevenson. Wanted to acknowledge his role in introducing her to the Council many years ago. J Hoult particularly noted the way in which he engaged and treated people and was prepared to listen and how these qualities had impressed her.

11.8 **M Clarke**
∑ Raised concerns regarding a development work site operating late at night and also causing footpath debris issues which were resolved by staff.
∑ Attended joint Drainage Advisory Groups’ meeting, staff discussed what was happening to alleviate issues.
∑ Moving of extra building for Health Hub was being slowed by work on Oxford Terrace and would more likely be November. Hospital staff were looking at running patient clinics at the Health Hub.

12 **CONSULTATION PROJECTS**
∑ To establish and operate a pre-school and café.
∑ Circulated to Board Members for information 21 May 2018.

13 **REGENERATION PROJECTS**
Updates on the Rangiora Town Centre projects are emailed regularly to Board members. These updates can be located using the link below:

14 **BOARD FUNDING UPDATE**
14.1 **Board Discretionary Grant**
Balance as at 6 June 2018: $6,264.04.

14.2 **General Landscaping Fund**
Balance as at 6 June 2018: $1,840.

E Cordwell advised that the balance of the General Landscaping had been confirmed to be carried forward to next year.

15 **MEDIA ITEMS**

16 **QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**
Nil.

17 **URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**
Nil.
NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board is scheduled for 7pm, Wednesday 11 July 2018 in the Council Chambers at the Rangiora Service Centre.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 7.57pm

CONFIRMED

________________
Chairperson

________________
Date

Workshop held from 8pm – 8.30pm.

1. Community Board Plan (8pm to 8.15pm).
Members reviewed the updated plan and agreed to send any further comments to the Governance Adviser. A formal report and final draft will be presented to the July Board meeting.

2. Community Board Discretionary Grant Fund (8.15pm to 8.30pm).
Member reviewed the current criteria and application form and agreed that applications should be considered at each meeting (monthly), rather than at every other meeting as at present. A formal report will be presented to the July Board meeting.

3. Members Forum
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE KAIAPOI-TUAHIWI COMMUNITY BOARD
HELD IN MEETING ROOM 1 (UPSTAIRS), RUATANIWHA KAIAPOI CIVIC CENTRE,
176 WILLIAMS STREET, KAIAPOI ON MONDAY 18 JUNE 2018 COMMENCING AT
4.00PM.

PRESENT
J Watson (Chairperson), C Greengrass, R Blair, M Pinkham and P Redmond.

IN ATTENDANCE
J Palmer (Chief Executive), E Cordwell (Governance Advisor), G Wilson (Building WOFs
and Earthquake Prone Buildings), and A Smith (Committee Advisor)

1 APOLOGIES

Moved J Watson seconded C Greengrass
THAT apologies for absence be received and sustained from A Blackie, Board
Members N Atkinson and S Stewart.
CARRIED

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

There were no conflicts of interest noted.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

3.1 Minutes of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board – 21 May 2018

Moved P Redmond Seconded C Greengrass

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:
(a) Confirms the circulated minutes of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community
Board meeting, held 21 May 2018, as a true and accurate record.
CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING

P Redmond noted that the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board have agreed to the
recommendation of this Board for the road naming of the new arterial road in west
Kaiapoi (as per agenda Item 7.2).
5 **DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS**
There were no deputations or presentations.

6 **ADJOURNED BUSINESS**
There was no adjourned business.

7 **REPORTS**

7.1 **Building (Earthquake Prone Buildings) Amendment Act 2016** – Greig Wilson (Building Inspector) and Lynley Beckingsale (Policy Analyst)

G Wilson presented this report, with the aid of a powerpoint presentation on Earthquake Prone and Priority Buildings. A map of Seismic Risk Zones across the country showed that Waimakariri District sits in the High Risk area.

An explanation of the Building (Earthquake-Prone Buildings) Amendment Bill 2016 was provided to members. This Amendment had a commencement date of 1 July 2017 and covers matters that had previously been included the Council’s Earthquake Prone Building Policy. The most significant change is that individual elements of buildings which may be earthquake prone need to be identified. The Act states that whether a building or a part of a building is earthquake prone is determined by the Territorial Authority (TA) in which the building is situated. Once identified, building owners have 15 years to have their buildings earthquake strengthened to the required standard. G Wilson noted that this Council has good relationships with building owners and there are very few buildings left in the district that fit the definition of 'earthquake prone’. Under the changes to the Building Act, TAs are to identify potential earthquake prone buildings (EPB) using the Profile Categories described in the EPB methodology.

