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AGENDA FOR THE MEETING OF THE RANGIORA-ASHLEY COMMUNITY BOARD TO BE HELD IN THE CUST COMMUNITY CENTRE, 9 MILL ROAD, CUST ON TUESDAY 13 AUGUST 2019 AT 7PM.

RECOMMENDATIONS IN REPORTS ARE NOT TO BE CONSTRUED AS COUNCIL POLICY UNTIL ADOPTED BY THE COUNCIL

BUSINESS

1 APOLOGIES

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

3.1 Minutes of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board – 10 July 2019

8 - 15

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:

(a) Confirms the circulated Minutes of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting, held on 10 July 2019, as a true and accurate record.

4 MATTERS ARISING

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS

7 REPORTS

7.1 Garrymere Water Supply Upgrade – Feedback from Community Consultation 2019 – Colin Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager)

16 – 32

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board recommends:

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190731107249.

(b) Notes that the Garrymere Water Supply Advisory Group has carried out extensive work investigating options to upgrade the Garrymere water supply to achieve compliance with the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand, and to provide a safe and affordable drinking-water supply to the community.
(c) **Notes** that the Garrymere community have been consulted on the proposed upgrade option, and that there was one submission received in favour of this proposal, and no submissions received against the proposal.

(d) **Notes** that following public consultation the Garrymere Water Supply Advisory Group recommends that the Council proceed with Option A of filtration and UV disinfection being installed at the Garrymere water supply headworks.

(e) **Notes** that there is sufficient budget available of $450,000 to complete this upgrade.

(f) **Approves** staff to proceed with the recommended option to construct a filtration and UV disinfection treatment system at the Garrymere water supply headworks.

7.2 **Tree Removal and Replacement outside 7a Wiltshire Court, Rangiora** – **Grant Reburn (Parks and Recreation Operations Team Leader)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190731106910

(b) **Declines** the request for removal from the berm outside 7a Wiltshire Court a Council owned Claret Ash tree which would then be replaced with a suitable new tree.

7.3 **Cone Street Project Update - Glenn Kempton, Project Engineer & Joanne McBride (Roading & Transport Manager)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report N° 190731106893,

(b) **Notes** that the installation of the footpath on Cone Street from High Street the new development at No. 9 Cone Street is required irrespective of the preferred layout and that work will proceed on the installation of this path;

(c) **Notes** that five carparks will need to be removed on the western side of Cone Street between High Street and the new development to allow for the installation of a new footpath and two on the eastern side of the road opposite the new development entrance to allow for manoeuvring;

(d) **Notes** that further workshop(s) and consultation will be carried out with stakeholders from the area to ensure key issues are identified and addressed before the options are further progressed;

(e) **Notes** that further information will be brought to the Board for consideration;

And:
RECOMMENDS THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee:

(f) Approves the removal of five carparks on the western side of Cone Street between High Street and the new development to allow for the installation of a new footpath and two on the eastern side of the road opposite the new development entrance to allow for manoeuvring;

(g) Notes that four of these spaces should, according to our Code of Practice, be marked as no-stopping within the current road layout due to either the existing road width, or proximity to the intersection of High Street.

7.4 Application to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board’s Discretionary Grant Fund 2019/20 – Thea Kunkel (Governance Adviser)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 90712098434.

(b) Approves a grant of $................ to the Reflections Community Trust towards the cost of advertising the Waimakariri Light Party.

OR

(c) Declines the application from the Reflections Community Trust.

(d) Approves a grant of $................ to Fernside School towards the cost of upgrading the school library.

OR

(e) Declines the application from Fernside School.

8 CORRESPONDENCE

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives the letter in response to the Draft Annual Plan 2019-20 submission (Trim No. 190624088691).

(b) Receives the memo regarding Service Requests as at 30 June 2019 (Trim No. 190731107187).

9 CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT

9.1 Chair’s Diary for July 2019

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190805108798.
10 MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

10.1 **Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting minutes – 4 July 2019** (Trim No. 190705094928).

10.2 **Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting minutes – 8 July 2019** (Trim No 1907003093846).

10.3 **Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting minutes – 15 July 2019** (Trim No 190709096349).

10.4 **Youth Council meeting minutes – 30 April 2019**.

10.5 **Youth Council meeting minutes – 28 May 2019**.


THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board receives the information in Items 10.1-10.6.

**Note:**

1. Agenda links were circulated via email as they became available during the month.

2. Matters for Information were circulated separately to members.

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.

12 CONSULTATION PROJECTS

**Proposed Plan Change 7 to the Land and Water Regional Plan (Environment Canterbury)**

Consultation closes 13 September 2019.


13 BOARD FUNDING UPDATE

13.1 **Board Discretionary Grant**

Balance as at 2 July 2019: $9,630.

13.2 **General Landscaping Fund**

Balance as at 2 July 2019: $24,860.

14 MEDIA ITEMS

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Minutes/Report of:</th>
<th>General subject of each matter to be considered</th>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>Simon Hart (Business &amp; Centres Manager) &amp; Rob Hawthorne (Property Manager)</td>
<td>Strategic Property.</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Reason for protection of interests</th>
<th>Ref NZS 9202:2003 Appendix A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>To carry out commercial activities without prejudice.</td>
<td>A2(b)ii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CLOSE MEETING

See Public Excluded Agenda (blue papers)

OPEN MEETING

16 QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

17 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board is scheduled for 7pm, Wednesday 11 September 2019 in the Council Chambers at the Rangiora Service Centre.
Workshop

- Tuahiwi to Ashley River Speed Limit Review – Bill Rice (Senior Transport Engineer)
- Landscaping Budget – Grant Stephens (Greenspace Community Engagement Officer)
- West & East Structure Plans – Heike Downie (Principal Planning Analyst) - Memo (Trim 190725104400) previously circulated.
- Members Forum

Briefing

Note a briefing is public excluded

- Strategic Property Exchange – Simon Hart.
MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF THE RANGIORA-ASHLEY COMMUNITY BOARD
HELD IN THE WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 215 HIGH STREET,
RANGIORA ON WEDNESDAY 10 JULY 2019 AT 7PM.

PRESENT
J Gerard (Chair), D Lundy (Deputy Chair), R Brine, M Clarke, D Gordon, J Hoult, S Lewis,
G Miller and P Williams.

IN ATTENDANCE
J Millward (Finance & Business Support Manager), C Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager), K
Simpson (3 Waters Manager), S Nichols (Governance Manager), D Ayers (Mayor), T
Kunkel (Governance Team Leader) and E Stubbs (Governance Support Officer).

1 APOLOGIES
Moved P Williams seconded M Clarke.
Apologies were received and sustained from K Barnett, K Galloway and C Prickett
for absence.

CARRIED

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
Item 7.4 – S Lewis and D Gordon - Waimakariri Winter Festival.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board – 12 June 2019
Moved D Gordon seconded R Brine.

THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:
(a) Amends the circulated Minutes of the Rangiora-Ashley Community
Board meeting, held on 12 June 2019 to state, “Present - R Brine left
during Item 12 not Item 10”.
(b) Confirms the amended circulated Minutes of the Rangiora-Ashley
Community Board meeting, held on 12 June 2019, as a true and
accurate record.

CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
There were no matters arising.

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS
There were no deputations.

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS
There was no adjourned business.
7 REPORTS

7.1 Proposed Roading Capital Works Programme for 2019/20 – J McBride (Roading and Transport Manager)

J McBride spoke to the report noting that every year there was a general allocation in the budget for renewal of footpaths and minor safety improvements. A condition rating across the district was carried out and the programme was formed out of that. Information was also gathered from service requests, safety inspections and crash reports. The new footpath programme had also undergone a prioritisation process.

J Gerard commented that 2-3 years ago kerb and channel improvements were done at the top half of Good Street, Rangiora. He enquired if the bottom half of Good Street would be completed within the next two years. J Millward undertook to follow up this matter.

D Gordon asked if the resurfacing of Ashley Street, Rangiora, would form part of the Roading Capital Works Programme for 2019/20. In response, J McBride advised that this work would come from a separate budget. She noted that a memo (Trim 190708096076), was circulated earlier, which dealt with to Ashley Street.

J Hoult enquired about the possible repairing of the kerb (vehicle crossing) along the Douglas Street cul-de-sac (on the number 14 side). J McBride explained the process undertaken prior to on-site work being started. She undertook to follow up this matter.

P Williams referred to footpaths being broken up for illegal crossings and asked how actively that was being followed up. J McBride confirmed that this was being followed up on a regular basis.

In response to questions, J McBride advised that the Road Department was in the process of engaging a consultant to undertake an assessment of the Southbrook Road Safety issues. They would be looking at a dedicated right turn bay and addressing visibility issues, she was confident that she would be able to report back to the Board on this matter by December 2019.

D Gordon asked if there could be an update on the narrow bridges on Fernside Road, Rangiora. J McBride advised there would be a wider review of the entire west Rangiora route in light of the increased traffic movements. The Roading Department would also be engaging a consultant to deal with this.

Moved D Gordon seconded R Brine

THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190627091241;
(b) Notes that feedback can be provided to the Roading and Transport Manager at the Board meeting.

CARRIED

D Gordon noted it was a very large programme that included a lot of work and he was impressed with the programme detail. He commented positively on the work being done by C Grabowski (Roading Operations Team Leader). He also noted the expectations of the Board around roading.

Following consideration of Item 7.1, the meeting adjourned for a Coldstream Road Scheme Workshop from 7.14pm to 7.34pm.
7.2  **Elected Member Code of Conduct Refresh – Sarah Nichols (Governance Manager)**

S Nichols spoke to the report noting the Council and Community Boards were legally required to have a Code of Conduct in place. The previous code was approved by the Council in 2016, but at that time the Council also resolved to review the code. An updated Code of Conduct was therefore adopted by the Council in May 2019.

S Nichols highlighted the changes and objectives of the proposed code outlined in paragraphs 4.4 and 4.6 on page 27 of the Agenda respectively.

S Nichols acknowledged that the proposed code did referred to ‘Councillors’ when it should refer to ‘Elected Members’. This would however be amended. She also requested that the word ‘familiar’ in paragraph 5.2 on page 35 of the Agenda be removed. The word ‘sexual’ in the phrase ‘sexual harassment’ in the same paragraph should also be removed.

S Nichols stated that the proposed code did not differ much for the current one, however it provided greater clarity on the issue of the Code of Conduct Committee. She noted that it was fortunate that due to all members working together for the greater good of the community, there has not been a Code of Conduct hearing since 2002.

In response to questions, she advised that in the instance of a Code of Conduct breach, there would initially be low-level resolution that included a meeting with the Mayor or Deputy Mayor, in 99% of cases this would resolve the issue.

S Nichols advised that Oxford-Ohoka and Woodend-Sefton Community Boards adopted the new code with the minor amendments as noted. Adopting the code would align the Community Boards with the Council.

J Gerard referred to the previous code (Page 55) which states ‘this code does not apply to members of any Community Boards…’ He suggested that this meant that Community Boards had autonomy from the Council. However, it was proposed that only Councillors would serve on the Code of Conduct Committee.

J Gerard therefore recommended that the authority of the Council’s Code of Conduct Committee over all elected members needed to be specified in the Code of Conduct, i.e. that Community Board members would also be subject to the Council Committee. J Millward confirmed that this issue would be clarified going forward by adding an inclusion definition.

S Nichols confirmed that the Council had a Register of Interests that was reviewed twice yearly. However, it was only the responsibility of elected members to declare any interests.

D Lundy sought clarity regarding a situation where a spouse was inadvertently involved. S Nichols advised it was preferable to declare spousal involvement, however again it was up to the individual elected members. The advice was, when in doubt, declare.

Moved **D Gordon**  seconded **G Miller**

THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:

(a)  **Receives** report No. 190610085590.

(b)  **Adopts** the 2019 Elected Member Code of Conduct, effective from 31 July 2019 (Trim 19062508931) with the amendments as described.

CARRIED
7.3 **Rangiora-Ashley Community Board’s Discretionary Grant Fund 2019/20 and General Landscaping Fund 2019/20 – T Kunkel (Governance Adviser)**

*Moved G Miller seconded D Lundy*

**THAT** the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190612082905.

(b) **Notes** that the Board’s General Landscaping Budget allocated by the Council for 2019/20 is $24,860 with a carry forward for 2018/19 still to be determined due to outstanding invoices.

(c) **Notes** that the Board’s Discretionary Grant Funding allocated by the Council for 2019/20 is $11,550.

(d) **Approves** the Board’s 2019/20 Discretionary Grant Fund Application Criteria and Application Form (Trim No. 190621087517)

(e) **Approves** the Board’s 2019/20 Discretionary Grant Accountability Form (Trim No. 1906211087556).

(f) **Approves** that Discretionary Grant Fund applications be considered at each meeting for the 2019/20 financial year (July 2019 to June 2020).

**CARRIED**

*Having declared a conflict of interest D Gordon and S Lewis left the Council Chamber at 7:45pm prior to the consideration of Item 7.4.*

7.4 **Application to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board’s Discretionary Grant Fund 2019/20 – T Kunkel (Governance Team Leader)**

T Kunkel noted that the Rangiora Festival Charitable Trust would be using the funds to cover the expenditure of the Waimakariri Winter Festival. However it was clear from the quotation for the proposed Health and Safety (Page 81), that the cost of wages was included.

T Kunkel therefore suggestion was that if the Board wished to approve the application, they should stipulate that the funding was to be for toilets, power and a marquee.

*Moved M Clarke seconded J Hoult*

**THAT** the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No. 19060607992.

(b) **Approves** a grant of $500 to the Rangiora Festival Charitable Trust towards the event cost of the Waimakariri Winter Festival. Provided that the grant funding being used for toilets, power and a marquee.

**CARRIED**

M Clarke commented it was a worthwhile event and the issue of paying wages had been addressed.

*Having D Gordon and S Lewis re-entered the Council Chamber at 7:55pm.*

*Moved G Miller seconded R Brine*

(c) **Approves** a grant of $500 to the R13 Youth Development Trust towards the running costs of various Community Youth Programmes.
G Miller approved of the investment in youth.
R Brine commented the police work did come up in reports.

Consideration being concluded, D Gordon and S Lewis re-entered the Council Chamber at 7:55.

8 CORRESPONDENCE

Moved J Gerard seconded D Lundy.

THAT the Rangiora-Ashley-Community Board:
(a) Receives the Memo the Loburn Dog Incident (Trim No 190710097115).
(b) Receives the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board Roading Update Memo (Trim No 190708096076).

CARRIED

9 CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT

9.1 Chair’s Diary for June 2019

Moved J Gerard seconded M Clarke

THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:
(a) Receives report No. 190625089268.

CARRIED

10 MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

10.1 Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting minutes – 6 June 2019
(Trim No. 190530076796).

10.2 Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting minutes – 10 June 2019
(Trim No 190606079729).

10.3 Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting minutes – 17 June 2019
(Trim No 190612082938)

Moved P Williams seconded D Lundy

THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board receives the information in Items 10.1-10.3.

CARRIED

11 MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE

11.1 P Williams
  • Attended Migrants Suitcase Exhibition in Oxford and recommended Board Members viewing;
  • Attended meeting regarding sewage pond fencing;
  • Noted work on Kaiapoi pontoons; and
  • Noted concerns around funding availability from NZTA in the future.

11.2 D Gordon
  • Attended Saracens ‘Speakeasy’ fundraiser;
  • Attended local pianist Michael Endres concert;
• Attended site meeting with Sicon and Roading staff regarding serious potholes on Loburn Terrace Road;
• Took part in Rangiora Promotions Big Splash Stroke fundraiser, $11,000 was raised;
• Attended Cust Volunteer Fire Brigade pancake breakfast;
• Attended Lions Leo quiz raising funds for Big Brothers Big Sisters;
• Attended Loburn School production;
• Attended Friends of Rangiora Town Hall AGM.
• Attended Salvation Army Just Brass young students’ concert;
• Viewed Suitcase Exhibition;
• Attended Waimakariri Youth Space Stakeholder Forum that was well organised / facilitated;
• Noted the upcoming Garrymere meeting and invited Board members to attend; and
• Noted upcoming events – Kaiapoi Art Expo, Blackwells Fire and Ice and Winter Fest.

11.3 D Lundy
• Attended drainage meeting noted issues raised around financial recording;
• Noted the upcoming Garrymere meeting;
• A major Civil Defence Exercise to be held 27 July 2019; and
• Liaising with Loburn School regarding an environmental project at Loburn Reserve.

11.4 M Clarke
• Attended Big Splash fundraiser;
• Attended All Boards meeting in Kaiapoi;
• Attended Rangiora Promotions Association meeting;
• Had discussion with Ashley Hotel regarding fire alarm system explanation; and
• Attended Grey Power meeting, where they were advocating for improved health services.

11.5 J Hoult
• Attended local pianist Michael Endres concert – noted his outstanding international reputation;
• Timebank - recently held sustainability focussed workshop. AGM to be held 8 August social occasion and election;
• Attended All Boards meeting;
• Attended unveiling and blessing of artwork in Chambers; and
• Landmarks – research to support District Plan heritage list.

11.6 S Lewis
• Attended Lions Leo quiz fundraiser;
• Attended Rangiora Hockey Club fundraiser;
• Attended Saracens fundraiser;
• Took part in Rangiora Promotions Big Splash Stroke fundraiser; and
• Invited Board members to attend North Loburn School visit on 21 August at 12.20am to view bike track – North Canterbury Sport and Recreation Trust to also attend.

11.7 G Miller
• Commented on Dog Control Bylaw and advised he would be submitting; and
• Had meeting with Greg Bennett (Stormwater engineer) regarding outdated, potentially dangerous, wooden drains;
12 CONSULTATION PROJECTS

The Dog Control Bylaw & Policy Review
Consultation closes on Friday 26 July 2019.

Natural Hazards
Consultation closes on Friday 26 July 2019.

The upcoming Natural Hazard Workshop was noted.

13 BOARD FUNDING UPDATE

13.1 Board Discretionary Grant
Balance as at 2 July 2019: $10,630.

13.2 General Landscaping Fund
Balance as at 2 July 2019: $24,860 (excluding carry forward).

14 MEDIA ITEMS
There was no media items.

15 QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS
There was no questions.

16 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS
There was no urgent general business.

NEXT MEETING
The next meeting of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board was scheduled for 7pm, Tuesday 13 August 2019 in the Cust Community Centre.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 8.09pm.

CONFIRMED

__________________
Chairperson

__________________
Date
Workshop

- Coldstream Road Scheme – Joanne McBride (Manager Roading and Transport)
- Members Forum

Briefing

Note a briefing was public excluded

- Well in Kaiapoi – Colin Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager) and Kalley Simpson (3 Waters Manager)
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1. The purpose of this report twofold:

1. To present the consultation feedback from the community on the proposed upgrade of the Garrymere water supply.

2. To seek approval from the Community Board on the preferred way forward for the water supply.

1.2. The Garrymere water supply does not comply with the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand (DWSNZ) and represents an unacceptable risk to the public health of the Garrymere community in the long term.

