PRESENT
D Nicholl (Chair), M Brown, W Doody, J Ensor, S Farrell, K Felstead, J Lynn and T Robson.

IN ATTENDANCE
S Markham (Manager Strategy & Engagement), B Rice (Senior Transport Engineer), K Straw (Civil Projects Team Leader), C Brown (Community and Recreation Manager), D Lewis (Construction Management Engineer), E Cordwell (Governance Team Leader), and E Stubbs (Governance Support Officer).

1 APOLOGIES
There were no apologies.

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
Item 7.1 J Lynn as a member of the Ohoka Gate Keepers Lodge Committee.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board – 8 November 2018
Moved J Ensor  seconded S Farrell
(a) THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:
Confirmed the circulated minutes of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting, held 8 November 2018, as a true and accurate record.
CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
An update on the Ohoka Water supply chlorination was requested. E Cordwell advised that a separate meeting had been arranged with the concerned residents, C Roxburgh, D Nicholl, K Felstead and W Doody on 17 December.

An update was requested on the Meyer Place safety barrier as it had not yet been installed. K Felstead advised he had requested an update from J McBride and G Cleary.

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS
5.1 Emily Chapman and colleague from the Oxford Community Trust thanked the Board for its assistance with funding and commented that the funding helped with extras for the holiday programme. E Chapman gave an update on the services the Trust provided to the community. The Trust worked with agencies such as Oranga Tamariki, Youth Programmes and Foodbank. They had 60 volunteers working in different areas. They also worked with the North Canterbury Mini Bus Trust to assist older residents travelling for appointments.

They advised that two years ago they arranged with Satisfy for a regular food parcel. It was offered at a set weekly time and worked well as a method of regularly checking in and catching up with members of the community.
E Chapman advised that another area where they helped in the community was the U Drive programme which was a youth mentor driving program. A group of volunteer mentors took young people to practice their driving once a week. The mentors also underwent training.

W Doody asked if the Trust benefited from the ‘Toot for Tucker’ event. E Chapman replied that everything collected in Oxford would be distributed in Oxford.

J Lynn asked about funding and E Chapman advised they received funding from COGs, Lotteries, Rata, WDC and United Way. They needed to apply annually for funding however Rata had now approved a three yearly grant.

Dave Trayner from Bay Road, Oxford provided a handout (Trim 181210145551). He spoke to the Board about the proposed changes to Bay Road Footpath. He advised that the existing footpath is 3.16m wide and that the footpath is recognised as high-volume pedestrian particularly with the school and showgrounds and oval traffic. Residents had received notice that the Council intended to replace the footpath and as there was an issue with tree roots from house number 14, it proposed the new footpath should have a width of 1.8m with a grass berm along property boundaries.

D Trayner noted that the NZTA Guide for design of Pedestrian Network recommended a minimum width of 2.4m for major pedestrian footpaths. New Zealand Standard 4121:2001 recommended the minimum clear width of 1200mm. D Trayner noted that when recycling and rubbish bins were on the path the 1.8m would be further reduced to 1.07m. The width of 1.8m was the minimum width given by the NZTA guide for the design Pedestrian Network for wheelchair users however it did not take into account space taken up by driveways.

D Trayner respectfully asked the Council to reconsider the proposed changes. He referred to the photo on the last page of the handout which showed a footpath with grass berms and asked if this was the visual appearance people wanted for Oxford.

W Doody asked if Karadean Court facility had been consulted and it was noted they had not provided a response.

There was some discussion about the previous upgrade to parts of Bay Road which was completed in March 2017 at a cost of $30,000.

M Brown asked if there had been a response from the school. D Trayner was not sure if they had made a submission. He noted that close to the school, in place of grass, there was shingle and asked if that was acceptable.

K Straw was invited to the table to speak to the Board to assist with the comments made via the deputation.

K Straw advised that the footpath on Bay Road was part of the kerb and channel renewal programme and was coming to the end of its life. He advised that reducing the paved width to 1.8m was not governed by the effect of tree roots as noted by D Trayner, rather it was based on code of practice. The minimum required width was 1.5m, this was not acceptable for motorised scooters and therefore 1.8m was used. 1.8m was the width used throughout the district including around schools in Rangiora and Victoria Street. Staff had received no negative feedback on that. A grass verge rather than paved was generally accepted.