The Act also introduces ‘priority buildings’ and requires Council to undertake community consultation to identify these and any roads/footpaths that could be impacted, with potential for any unreinforced masonry part to fall onto the identified thoroughfare. Priority Buildings in High and Medium Risk Zones are those with concrete unreinforced masonry on brick buildings. PowerPoint Photos showed how poorly these withstood the 2010 and 2011 Canterbury earthquakes. The timeframe for these buildings to be strengthened to the required standard is half that of other EPBs, being seven and a half years. These timeframes will be in force from the time that the public consultation decision has been adopted.

There have been three roads identified as fitting into this category to be consulted on. These are:

- Williams Street Kaiapoi (Old BNZ building)
- Ranfurly Street, Kaiapoi (Kaiapoi Mill)
- High Street, Rangiora (approximately nine buildings)

Questions:

P. Redmond, questioned the Kaiapoi Mill building in Ranfurly Street being a priority building. G Wilson said this is something that will be consulted on with the community and the community may not consider it a priority. P Redmond suggested the footpath could be relocated to the other side of the street as a safety measure. This matter could be considered by the Council's Roading Department.
There is also the opportunity for someone else to take over the Mill building and there are options for remediation.

Regarding the former BNZ building in Kaiapoi, Greig provided an update on the work planned for the BNZ building. Building consent has been issued for this to be strengthened and there is progress being made.

Moved J Watson Seconded M Pinkham

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180530059676.

(b) Notes consultation with affected property owners is being undertaken

CARRIED

Mr Palmer took this opportunity to thank G Wilson for his work with building owners in the district dealing with earthquake strengthening matters.

7.2 Kaiapoi Signage Working Group – Michelle Flanagan (Landscape Planner – District Regeneration)

Kevin Dwyer (Landscape Architect, WDC) presented this report on behalf of Michelle Flanagan seeking approval of the Board to establish a working group to consider interpretive and information signage in reserves and public spaces in Kaiapoi. This will focus primarily on the Regeneration areas and adjacent to reserves. The report also seeks three appointments from the Board to the Kaiapoi Signage Working Group.

The signage hierarchy would be included as part of the reserves master plan that the Regeneration Team are developing at the moment for the Regeneration Area. Membership of the Working Group would also include representatives from Te Ngāi Tuahuriri Runanga, Kaiapoi Museum and the Waimakariri District Council Green Space team.

Regarding the Draft Terms of Reference for the group, M Pinkham questioned the exclusion of the Entrance signs to the township and town centre from the scope of this working group, and would suggest that these be included.

Moved J Watson Seconded P Redmond

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180518055013.

(b) Appoints C Greengrass, J Watson and R Blair from the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board to the Kaiapoi Signage Working Group.

(c) Notes that a representative from Te Ngāi Tuahuriri Rūnanga will be invited to be part of the Working Group.

(d) Notes the draft Terms of Reference for the Kaiapoi Signage Working Group (180518055044), which will be reviewed at the first meeting of the Working Group and brought back to the Community Board for approval.

CARRIED
7.3 Application to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board’s 2017/18 Discretionary Grant Fund – Karanga Mai Early Learning Centre - Edwina Cordwell (Governance Adviser)

This report was taken as read and there were no questions.

Moved J Watson Seconded R Blair

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180530060133.

(b) **Approves** a grant of $439 to Karanga Mai Early Learning Centre towards the cost of a heavy duty washing machine.

CARRIED

M Pinkham abstained from voting

7.4 Allocation of the balance of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board’s 2017/18 Discretionary Grant Fund – Edwina Cordwell (Governance Adviser)

E Cordwell spoke to this report noting that the Council has agreed to carry forward any unallocated Discretionary Grant Funds to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board’s 2018/19 Discretionary Grant.

Moved P Redmond Seconded C Greengrass

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180529059485.

(b) **Notes** that as of 17 June 2018 there is currently $1,600 remaining in the Board’s Discretionary Grant Fund.

(c) **Notes** there is one application for Discretionary Grant Funding totalling $439 to be considered at the 18 June 2018 Board meeting.

(d) **Notes** the Council has approved the carry forward of any unallocated funds to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board’s 2018/19 Discretionary Grant.