1.3. In March 2018, Council consulted with the Garrymere community on options to upgrade the water supply to achieve compliance. Strong feedback from the community was given that the cost of all options was too high, and that more work and more resident involvement was required.

1.4. After considering this feedback, Council opted to establish a Garrymere Water Supply Advisory Group (GWSAG) to work through the issues and report back to Council with a recommendation.

1.5. The GWSAG has carried out extensive work, and ultimately recommended to the community that a central treatment plant upgrade be completed.

1.6. In parallel with the work being undertaken by the GWSAG, the Council reviewed the way it would fund UV treatment upgrades across the district, and opted to share these costs across the district’s water supply schemes. This has reduced the rating impact of the proposed upgrade option to the community.

1.7. Consultation was undertaken with the community to seek feedback on the proposed upgrade option throughout July 2019. This included distribution of information pamphlets, and a public meeting.

1.8. Following consultation, one submission was received, which supported the proposal made by the advisory group.
1.9. Taking into account the feedback received, and the lack of opposition to the proposal, the GWSAG has recommended to Council that the proposed filtration and UV upgrade option be proceeded with.

1.10. It is recommended that the Rangiora Ashley Community Board supports the GWSAG recommendation, and recommends to Council that the proposed upgrade option be proceeded with.

Attachments:

i. Consultation material (190626090032)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Rangiora Ashley Community Board recommends:

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190731107249.

(b) Notes that the Garrymere Water Supply Advisory Group has carried out extensive work investigating options to upgrade the Garrymere water supply to achieve compliance with the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand, and to provide a safe and affordable drinking-water supply to the community.

(c) Notes that the Garrymere community have been consulted on the proposed upgrade option, and that there was one submission received in favour of this proposal, and no submissions received against the proposal.

(d) Notes that following public consultation the Garrymere Water Supply Advisory Group recommends that the Council proceed with Option A of filtration and UV disinfection being installed at the Garrymere water supply headworks.

(e) Notes that there is sufficient budget available of $450,000 to complete this upgrade.

(f) Approves staff to proceed with the recommended option to construct a filtration and UV disinfection treatment system at the Garrymere water supply headworks.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1. The Garrymere water supply scheme has been identified for a proposed upgrade to provide a supply that meets the water quality requirements of the Drinking Water Standards for New Zealand (DWSNZ), and to provide a safe and reliable water supply.

3.1. The Board, Utilities and Roading Committee and Council have received the following reports on the proposal to upgrade the Garrymere water supply which can be referred to for background information:

- 8 November 2017 Report to RACB Request to consult with community (171025115123[v2]).
- 12 December 2017 Report to Utilities and Roading Committee, Request to consult with community (171128128873[v2]).
- 16 May 2018, Report to RACB, summary of consultation feedback and request to establish water supply advisory group (180504048871[v2]).
- 2 October 2018 Report to Council, Request to approve terms of reference for advisory group (180829098070).
3.2. In March 2018, Council consulted with the Garrymere community on options to upgrade the water supply to achieve compliance. Strong feedback from the community was given that the cost of all options was too high, and that more work and more resident involvement was required.

3.3. After considering this feedback, Council opted to establish a Garrymere Water Supply Advisory Group (GWSAG) to work through the issues and report back to Council with a recommendation.

3.4. The GWSAG has carried out extensive work, and considered the following key options:

   **Option A** – Central Treatment (i.e. install filtration and UV disinfection at the existing treatment plant).

   **Option B** – Drill New Well

   **Option C** – Connect to Summerhill Scheme

   **Option D** – Install Private ‘Point of Entry’ Treatment System at each Property

   **Option E** – Connect to the Ashley Scheme.

3.5. Option B, C and E were reviewed and eliminated from further consideration early in the process for the following reasons:

   3.5.1. Option B would have high costs with a high risk of being unsuccessful in striking a secure and deep water source, and would have the risk that UV treatment would be required in the future following an upcoming revision of the Drinking-water Standards, escalating costs further.

   3.5.2. Option C would have high costs due to needing to pump the water a long way across the district (from West Eyreton), and would require two river crossings. This would also introduce the need for further consultation with the West Eyreton and Summerhill communities.

   3.5.3. Option E would have high costs, would require significant development contributions be paid to the Ashley scheme and as the Ashley scheme is not compliant with the Drinking-water Standards, would not achieve the primary goal of providing safe and compliant water.

3.6. The advisory group then considered Option A and Option D in more detail. Both essentially treat the water in the same way – using cartridge filters and UV disinfection. The key difference is that Option A provides treatment at the treatment plant before the water is distributed, while Option D would treat the water at each individual property before the water enters each house.

3.7. A number of other groups were consulted on Option D as it carried a large amount of uncertainty, with no known cases of this being implemented in New Zealand. Groups consulted included the Hurunui District Council, the Canterbury District Health Board (who consulted with other health boards), The Waimate District Council, the private Glentui scheme and the Canterbury Drinking-water Reference Group.

3.8. Ultimately following this advice and further work by staff it was concluded that Option D would have a high risk of not achieving compliance, would put additional onus on residents to maintain their own systems, would introduce legal challenges if residents did not cooperate with the processes required of them, and would not save any cost over Option A.
3.9. By contrast Option A was assessed as having a much greater degree of certainty around compliance requirements and costs, as it is clearly allowed for within the Drinking-water Standards and is a type of system commonly used throughout the country.

3.10. A key issue raised by residents in the 2018 consultation that was not able to be significantly addressed through the work carried out by the GWSAG, was that the cost of all options was perceived to be high. While the cost estimate for the central treatment option did reduce as part of the work carried out by the advisory group, this was not by a great margin to fully address these concerns.

3.11. The core issue with cost however is not solely the capital cost estimates, but that the costs were projected to have significant rating impacts due to the low number of residents on the scheme to fund the upgrade. This was largely driven from the Council’s targeted rating policy for water supplies.

3.12. In parallel with the work being carried out by the GWSAG, the Council recognised this issue and reviewed the way that UV disinfection upgrades are funded across the district. This formed part of the consultation on the draft 2019-20 Annual Plan. As a result of this process, the Council opted to share costs associated with UV disinfection across the district, which resulted in a significant rating impact of this project on Garrymere scheme members. This matter is covered in report 190426060012 that went to Council in May 2019.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. The consultation process comprised the following steps:

1) An information brochure was distributed to all scheme members, along with a return addressed submission form. This was distributed on 26 June 2019, and the consultation period ended on 31 July 2019 (record number 190626090032).

2) A public meeting was held on 16 July 2019. This was well attended by elected members, advisory group members and a small number of residents. A presentation was given to residents, and there were a small number of questions.

One question raised was whether or not chlorine would be able to be taken out of the water following the upgrade. Staff advised that this would not be possible, given Council’s chlorination strategy which requires restricted schemes to be chlorinated due primarily to the risk of contamination post distribution of the water, which is heightened when water enters a private water tank. It was noted that the level of chlorine would likely be able to be reduced however.

3) Written submissions were received by 31 July 2019. One submission was received. This resident indicated that they support the advisory group’s proposal, but did not offer any further comment. There were no submissions that did not support the proposal.

4.2. In the 2018 consultation, there were 26 submissions received, with the majority raising concerns with some part or numerous parts of the proposed project. In 2019, while there were not large numbers of residents indicating support for the proposal, the lack of opposition (both at the public meeting and through written submissions), indicates at best silent support for the proposal or at worst a lack of opposition or arguments against the proposal.

4.3. Based on the community consultation results and the lack of opposition or arguments against the proposal, at their 1 August 2019 meeting the Garrymere Water Supply Advisory Group resolved “that following public consultation, the Garrymere Water Supply
Advisory Group recommends that the Council proceed with Option A of filtration and UV disinfection”.

4.4. It is therefore recommended that the Rangiora Ashley Community Board support the GWSAG recommendation to proceed with the filtration and UV disinfection upgrade option.

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

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

5.1.1. This report expresses the views of the Garrymere Water Supply Advisory Group, who recommend that the scheme be upgraded by way of installation of a filtration and UV disinfection system.

5.2. **Wider Community**

5.2.1. The views of the Garrymere community have been outlined in the consultation section above.

5.2.2. In brief, it is considered that the issues raised during the first consultation exercise of a lack of community involvement, a need for more work on some options and the high rating impact have been addressed through the work carried out by the GWSAG and the Council’s new UV funding mechanism. This is reflected through the lack of opposition to the proposal during the 2019 consultation exercise.

5.2.3. A site meeting has been held with the two land owners most immediately affected by the upgrade. Council has an easement over the property where the current headworks is located and where the extension will be constructed. The scope of the upgrade has been discussed and agreed with the relevant residents.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

A total budget of $450,000 was allocated as part of the Council 2017/18 Annual Plan to fund the proposed source upgrade which was based on the initial estimate for the recommended option of filtration and UV disinfection. This is a capital budget held under the ‘District Water UV’ account.

More recent estimates are that approximately $350,000 may be sufficient to complete the project, however the budget has been left at the original level at this time. This allows for any unforeseen costs that may arise as the project progresses from concept to detailed design.

The budget is currently set up for design in 2019/20, and construction in 2020/21. This timeframe was set to be conservative, in particular due to the risk of delays with projects that involve consultation. Based on the progress made to date, it is anticipated that the project will be able to be completed within the current financial year. If the design and tendering stages remain on track for this to be the case, a further report will be brought to Council to request that the construct budget be brought forward to be entirely within the current financial year.

6.2. **Community Implications**
This project will benefit the Garrymere community by providing safe and compliant drinking water to the scheme members, and addressing the risk currently presented by the current source and treatment system.

6.3. **Risk Management**

This project addresses the primary risk identified with the scheme, in that it does not currently provide any treatment for protozoa.

There is a residual risk with the scheme that has not been addressed as part of this project which is that there is no backup source for the supply. This was not considered to be part of the treatment upgrade scope as it is a separate matter. Once the Poyntz Road scheme joins to West Eyreton, Garrymere will be the only scheme without a backup source. Given the size of the scheme and the shallow nature of the well, this has been considered an acceptable risk to date. Further consideration of this will be given in future Activity Management Plans and Long Term Plans.

6.4. **Health and Safety**

The Garrymere supply currently does not provide any treatment for protozoa. This inherently presents an unacceptable level of risk and under the Health Act Council is obliged to take all practicable steps to address this risk. This project will address this issue.

Health and Safety during construction works will be managed through Council’s usual Health and Safety and contract management processes. A panel of contractors has been selected to tender UV upgrade works through an expression of interest process, and this process took into account the contractors’ ability to adequately manage health and safety on projects of this nature.

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

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

7.2. **Legislation**

The Health (Drinking Water) Amendment Act is relevant in this matter.

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

The main community outcomes related to the issue are:

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

- Core utility services are provided in a timely and sustainable manner
  - Council sewerage and water supply schemes, and drainage and waste collection services are provided to a high standard.

7.4. **Delegations**

The Rangiora Ashley Community Board has the delegation to make recommendations on matters such as this.
The Garrymere water supply requires an upgrade to comply with the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand (DWSNZ).

Following consultation with the Garrymere community in 2018, and in response to recommendations from residents, a Garrymere Water Supply Advisory Group (GWSAG) was established. This was established to allow nominated residents to work through options to provide good quality drinking water to the Garrymere Community alongside staff and elected members.

This information provides you with an update about the work that the GWSAG have carried out so far. It also seeks your views about how the Council should progress to upgrade the Garrymere water supply, so that it not only improves drinking water but also meets the requirements of the DWSNZ.

There will be a public meeting to provide an opportunity to talk to staff, elected members, and the Advisory Group in more detail, and for the Council to answer any questions you may have.
What’s the issue?

The Garrymere water supply currently draws water from a shallow bore. The water is treated with chlorine which treats bacteria, but there is no treatment for protozoa. Protozoa includes potential contaminants such as giardia and cryptosporidium. Because of this, the water supply does not comply with the DWSNZ and must be upgraded.

Summary

The Garrymere water supply needs an upgrade in order to meet the Drinking-water Standards. In 2018 when Council consulted with the community on this project, there was some strong feedback received which included the following key points:

- **The costs and rating impact were too high**
- **There needed to be a more thorough investigation into options, in particular with more work on the point-of-entry treatment option**
- **Residents needed to be more involved and have more say in the process.**

**Council has since taken the following steps to address the concerns raised above:**

- Established the Garrymere Water Supply Advisory Group to ensure that residents are involved closely in ensuring that the best solution is proceeded with, and that costs are affordable
- The advisory group has put all options through a lot more scrutiny, and is now in a position to recommend Central Treatment as the preferred upgrade option. The cost estimate for this option has reduced from that initially presented.
- The Council has acknowledged that the rating implications resulting from this project were significant, and has adopted a new rating structure for UV treatment upgrades. These costs will now be shared across the District, minimising the impact to small schemes such as Garrymere.

To understand in detail the process that has occurred, please review the information in this brochure. Once you have reviewed the information, there will be an opportunity to attend a public meeting and make a submission to Council to tell us what you think of the proposal.
Overview of Advisory Group Work

Following consultation with the community in 2018, an advisory group was formed so that residents could work alongside staff and elected members on this project. Representatives on the advisory group are:

- Councillor Dan Gordon (Chair)
- Councillor Paul Williams
- Christine Levett (resident)
- Amanda Black (resident)
- Alastair Ring (resident)
- Gerard Cleary (Council Manager Utilities and Roading)
- Steve Gregory (Deputy Chair and resident)
- Duncan Lundy (Rangiora Ashley Community Board)
- Chris Prickett (Rangiora Ashley Community Board)
- Kalley Simpson (Council 3 Waters Manager)
- Colin Roxburgh (Council Water Asset Manager)

The Advisory Group worked through a number of issues to understand the need for the upgrade, and to identify the best option to ensure the safety of the supply, while achieving compliance with the standards.

These topics included:

- Review of background information and initial options identified
- A more detailed review of point-of-entry treatment systems. This was an option requested to be investigated further, that would involve individual domestic treatment systems to be installed at each house as a means of ensuring the safety of the water
- Discussions with Hurunui District Council (HDC) about point-of-entry treatment, and a potential connection to the Ashley Rural water scheme which is managed by HDC.
- Consultation with a Canterbury District Health Board representative on point-of-entry treatment
- Research of a water scheme near Gore that is proposed to be run by residents rather than Council. Residents have since taken this scheme over, however are still obliged to meet the DWSNZ
- Overview of Government’s Three Waters Review, which is currently underway
- Briefing on the alternative funding option being considered by Council through the Annual Plan
- Review of similar upgrade being carried out by the Glentui private water scheme
- Review of surrounding land use and other water takes in the Garrymere area to understand the catchment.

Analysis of the above topics allowed the group to undertake an informed assessment of the options available to upgrade the Garrymere water supply.

Minutes of the meetings can be found at waimakariri.govt.nz keyword search ‘Garrymere water supply’.
Preliminary Investigation

Originally the following five options were assessed by the Advisory Group. These included those presented by Council during the community consultation in 2018, as well as some other options that the group wanted to explore:

OPTION A – Central treatment
OPTION B – Drill new well
OPTION C – Connect to Summerhill
OPTION D – Install private treatment system at each property
OPTION E – Connect to the Ashley Scheme

Each option was initially assessed at a high level by the group. Options B, C and E were eliminated primarily based on cost following preliminary assessments, leaving Options A and D for further detailed investigation. A summary table of this options assessment is included in this brochure.

Treatment Options Comparison

Following the preliminary assessment leading to the elimination of the options B, C and E that were previously put forward for public feedback, the group was left with two options to consider in more detail:

Option A – Central treatment

Option D – Install private treatment system at each property

Both of these remaining options involve the treatment of the existing source water by cartridge filtration, followed by ultra-violet (UV) disinfection. The filtration removes any particles from the water to allow the UV disinfection to be effective in treating both bacteria and protozoa.

The difference in the options is that Option A involves centrally treating the water at the treatment plant, so that the Council and residents can be confident that the water they receive at the property is fully compliant and safe to drink. Option B would involve no change in the water supplied by Council to residents, but would involve a new filtration and UV treatment system being installed at each individual property.

In terms of compliance, Option A is clearly allowed for within the current drinking-water standards, while Option D is not. However, if the scheme could meet criteria to be defined as a ‘Rural Agricultural Drinking-water Supply’ this type of treatment could be allowed to ensure compliance with the Health Act, even though it wouldn’t comply with the Drinking-water Standards.

Option A – Central Treatment

The cost estimate for this option has been revised following the initial assessment carried out in 2018, with the total recommended budget to complete it being estimated at $350,000. This is less than the earlier total budget estimate of $390,000. Details of this cost estimate are attached to this brochure.

This option is seen as having the following key benefits:

- A conventional style treatment system, giving a high degree of confidence in performance
- Well defined scope giving a high degree of confidence in the cost estimate
- Relatively easy to construct on a Council easement at the existing treatment plant site.
**Option D – Install Private Treatment System at Each Property**

A large amount of research was conducted into this option, as the group were not able to find other examples of this type of system being successfully used in New Zealand. The group discussed the following key points:

**Compliance of a Private Treatment System**

- This type of private ‘point-of-entry’ treatment system can only be used if the scheme can be defined as a ‘Rural Agricultural Drinking-water Supply’. To do this, it would need to be demonstrated that at least 75% of water used on the scheme was used for agricultural purposes.

- All aspects were considered to calculate this flow split based on a desktop assessment and it did not achieve the required threshold. The only way to potentially demonstrate this would be to install flowmeters at each house or dwelling and measure the flow over a 12 month period, then calculate what the proportion of the total flow is. This would have the following issues:
  - It would require the cost of installing and reading flowmeters to be added to the project, and would add at least another 12 months to the completion date.
  - There are no guarantees that this analysis would demonstrate the required split of agricultural use.

**Ongoing Compliance Requirements**

Assuming that the scheme could be defined as a Rural Agricultural Drinking-water Supply (as above), there would be a number of other steps to be considered for the individual treatment systems to be compliant:

- The UV/filtration system at each property would need to be shown to be compliant with either the appropriate New Zealand Standard, or an accepted international standard

- A location at each property would need to be agreed with each property owner where the system could be installed, with power supply available and access to plumbing before it enters the dwelling

- The Council would be ultimately responsible for ensuring the units are operated and maintained correctly. This could either be by Council staff doing these tasks at each property, or training residents to do this, then carrying out inspections to ensure that it is being done

- Both the installation and maintenance arrangements would require individual agreements with each property owner. This could add time and cost if agreements could not be easily reached.

**Discussions with Other Groups**

In order to better ensure the group understood the option of private point-of-entry treatment, individuals from other organisations attended meetings and provided information from their experiences. This information is provided below:

- **Hurunui District Council**: Had analysed private point-of-entry treatment for some of its smaller supplies. Their calculations did not show this to be viable either from a proportion of flow perspective, or from a cost perspective.