D Nicholl asked if trip hazards at vehicle entrance ways could be addressed. K Straw commented there were pros and cons regarding the location of kerb/footpath, the aim was to have footpath down the centre with a berm either side.
M Brown asked how many households were affected and how they felt about maintaining a grass berm. D Trayner advised that he understood that it was 9 to 11 households, and they were opposed to looking after a berm.

J Lynn asked about variation of the footpath along the road. K Straw advised that in places the footpath was only 2.1m therefore was left as is. K Straw commented that in September there had been a notice to residents directly affected and there had been no response in terms of maintenance of the grass berm. He noted the information may also have been circulated via social media. D Trayner commented that the consultation document went out during the school holidays, also it was not circulated to users such as the school, A&P show or rugby club.

M Brown asked if the reason for the work was to repair damage from tree roots at one property. K Straw replied no, the work was part of footpath and kerb renewal, the tree roots were an onsite observation.

K Felstead asked if it was a problem to build the footpath to 3.16m. K Straw replied that the cost was similar, engineering advice was that for a footpath over 2.5m a berm should be installed. The existing footpath was being brought into line with recommendations.

W Doody asked if K Straw believed there should have been wider consultation. K Straw commented there were two issues, firstly the desired footpath width and secondly the maintenance of the proposed grass berm.

There was some discussion about the correct engineering standards to be applied.

S Markham commented that with regard to the September consultation there were possibly some other interested parties and consideration should be given whether those views should be included. He suggested that such feedback could be brought together and reflected to the Community Board early in the New Year.

S Markham commented from a staff point of view they needed to consider the precedent effect and variations to the code they followed. In the future how would they deal with requests as renewal projects came up? With more variation there was more cost added across the district.

S Farrell asked if the 1.8m was adequate for people to go down, and why there was a need for a grass berm when it was not down the rest of the street. K Straw reiterated that at greater than 2.5m, Council tried to incorporate a berm, ideally it would be split in two, however the minimum berm width was 0.7m. K Straw advised that residents were expected to maintain a berm, however not all the street was residential.

M Brown noted he agreed with the comments from S Markham and asked about timing if further consultation was undertaken and brought back to the Community Board. K Straw advised that it would delay the work as the tender for five sites had closed and been awarded and work would begin in early January. However it was possible that if Bay Road was placed at the end of that sequence it would provide an opportunity for further thought.

D Trayner commented that, in his view, if the width was below code of practice there was the potential for Council to be liable for accidents.

T Robson asked about how footpath traffic would be managed during construction. K Straw advised that had been part of awarding the contract. The traffic management plan would have pedestrians on a path on the same side of road.

K Straw advised he would circulate a copy of the notice emailed to residents.
Moved M Brown seconded S Farrell

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives the Oxford Residents’ Petition regarding the proposed Bay Road kerb and channel renewal.

CARRIED

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS

There was no adjourned business.

7 REPORTS

7.1 General Landscaping Budget – Grant Stephens (Green Space Community Engagement Officer)

C Brown spoke to the report noting that the topic had been workshopped with the Board and the Board had requested staff take a number of options away to investigate further.

The recommendation was to allocate $1,778 to the Ohoka Gate Keeper’s Lodge and spend the remaining in the Oaks Reserve dog park.

The option of tidying up the car park for Pearson Park had been investigated. An option that was within the General Landscaping budget, was to seal a partial section down the centre of the carpark. Staff were concerned that a single strip would be undermined over time and need repair.

C Brown advised that tree work in the proposed dog park was already scheduled and in the maintenance budget. Other items to be funded were fencing, signage, rubbish bins and dog bag dispenser. The mowing contractor could be requested to mow a ‘track’.

C Brown commented that there were several possible ways the dog park could be configured and there were a couple of examples in the report. As it was not normal for dogs to be allowed in a cemetery then a pedestrian link to Oxford Road for dogs could be created.

C Brown commented that there was a lot of machinery on the land that would need to be removed, in addition the land was currently being leased on a month by month basis.

C Brown noted that there was currently $13,938 available to allocate toward landscape projects, there had been a further $2,530 allocated to the budget than the previous year.

S Farrell asked if it was possible to ‘square off’ the cemetery shape. C Brown replied there was no reason why not.