CARRIED

8 CORRESPONDENCE

There was no correspondence.
9 CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT

9.1 Chair’s Diary for May-June 2018

J Watson provided a verbal Chairs Diary update for May-June, as follows:

- Attended Pines Kairaki Beach Association meeting – 22 May
- Attended the Community Networking Meeting on 13 June, noting these are valuable meetings
- Attended Maori protocol training at the Tuahiwi Marae on Wednesday 13 June
- Attended the Regeneration land Divestment ceremony on Friday 15 June
- Noted that the Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan has been released.
- J Watson also noted that the Breeze Walking Festival organisers are intending to include the Kaiapoi Riverbank in the Walking Festival this year.

Moved J Watson Seconded P Redmond

(a) THAT the Chairpersons verbal report for May-June be accepted

CARRIED

10 MATTERS REFERRED FOR INFORMATION

10.1 Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting minutes – 3 May 2018 (Trim No. 180426045323).
10.2 Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting minutes – 14 May 2018 (Trim No. 180510051232).
10.3 Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting minutes – 16 May 2018 (Trim No. 180515052911).
10.4 Youth Council meeting minutes – 1 May 2018 (Trim No. 140605059180).
10.5 Capital Projects Report for the period ended 31 March 2018 Report to Audit and Risk Committee 22 May 2018 (Trim No. 180424044711).
10.6 Libraries Update Report to Community and Recreation Committee 22 May 2018 (Trim No. 180511051846).
10.7 Fees and Charges for Community Facilities Report to Council 29 May 2018 (Trim No. 180514052641).
10.8 Funding and Budget Options Kaiapoi River Dredging Proposals Report to Council 29 May 2018 (Trim No. 180514052211).

Moved J Watson Seconded R Blair

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board receives the information in items 10.1-10.10.

CARRIED
11 MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE

The purpose of this exchange is to provide a short update to other members in relation to activities/meetings that have been attended or to provide general Board related information.

P Redmond

Attended the Kaiapoi Museum AGM on 23 May
Attended the combined Drainage Groups meeting update on 24 May
Sat in on LTP relating to the Multi-Sport Stadium on 29 May, noting good discussion and debate amongst Councillors
Attended Kaiapoi Maritime Heritage Trust meeting on 29 May
Attended Webinar on LGNZ on Climate Change, a series of three of these.
Attended Art on the Quay on 31 May
Attended Ken Stevenson (WDC Roading Manager) farewell morning tea on 8 June
Attended Regeneration Steering Group Meeting on 11 June
Attended the Coastguard special general meeting on 12 June (to consider a name change), which will now be known as Coastguard North Canterbury. This group are fundraising for a new boat, which will have a cost in excess of $500,000.
Attended cultural training day at Tuahiwi on 13 June
Attended Regeneration land divestment ceremony on 15 June

It was noted that the Rotary sign on the right hand side on the southern approach into Kaiapoi is in need of maintenance and improvement and P Redmond suggested this is something the new Kaiapoi Signage Working Group could look at.

M Pinkham

Attended Wellbeing North Canterbury meeting on 28 May
Submitted to the NZTA and Christchurch City Council re Cranford Street upgrade.
Attended committee meeting of Kaiapoi Promotions Association on 6 June
Attended Ken Stevenson farewell on 8 June
Attended the Regeneration Steering group meeting 11 June

C Greengrass

Attended Kaiapoi Museum AGM on 23 May
Attended Pines Kairaki Beach Association meeting 22 May
Attended Regeneration land Divestment ceremony on 15 June
YOU ME WE US ran a very successful Mud Run on Sunday 17 June
Attended farewell of teacher at Kaiapoi North School
Noted that the Community Housing feasibility study funding has been approved.

C Greengrass noted that 25 Kaiapoi businesses are supporting the street lantern project and will be having lanterns hanging outside their businesses during the week prior to the Kaiapoi Art Expo.

R BLAIR

R Blair has also attended events and meetings as listed by other members above.
Attended recent North Canterbury Neighbourhood Support meeting and advised that the Police have given Neighbourhood support over $22,000 to get established in Kaikoura. To date this has enabled 500 residences into the Get Ready plan. Neighbourhood Support have also submitted to the Hurunui District Council, but there needs to be someone involved from the Amberley or Cheviot areas to get established there.
Funding application has been lodged for the NC Neighbourhood Support Old Fashioned Family picnic.
R Blair suggested there needs to be more promotion of Neighbourhood Support so people are more aware of it.

R Blair noted that several members of the public have voiced concerns regarding safety issues with the former BNZ building in Kaiapoi and understands that other Board members had also had concerns expressed by community members.