- **Glentui Private Water Supply**: Had initially considered point-of-entry treatment as an option, but ultimately opted for a central treatment system. Their initial feedback from the Ministry of Health on a point-of-use treatment system run by individuals would not be compliant in the way they had proposed.

- **Canterbury District Health Board**: The CDHB have seen examples of these private systems not being operated well, so Council would need to put steps in place to ensure and demonstrate that this would not be the case. Agreed that a barrier was demonstrating the required split of flow (75% agricultural use), and that on current data this could not be done unless individual flowmeters could prove otherwise.

**Capital Cost**

The final part of the analysis carried out by the group was to assess the cost of installing and running a private point-of-entry system at each property, if the scheme could meet the criteria to be defined as a Rural Agricultural Drinking-water Supply. The total capital cost estimate for this option is $308,000.
**Cost Comparison**

With cost estimates completed for both potential treatment options, a comparison was able to be carried out between the two. This was done by calculating all annual costs of both options.

The table below represents the additional annual costs of both options, over and above the costs of running the scheme as it currently is. It is noted that for Option A all costs would be recovered through Council rates, while for Option D some costs would be on individuals rates and others would need to be covered directly by individuals on the scheme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Option A Central Treatment</th>
<th>Option D Private Point of Entry Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total for Scheme ($ per year)</td>
<td>Average Per Property ($ per year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Repayments</td>
<td>24,800</td>
<td>605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulb Replacements</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensor Replacements</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filter Replacements</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour for Operating and Maintenance</td>
<td>3,380</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour for Compliance Checks</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43,530</td>
<td>1,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (incl. GST)</strong></td>
<td><strong>50,059</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,221</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Required to be paid directly by individuals rather than through Council rates.
## Summary - Comparison of Treatment Options

A summary of the detailed analysis of the two treatment options is presented below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Option A - Central Treatment</th>
<th>Option D - Private Point of Entry Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Cost Estimate</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$308,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Annual Costs ($/year)</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$93,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance with DWSNZ/Health Act</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conventional design so high degree of certainty in requirements and compliance of proposal.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Not compliant as a Rural Agricultural Drinking-water Supply on current data, flowmeters required and 12 months data to potentially prove compliance (will add time and cost, and no guarantee of compliance).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Risk of flow split changing over time making scheme non-compliant in future.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Risk of Health Act changing as this path to compliance is not widely used (no examples known).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety of Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• High level of treatment with filtration and UV disinfection.</td>
<td>• High level of treatment with filtration and UV disinfection.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• High degree of certainty that equipment is functioning as performance of equipment will all be monitored and alarmed.</td>
<td>• Less certainty as relies on individuals to respond to alarms and rectify issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work on Private Property</td>
<td>• All work can be undertaken at treatment plant on Council easement.</td>
<td>• Access required for installation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Residents required to carry out maintenance tasks on their property, but Council ultimately responsible and required to audit and inspect (so ongoing access required)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the above comparison of cost along with compliance, safety and minimising works on private property, the Advisory Group recommends Central Treatment as the preferred upgrade option.

### Rating Impact

During the 2018 consultation process, significant rating impacts were signalled as a result of this project. There was strong feedback from the community that these costs were too high. Council has since acknowledged this issue and as a result adopted an alternative way of funding UV projects.

Under the new rating structure, all water supply ratepayers will be charged a uniform annual amount for UV treatment costs. This essentially means that the costs of UV treatment are shared across the District, rather than being targeted on a scheme by scheme basis which can have significant effects on small schemes such as Garrymere.

The graphs below show the difference in rating impact from the previous funding structure which formed part of the consultation in 2018, compared to the rating impacts under the new rating structure. The projections shown are for the recommended upgrade option (Central Treatment).
**The Proposal**

Based on the detailed work carried out by the Garrymere Water Supply Advisory Group, the group proposes Option A as the recommended option (Central Treatment).

The Council would like to hear your feedback on the proposal, and whether you agree with this recommendation. Please give us your feedback on the form attached.

**What Next?**

- Attend the public meeting on Tuesday 16 July at 7.30pm at the Loburn Domain for more information and to talk to Council staff, Advisory Group members and elected members.

- The Rangiora-Ashley Community Board will consider the feedback from the community and will make a recommendation to Council on how to proceed. Ultimately the Council will decide on the way forward, taking into account the views of the community and the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board.

Tell us whether or not you support this proposal using the form attached, or online at: surveymonkey.com/r/P7WZS9Q

Make sure your feedback reaches us by the end of Wednesday 31 July.
The following table summarises the issues identified with Options B, C and E that led to them being removed from further consideration.

Table 1: Reasons for Options B, C and E being excluded from further consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| B      | Drill New Well | • High Cost: Well is likely to be required to be drilled very deep at high cost (budget estimate for all infrastructure $880,000).  
• Uncertainty: No guarantees that a suitable source would be found.  
• Risk of Change of Standards: New drinking water standards are expected to remove secure section meaning protozoal treatment would be required anyway. |
| C      | Connect to Summerhill | • High Cost: Large amount of new infrastructure has a high cost (budget estimate $1.0 – 1.8M).  
• Limited Capacity: May be costs to Summerhill / West Eyreton scheme to offset extra capacity used.  
• Risks with River Crossings: There is a risk of the pipe being washed out during flood when installed beneath a river, and there would be extra costs and/or risks of delays due to consent requirements to install pipes within riverbed. |
| E      | Connect to Ashley Scheme | • Limited Capacity: Would require all Garrymere connections to be converted to fully restricted connections.*  
• Development Contributions: These would be required to allow connection to the Ashley Rural water scheme to pay for existing infrastructure on this scheme being utilised.  
• High Capital Cost: Estimated to cost from $600,000 to $1,000,000 depending on whether additional pump station required.  
• Ashley Scheme Not Compliant: The Ashley scheme is currently not compliant with the DWSNZ. |

* Currently the majority of the connections to the Garrymere scheme are semi-restricted. These connections would need to be converted to full restricted connections to meet the requirements of the Ashley scheme, limited the amount of water able to be taken for this scheme.

Table 2: Capital Cost Estimate for Option A – Central Treatment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Detailed Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary and general</td>
<td>$21,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General site works</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment container</td>
<td>$15,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UV units, filtration, flow meters, pump set</td>
<td>$64,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water pipework within container</td>
<td>$19,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water tanks and water pipework buried outside building</td>
<td>$61,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing and commissioning</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>$33,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$238,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction contingency (10%)</td>
<td><strong>$23,800</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design fees and construction monitoring (assume 10%)</td>
<td><strong>$23,800</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project contingency (10%)</td>
<td><strong>$28,600</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Remaining Project Cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>$314,100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure to Date</td>
<td><strong>$35,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Recommended Budget</strong></td>
<td><strong>$349,100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Capital Cost Estimate for Option D – Private Point of Entry Treatment at Each Property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flowmeters</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>$20,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UV Unit</td>
<td>3235</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>$132,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filters</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>$20,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pump Upgrades</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>$12,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>$30,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$195,775</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Contingency</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$19,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Fees</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$29,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure to Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Contingency</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$28,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Recommended Budget</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$307,800</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Your feedback is important to us. We want to hear what you think of the proposed option to upgrade the Garrymere Water Supply by extending the treatment plant at the existing headworks, to install a filtration and UV treatment system (Option A):

- Yes I support the Garrymere Water Supply Advisory Group’s proposal
- No, I do not support the Garrymere Water Supply Advisory Group’s proposal

Comments (Continue overleaf if necessary)

Name: ________________________________
Address: _________________________________________________________________
Email: ________________________________________________________________

Colin Roxburgh
Waimakariri District Council
Private Bag 1005
Rangiora 7440

If you have any questions regarding this proposal, come and see us at the public meeting on 16th July, or contact:

Colin Roxburgh - Water Asset Manager
GWSAG member
Phone 0800 965 468
Email colin.roxburgh@wmk.govt.nz

Dan Gordon - Councillor and Chair of GWSAG
Phone 021 906 437
Email dan.gordon@wmk.govt.nz

Steve Gregory - Resident and Vice Chair of GWSAG
Phone 027 563 6080

Or return this feedback from (no stamp required) back to us by 31 July. You can also give us your feedback online at surveymonkey.com/r/P7WZ59Q
1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report requests that the Board decline a request to remove the tree from the roadside berm outside 7a Wiltshire Court, Rangiora. This request is from the owner of 7a who wishes to pay for the removal.

1.2 Attachments:
  i Previous community board report (160428037797)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Rangiora Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190731106910

(b) Declines the request for removal from the berm outside 7a Wiltshire Court a Council owned Claret Ash tree which would then be replaced with a suitable new tree.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 In May 2016 the Rangiora Community Board resolved the following;

(a) Receives report No. 160428037797

(b) Approves the retention of the council owned Claret Ash tree situated in the berm adjacent to 7a Wiltshire Court, Rangiora.

(c) Notes that the retention of the Claret Ash tree is consistent with section 3.3 of the Council’s standard operating procedure for the removal of trees.

3.2 Since this report was considered by the Board in 2016 the resident at 7a Wiltshire Court has written to Council again requesting that the decision on the tree removal be reconsidered and has offered additional terms which is why officers are submitting this further report.
3.3 Due to staff illness, resources were delayed to resolve this in a timely fashion that would normally be expected by the board and community. Staff were also expected to provide a planting program for trees within the street and this is yet to be actioned.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. Mr Byers, a resident of Wiltshire Court, wrote a letter to the Board Chair which was received in April this year outlining issues resulting from a Claret Ash Tree (*Fraxinus oxycarpa raywoodii*) located in the berm outside his house at 7a Wiltshire Court as shown in figure 1 below.

![Figure 1](image)

**Figure 1.**

4.2. Mr Byers said that the situation arising from the tree was no longer acceptable. The issues causing concern were rapid tree growth leading to leaves being deposited in the Byers's internal garden, on an internal path and in roof guttering. The leaves were also being carried indoors resulting in staining of floor coverings.

4.3. The Board Chair and a Greenspace staff member met on site with the residents in April to look at the tree and associated issues. A further meeting was held on site with Mr Byers to look at the best location along the adjacent berm should a new tree be planted. Staff were mindful of the need to minimise any future impact on residents should the Board approve the removal of the existing tree and agree to a new tree somewhere on the adjacent berm.
4.4. Mr Byers sent a further letter in May offering to pay $300 towards the cost of the tree removal and requesting that any replacement tree be of a variety that the Byer’s approved of along with its siting on the berm. Figure 2 below shows the location of the tree that the resident has requested be removed and the proposed site of any new tree should the Board agree to the request.

4.5. The proposed new tree location is likely to achieve the outcomes that Mr Byers is keen to see and it will limit impacts on other properties.

4.6. The existing Ash tree has been inspected by a staff member who is a qualified arborist. The tree was found to be in good health, form and condition.

Figure 2

4.7. **Options**

4.8. **Option 1**

4.9. **That the Board approve the request to remove the existing Ash tree and accept Mr Byers $300 contribution towards planting a new tree in the circle location shown in Figure 1 above.**

This option would satisfy the Byer’s concerns and there would be no net loss of trees on the street if a new tree was planted. There would however be the loss of a semi-mature Ash tree of about 6 metres in height. There is likely to be a negative impact on the street amenity should the tree be removed. The other known benefits that larger trees provide in...
the environment such as reducing air pollution and providing shade and cooling of hard surfaces are also likely to be lost. The loss of these benefits would be regained over time if a new tree was planted and became established. This option although not considered by staff to be ideal may achieve a reasonable balance between tree related benefits and the residents’ quality of life.

In the 2017 Street and Reserve Trees policy under section 4.4, it does state that a tree may be removed where it is necessary for a street tree redevelopment plan to be implemented. As noted previously at the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting of May 2016, the minutes request that staff would look at a replanting program for Wiltshire Court, this is yet to occur.

Staff do not prefer this option.

4.10. Option 2

That the status quo is maintained and the Board declines the request to have the Ash tree removed and a new tree planted in its place.

In terms of the tree removal, the Board took this option in 2016 when the previous report was submitted.

Staff see that the tree offers the following benefits as also stated in the original report from 18th May 2016:

The tree adds character and amenity value to the streetscape and the neighbourhood. Street trees contribute to the health of the environment by reducing air pollution, while at the same time providing ecological diversity by attracting and supporting bird and insect life. Street trees contribute to the character, shape and form of the district by adding a natural element to the urban environment.

Staff would support this option and it is consistent with Councils policy around removal of trees. This option is not likely to satisfy the Byer’s on-going concerns.

Staff recommend this option.

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

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

Several site meetings have been held with Mr and Mrs Byers this year to hear their concerns and determine what a possible solution would be.

5.2. Wider Community

5.3. No consultation has been undertaken with the wider community this year. However in 2016 a consultation flyer and feedback form was delivered to 21 residents of Wiltshire Court asking their views on either removing or retaining the tree outside 7a Wiltshire Court.

5.4. Of the 21 residences surveyed a total of 2 responses were received. Of those responses one supported the removal of the tree while the other expressed a desire for the tree to be retained.
6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

6.2. Option 1: Removal of the Ash tree and replacement with another tree further along the berm. The costs involved with this option would be associated with Councils tree contractor Asplundh removing the tree and grinding the remaining stump. The approximate cost to Council of this option would be $210 plus GST. Mr Byers has offered $300 towards the cost of any work which will cover the tree replacement part of this option.

6.3. Option 2: The Status Quo option would have no cost to Council.

6.4. Community Implications

6.5. The main community implications associated with a decision to remove the tree in question would be that the residents and users of Wiltshire Court will potentially enjoy less amenity and experience less shade in this area of the street when using the footpath in warmer months. This impact will gradually diminish once a replacement tree is planted and becomes established.

6.6. Risk Management

6.7. Staff believe there are no significant risks associated with this decision.

6.8. Health and Safety

6.9. There are no health and safety issues of concern. Should the tree be removed Council’s tree contractor Asplundh will carry out the tree removal and new tree planting with the required health and safety processes in place.

7. CONTEXT

7.1. Policy

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

7.2. Legislation

7.3. There is no specific legislation regarding the removal of street trees. Applicants do have the right of legal recourse under the provisions of the Property Law Act 2007 should the Board decide not to authorise removal of the tree. Sub part 4 of the Act refers to the removal of trees. Section 335 refers to what the court may consider should an application be made.

7.4. Community Outcomes

7.5. The maintenance of parks and reserves contributes to the following outcome: Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality.

7.6. Delegations

7.7. The Rangiora – Ashley Community Board has the delegated authority to authorise tree removal within the Ward.
1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to provide the Rangiora Community Board with information to allow a decision to be made on the future of the Claret Ash (Fraxinus oxycarpa Raywoodii) street tree situated outside 7a Wiltshire Court, Rangiora.

1.2. The resident has requested that the Council owned Claret Ash tree situated outside the property be removed due to concerns over the future growth of the tree damaging underground services, paths and house foundation.

1.3. There has been damage to the footpath adjacent to the tree which appears to be from the roots of the tree and this has been repaired by Councils’ roading contractor.

1.4. A survey of adjacent residents was conducted between 13th and 30th January. The survey requested residents express their views on the removal of the tree and was conducted by hand delivered mail drop to the residences in the street that would be effected by the removal of the tree. It provided the opportunity for residents to provide feedback on the proposed removal of the tree.

1.5. This report proposes that the Rangiora Community Board decides on the best course of action on the future of the tree.

Attachments:

i Wiltshire Court tree site map
ii Photograph of the Claret Ash tree in Wiltshire Court

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Rangiora Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 160428037797

(b) Approves the retention of the council owned Claret Ash tree situated in the berm adjacent to 7a Wiltshire Court, Rangiora.

(c) Notes that the retention of the Claret Ash tree is consistent with section 3.3 of the Council’s standard operating procedure for the removal of trees.
3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. The resident of 7a Wiltshire Court have requested the removal of the adjacent Claret Ash street tree.

3.2. The reasons given by the resident for requesting the removal are that he is concerned that as the tree grows it will damage directly adjacent underground services and that the tree will grow much larger than its present size which may also damage the adjacent footpath in the short term and possibly a path and foundations within the property. Shading issues created by the tree have also been reported as a concern by the residents. The resident has offered to pay for a replacement tree if approved by the Board.

3.3. The tree is a Claret Ash (Fraxinus oxycarpa Raywoodii) and is approximately 7 metres in height with a trunk diameter of 400mm and a crown spread of 5 metres. It is approximately 20 to 25 years old and is classed as under mature. Claret Ash trees can reach a height of 15 to 20 metres but as a street tree it is expected to reach a height of around 12 to 15 metres over an expected lifetime of approximately 50 to 70 years. The tree is deciduous and drops leaves in autumn.

3.4. The tree is located in a cul-de-sac where the majority of individual residences are located on the eastern side of the street and around the head of the cul-de-sac with the Wiltshire Retirement Village on the western side. It appears that there have been a number of street trees removed from the street in previous years although there is no record of the reason for removal. The western side of the street contains a number of shrub gardens as part of the retirement village and private residences landscaping. The remaining Council owned trees are located on the eastern side of the street and the head of the cul-de-sac. Staff considers the tree, while not a unique specimen, does provide significant amenity value to the street and surrounding area.

3.5. Staff have inspected the tree and have found that it is in good health and form with no apparent disease or deterioration. Maintenance work has been carried out on the tree in the past 12 months under Councils’ Tree Maintenance Programme. The tree will be subject to ongoing programmed maintenance should it be retained.

3.6. Staff do not recommend removal of the tree for the following reasons;

3.6.1. The tree adds character and amenity value to the streetscape and the neighbourhood.

3.6.2. Street trees contribute to the health of the environment by reducing air pollution, while at the same time providing ecological diversity by attracting and supporting bird and insect life.

3.6.3. Street trees contribute to the character, shape and form of the district by adding a natural element to the urban environment.

3.6.4. In addition to the above reasons staff provide the following information in relation to the specific concerns raised by the resident:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Future Growth</td>
<td>Councils programmed maintenance will ensure that it remains healthy and in good form, minimising the possibility of failure of the tree's structure. The tree is expected to reach a maximum height of approximately 15 metres which is not considered excessive.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is no evidence or record of damage to underground services by the roots of this tree at this stage. All street trees have the potential to cause damage to services however it is not practical to install root guard to all street trees. Should an issue to services be identified in the future appropriate action will be taken.

The adjacent footpath has been damaged by the tree’s roots and this has been repaired by Council's roading contractor. This may be an ongoing issue but repairs to the path will be carried out using Council's footpath maintenance budget as required. Root pruning will also occur if appropriate. The Council currently undertakes footpath maintenance caused by tree root damage from both Council and private trees where the maintenance will not have a long term impact on the health of the tree.

There is no visual evidence of root damage to the foundations of the residents dwelling. When the resident had work done to replace a path on the property near the boundary a large root was found to have gown under the path. This was removed by the contractor. The house sits well outside the drip line of the tree and therefore root pruning could be done in the future without causing any harm to the tree. Any ongoing root pruning that may be required will be funded from Council Tree Maintenance operations budget.

The tree is deciduous and, therefore, creates a minimum amount of shading on the adjacent property once leaf fall has occurred in autumn. The tree is maintained under Council’s Tree Maintenance Contract on a three year cycle which includes shaping, lifting and thinning of the tree crown. This minimises shading. Under Council’s standard operating procedures shading is not considered to be sufficient reason to remove a healthy tree.

It is possible to mitigate the above issues by applying standard established practices within allocated Council maintenance budgets.

3.7. Damage to the footpath has been repaired by Council’s roading contractor. The resident has also had work done on the property to repair an earthquake damaged path and roots that were intruding into the property were cut back at that time.

3.8. Standard Operating Procedure defines the conditions for the removal of street trees only in cases where trees are dead, diseased or dying or where they are creating severe hardship.

3.9. The options for the future of the tree is to either:

3.9.1. **Maintain the status quo**, (i.e. allow the tree to remain in its current state with appropriate future maintenance to maintain its natural shape). This is the preferred option. There was little feedback received from adjacent residents but that received is evenly split between retaining the tree in its current state with suitable regular maintenance or removing the tree. Only two responses were received (one written one verbal)

OR

3.9.2. **Remove the tree entirely and replace it with another species** of juvenile tree. This is not the preferred option. As indicated in option 1 above there was little feedback received from adjacent residents but that received is evenly split between retaining the tree in its current state with suitable regular maintenance or removing the tree. Only two responses were received (one written one verbal)
4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. A consultation flyer and feedback form was delivered to 21 adjacent residents of Wiltshire Court asking their views on either removing or retaining the tree.

4.2. Of the 21 residences surveyed a total of 2 responses were received. Of those responses one (50%) supported the removal of the tree while the other (50%) expressed a desire for the tree to be retained.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. **Option 1**: Maintain the status quo. Should the status quo remain there is no additional cost to the Council.

5.2. **Option 2**: Remove the tree entirely and replace it with an appropriate species of juvenile tree. If the tree is removed there will be an approximate cost of $400 for removal of the tree which would be paid out the Council’s tree maintenance budget. It should be noted that the resident of 7a Wiltshire Court has offered to pay for the for a replacement tree. The cost of a replacement tree including planting is approximately $270.

6. CONTEXT

6.1 **Policy**

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

6.2 **Legislation**

There is no specific legislation regarding the removal of street trees. Applicants do have the right of legal recourse under the provisions of the Property Law Act 2007 should the Board decide not to authorise removal of the trees. Sub part 4 of the act refers to the removal of trees. Section 335 refers to what the court may consider should an application be made.

**335 Matters court may consider in determining application for order under section 333**

(1) In determining an application under section 334, the court may make any order under section 333 that it thinks fit if it is satisfied that —

(a) the order is fair and reasonable; and

(b) the order is necessary to remove, prevent, or prevent the recurrence of -

(i) an actual or potential risk to the applicant’s life or health or property, or the life or health or property of any other person lawfully on the applicant’s land; or

(ii) an undue obstruction of a view that would otherwise be enjoyed from the applicant’s land, if that land may be used for residential purposes under rules in a relevant proposed or operative district plan, or from any building erected on that land and used for residential purposes; or

(iii) an undue interference with the use of the applicant’s land for the purpose of growing any trees or crops; or

(iv) an undue interference with the use or enjoyment of the applicant’s land by reason of the fall of leaves, flowers, fruit, or branches, or shade or interference with access to light; or
(v) an undue interference with any drain or gutter on the applicant’s land, by reason of its obstruction by fallen leaves, flowers, fruit, or branches, or by the root system of a tree; or
(vi) any other undue interference with the reasonable use or enjoyment of the applicant’s land for any purpose for which it may be used under rules in the relevant proposed or operative district plan; and
(c) a refusal to make the order would cause hardship to the applicant or to any other person lawfully on the applicant’s land that is greater than the hardship that would be caused to the defendant or any other person by the making of the order.

6.3 Delegated Authority

The Rangiora Community Board has the delegated authority to authorise tree removal within the ward.

6.4 Quality Systems

The Council's operating procedures contained within the Quality Manual (QS-R905 Street Trees), relating to tree removal in streets and relevant to this situation are as follows:

3. REMOVAL OF STREET TREES;

3.1 Objective

To protect the Council’s and community’s investment in street trees in the immediate future and throughout generations.

3.2 Explanation

3.2.1 Not everyone values street trees. The Council receives a number of requests each year from residents requesting that a particular tree or street of trees be removed. The most common reasons given for the request are nuisance from shading and leaf litter.

3.2.2 In some cases inappropriate species have been planted and a replacement programme is needed. In others the Council considers the nuisance the tree is causing an individual is less than the loss the removal of the tree will be to the community and future generations, given the number of years it takes for a tree to reach maturity.

3.3 Standard Operating Procedure

3.3.1 The removal of a healthy tree will only be considered in the following circumstances and even then, only when all options for retaining it have been eliminated:

• Where it causes severe hardship consistent with District Court decisions
• Where it causes severe disruption to essential services
• Where it is necessary for a street tree redevelopment plan to be implemented
• Where it is necessary for the realignment/reformation of a footpath

3.3.2 Trees, which are obviously dead, dangerous or diseased will be removed. Note: The Rangiora Community Board has delegation for the removal of trees from parks, reserves and streets or other Council land located in Rangiora.
3.3.3 In situations where residents claim healthy street trees are having a negative impact on their properties, the following procedure will be followed:
• The tree/s will be inspected by a Council Recreation and Reserve Advisor to ascertain the problem/s.
• Any appropriate remedial works will be carried out by skilled tree contractors at the Council’s expense. (appropriate works are defined as those necessary to alleviate the problem/s, although not to the extent that the natural attractive form or stability of the tree is destroyed in the operation).

3.3.4 Where a resident’s request for the removal of a tree is declined, the applicant may ask for the issue to be forwarded to Council’s Community & Recreation Committee or the Community Board for its consideration.

3.3.5 Where a resident’s request for the removal of a tree has been declined by the Council, the resident has the right to apply to the District Court to have the matter heard.

3.3.6 In the event of a road widening or other type of public work where trees are present and have to be removed, consideration is to be given to relocate the trees, if they are suitable for this purpose."

7. **COMMUNITY OUTCOMES**

The maintenance of parks and reserves contributes to the following outcome;

Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality.

---

Greg Barnard
Parks Community Assets Officer
Attachment 1: Wiltshire Court tree site map

Claret Ash tree requested to be removed
Attachment 2: Photograph of the Claret Ash tree in Wiltshire Court
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1. The purpose of this report is to update the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board on progress with the Cone Street Upgrade and layout options for the street.

1.2. Cone Street currently has no footpath which requires pedestrians to use the carriageway and there is informal parking along the street. This has been identified as a growing safety risk and this will increase as further development occurs in the area.

1.3. A workshop was held with the Community Board on 13 February 2019. At the workshop staff presented four options for discussion as follows:
   - Option One – On-street Parking western side only
   - Option Two – No On-street Parking
   - Option Three – On-street Parking with property Purchase
   - Option Four – One Way retaining all parking

1.4. The Board asked that staff carry out additional investigation to confirm the impacts of Option four (One Way).

1.5. The first stage of public consultation has been carried out with immediately adjacent businesses and property owners. Feedback from this process has been mixed.

1.6. Abley Consultants were engaged to determine the feasibility of changing Cone Street to a one-way street. The option they recommended was to reconfigure Cone Street to a northbound one-way system with Collins Street remaining as two-way with a Cul-de-sac turning head at the end. A footpath is required along the western side of Cones Street to south of the entrance to the development at no. 9 Cone Street irrespective of the final layout of the street. Work to install this path will be carried out in conjunction with the development.

1.7. To allow the footpath to be installed five car parks will need to be removed along the western side of Cone Street between High Street and the entrance to the new development. Two carparks will also need to be removed opposite the new development entrance to allow for vehicle manoeuvring in and out of the entrance.
1.8. It is proposed that the next step would be to hold workshop(s) with stakeholders from the area to allow an opportunity to talk through any issues / concerns which they may have and to be able to further progress the options.

Attachments:

i. Proposed Layout (Trim No. 190806109525)
ii. Traffic Flow Options Assessment (Trim No. 190404049892)
iii. Cone Street – Consultation “Let’s Talk” Information Notice (Trim No. 190415055960)
iv. Cone Street Upgrade – Summary of Submission Responses (Trim No. 190806109563)

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives report No 190731106893,
(b) Notes that the installation of the footpath on Cone Street from High Street the new development at No. 9 Cone Street is required irrespective of the preferred layout and that work will proceed on the installation of this path;
(c) Notes that five carparks will need to be removed on the western side of Cone Street between High Street and the new development to allow for the installation of a new footpath and two on the eastern side of the road opposite the new development entrance to allow for manoeuvring;
(d) Notes that further workshop(s) and consultation will be carried out with stakeholders from the area to ensure key issues are identified and addressed before the options are further progressed;
(e) Notes that further information will be brought to the Board for consideration;

And:

RECOMMENDS that the Utilities and Roading Committee:

(f) Approves the removal of five carparks on the western side of Cone Street between High Street and the new development to allow for the installation of a new footpath and two on the eastern side of the road opposite the new development entrance to allow for manoeuvring;
(g) Notes that four of these spaces should, according to our Code of Practice, be marked as no-stopping within the current road layout due to either the existing road width, or proximity to the intersection of High Street.

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1. There is currently no footpath in Cone Street and as such pedestrians who walk down Cone Street use the existing carriageway and property frontages while trying to access the various commercial and residential properties. As there is no separation between vehicles and pedestrians this raises safety concerns in a busy town centre location.

3.2. Cone Street is primarily a commercial area with commercial vehicles servicing businesses frequently.

3.3. Future and planned developments within the area will increase pedestrian and vehicle numbers within this area.
3.4. Cone Street has a narrow road reserve which varies from 9.5m at the northern end to 13m at the southern end. This does not allow adequate space for two lanes of traffic, a footpath and on street parking.

3.5. Irrespective of the future configuration of Cone Street, a footpath is required along the western side from High Street to south of the entrance at the development of no. 9 Cone Street. Work to install this path needs to be carried out in conjunction with the development.

3.6. To allow the footpath to be installed five car parks will need to be removed along the western side of Cone Street between High Street and the entrance to the new development.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. A number of layout options have been identified during the investigation process. These were presented to the Community Board for discussion during a workshop in February 2019.

4.2. The Board asked that staff carry out some additional work to further consider the effects of a one-way system. Abley Consultants were engaged to carry out modelling work and provide further advice on the effectiveness of a one-way system.

4.3. The options that Abley's considered are detailed in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>Two Way (No change to traffic flow but requires removal of on street parking).</td>
<td>• Footpath is not located next to parking therefore pedestrians are protected from opening car doors.</td>
<td>Not recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Traffic Movement remains as is.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Removal of on street parking to make way for the footpath may not be accepted by adjacent businesses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Rat-running continues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>One way Northbound including Collins Street</td>
<td>• Avoids right turn que clashes at High Street intersection although right turn into Cone St is low.</td>
<td>Recommended over option 1 and 3 however a hybrid option detailed below should be strongly considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Allows vehicles parked on west side to exit passenger side of car.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Cone St/Collins St approaches will be narrower at the intersections, which shortens pedestrian crossing distance &amp; removes pedestrian/vehicle conflict points.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Retain all on street parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduces left turning conflict with through cyclists.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Traffic flow adjustments (potential increase in traffic on Collins St as motorists will not be able to enter and exit Cone St).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Less network permeability for cyclists, southbound cyclist would need to go through Ivory St/High St signalised intersection or ride on footpath.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Traffic calming required because the traffic lane would be too wide for one-way.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Option 3
One-way Southbound

- Retains all on street parking
- Narrows intersection as above
- Traffic flow adjustments (potential increase in traffic on Collins St as motorists will not be able to enter and exit Cone St).
- Less network permeability for cyclists, southbound cyclist would need to go through Ivory St/High St signalised intersection or ride on footpath
- Rat running continues

Not recommended

### Option 4
Cone Street one-way northbound and Collins Street two-way.

- Reduces impacts on residential properties.
- Avoids need for traffic calming on Collins Street.
- The Cone St/Collins St interface could be designed as such it appears as a cul-de-sac in both directions which will deter any rat running traffic.
- The treatment at Collins St/Cone St interface would need to be suitably designed.
- Potentially higher cost than other options

This hybrid option with northbound traffic on Cone Street is our recommendation. This option will facilitate the desired outcomes whilst minimising traffic impacts.

---

4.4. The first stage of public consultation has been carried out with immediately adjacent businesses and property owners. This included a “Let’s Talk” information notice being prepared and hand delivered or posted to all properties within the immediate area.

4.5. A total of 40 business and residential properties were consulted including properties that fronted onto High Street.

4.6. A number of the businesses and residents did not have a preferred option however were happy to see some safety improvements being made to their street.

4.7. Feedback from the face to face consultation was generally that the one way system would be beneficial however concerns were raised by one business stating that two way traffic was vital.

4.8. Some of the business owners and residents raised concerns for consideration. These included;
   - Vehicles parking in Cone Street and Collins Street all day limit customer turnover and resident parking.
   - Reducing the speed limit as currently Collins Street and Cone Street is currently used as a way to avoid the High Street traffic lights with some high speeds being witnessed.
   - The intersection of Collins Street and Ivory Street can already be difficult to negotiate without the added turning traffic volume.

4.9. As the feedback from the consultation process was mixed it is considered appropriate to hold follow up workshop(s) with stakeholders from the area to further discuss the options and to ensure key issues are identified and addressed before the options are further progressed.
5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

5.2. As detailed under the “Issues and Options” section, staff have carried out consultation with the stakeholders in the immediate area including affected businesses, residents and property owners. This consisted of visits by staff and delivery of the information notice.

5.3. **Wider Community**

5.4. No specific consultation has been carried out with the wider community.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISK**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

6.2. Funding of $45,000 has been allowed for from the Subdivision Contribution Budget for the section of kerb & footpath from High Street to the new development at No. 9 Cone Street.

6.3. Development contributions have also been take as part of the resource consent process for the new development at No. 9 Cone Street.

6.4. **Community Implications**

6.5. This project will be of significant interest to the community being within the town centre.

6.6. This project will have positive implications to the community, it will ultimately provide safe pedestrian links between High Street, Collins Street and Cone Street.

6.7. **Risk Management**

6.8. There is a risk that the community may not support a particular option. This risk can be mitigated by working closely with the community and with affected businesses to identify key areas of concern and resolve any potential issues early in the process.

6.9. There is risk of new development being completed prior to the construction of the works which may cause finished level issues or damage to newly constructed surfaces. This risk can be mitigated by ensuring communication with the developers is clear and concise and the work is completed within the same timeframe as the new development.

6.10. **Health and Safety**

6.11. Standard construction Health and Safety risks are associated with the project. These risks will be mitigated by carrying out a Safety in Design review, requiring contractor prequalification, carrying out a Health and Safety assessment at tender approval time and requiring the implementation of a Site Specific Safety Plan.

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

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

7.2. **Legislation**

There is no relevant legislation in this matter.
7.3. **Community Outcomes.**

The following community outcomes are relevant in this matter:

- There is a safe environment for all;
- Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality.
- Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable and sustainable
- Businesses in the District are diverse, adaptable and growing.

7.4. **Delegations**

7.4.1. The Board, under delegation S-DM 1041, has specific jurisdiction for:

“To advise the Council and Standing Committees on local implications of such policies, projects and plans, which have district-wide impacts and are referred to the Board for comment.”
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1. Introduction

Waimakariri District Council (WMK) commissioned Abley Limited to investigate opportunities to convert Cone Street and Collin Street, Rangiora into a one-way street. The changes are driven by the need to provide a footpath on Cone Street whilst potentially maintaining on-street parking.

The Rangiora Paramics Microsimulation model has been utilised to assess the likely network effects of Cone Street options. This technical note summarises the traffic modelling component of the study and outlines the pros and cons of each of the following options;

- Cone Street/ Collin Street being two-way (existing)
- Cone Street/ Collin Street one-way for northbound traffic
- Cone Street/ Collin Street one-way for southbound traffic

The alignment of Cone Street/ Collin Street is shown in Figure 1.1.

Figure 1.1 Cone Street/ Collin Street Alignment
2. Data collection

Abley undertook traffic turning movement surveys on Thursday, 14 March 2019 for the morning and evening peak periods (7am to 9am and 4pm to 6pm) at the following intersections:

- High Street/ Cone Street
- High Street/ Albert Street
- Ivory Street/ Collins Street

The surveys show that the morning peak hour is 8am to 9am and the evening peak hour is between 4:15pm and 5:15pm. The turning movements at the Ivory/ High/ Ashley signalised intersection were obtained from SCATS data on the same survey day. The morning and evening peak hour turning movements at the intersections are shown in Figure 2.1 and Figure 2.2 respectively. The SCATS data is recorded in 30 minute intervals and the turning volumes at the Ivory/ High/ Ashley signalised intersection peaked at 4:30pm to 5:30pm as shown in Figure 2.2.

![Figure 2.1 Existing morning peak hour traffic volumes (8am - 9am)](image1)

![Figure 2.2 Existing evening peak hour traffic volumes (4:15pm - 5:15pm)](image2)
Figure 2.1 and Figure 2.2 show that the road network is busier in the evening peak hour when compared to the morning peak hour. The morning peak hour two-way traffic volume on Cone Street and Collins Street is between 52 vehicles per hour (vph) and 68 vph and increases to between 82 vph and 87 vph during the evening peak hour.

Number plates of southbound vehicles on Cone Street and westbound vehicles on Collins Street were recorded to assess the quantity of through traffic ("rat-running") between High Street and Ivory Street. The results show that there were 20 vehicles travelling through Cone Street and Collins Street to avoid the Ivory/High signals during the morning peak period (7am-9am) and 15 of these occurred during the morning peak hour of 8am-9am. The number of through vehicles doubled in the evening peak period (4pm-6pm) to 40 vehicles and 23 of these occurred during the evening peak hour of 4:15pm-5:15pm.

3. Model Calibration

The traffic count locations with modelled flows in the 2017 Rangiora Paramics model and the difference from the observed count for the morning and evening peak hours are included in Figure 3.1 and Figure 3.2 respectively.