12 CONSULTATION PROJECTS
Nil.

13 REGENERATION PROJECTS
13.1 Town Centre, Kaiapoi
Updates on the Kaiapoi Town Centre projects are emailed regularly to Board members. These updates can be accessed using the link below:

13.2 Kaiapoi Regeneration Steering Group
The next meeting of the Kaiapoi Regeneration Steering Group will be held in Meeting Room 1, Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre, 4pm on Monday 2 July 2018. This meeting is open to the public.

14 BOARD FUNDING UPDATE
14.1 Board Discretionary Grant
Balance as at 18 June 2018: $1,600.

14.2 General Landscaping Budget
Balance as at 18 June 2018: $60,080.

15 MEDIA ITEMS
There were no media items.

16 QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS
There were no questions.

17 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS
There was no urgent general business
NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board is scheduled for 4pm, Monday 16 July 2018 at the Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 4.50pm.

CONFIRMED

_________________________  __________________________
Chairperson  Date

Workshop

Σ Edwina Cordwell (Governance Adviser) - Community Board Plan. (4.50pm to 5.05pm) The updated draft plan was discussed. Members made various comments which J Palmer suggested should be incorporated. A formal report and revised draft will be presented to the Board at its July meeting.

Σ Edwina Cordwell (Governance Adviser) - Community Board Discretionary Grant Fund. (5.05pm to 5.20pm) Members reaffirmed the current criteria and forms. A formal report will be presented to the July Board meeting.
# WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

## REPORT FOR INFORMATION

**FILE NO:** GOV-18 / 180619067641  
**REPORT TO:** Council  
**DATE OF MEETING:** 3 July 2018  
**FROM:** David Ayers, Mayor  
**SUBJECT:** Mayor’s Diary 30 May – 24 June 2018

## 1. SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 30 May</td>
<td>Kids First AGM, Christchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 31 May</td>
<td>Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 31 May</td>
<td>Art on the Quay Opening – IHC exhibition. Kaiapoi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 1 June</td>
<td>North Canterbury News – David Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 5 June</td>
<td>Compass FM Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 6 June</td>
<td>Matt Doocey Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Video interview for Ashley-Rakahuri Rivercare Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waimakariri Passchendaele Trust meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 7 June</td>
<td>Oxford – Ohoka Community Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 7 &amp; Friday 8 June</td>
<td>LGNZ Rural &amp; Provincial – Cr Al Blackie attended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 8 June</td>
<td>Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greater Christchurch Public Transport Joint Committee, Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee, Regional Transport Committee joint workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Canterbury News – David Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 9 June</td>
<td>Academy of Saiko-Kai Karate Opening, Kaiapoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attended Warriors v Manley match at invitation of Canterbury Rugby League</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 10 June</td>
<td>Chamber Gallery Opening – 50th Anniversary of Rangiora Pottery Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 11 June</td>
<td>Regeneration Steering Group meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 12 June</td>
<td>Compass FM Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attended Rangiora Promotions AGM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 13 June</td>
<td>Waimakariri Safety Co-ordinating Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 14 June</td>
<td>Honda NZ Reps Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attended Heritage Lecture at Isaac Theatre Royal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 15 June</td>
<td>Red Zone / Regeneration divestment of Crown-owned land by Minister Hon Megan Woods. Several media interviews in relation to this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General discussion with Hon Jacqui Dean (National Spokesperson for Local Government) and Hon Nicky Wagner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attended Canterbury Heritage Awards, Isaac Theatre Royal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 16 June</td>
<td>Trim Trail Opening with Rotary Club of Rangiora, Ashley Picnic Ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 17 June</td>
<td>Attended and participated in Rangiora Reflections concert organised by the Friends of the Rangiora Town Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 18 June</td>
<td>Kaiapoi /Tuahiwi Community Board meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Met Mayor Sam Broughton and Denise Kidd of Selwyn District Council re welcoming newcomers to our Districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deputy Mayor Kevin Felstead attended on my behalf a meeting of One Voice - Te Reo Kotahi with Hon Peeni Henare, Minister for the Community and Voluntary Sector. I also attended later.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 19 June</td>
<td>Compass FM Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 20 June</td>
<td>Speech to residents at Charles Upham Retirement Village –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting re Abbeyfield retirement concept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 22 June</td>
<td>North Canterbury News – David Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 23 June</td>
<td>Opening of Rangiora Woodend Path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did the Big Splash! This week was National Stroke Awareness Week.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speech to IHC Volunteers in recognition of National Volunteer Week</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THAT** the Council:

a) **Receives** report No. 180619067641

David Ayers
MAYOR