![Figure 3.1 Paramics model validation - AM peak hour (8am-9am)](image)

![Figure 3.2 Paramics model validation - PM peak hour (4:15pm-5:15pm)](image)
Figure 3.1 and Figure 3.2 show that the Paramics model generally validates well with the surveyed or observed traffic counts except for the through volumes on High Street at its intersection with Cone Street and Albert Street. The Paramics model is showing higher through volumes on High Street at the High Street/Albert Street and High Street/Cone Street intersections, however it is noted that the volumes on High Street (east of Ashley Street) validate well with the SCATS flows. As such there is some discrepancy between the SCATS and turning movement surveys on this corridor.

In light of the inconsistent survey data, no adjustments were made to the Rangiora Paramics model as part of the model calibration as it is considered that the model with higher volumes on High Street was suitable for providing a conservative assessment of the effects of the Cone Street/ Collins Street options.
4. Option testing

The Paramics base year (2017) model has been run for the morning and evening peak periods for the following three options:

1) Retain Cone Street and Collins Street as a two-way corridor (existing situation)
2) Cone Street and Collins Street one-way for northbound traffic
3) Cone Street and Collins Street one-way for southbound traffic

The modelling assessment has been based on the average of three consecutive model runs.

4.1 Comparison of modelling results

Modelled flows

The modelled flows on Cone Street and Collins Street under each option are as follows in the morning peak hour:

- Option 1 (existing) model has 56 vehicles (two way) on Cone Street and 47 vehicles (two way) on Collins Street
- Option 2 (northbound) model has 22 and 62 vehicles on Cone Street and Collins Street respectively
- Option 3 (southbound) model has 88 and 19 vehicles on Cone Street and Collins Street respectively

The modelled flows on Cone Street and Collins Street under each option are as follows in the evening peak hour:

- Option 1 (existing) model has 52 vehicles (two way) on Cone Street and 57 vehicles (two way) on Collins Street
- Option 2 (northbound) model has 55 and 20 vehicles on Cone Street and Collins Street respectively
- Option 3 (southbound) model has 30 and 58 vehicles on Cone Street and Collins Street respectively

The total change in vehicles flows on the network are very small approximately one vehicle per minute travelling along the Cone Street and Collins Street corridor.

Key intersection performance

A general description of level of service is shown in Table 4.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Service Band</th>
<th>General Traffic Flow Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOS A</td>
<td>Primarily free-flow operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS B</td>
<td>Reasonably unimpeded operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS C</td>
<td>Stable operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS D</td>
<td>A less stable condition in which small increases in flow may cause substantial increases in delay and decreases in travel speed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS E</td>
<td>Characterised by unstable operation and significant delay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS F</td>
<td>Characterised by flow at extremely low speed. Congestion is likely occurring at the boundary intersections, as indicated by high delay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A comparison of intersection performance for the three modelling scenarios is shown in Attachment A, Table 1 to Table 4 for the morning peak hour and in Attachment A, Table 5 to Table 8 for the evening peak hour. Key points from the comparisons include:

- All intersections currently operate satisfactorily, during the morning and evening peak hours, with overall intersection performance operating at LOS C or better.
• The overall intersection performance (average delay and LOS) for all intersections remain similar or the same as the existing for both Option 2 and 3.

• The overall intersection traffic volume at the Ivory/High/Ashley signalised intersection is expected to increase by 40vph to 80vph during the peak hours in Option 2 and 3. The overall intersection traffic volume at the other three priority intersections is expected to remain similar to the existing with differences within 45vph.

Overall, converting Cone Street and Collins Street to a one-way street has minimal impact on intersection performance. This is predominantly due to the relatively low traffic volume on Cone Street and Collins Street that would be affected as a result of converting the two-way streets to one-way streets.

Queue observations

Modelled vehicle queues were observed to identify any operational issues such as queue propagation on intersection approaches affecting capacity and queue discharge at nearby intersections. Key observations are as follows:

• There are no queues on Cone Street and Collins Street approaches during both morning and evening peak hours.

• The right turn queue on High Street turning right into Albert Street at the High Street/Albert Street intersection reaches three to four vehicles at times but is generally no more than two vehicles during peak hours.

• The queue on the Albert Street approach to High Street reaches up to four vehicles during the peak hours.

• The queue on the High Street approach to the Ivory/High/Ashley signalised intersection, extend beyond the High Street/Cone Street intersection at times during the both morning and evening peak hours but does not extend to the railway crossing on High Street.

• Queues on the Ivory Street approach to the Ivory/High/Ashley signalised intersection extend to Alfred Street intersection during the peak hours but does not extend to the Collins Street intersection.

• Vehicle queues were observed to be similar between the three model runs therefore converting Cone Street and Collins Street to one-way streets does not result in significant changes in vehicle queues on the adjacent road network.
5. Qualitative Option Assessment

Following the traffic modelling assessment, a qualitative assessment of each option was conducted. During this process a hybrid option of converting only Cone Street to one-way and maintaining Collins Street as two-way was identified. This alternative was considered as Collins Street is wider than Cone Street so making it one-way is problematic in terms of road space (may need narrowing). It was also considered as a way to reduce the impact on accessibility for Collins Street residents.

It is assumed that providing a footpath is required in any option. Considering the activity type, number of accesses and access widths on each side of Cone Street, it is recommended that the footpath is provided on the west side of Cone Street. This would align well with any future pedestrian connections to developments on Ivory Street. Pros and cons assessment of each option is summarised in Table 5.1. It is noted that an existing footpath is located on the east side of the street for approximately 50 metres north of Collins Street.

Table 5.1 Qualitative Option Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Option 1 - Two-way (no change to traffic flow but requires removal of parking on one side) | • Footpath is not located next to parking therefore pedestrians are protected from opening car doors  
• Traffic movement remains as is | • Removal of on street parking to make way for the footpath may not be accepted by adjacent businesses 
• Rat-running continues | Not recommended |
| Option 2 – One-way Northbound | • Avoids right turn queue clashes at High Street intersection (although right turn into Cones Street is low)  
• Allows vehicles parked on west side to exit passenger side of car.  
• The Cone Street/ Collins Street approaches will be narrower at the intersections, which shortens pedestrian crossing distance and removes pedestrian/ vehicle conflict points  
• Retain all on street parking  
• Reduces left turning conflict with through cyclists | • Traffic flow adjustments (potential increase in traffic on Collins Street as motorists will not be able to enter and exit using just Cone Street)  
• Less network permeability for cyclists, southbound cyclist would need to go through the Ivory Street/ High Street signalised intersection or ride on the footpath.  
• Traffic calming required because the traffic lane would be too wide for one-way. | Recommended over option 1 and 3 however the hybrid option detailed below should be strongly considered. |
| Option 3 – One-way Southbound | • Retains all on street parking  
• Narrows intersection as above | • Traffic flow adjustments (potential increase in traffic on Collins Street as motorists will not be able to enter and exit using just Cone Street)  
• Less network permeability for cyclists, southbound cyclist would need to go through the Ivory Street/ High Street signalised intersection or ride on the footpath.  
• Rat-running continues | Not recommended |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Option 4 - Cones Street One-way northbound and Collins Street two-way (Hybrid Option) | • Reduces impact on residential properties  
• Avoids need for traffic calming because the traffic lane would be too wide for one-way.  
• The Cone Street/ Collins Street interface could be designed as such it appears as a cul-de-sac in both directions which will deter any rat running traffic. | • Traffic calming required because the traffic lane would be too wide for one-way (encouraging higher speeds).  
• The treatment at Collins Street/ Cone Street interface will need to be suitably designed  
• Potentially higher cost than other options | This hybrid option with northbound traffic on Cone Street is our recommendation. This option will facilitate the desired outcomes whilst minimising traffic impacts.  
An indicative layout of this option is shown in Figure 5.1. |

![Figure 5.1 Hybrid Option Layout](image)

This document has been produced for the sole use of our client. Any use of this document by a third party is without liability and you should seek independent traffic and transportation advice. © No part of this document may be copied without the written consent of either our client or Abley Ltd. Please refer to [http://www.abley.com/output-terms-and-conditions-1-0/](http://www.abley.com/output-terms-and-conditions-1-0/) for our output terms and conditions.
### Table 1: High Street/ Cone Street intersection performance - AM peak hour (8am-9am)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Option 1 - Existing</th>
<th>Option 2 – Northbound</th>
<th>Option 3 – Southbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Through</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Through</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1066</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2: High Street/ Albert Street intersection performance - AM peak hour (8am-9am)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Option 1 - Existing</th>
<th>Option 2 – Northbound</th>
<th>Option 3 – Southbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Through</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Through</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1089</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3: Ivory Street/ Collins Street intersection performance - AM peak hour (8am-9am)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Option 1 - Existing</th>
<th>Option 2 – Northbound</th>
<th>Option 3 – Southbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Through</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Through</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1195</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4  Ivory/High/Ashley intersection performance - AM peak hour (8am-9am)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Option 1 - Existing</th>
<th>Option 2 – Northbound</th>
<th>Option 3 – Southbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Thru</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Thru</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Thru</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Thru</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td></td>
<td>1625</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5  High Street/ Cone Street intersection performance - PM peak hour (4:15pm-5:15pm)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Option 1 - Existing</th>
<th>Option 2 – Northbound Only</th>
<th>Option 3 – Southbound Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Through</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Through</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td></td>
<td>1263</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6 High Street/Albert Street intersection performance - PM peak hour (4:15pm-5:15pm)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Option 1 - Existing</th>
<th>Option 2 - Northbound</th>
<th>Option 3 - Southbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Through</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Through</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td></td>
<td>1295</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 Ivory/Collins intersection performance - PM peak hour (4:15pm-5:15pm)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Option 1 - Existing</th>
<th>Option 2 - Northbound</th>
<th>Option 3 - Southbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Through</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Through</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td></td>
<td>1192</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 Ivory/High/Ashley intersection performance - PM peak hour (4:15pm-5:15pm)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Option 1 - Existing</th>
<th>Option 2 - Northbound</th>
<th>Option 3 - Southbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Thru</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Thru</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Thru</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Thru</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td></td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Council is proposing to construct a new footpath along Cone Street. This is to provide a safe option for pedestrians accessing the new development on the corner of High Street and Ivory Street, and to address pedestrian safety through Cone Street.

Included in the new development is a Burger King with a drive through. With additional traffic accessing this area, the Council is aware that pedestrian safety needs to be addressed.

Investigation work has been carried out to identify possible options for the new footpath. There are some constraints in the area, particularly with the narrow road width between High Street and Collins Street. On-street parking also needs to be formalised as currently it is not clearly defined.

Other constraints include:
- The area is primarily commercial activity with heavy vehicles using Cone Street to undertake deliveries
- A dish-drain runs along the eastern side of the road, reducing the road width and provides limited stormwater runoff options
- There is a ‘pinch-point’ outside number five and nine Cone Street due to the existing footpath creating a limited road width to work with.

Proposals
Four options have been developed for consideration and we would like your feedback.

**Option one: On-street parking with no property purchase**
- This option allows for a 1.5m footpath
- Allows for two 3.0m road lane widths with a 2.1m parking bay on the western side
- Allows for on-street parking and pedestrian access
- Existing road lanes move east removing 15 carparks. Seven are retained on the western side.
- Footpath widths are not desirable for the retail area, however the alternative footpath on High Street and Ivory Street are wide and will provide primary access.

**Option two: No on-street parking**
- This option allows for pedestrian access with a 2m footpath
- No on-street parking is allowed for
- Allows for two 3.4m road lane widths
- Removes 22 carparks.
Option three: On-street parking with property purchase
- Footpath varies from 1.5m to 2m
- Allows for two 3m road lane widths and a 2.1m parking bay on the western side
- On-street parking and pedestrian access is allowed for
- Removes 14 carparks and retains eight on the western side
- Property purchase relieves the ‘pinch point’ outside numbers five and nine Cone Street.

Option four: Cone Street one-way
- Footpath varies from 1.5m to 2m
- Allows for two 3.2m road lane widths and two 2.1m parking bays
- Allows for on-street parking
- No carparks are removed. 22 carparks remain
- One-way access could potentially be less convenient for businesses and residents.

Timing of works
Following feedback, the detailed design of the street improvements will be finalised. Construction of the project will be carried out during mid-late 2019. Construction of the footpath on High Street near Burger King may take place earlier.

Tell us what you think
Your feedback is important to us and we want to hear what you think of the proposed options. You can provide your feedback online at waimakariri.govt.nz/letstalk, or fill out the form provided and return it to us FreePost.

To view detailed drawings of the options, or for more information about the proposals, contact glenn.kempton@wmk.govt.nz or phone 0800 965 468.

Let us know your thoughts by 5pm, Friday 10 May 2019.
Feedback Form

Name: __________________________________________
Organisation: (if applicable) __________________________
Address: ____________________________________________
____________________________________________________
Postcode: ____________________________________________
Email: _______________________________________________
Phone: ______________________________________________

1. Please tick your preferred option:
   □ Option one: on-street parking with no property purchase
   □ Option two: no on-street parking
   □ Option three: on-street parking with property purchase
   □ Option four: Cone Street one-way.

2. Your feedback is important to us. Please provide any comments, suggestions or feedback you have about the proposals:

   __________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________
If you have any comments or questions regarding Cone Street Improvements please contact:

Glen Kempton
Engineering Technician
Waimakariri District Council
Phone: 0800 965 468
Email: records@wmk.govt.nz

Or return this feedback form (no stamp required) back to us by 5pm, Friday 10 May 2019.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Owner / Tenant</th>
<th>Preferred Option</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76 Ivory Street</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Option Two</td>
<td>Submission on five properties. No on-street parking. Congestion on Ivory Street. Access for heavy vehicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cone Street</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Option Two</td>
<td>Submission on five properties. No on-street parking. Congestion on Ivory Street. Access for heavy vehicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Cone Street</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Option Two</td>
<td>Submission on five properties. No on-street parking. Congestion on Ivory Street. Access for heavy vehicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a Cone Street</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Option Two</td>
<td>Submission on five properties. No on-street parking. Congestion on Ivory Street. Access for heavy vehicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b Cone Street</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Option Two</td>
<td>Submission on five properties. No on-street parking. Congestion on Ivory Street. Access for heavy vehicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b Cone Street</td>
<td>Tenant</td>
<td>Option Four</td>
<td>Retain all on street parking. Prefers narrower footpath on eastern side of the road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Collins Street</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Option Four</td>
<td>One way from High St. Left only out of BK into Ivory Street. No parking on right hand side of road. Left hand side only Collins St and Cones St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Collins Street</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Option Two</td>
<td>One way would disadvantage our living. Would not be able to come off Ivory St. Footpath would be appreciated as it is dangerous walking on the road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/6 Cone Street</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Option Four</td>
<td>Leads to the best parking outcome. Parking should be for businesses and therefore P60 / P75 / P120 or similar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Cone Street</td>
<td>Tenant</td>
<td>Option Four</td>
<td>To lose 22 parks is not practical to our business. Being one way is not an issue to us.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a Cone Street</td>
<td>Tenant</td>
<td>Option Two</td>
<td>Wants footpath on the eastern side of the road. Two way traffic is vital for our business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/1 Cone Street</td>
<td>Tenant</td>
<td>Option Four</td>
<td>Please don't take the carparks away.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/1 Cone Street</td>
<td>Tenant</td>
<td>Option Four</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 High Street</td>
<td>Tenant</td>
<td>Option One</td>
<td>Maintain two way for businesses. Footpaths only need to be minimal as it is not a high volume pedestrian area (people don't shop by foot in this area). Less carparking. More yellow lines to make it safer. Entrance at Collins St needs consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/2 Cone Street</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Option One</td>
<td>Definitely not one way for Cone Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>High volume of pedestrians along High Street. Removing parking improves visibility for both pedestrians and drives. I would recommend parks closest to High Street are removed. Install tactile indicators for visually impaired.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cnr High / Cone Street</td>
<td>Tenant</td>
<td>Option Four</td>
<td>Limited all day parking in the area. Concerned about where BK workers will park. Likes one way with footpath. Prefers painted carparks to guide parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Monkey</td>
<td></td>
<td>Option One</td>
<td>If you don't have car parks then people will not stop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Monkey</td>
<td></td>
<td>Option Three</td>
<td>Actually a mixture of option 3 &amp; 4 would be best. I live on Cone Street and am aware of the issues. My concern is which way the one way goes (north or south). The road in/out to BK needs to be addressed. Similar to drive through at KFC. Same issues as Ivory St. Maybe timed parking and 30 km/h speed limit could be looked at.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Monkey</td>
<td></td>
<td>Option Four</td>
<td>Leaves parking for businesses and wide enough for comfortable driving space and safer room for pedestrians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cone Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>Option Four</td>
<td>Modified to be north to south as this is better for businesses. Parking is at a premium.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Preferred Option:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>One</th>
<th>Two</th>
<th>Three</th>
<th>Four</th>
<th>Not stated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT

FILE NO and TRIM NO: GOV-26-11-06 / 190712098434

REPORT TO: Rangiora-Ashley Community Board

DATE OF MEETING: 13 August 2019

FROM: Thea Kunkel, Governance Team Leader

SUBJECT: Application to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board’s Discretionary Grant Fund 2019/20

SIGNED BY:

Department Manager

Chief Executive

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to consider two applications for funding received from:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Organisation</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Amount requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reflections Community Trust</td>
<td>Towards the cost of advertising the Waimakariri Light Party</td>
<td>$184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernside School</td>
<td>Toward the upgrading of the school library</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$684</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2. Current balance: $9,630.

Attachments:

i. Application from Reflections Community Trust (Trim No: 190709096799).
ii. Application from Fernside School (Trim No. 190731107344)
iii. Spreadsheet showing previous two years grants.

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 90712098434.

(b) Approves a grant of $............... to the Reflections Community Trust towards the cost of advertising the Waimakariri Light Party.

OR

(c) Declines the application from the Reflections Community Trust.
(d) **Approves** a grant of $..................... to Fernside School towards the cost of upgrading the school library.

OR

(e) **Declines** the application from Fernside School.

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1. The **Reflections Community Trust** will be hosting the 15th Waimakariri Light Party on 31 October 2019 and is seeking funds towards the advertising of the event in the North Canterbury News.

3.2. **Fernside School** wishes to upgrade the school library to ensure the books for their junior tamariki are both current and culturally diverse in their content

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

**The Reflections Community Trust**

4.1. The concept of the Light Party is a ‘nation-wide’ non-scary alternative to Halloween. The Trust aims to provide a fun night for children and youth by offering safe, family entertainment. The Light Party effectively keeps children from ‘trick or treating’, an activity which can be intimidating for vulnerable community members.

4.2. Especially elderly people in the community have expressed their relief that there are fewer children roaming the streets on Halloween. As they often feel intimidated into opening their doors in the evening to people they do not know. There is also the financial burden of providing the demanded lollies.

4.3. The event will this year again be hosted at Wylie Park in Kaiapoi, as this the most suitable venue in the Waimakariri area given the nature and size of the event. However, the Light Party is truly a Waimakariri wide event with participants attending from Kaiapoi (48%), Rangiora (28%), other areas in the Waimakariri District (13%) and Christchurch (11%).

4.4. Started in 2004 with approximately 350 attendees, the event has grown to in-excess of 5,000 pre-schoolers, children, youth and families attending. The Trust relies heavily on the generous support and donation of time from volunteers to manage the event e.g. set-up and breakdown of the event, managing entertainment, the collection of rubbish etc.

4.5. Besides being fun, community events such as the Light Party offer a host of economic and social benefits to the greater Waimakariri community. These events also offer an opportunity to foster stronger relationships between the various communities within the Waimakariri district.

4.6. The Trust is requesting a grant of $184 which will be used to advertise the Light Party in the North Canterbury News. The event will however continue even if this application is unsuccessful.

4.7. The Board funded this event last year ($292) by also covering the cost advertising. However, the Trust received a special not-for-profit rate for the North Canterbury News and was therefore able to refunded $199.64 of the grant awarded. The required accountability form was received. The Trust is also applying to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board for funding to cover the cost of a Natural Magic Pirates Show.

**Fernside School (The School)**

4.8. The School wishes to ensure that the junior tamariki have access to a greater range of resources for literacy educating, with greater opportunities for learning and embracing the
Te Reo Maori language. The provision of a wider variety of reading material will enable the school to offer more opportunities for literacy and cultural base learning.

4.9. The School library is accessed by the School’s tamariki and their wider whanau, including the pre-schoolers in the community. The provision of new diverse reading material will therefore benefit not only the school but also the wider community.

4.10. All funds received will be directly used for the purchasing of new books. The School has not applied for funding for any other organisations and the School will therefore not be able to continue with the project if this application is declined. This is the first time the School has applied for funding from the Community Board.

4.11. The Board may approve or decline grants in accordance with the grant guidelines.

4.12. The Management Team has reviewed this report.

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1 Groups and Organisations
Not applicable.

Wider Community
Not applicable.

6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications
The Annual Plan for 2019/20 includes budget provision for the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board to approve grants to community groups up to a total of $11,550. The balance of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board’s Discretionary Grant Fund 2019/20 is currently $9,630.

The application criteria specify that grants are normally limited to a maximum of $500 in any one financial year (July to June) but a group can however apply up to twice in a year, providing it is for different projects. GST is paid to appropriately registered groups where applicable above the Board resolved values.

6.2. Community Implications
6.2.1 The Light Party offer a host of economic and social benefits to the greater Waimakariri community. The event will offer an opportunity to foster stronger relationships between the various communities within the Waimakariri district.

6.2.2 The upgrading of the Fernside school library will provide opportunities to the wider community to learn and embrace the Te Reo Maori language.

6.3. Risk Management
Not applicable.

6.4. Health and Safety
All health and safety related issues will fall under the auspice of the Reflections Community Trust and the Fernside School.

7. CONTEXT

7.1. Policy
These matters are not of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.
7.2. Legislation
Not applicable.

7.3. Community Outcomes
People are friendly and caring, creating a strong sense of community in our District.

There are wide-ranging opportunities for people of different ages, abilities and cultures to participate in community life and recreational activities.

7.4. Delegations
Community Boards have delegated authority to approve such grants.

Thea Kunkel
Governance Team Leader
Groups Applying for Board Discretionary Grants 2018/2019

Name of Group: REFLECTIONS COMMUNITY TRUST.

Address: 35 CHARLES STREET, KAIAPOI

Contact Person within Organisation: TIANA WILLS

Position within Organisation: TRUST ADMINISTRATOR AND EVENTS COORDINATOR

Contact phone number: 024 484 759 Email: tiana.wills@outlook.com

Describe what the project is and what the grant funding be used specifically for? (Use additional pages if needed)

Our project is the Waikarari Right Party in its 15th year to the whole district (community).

Our full project description is attached. Thank you.

1 Advertising quote attached.

What is the timeframe of the project/event date? 31/10/2019

Overall Cost of Project: $ 361 711.79 Amount Requesting: $ 184 00

How many people will directly benefit from this project? 5000 people or more

Who are the range of people benefiting from this project? (You can tick more than one box)

- People with disabilities (mental or physical)
- Cultural/ethnic minorities
- District
- School/youth
- Older adults
- Whole community/ward

Provide estimated percentage of participants/people benefiting by community area:

Rangiora-Ashley 28% Oxford-Ohoka 8% Woodend-Sefton 5% Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi 48%

Other (please specify): Christchurch at 11%

If this application is declined will this event/project still occur? Yes No

If No - what are the consequences to the community/organisation?
What are the direct benefit(s) to the participants?

We are promoting physical, emotional, mental, spiritual and social health, creating a safe environment in which people are respected, accepted and contributing to their wellbeing and being connected to their whanau.

What is the benefit(s) to your organisation?

The purpose and aims of our trust are to serve the children and their families in our community.

What are the benefit(s) to the Rangiora-Ashley community or wider district?

We are providing quality effective educational community based programmes, projects, and events that are accessible to all people in our Waimakariri District (Community).

Is your group applying under the umbrella of another organisation (that is Charity/Trust registered?)

No

If yes, name of parent group

What is the relationship between your group and the parent group?

What other fundraising has your group undertaken towards this project/event? List any other organisations you have applied or intend to apply to for funding this project and amount applied for this project:

Our preliminary budget is attached.

Thank you.

Have you applied to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board or any other Waimakariri Community Board for other project funding in the past 18 months?

Yes

If yes, please supply details:

$291.64 cents Advertising with North Canterbury News.

Enclosed

Financial Balance Sheet and Income & Expenditure Statement (compulsory – your application cannot be processed without financial statements)

Supporting costs/quotes

Other supporting information

I am authorised to sign on behalf of the group/organisation making this application.

I declare that all details contained in this application form are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

I accept that successful applicants will be required to report back to the Community Board by completing a simple Accountability Report.

I accept that information provided in this application may be used in an official Council report available to the public.

PLEASE NOTE - If submitting your application electronically, entering your name in the Signature box below will be accepted as your signature:

[Signature]

08/07/19

(Treasurer)
4 July 2019

Community Board Advocate
Rangiora-Ashley Community Board
C/- Waimakariri District Council
Private Bag 1005, Rangiora 7440

Dear Sir/Madam

RE: APPLICATION FOR FUNDING — WAIMAKARIRI LIGHT PARTY 2019

On behalf of the Trustees of the Reflections Community Trust ("the Trust"), I attach our completed Discretionary Grant Application in the sum of $184.00, together with supporting documentation, for your attention.

The Trustees are requesting a grant from the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board to assist with funding for advertising our event with the North Canterbury News.

The Waimakariri Light Party falls under the direction of the Reflections Community Trust, and is held annually on 31 October from 4.30pm to 7.30pm. It has become an iconic Waimakariri event for families now in its 15th year.

The concept of the Light Party is a "nation-wide" non-scary alternative to Halloween. The Trust aims to provide a fun night for children and youth, by providing safe, family fun, non-scary entertainment. The Light Party effectively keeps children off the streets from trick and treating, an activity which can turn sour quite easily. Householders, particularly the elderly have expressed their relief that there have been much fewer children coming to their homes on the evening of the 31st of October. They often feel intimidated having to open their doors in the evening to children and teenagers in scary costumes asking for lollies. Not only is this often a financial burden to provide, but there is the potential 'threat' of a trick should they not have any lollies.

Although the event is held in Wylie Park, Kaiapoi (Wylie Park is the most suitable venue in the Waimakariri area for the nature and size of the event), the Light Party is truly a Waimakariri wide event with participants attending from Rangiora (28%), Kaiapoi (48%), other areas in the Waimakariri district (13%) and Christchurch (11%).

A grant from the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board would directly benefit the many pre-schoolers, children, youth and families in the Waimakariri area who attend the Waimakariri Light Party and enable the Trust to continue to provide family fun non-scary entertainment in a positive and safe environment.

Lastly, I would like to extend an invitation to all Board Members to attend the event to join-in and enjoy in the festivities.

I thank you in advance for considering our application and look forward to hearing from you in due course.

Yours faithfully

Tiana Wills
Trust Administrator and Event Coordinator
Motion to Apply for Funding

It was agreed at a meeting held on 4th July 2019 of Reflections Community Trust to apply to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board for a donation of One hundred And Eighty Four Dollars $184.00 to cover the cost of the below mentioned advertising for the 2019 Waimakariri Light Party.

This application to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board would be used to cover costs towards:

- Advertising x 2 insertions $80.00
- $12.00 gst
- Total for 2 insertions $184.00

Funding for the event will be met with funding from various funders, sponsorship, donations and Trust contribution.

I certify that this is a true and correct record of a resolution passed at this meeting.

Julie Knowles (Trustee on behalf of)
Sue Edwards
Secretary
Reflections Community Trust
Reflections Community Trust

4th July 2019

Dear Tiana

Thanks for your enquiry to advertise the Light Party in October 2019 for two insertions, for a 8x2 (8 centimetres down by 6.4 centimetres across) would cost $80 plus gst per insertion.

The Community Notices is at no charge, but we can’t guarantee it will go in, but we do try our best.

Any queries please don’t hesitate to call me,

Regards
Amanda Keys
North Canterbury News
Phone 313 2840
amanda.keys@ncnews.co.nz
### Preliminary Budget for 2018 Waimakariri Light Party

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Own Funding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Administrator &amp; Event Coordinator Wages</td>
<td>$11,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Food Vendor</td>
<td>$640.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chartites Services</td>
<td>$54.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Group Fees</td>
<td>$105.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accountant Fees</td>
<td>$120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust’s own funding</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry donations -3,227.35 @ $2.00 each</td>
<td>$6,454.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Total of own funds</strong></td>
<td>$7,799.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business Donations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Outlook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Northern Outlook (Thank you Notice)</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posters (donated)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total estimated business donations</strong></td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Church Donations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fancy Dress Competition expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fire Service Donation</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total estimated church donations</strong></td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding Applications</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERT</td>
<td>$5,150.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>$1,190.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mileage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pub Charity</td>
<td>$6,558.69</td>
<td></td>
<td>Portable Photographic Club</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett Ostler</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Portable Generators</td>
<td>donated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish Bin Hire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rubbish Bin Hire</td>
<td>donated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Community Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Signage</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend Community Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust Aoraki</td>
<td>$4,058.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sponsor Board</td>
<td>$272.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Community Board</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>St John Donation</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lion Foundation</td>
<td>$4,050.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stationary + Postage</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funding Applications</strong></td>
<td>$20,517.44</td>
<td></td>
<td>Storage - Kaiapoi Mill (beers)</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$36,711.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone - Mobile Calls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilet Hire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>donated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer Wages</td>
<td>$1,700.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$25.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venue Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment/Sound?Mcee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,517.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Description of Project

The Reflections Community Trust requests assistance from the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board towards the 2019 Waimakariri Light Party in the sum of $184.00. This financial assistance will be used for advertising our event in the North Canterbury News.

The Waimakariri Light Party falls under the direction of the Reflections Community Trust and is organised by a special committee – the Waimakariri Light Party Committee.

The Waimakariri Light Party will be held at Wylie Park, Kaiapoi, on Thursday 31 October 2019 between 4.30pm and 7.30pm.

The concept of the Light Party is a “nation-wide” non-scary alternative to Halloween and is a great option for parents who do not like the creepy side of the Halloween tradition but do not want their children to feel like they are missing out. The Trust aims to provide a fun night for children and youth (aged between 4 to 14 years old), by providing safe, family fun, non-scary entertainment. The Light Party effectively keeps children off the streets from trick or treating, an activity which can turn sour quite easily. Children and youth who attend have fun and receive sweets and lollies in a safe and positive environment. Householders, particularly the elderly have expressed their relief that there have been much fewer children coming to their homes on the evening of 31 October.

The Waimakariri Light Party is now in its 15th year, having provided to the community a safe alternative to Halloween since 2004. Starting from extremely humble beginnings of around 350 attendees – the event has grown to in-excess of 5,000 pre-schoolers, children, youth and families attending the event.

The Light Party has become an iconic Waimakariri event for families and although based in Kaiapoi, is truly a Waimakariri wide event with participants attending from Kaiapoi (48%), Rangiora (28%), other areas in the Waimakariri district (13%) and also with 11% attending from Christchurch.

Survey results show that participants reach our target market; Pre-schooler (25%), 5 – 8 years (28%), 9 – 11 years (25%), 12 – 14 years (8%), 15-18 years (3%), Older (11%). This older bracket included mums, dads, grandparents and older siblings in charge of their younger brothers and sisters.

Current local Waimakariri MP, Matt Doocey, will officially open the event at 4.30pm. The fun at the Waimakariri Light Party, will kick-off with a multitude of entertainment such as bungees, bouncy castles, horse and carriage rides, climbing walls, mini jeeps, and pedalmania crazy bikes. A highlight of the night will be a non-scary fancy dress competition, followed by a fancy-dress parade. Additional entertainment will include a dog agility display by the Waimakariri Dog Training Club, children’s entertainment duo – the Natural Magic Pirates, face painting, Clowns, a magician, and balloon artists. Kaiapoi High School will be performing up on the stage.

Food will be available to purchase during the event from many community group food stalls. This is an opportunity for local groups, schools and churches to raise funds as well as promote themselves and be active in the community.

The Waimakariri Light Party will also host local community information stands including the Police, Neighbourhood Support, and St Johns. NZ Fire Service and the Coastguard will also be in attendance.
The Waimakariri Light Party relies on the generous support and donation of time from volunteers to manage the event, from the Committee to event marshals, activity participation, i.e. face painting, set-up and breakdown of the event, collection of rubbish... the jobs are endless.

The Trust aims to ensure the Waimakariri Light Party remains accessible for all families to attend regardless of their financial situation. To date, this has been achieved with the generous support of funding organisations, local Churches, service organisations and local businesses who provide funding, sponsored goods and voluntary hours to the event.

The Waimakariri Light Party was a free event until 2015, when the Trust reluctantly made the decision to introduce a gold coin donation entry charge. (This year it is a $2.00 donation entry charge). The donation entry charge was introduced to enable the Trust to continue to provide a high-quality event that is still very affordable for families and participants. In an ideal world, it would be fantastic to continue to have a totally free event, however, organisers are committed to the longevity of the event, so to achieve this they felt the time had come to request a small voluntary entry fee from participants.

The organisers of the Waimakariri Light Party, the Reflections Community Trust, aim to serve the children and their families in our community, by providing early intervention through quality effective and educational community based programmes, projects and events that are accessible to all people in our community along with providing hope in the next generation.
Benefits to the Rangiora-Ashley Community or Wider Districts

Community events bring BIG benefits to the community. Besides being fun, the well-organised Waimakariri Light Party event will offer a host of economic and social benefits to the community. Events bring a community together and instil a sense of community pride.

The social benefits of local events are less visible than the economic benefit, but are just as, if not more important. Fun-day events provided by community organisation foster community pride, teach people new things and strengthen relationships. The economic benefit of providing local events is the growth of local tourism and economic benefit to local businesses in the district.

Local events also provide free marketing for local business as visitors talk about their fun, positive experiences.

Events foster community pride as it involves many members of the community. The Waimakariri Light Party event will be held at Wylie Park, Kaiapoi, and will promote community pride by celebrating ALL the things that make the Waimakariri wide community special and evoke good feelings.

The Waimakariri Light Party fosters stronger relationships within the community as we build connections with suppliers, volunteers, interested residents, business, community groups and likeminded people. These connections are the ‘glue’ that hold the district together – this is our social capital that makes for healthy communities.
Thursday 31 October 2019
4.30pm to 7.30pm
Wylie Park, Kaiapoi

The Waimakariri Light Party falls under the direction of the Reflections Community Trust, a charitable trust set up in 2002 and based in Kaiapoi.

The concept of the Light Party is a “nation-wide” non-scary alternative to Halloween and is a great option for parents who may not like the creepy side of the Halloween tradition, but at the same time, do not want their children to feel like they are missing out. The Trust aims to bring the local community together and put on a fun night for children and youth (aged between 4 to 14 years old), by providing family orientated, non-scary entertainment in a safe and positive environment. The Light Party effectively keeps children off the streets from trick or treating, an activity which can turn sour quite easily. Local householders, particularly the elderly have expressed their relief that there have been fewer children coming to their homes trick or treating on the evening of 31 October.

The Waimakariri Light Party is now in its 15th year, having provided to the community a safe alternative to Halloween since 2004. Starting from extremely humble beginnings of around 350 attendees – the event has now grown to more than 5,000 preschoolers, children, youth and families attending each year. The Light Party has become an iconic Waimakariri event for families, and although based in Kaiapoi, (Wylie Park is the most suitable venue in the Waimakariri area for the nature and size of the event) it is truly a Waimakariri wide event with participants attending from Kaiapoi (48%), Rangiora (28%), other areas in the Waimakariri district (13%), and with 11% attending from various Christchurch suburbs. (Figures taken from 2018 survey of event.)

Local Waimakariri MP, Matt Doocey, will officially open the event at 4.30pm. The fun at the Waimakariri Light Party, will kick-off with a multitude of entertainment including bungees, bouncy castles, soft archery, horses and carriage rides, climbing walls, mini jeeps, water walkers and Pedalmania crazy bikes. A highlight of the night will be a non-scary fancy dress competition. Additional entertainment will include a dog agility display by the Waimakariri Dog Training Club, and stage performances by the Natural Magic Pirates. Clowns (Silly Billy Clown and Lieutenant Lou), and magician, Josh Grimaldi, will be roaming around the event interacting with attendees.

Food will be available to purchase during the event from commercial food vendors as well as community group food stalls. This is an opportunity for local groups, schools and churches to raise funds as well as promote themselves and be active in the community. The Light Party will also host local community information stands including NZ Fire Service, North Canterbury Neighbourhood Support, St John, Plunket and Eco Educate.

The Waimakariri Light Party relies on the generous support and donation of time from volunteers to manage the event, from the Committee to event marshals, set-up and breakdown of the event, collection of rubbish, ... the jobs are endless. The Trust aims to ensure the Waimakariri Light Party remains accessible for all families to attend regardless of their financial situation. To date this has been achieved with the generous support of funding organisations, local Churches, and local businesses who provide funding, sponsored goods and voluntary hours to the event. In 2015, the Reflections Community Trust reluctantly made the decision to introduce a $2.00 donation to enter the Light Party, to enable the Trust to continue to provide a high-quality event that is still very affordable for families and participants.

The Reflections Community Trust aims to serve the children and their families in our community, by providing early intervention through quality effective and educational community-based programmes, projects and events that are accessible to all people in our community to provide hope in the next generation.

Organised by: P O Box 215, Kaiapoi, Tel: 021 157 6914 reflections.trust@gmail.com Website: www.waimaklightparty.org Facebook: “waimaklightparty"
43 surveys were completed with a total of 75 participants recording details.

How did you hear about the Waimakariri Light Party?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posters/Signs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known/other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Including previously attended event, found out from family, church

What Age bracket are your children?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Bracket</th>
<th>Pre-schooler</th>
<th>5-8 years</th>
<th>9-11 years</th>
<th>12-14 years</th>
<th>15-18 years</th>
<th>Older</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Caregivers, Parents, Grandparents, Older Siblings

Where do you normally live?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Kaiapoi</th>
<th>Rangiora</th>
<th>Woodend</th>
<th>Pegasus</th>
<th>Christchurch</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Haswell, New Brighton   ** Tuahiwi, Lincoln, Waikuku, Swananaa

Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>NZ European</th>
<th>Maori</th>
<th>Pacific</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>British</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How much would you be prepared to pay to attend the Waimakariri Light Party?

- $2.00 per person entry: 39 (52%)
- $5.00 per person entry: 11 (15%)
- A charge per family*: 25 (33%)

Cap at $10 for 2 adults and 2 children most common reply $5.00 per child, adults free

Additional Comments

- Loved the horse and carriage rides
- Mini jeeps were great.
- Doing a great job.
- Need more stuff for under 5's
- There were less rides than last year
- Loved the Pedalmania bikes
- Great community event
- Gets better every year
- Would like to have seen Facepainting
- Loved the free lollies
- Enjoyed the balloon animals
- Friendly staff and well organised
- Need more rubbish bins and toilets
- We love the bouncy castles
- Would like to see free food at the Light Party
- Get rid of the fancy dress competition
- Enjoyed the entertainers and songs
- More bouncy castles for pre-schoolers
- More food
- Queues too long for some rides
- Enjoyed the Pirate Show
- More singing, more music
- Loved the Bungy!
- Enjoyed the candy floss
- Parking needs to be better advertised
- How about a Maze?
- Need cheaper drinks
- Loved the atmosphere
- The dog agility display was great
- A very well put together event
- You guys do a great job!
- Need a petting zoo/farmyard
- More petting zoos/farmyards
- More food selection this year

Multiple comments that children loved the bouncy castles, enjoyed the Gypsy Divine horses, where was the Mickey Train,
4th June 2017

The Treasurer
Reflection Community Trust

Dear Jannene

I have reviewed the books for the Reflections Community Trust for the year ended 31st March 2017 with the information provided and have found everything to be correct.

The records have been kept in excellent order with easy to follow referencing.

The results summary is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RCT General</td>
<td>Loss $ 868.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Party</td>
<td>Profit $3390.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmas meal</td>
<td>Profit $ 14.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childrens Day</td>
<td>Loss $2297.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>Profit $ 238.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westpac Cheque Account Op bal 1/4/16</td>
<td>$11181.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall profit</td>
<td>$ 238.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI Bal 31/3/17</td>
<td>$11419.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A detailed breakdown of the donations, grants and sponsorship as provided by you, is attached.

Yours faithfully

Glenda Greenwood
27 Cam Road
Kaiapoi
Groups Applying for Board Discretionary Grants 2018/2019

Name of Group: Feinside School
Address: 285 O’Roarkes Road, Feinside 7471
Contact Person within Organisation: Vicki Edwards
Position within Organisation: Grants Committee Member
Contact phone number: 0273030032 Email: edwardsvm1@gmail.com

Describe what the project is and what the grant funding be used specifically for? (Use additional pages if needed)

Upgrade of the school library to ensure our books for the junior tamariki are both current and culturally diverse in their content. All funds received will be directly used for purchase of new books.

What is the timeframe of the project/event date? Aug - Oct 2019
Overall Cost of Project: $660.33
Amount Requesting: $500.00

How many people will directly benefit from this project? 500+

Who are the range of people benefiting from this project? (You can tick more than one box)

☐ People with disabilities (mental or physical) ☑ Cultural/ethnic minorities ☐ Older adults ☐ Whole community/war

Provide estimated percentage of participants/people benefiting by community area:

Rangiora-Ashley 90% Oxford-Ohoka 5% Woodend-Sefton 5% Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi%

Other (please specify):

If this application is declined will this event/project still occur? ☐ Yes ☑ No

If No – what are the consequences to the community/organisation?
What are the direct benefit(s) to the participants?

To have access to a greater range of resources for literacy education, with greater opportunities for reading and embracing the Te Reo Maori language.

What is the benefit(s) to your organisation?

Provision of a wide variety of reading material will enable our school to offer opportunities for literacy and cultural based learning.

What are the benefit(s) to the Rangiora-Ashley community or wider district?

Our school library is accessed by our tamariki and their wider whānau, inclusive of preschoolers in our community. Therefore provision of new reading material will benefit everyone in our school and whānau community.

Is your group applying under the umbrella of another organisation (that is Charity/Trust registered?)

Yes  No

If yes, name of parent group

What is the relationship between your group and the parent group?


What other fundraising has your group undertaken towards this project/event? List any other organisations you have applied or intend to apply to for funding this project and amount applied for this project:

None

Have you applied to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board or any other Waimakariri Community Board for other project funding in the past 18 months?

Yes  No

If yes, please supply details:

Enclosed

Financial Balance Sheet and Income & Expenditure Statement (compulsory – your application cannot be processed without financial statements)

Supporting costs/quotes

Other supporting information

I am authorised to sign on behalf of the group/organisation making this application.

I declare that all details contained in this application form are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

I accept that successful applicants will be required to report back to the Community Board by completing a simple Accountability Report.

I accept that information provided in this application may be used in an official Council report available to the public.

PLEASE NOTE - If submitting your application electronically, entering your name in the Signature box below will be accepted as your signature:

Signed:  Date: 15/7/19
285 O'Roarkes Road
RD1
Rangiora 7471

Telephone: 313 8608
fernsideschool@fernside.school.nz
www.fernside.school.nz

31st July 2019

The Chairperson
Rangiora-Ashley Community Board
Waimakariri District Council
Rangiora 7440

FUNDING APPLICATION:
Fernside School Grant Application towards the cost of purchasing library books.

The Fernside School Board of Trustees' resolved at its meeting on Tuesday 30th July 2019 to approve and support an application to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board for a grant of $500 to purchase more library books in support of advancing student learning.

I certify that the above is a true and correct resolution passed at this meeting.

[Signature]

Geoff Gale
Chairperson
Fernside School Board of Trustees
# Whitcoulls

**QUOTATION FOR:** FERNSIDE SCHOOL  
**REQUEST MADE BY:** JASMINE ADAIR  
**DATE:** 20/06/2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>PRICE EXCL. GST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9781775503514</td>
<td>Te Pohu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$16.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6257972</td>
<td>He Wahi I te Puruma</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$13.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6167240</td>
<td>Tuna &amp; Hiriwa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$13.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9781775502906</td>
<td>Toku Whenua Aotearoa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$18.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9781775502890</td>
<td>Toku Ao</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$18.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6167237</td>
<td>Kei hea te Hipi Kakariki</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$13.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9781775502098</td>
<td>Whiti te Ra</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$17.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9781775502074</td>
<td>Haka</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$17.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9781775501398</td>
<td>Ole Ketapila Matua Fia Ai</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$14.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9781775501541</td>
<td>First Readers in Maori</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$27.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5892354</td>
<td>Te Mihini Hi Kowhai</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$13.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5871157</td>
<td>Te Tanguruhau</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$13.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5830307</td>
<td>Kei Reira Nga Weriweri</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$17.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5815110</td>
<td>Te Anuhe Tino Hiakai</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$13.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5815105</td>
<td>Te Haere ki te Rapu Pea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$13.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5665196</td>
<td>Everyday Words in Maori</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$13.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6108660</td>
<td>Awful Auntie</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$13.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5712009</td>
<td>Baa Baa Smart Sheep</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$13.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4200892</td>
<td>Bad Dad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$13.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5667433</td>
<td>Billie B Brown Soccer Star</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5550644</td>
<td>Captain Underpants #1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$9.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6118407</td>
<td>Charlie and the Chocolate Factory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$14.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6438374</td>
<td>Dear Zoo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$10.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6019069</td>
<td>Demon Dentist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$13.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6186663</td>
<td>Diary of a Minecraft Zombie #1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$7.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5629651</td>
<td>Diary of a Wimpy Kid #1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$12.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6172107</td>
<td>Dog Man #1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$13.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6024685</td>
<td>Dork Diaries #1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$13.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5995091</td>
<td>Dragon Hunters #1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$13.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5993948</td>
<td>Elia Diaries #1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$9.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5764507</td>
<td>Elia &amp; Olivia #1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$6.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5662554</td>
<td>Gansta Granny</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$13.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5605470</td>
<td>Geronimo Stilton #1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$10.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6229670</td>
<td>Goodnight Stories for Rebel Girls</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$27.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6217899</td>
<td>Grandpas Great Escape</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$13.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6164310</td>
<td>Green Eggs &amp; Ham</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$9.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5901918</td>
<td>Hairy Maclary #1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$12.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5950599</td>
<td>Harry Potter #1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$15.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6189309</td>
<td>I Need a New Bum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$13.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6281343</td>
<td>Kiwicorn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$13.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5983953</td>
<td>Kuwi's First Egg</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$13.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL EXCL. GST** $574.20

**GST** 8.15%

**Total** $660.33

**Quotation pricing is valid for 28 calendar days from document date.**

Orders are freight free if over $50. Freight will be added if your order is under $50.
**QUOTATION**

From: TURNERGC LIMITED, Trading as Paper Tree Rangiora  
206 High Street  
Rangiora 7400

To: Fernside School PTA  
285 O’Roarkes Road  
Fernside 7471

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISBN</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9781775503514</td>
<td>Te Pohu</td>
<td>$21.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9781775503293</td>
<td>He Wah i te Puruma</td>
<td>$18.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9781775502272</td>
<td>Tuna &amp; Hiriwa</td>
<td>$18.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9781775502906</td>
<td>Toku Whenua Aotearoa</td>
<td>$23.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9781775502890</td>
<td>Toku Ao</td>
<td>$23.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9781775502035</td>
<td>Kei hea te Hipi Kokariki</td>
<td>$18.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9781775502099</td>
<td>Whiti te Ro</td>
<td>$23.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9781775502074</td>
<td>Haka</td>
<td>$23.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9781775501398</td>
<td>Ole Kelapilla Matua Fia Ai</td>
<td>$18.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9781775501541</td>
<td>First Readers in Maori</td>
<td>$38.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9781775501381</td>
<td>Te Mihiri Hi Kowhai</td>
<td>$18.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9781775501268</td>
<td>Te Tanguruha</td>
<td>$18.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9781775501114</td>
<td>Kei Reira Nga Wer iweri</td>
<td>$22.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9781775500483</td>
<td>Te Anuhe Tino Hikak</td>
<td>$18.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9781775500445</td>
<td>Te Haere ki te Rapu Pea</td>
<td>$18.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9781869993965</td>
<td>Everyday Words In Maori</td>
<td>$18.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9780007455627</td>
<td>Awful Auntie</td>
<td>$16.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>978098646847</td>
<td>Bad Baa Smart Sheep</td>
<td>$17.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9780008144669</td>
<td>Bad Ded</td>
<td>$16.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9781610479966</td>
<td>Billie &amp; Brown Soccer Star</td>
<td>$7.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9785998462988</td>
<td>Captain Underpants # 1</td>
<td>$8.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9780142410319</td>
<td>Charlie and the Chocolate Factory</td>
<td>$18.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9781529017571</td>
<td>Dear Zoo</td>
<td>$16.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97800062417053</td>
<td>Demon Dentist</td>
<td>$16.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9781743811504</td>
<td>Diary of a Minecraft Zombie #1</td>
<td>$9.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9780143303831</td>
<td>Diary of a Wimpy Kid #1</td>
<td>$14.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9781407140391</td>
<td>Dog Man #1</td>
<td>$13.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9781471144011</td>
<td>Dork Diaries #1</td>
<td>$18.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9780432949767</td>
<td>Dragon Hunters #1</td>
<td>$15.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9781743628538</td>
<td>Elsa Diaries #1</td>
<td>$12.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9781740833545</td>
<td>Elsa &amp; Olivia #1</td>
<td>$6.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9780002371454</td>
<td>Gangsta Granny</td>
<td>$14.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9780439559638</td>
<td>Geronimo Stilton #1</td>
<td>$13.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9780149186005</td>
<td>Goodnight Stories for Rebel Girls</td>
<td>$31.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9780008183424</td>
<td>Grandpas Great Escape</td>
<td>$16.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9780008201470</td>
<td>Green Eggs &amp; Ham</td>
<td>$10.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9780143306153</td>
<td>Hairy Maclary #1</td>
<td>$8.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9781408655629</td>
<td>Harry Potter #1</td>
<td>$21.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9780974001600</td>
<td>Need a New Bum</td>
<td>$17.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9780099436436</td>
<td>Kiwicorn</td>
<td>$14.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9780473299035</td>
<td>Kow's First Egg</td>
<td>$17.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: (Incl GST @ 15% of $96.73) $741.59

GST Number: 119-958-563
Date: 27/6/2019
Reference: FPTA190627
# Income Statement - Summary

**Fernside School**  
For the month ended 31 May 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MAY 2019</th>
<th>YTD ACTUAL</th>
<th>ANNUAL BUDGET</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
<th>% OF BUDGET USED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Funding</td>
<td>34,988</td>
<td>219,526</td>
<td>446,627</td>
<td>227,101</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>5,579</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>28,421</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Fees</td>
<td>7,309</td>
<td>7,652</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>5,848</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>1,349</td>
<td>3,429</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>9,571</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>9,562</td>
<td>13,900</td>
<td>4,338</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Income</strong></td>
<td>44,782</td>
<td>245,749</td>
<td>521,027</td>
<td>275,278</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Activities</td>
<td>(856)</td>
<td>(3,636)</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>4,636</td>
<td>(364)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trading Income</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>2,676</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Other Income</strong></td>
<td>(221)</td>
<td>(3,312)</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>7,312</td>
<td>(83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td>44,561</td>
<td>242,437</td>
<td>525,027</td>
<td>282,590</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>14,436</td>
<td>79,510</td>
<td>203,636</td>
<td>124,126</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Resources</td>
<td>3,642</td>
<td>45,350</td>
<td>177,340</td>
<td>131,990</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Maintenance</td>
<td>8,736</td>
<td>49,531</td>
<td>130,676</td>
<td>81,145</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset Transactions</td>
<td>5,163</td>
<td>25,516</td>
<td>72,000</td>
<td>46,484</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td>31,977</td>
<td>199,908</td>
<td>583,652</td>
<td>383,744</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Surplus (Deficit)</strong></td>
<td>12,584</td>
<td>42,529</td>
<td>(58,625)</td>
<td>(101,154)</td>
<td>(73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Surplus (Deficit)</strong></td>
<td>12,584</td>
<td>42,529</td>
<td>(58,625)</td>
<td>(101,154)</td>
<td>(73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting considered</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Amount Requested</td>
<td>Amount Granted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>Reflections Community Trust</td>
<td>Waimakariri Light Party</td>
<td>$273</td>
<td>$273</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>Coastguard</td>
<td>Boat</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>Pegasus Residents Group</td>
<td>Towards the Christmas on the Lake event 2018</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>Pegasus Bay School PTA</td>
<td>Towards candy floss machine and bouncy castle</td>
<td>$445</td>
<td>$445</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>The Lions Club of Pegasus Town</td>
<td>Towards the cost of running a Charity Fun Mud Run</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Waimakariri Arts Trust - Kaiapoi Arts Expo</td>
<td>Towards the costs of running the Expo in particular advertising in local papers</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Sefton Community Group</td>
<td>Towards the cost of running ANZAC Day service and Christmas carols in the domain</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Presbyterian Support</td>
<td>Towards costs of running An Expo of Ideas to Live Well and Give Well</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Northside Boardriders Club Inc</td>
<td>For rescue boards</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Woodend School</td>
<td>Towards lighting costs for concert</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>North Canterbury Model Railway Club Inc.</td>
<td>Towards the cost of signage to promote the club's Rangiora Sunday Markets</td>
<td>$410</td>
<td>$410</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>All About Bees</td>
<td>Towards the costs of hall hire, advertising, website promotion of the Bee Expo 2 September 2018</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>Reflections Community Trust</td>
<td>Waimakariri Light Party</td>
<td>$292</td>
<td>$292</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>NC Citizens advice</td>
<td>Anniversary celebration</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** |  |  | $4,750 | $4,218 | $11,513 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount 1</th>
<th>Amount 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>Coast guard</td>
<td>Replacement vessel</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>International Day of Older Persons</td>
<td>Concert and afternoon tea</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>McAlpines North Canterbury Pipe Band</td>
<td>Towards the costs of a piper attending the RNZ Pipe Bands Association Summer School</td>
<td>$395</td>
<td>$395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>Rangiora Croquet Club</td>
<td>Installation of electricity supply and air compressor</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>Community Wellbeing North Canterbury Trust</td>
<td>Cost of booklet guides Whanau care course</td>
<td>$480</td>
<td>$480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>Cust Tennis Club</td>
<td>Balls for junior teams</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>Rangiora High School Nursery School</td>
<td>Sensory equipment</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>Rangiora Toy Library</td>
<td>New bike and trike</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>Waimakariri Timebank</td>
<td>Promotional material</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>North Loburn School</td>
<td>Storage shed</td>
<td>$499</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>Presbyterian Support</td>
<td>An Expo of Ideas to Live Well and Give Well</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>North Canterbury Musical Society</td>
<td>Towards the costs of replacement signage for the club and building</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Waimakariri Arts Trust - Kaiapoi Arts Expo</td>
<td>Towards cost of advertising in the Northern Outlook Arts Expo etc</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Cust Netball Club</td>
<td>Towards the cost of uniforms for Year 7/8 teams</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Rangiora Gymnastics Club</td>
<td>Towards cost of 2 sets of panel mats</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>North Canterbury Athletic Club</td>
<td>Towards cost of crop tops</td>
<td>$432</td>
<td>$432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Thrive Church</td>
<td>Towards venue and equipment hire</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Ashley Playcentre</td>
<td>Towards arts and craft resources</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Salvation Army - Just Brass</td>
<td>Cost of music stands for school programme</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>$450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board 10.136.100.2410

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Group/Association</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Amounts</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Soroptimist North Canterbury</td>
<td>Cost of advertising for annual fair</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>North Loburn Home and School Association</td>
<td>Cost of materials for building a pergola</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Loburn School Board of Trustees</td>
<td>Towards cost of signage</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong>: $11,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>Reflections Community Trust</td>
<td>Toward costs of hiring bouncy castles for Waimakariri Light Party</td>
<td>$475</td>
<td>$475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>Pines and Kiaraki Beach Association</td>
<td>Towards the cost of promotional material advertising and signage for the new hall</td>
<td>$477</td>
<td>$477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>Kaiapoi North School Raupo Team</td>
<td>Outdoor play equipment</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>Coastguard North Canterbury</td>
<td>Replacement rescue vessel</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>Tuahiwi School</td>
<td>Tuahiwi Ka Matakura O Ruataniwha 2018 event</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>KPA</td>
<td>Float for Kaiapoi North School</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>You Me We Us</td>
<td>Towards Waitangi Day 2019 event</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>Karanga Mai Early Learning Centre</td>
<td>Towards the purchase of a washing line and wireless speaker</td>
<td>$415</td>
<td>$415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>Kaiapoi Baptist Church</td>
<td>Upgrade of PA system</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Waimakariri Arts Trust - Kaiapoi Arts Expo</td>
<td>Running costs of the Kaiapoi Art Expo</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Clarkville Playcentre</td>
<td>Double seated tricycle &amp; three balance bikes</td>
<td>$420</td>
<td>$420</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| April | Presbyterian Support | Towards cost of running the event An Expo of Ideas to Live Well and Give Well | $500 | $-
<p>| June  | Kaiapoi Toy Library | Towards the cost of new toys | $500 | $500 |
| June  | Person to Person Trust | Towards resources for interactive sessions | $500 | $500 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Amounts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Community Patrols of New Zealand</td>
<td>Towards first aid courses</td>
<td>$500 $800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>All Stars Marching Team</td>
<td>Towards the cost of a training camp</td>
<td>$500 $500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,022</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>Ohoka Netball Club</td>
<td>New playing uniforms</td>
<td>$500 $500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>Ohoka School</td>
<td>150th celebrations</td>
<td>$500 $500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>Oxford Community Mens Shed</td>
<td>Spring into Oxford event</td>
<td>$500 $500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>Oxford Community Garden</td>
<td>Potting mix and other gardening necessities</td>
<td>$343 $343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>Waimakariri Gorge Golf Club</td>
<td>UV water purification system</td>
<td>$500 $500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>Oxford Playcentre</td>
<td>New vacuum cleaner</td>
<td>$500 $500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>Coastguard North Canterbury</td>
<td>New rescue vessel</td>
<td>$500 $500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>Eyreton Pony Club</td>
<td>Planting of trees</td>
<td>$450 $450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>Clarkville Playcentre</td>
<td>Puzzles</td>
<td>$500 $500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>Oxford Community Trust</td>
<td>Holiday Programme trip to Quail Island</td>
<td>$500 $500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>Aimtru Archers Club Incorporated</td>
<td>Towards the cost of equipment (arrows) to introduce new programmes for people with disabilities</td>
<td>$500 $500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>Oxford Promotions</td>
<td>Signage Oxford Winter Lights festival</td>
<td>$500 $500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Waimakariri Arts Trust - Kaiapoi Arts Expo</td>
<td>Towards advertising</td>
<td>$500 $500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Ohoka Women's Institute</td>
<td>Towards purchase of park bench</td>
<td>$500 $727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,520</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Information to assist groups with their application

The purpose of the Board discretionary grants is to assist projects that enhance community group capacity and/or increase participation in activities.

When assessing grant applications the Board considers a number of factors in its decision making. These include, but are not limited to; type of project, time frame, benefits to the community and costs being contributed. The more information you as a group can provide on the project and benefits to participants the better informed the Board is. You are welcome to include a cover letter as part of your application. The decision to grant funds is the sole discretion of the Board.

The Board cannot accept applications from individuals. All funding is paid to non-profit community based organisations, registered charities or incorporated societies. Council funding is publicly accountable therefore the Board needs to demonstrate to the community where funding is going and what it is being spent on. This is one of the reasons the Board requires a copy of your financial profit/loss statements and balance sheet for the previous/current financial year. Staff cannot process your application without financial records.

The Board encourages applicants, where practically possible, to consider using local businesses or suppliers for any services or goods they require in their application. The Board acknowledges that this may result in a higher quote.

It would be helpful to the Board to receive an expense summary for projects that cost more than the grant being requested to show the areas where funds are being spent and a paragraph on what fund raising the group has undertaken towards the project, or other sources considered (ie voluntary labour, businesses for supplies).

Examples (but not limited to) of what the Board cannot fund:

- Wages
- Debt servicing
- Payment for volunteers (including arrangements in kind eg petrol vouchers)
- Stock or capital market investment
- Gambling or prize money
- Funding of individuals (only non-profit organisations)
- Payment of any legal expenditure or associated costs
- Purchase of land and buildings
- Activities or initiatives where the primary purpose is to promote, commercial or profit-oriented interests
- Payment of fines, court costs or mediation costs, IRD penalties

Examples (but not limited to) of what the Board can fund:

- New equipment
- Toys/educational aids
- Sporting equipment
- Safety equipment
- Costs associated with events
- Community training
Criteria for application

- Grant applications will be considered every month by the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board. Applications are recommended to be received three weeks prior to Board meeting dates for processing.
- Generally funding grants will be a maximum of $500 in any one financial year (July 2019 to June 2020) but the group can apply up to twice in that year, providing it is for different projects.
- The grant funding is limited to projects within the Board area or primarily benefiting the residents of the ward.
- Applications will only be accepted from non-profit community-based organisations, registered charities or incorporated societies.
- The group should have strong links with the Rangiora-Ashley community.
- The application should clearly state the purpose for which the money is to be used.
- The applicant should submit a 1-2 page balance sheet and an income and expenditure statement which shows their current financial assets and liabilities. Applications cannot be processed until financial information is received.
- Where possible, or feasible, applicants must declare other sources from which funding has been applied for, or granted from, for the project being applied to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board.
- The Board supports a wide range of community activities but the application will only be considered if it is deemed of the nature listed in the table of examples of what the Board can fund (see previous page).
- An accountability form must be provided to the Council outlining how the funds were applied, within six months of the grant being allocated, when funds are spent, or prior to a new application. A new application will not be accepted until the previous accountability form has been completed and returned. The group should maintain accurate records around the grant including, but not limited to: receipts, banks statements and invoices. In the event that funds are not spent on the project or activity applied for the recipient may be required to return the grant funding to the Council.
- If the activity/event for which funds have been granted does not take place or if the group does not provide the information to enable the grant to be paid within six months of approval of the grant being notified, then in both cases the application will be regarded as closed and funds released for reallocation by the Board.

What happens now?
Return your completed application form (with financial records and any supporting information which you believe is relevant to this application) to:

Governance Team
Waimakariri District Council
Private Bag 1005
Rangiora 7440
Email: records@wmk.govt.nz

Or hand deliver to:

- Oxford Library & Service Centre, 34 Main Street, Oxford
- Rangiora Service Centre, 215 High Street, Rangiora
- Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre, 176 Williams Street, Kaiapoi

What happens next?

- Your application will be processed and presented to the Board at the next appropriate meeting.
- Following the meeting a letter will be sent to notify you of the Board's decision and if successful an invoice and your organisation's bank account details will be requested.
- On receipt of this information payment will be processed to your organisation's bank account.
Ref: 190624088691
22 July 2019

Mr Gerard
Rangiora-Ashley Community Board
Waimakariri District Council
Private Bag 1005
Rangiora 7440

Dear Jim,

Draft Annual Plan 2019-20

Thank you for taking the time to prepare your submission on the Draft Annual Plan 2019/2020. The Council appreciates your contribution to the annual planning decision-making process and values the opportunity it had to hear submissions from those who attended the hearings.

This letter is to advise you of the Council's decisions in relation to the submission point(s) raised.

Submission Point: Ultra-violet Treatment of Water Supplies - Advance of Government Decision

Summary of submission: The Board supports the district wide funding model noting that the current model has made UV schemes for water supplies such as Garrymere unaffordable. The Board supports the introduction of UV where this is essential to meet Drinking Water Standards but is more reticent regarding the widespread introduction of UV until the Government Policy direction resulting from the outcome of the Havelock North Enquiry is known. Chlorination may be proposed for assessment and consideration.

The Board is also concerned that UV treatment does not eliminate all contaminants and that other methods may be needed and would not wish to see unwarranted expenditure on UV for the wider network until this final direction is identified by Government. Indeed there may be some schemes that do not require any additional treatment.

Council Decision: The Council acknowledges the points you have raised in support of the sharing of the costs of UV treatment across the Council's public water supplies. It is acknowledged while signals have been strong that all water will require treatment, the legislation has not yet come into effect to require this. Council will monitor progress as the situation develops and ultimately will make a decision after receiving advice from staff on timing for the projects. It is expected that this decision will be made early in 2020, with construction budgets for upgrades requiring completion by June 2021 for schemes currently without any treatment. It is noted that construction budgets for the proposed works have been adjusted through a staff submission to the Draft Annual Plan such that construction works are now planned for the 2020/21 year rather than construction being spread over the 2019/20
and 2020/21 years. This will allow time for review of draft Drinking-water Standards which are to be released in 2019, and any amendments to designs following this.

Please note that treatment options are not yet finalised and while UV is likely to be the most effective method, this will be considered at the time.

Ultimately after considering the points raised both in favour of and against the proposal to aggregate UV rating costs, Council decided to proceed with the proposal to aggregate these UV treatment costs into a uniform rate (Option A).

**Submission Point: Environment Canterbury Relationship**

**Summary of submission:** The Board supports Option A but does have a concern that this may also involve the Council picking up some functions and activities that should sit with Environment Canterbury but for whatever reason are not being undertaken. The Board asks that the relationships and responsibilities are carefully defined and monitored to prevent any inadvertent transference of these to WDC without proper funding or acknowledgement.

**Council Decision:** Council is working closely with Environment Canterbury to clarify roles and responsibilities to implement recommendations in the Zone Implementation Programme Addendum (ZIPA). This is to ensure the best outcomes for our freshwater resources and indigenous biodiversity, through identification of gaps and ensuring an equitable increase in resources.

**Submission Point: Tennis Court Development**

**Summary of submission:** The Board is wholly supportive of this proposal and believes that it will stimulate a growth in the sport and participation levels. The public access to the proposed facilities is welcomed and the proximity to the district wide Indoor Court Facility is ideal.

**Council Decision:** The Council received 87 submissions in total regarding the proposed development of a ten court tennis centre proposed for the Coldstream Road sport and recreation area in Rangiora. The Council spent some time considering all of the submissions. After careful deliberation the Council resolved to allocate up to $1m over two financial years as a contribution towards the development. This contribution is subject to the two tennis clubs involved in the development being able to show the Council that they have enough funding to ensure the development is achievable. This means that before the development can proceed the two tennis clubs will have to secure at least an additional $1m to match the funding allocated by the Council.

The Council will now look to develop a formal agreement with the tennis clubs which identifies their responsibilities both financially and operationally. Subject to this agreement being reached and the funding from the tennis clubs being secured the tennis centre development would proceed, subject to the necessary resource consents, with construction starting around October 2020.
**Submission Point:** Regional Public Transport Plan

**Summary of submission:** The Board is NOT supportive of Option A and supports the retention of Status Quo. The Board believes that promotion and evaluation of existing public transport and other transport options such as increasing the take up of the proposed multi occupancy lane on SH1 would be much more appropriate and beneficial.

**Council Decision:** A lot of work has been carried out by the Greater Christchurch Partners on the most efficient use of the Northern Corridor and maximising people moving capacity within the corridor. To help achieve this objective a managed lane is proposed on the northern corridor with a focus on improving car sharing and public transport. To support this objective it is important that Park and Ride facilities are strategically placed within the district. As such investigation to confirm suitable locations and determine the potential staging of facilities needs to be undertaken with a focus on the best outcome and long term plan for our district. Park and Ride is required to support car sharing and public transport which aligns with the objectives of the Greater Christchurch Partnership. Further investigation is required to determine suitable locations and potential future staging of facilities, allowing for future planning.

**Submission Point:** Sustainability

**Summary of submission:** The Board believes that this is an appropriate and fiscally sensible approach. The Board would urge the inclusion in the District Plan of encouraging/mandating solar energy options as well as grey water storage and usage for new builds.

**Council Decision:** Your support for the vision of investing in a sustainable and resilient future for our people, our businesses, our infrastructure and our environment by taking responsibility and showing leadership is appreciated. The Council's Sustainability Strategy is currently being developed and will be adopted by December 2019.

**Submission Point:** Rangiora Traffic Management

**Summary of submission:** With the new school and other businesses due to open this will increase the urgency for the proposed changes in traffic management and prioritisation.

**Council Decision:** Investigation and design for improvements along the Townsend Rd / Fernside Rd / Flaxton Rd / Skewbridge Road route is about to begin with physical works to follow. This project has been included in the current NZTA three year funding cycle (2018-21).

**Submission Point:** Rangiora Cycleways and Walkways

**Summary of submission:** The Board notes the inclusion of significant capital funding for these and is wholly supportive.

**Council Decision:** Staff have been working to develop a network plan which will be work-
shopped with the Community Board prior to being taken out for wider public consultation. Initial priorities are likely to be connecting the shared path from the motorway bridge through to the Passchendaele Path, walking and cycling connections within Woodend and also linking the new multi-use indoor sports facility to East Belt. Staff will work with the Board and discuss the priority routes before going out to wider public consultation.

A portion of this funding is a carry over from 2018/19 as there has been a significant amount of work required to develop an overall network plan, prioritise and gain approvals prior to undertaking any physical works.

**Submission Point: Rates and Fees**

**Summary of submissions:** The Board believes that staff submissions should not increase the rates burden overall. The Board believes that staff bids should have been submitted and assessed as part of the development of the Draft Annual Plan and should not be encouraged at this point.

**Council Decision:** In principal the Council agrees with the submission points made in relation the maintaining the Rates as published. However it also notes a few of the following matters that need to be taken into consideration, that may require adjustment to the rate signaled in the draft annual plan.

The Council, as the board would expect needs to consider the submissions made during the Special Consultation Period, particularly on the topics that are provided and the Council has requested feed back from the community. Although the Council states its preferred option, there may be compelling information presented to the Council that may require changes to the plan and possibly rating.

Given the timing of the Annual Plan timetable, and to provide the Community sufficient time to submit of the draft plan, the draft annual plan that goes out for consultation is formed on the best information known in late January. In relation to staff submissions there is a need to review projects that are underway. This can affect the rating provided in the draft annual plan primarily two ways:

1. Where a capital project is slightly behind or unable to be completed during the current year, it may require reforecasting into the following year or beyond. If not considered this will mean Council may be rating its community too much and therefore an adjustment is placed through the accounts, and;

2. Additional urgent works may arise which require inclusion into the plan and to correctly account and budget for current and draft plan.

These are two example where the Council will need to consider the impacts and balance the projects.

It should be noted that the Council has generally adopted a rate movement as consulted or very close to what was consulted within the draft annual plan in recent years. The rate for the 2019/20 financial year is 4.8% district average, whereas it was signaled in the draft Annual Plan of an average district rate of 4.5%.
Submission Point: Zone Implementation Programme Addendum - Private Wells

Summary of submission: Support Council's preferred option to play a co-ordination role, on top of educator and advisor.

Council Decision: The support for the Council's aim to care for our freshwater resources and indigenous biodiversity by playing a coordination role, in addition to educator and advisor is noted. The Zone Implementation Programme Addendum (ZIPA) funding does support providing guidance to owners of private wells to undertake regular testing and improve water safety.

The Council has adopted Option A for the Waimakariri Water Zone.

Copies of the adopted Annual Plan are available at the Rangiora, Kaiapoi and Oxford service centres and libraries and on the Waimakariri District Council website.

Once again, thank you for your interest and contribution to the development of our District's Annual Plan.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

David Ayers
Mayor
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEMO

FILE NO AND TRIM NO: CUS-03-04 / 190731107187
DATE: 30 July 2019
MEMO TO: The Rangiora-Ashley Community Board
FROM: Maree Harris, Customer Services Manager
SUBJECT: Service Request Reports to 30 June 2019

Service request graphs for the final quarter of 2018/2019 (March to June) are attached for the Board's information.

Bad weather at the start of June resulted in additional requests being recorded for road flooding and drainage.

The increase in recycling requests was due to new bins being ordered and bin size swaps. The introduction of the bin service for rubbish and organics resulted in additional orders for recycling bins from people who did not previously have one, and requests to change the size of recycling bins (generally upsizing).

The first column on the left is the new kerbside bin orders received between April and June, after the initial orders were complete.

The second graph shows the total request activity for the year and shows requests completed within and outside the target timeframes. The kerbside bin requests were entered in the last week of June for completion during July. This is a much higher level of activity than “business as usual” so the standard timeframes were not expected to be met.

If Board members have any specific questions regarding the graphs, or service request issues to follow up, please contact me.

Maree Harris
Customer Services Manager
maree.harris@wmk.govt.nz
2018/19 Service Requests – Total completed

In progress & Completed Service Requests By Date Received

SR Target  Inside Target  Outside Target

Roading: 378
Animal Control: 2498
Parks & Greenspace: 1688
Water: 1453
Kerbside Collection: 444
Recycling: 1211
Noise: 277
Drainage: 95
Health (Environmental Services): 1202
Planning Administration: 1181
Parking: 200
Sewer: 753
Building: 574
Council Property: 632
Complaint about Council: 416
Complainant: 354
Refuse / Rubbish: 233
District Regeneration: 190
Dust: 134
Civil Defence: 134
Aquatic Centres: 134
Rubbish: 134
Business and Centres: 134
Administration / Enquiries: 134
Rural Fire: 134
Online Service Requests: 134
New Connection Applications: 134
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT

FILE NO and TRIM NO: GOV-26-11-06/190805108798

REPORT TO: Rangiora-Ashley Community Board

DATE OF MEETING: 13 August 2019

FROM: Jim Gerard, Chairperson Rangiora-Ashley Community Board

SUBJECT: Chairperson’s Diary for July 2019

1. SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>EVENT / MEETING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 30 June 2019</td>
<td>FORTH (Friends of the Town Hall) AGM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Thursday 4 July 2019| • Opening of Housing NZ’s new accommodation  
|                     | • Waimakariri Youth Stakeholder Forum                                          |
| Friday 5 July 2019 | Youth Development Grant Award’s briefing                                        |
| Monday 8 July 2019 | Attended Selwyn DLC Appeal                                                      |
| Tuesday 9 July 2019| • Pre-board briefing with Thea Kunkel  
|                     | • RPA (Rangiora Promotions Association) Board meeting                           |
| Wednesday 10 July 2019| Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting                                        |
| Sunday 14 July 2019| Kaiapoi Art Expo                                                               |
| Tuesday 16 July 2019| Garrymere Water Public Meeting, Loburn                                          |
| Wednesday 17 July 2019| Waimakariri Sailing Club Quizz night                                          |
| Tuesday 23 July 2019| • Meeting with Grant Macleod/Dan Gordon regarding various  
|                     | Green Space issues.  
|                     | • Community Service Awards Evening.                                            |
| Wednesday 24 July 2019| Timebank Committee meeting                                                     |
| Friday 26 July 2019 | DLC Hearing, Re Plough Hotel.                                                  |

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190805108798.

Jim Gerard QSO
CHAIRPERSON