M Brown asked if there would be ongoing costs. C Brown replied bin emptying would be $500-$1,000 annually. There would also be mowing costs of around $80 annually. The track could be moved to grade 3 and the rest grade 4.

M Brown asked how many people would potentially use the park and C Brown replied that there had been a good response to consultation on the reserve and a lot of that had referred to the dog park. Judging from feedback it was potentially good. There was some risk regarding expectations around path, fencing, lighting and water.

M Brown asked where people would potentially park and C Brown replied along the road, same as for a sports field, there was no money for a carpark. A lot of people had indicated they would walk to the reserve however the
experience in Rangiora was that people drove to the dog park. It provided a social place for people to meet, greet and talk.

M Brown asked if the dog park improvements were approved, would there be an expectation to spend money on it in the future. C Brown replied yes, based on experience in Rangiora, however it was a good problem to have as it was a result of people being active in a community space. E Cordwell commented that in Rangiora the Lions Club had donated shelters and it was not all the result of Council funding. C Brown noted the assistance of the Lions Club in West Oxford Reserve.

D Nicholl commented that it could be used by a lot of people who had not paid for it. C Brown noted that the recreational budget was district wide rated.

S Farrell asked if the whole of the Reserve would be mowed as there were bluebells and daffodils. C Brown replied that the contractors would leave those.

M Brown asked what other projects on the list had staff been requested to investigate. C Brown replied it was seating at the Ohoka Domain and a project at View Hill.

T Robson asked if the Pearson Park Advisory Group were aware they had $31,000 available to allocate to projects within the park. C Brown replied they should be as staff reported to them regularly. It was money remaining from previous unspent budget.

W Doody commented that with the dog park there was an expectation from the community that it would happen. If it did not go ahead was Council going against what ratepayers requested. C Brown commented that the improvements were in the LTP year 9 or 10. While there were people in the community that wanted the dog park no one had approached staff. W Doody advised she had received requests from the community on the park. D Nicholl commented it had been on the agenda for many years.

J Lynn asked whose cost was it to remove the machinery in the Reserve. C Brown replied it was the leaseholders, however it would not be an easy task. An option may be to fence off some of that area with the machinery within existing budgets. It was the same situation when any lease came to an end. Anything left behind was the ownership of the Council.

T Robson requested clarification on the dog bag dispenser, C Brown replied there was a cost of $1,200 for two.

K Felstead asked if the extra $2,530 should be allocated to the Gatekeeper’s Lodge or dog park budget. C Brown commented the funds did not need to be spent in the current recommendation.

There was some discussion around options around layout of the dog park. T Robson commented he liked the link through the centre. C Brown noted that dogs should not walk through the cemetery which was why there was the option of the pedestrian link to Oxford Road, both options were possible. A layout ‘2a’ was described as desirable, this had both a pedestrian link from Oxford Road and a link through the cemetery (no dogs), also the cemetery was ‘squared off’.

S Farrell asked about fencing the pedestrian link through the cemetery with leasehold land on either side, and stock. C Brown noted it was not desirable to graze sheep and walk dogs together, it was possible to modify fences to make the proposal work.

J Lynn asked if it was possible for people to currently walk in the reserve. C Brown replied yes, the proposal was more lifting the level of service. Currently the reserve was rough, once the work was completed, people would be aware
that they could go there and the dog bag collection and mown track would lift the level of service.

Moved M Brown seconded S Farrell

THAT the Oxford - Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 181122137381.
(b) Notes the Board currently has $12,038.00 available to allocate to general landscape projects within the Oxford Ohoka ward.
(c) Approves the allocation of $1,778.00 towards general landscaping around the Ohoka Gate keepers Lodge in Ohoka Domain.

CARRIED

THAT the Oxford - Ohoka Community Board:

Moved T Robson seconded K Felstead

(a) Approves the allocation of $9,200.00 towards projects within The Oaks Reserve in line with Option 2a (and the minuted comments of the Board members) to make it friendlier to dog walkers.

CARRIED

M Brown, J Lynn against

T Robson noted that currently the reserve looked like someone’s property, not a place the public could walk. Signage was necessary to show people it was useable. It was a nice spot and it would be good to see it maintained and used.

M Brown was against the recommendation. He did not believe the parking situation on the road was resolved and a project in View Hill had not been investigated.

J Lynn concurred with M Brown, half of the money was to be spent on signage when it was already being used. He was not convinced of the need.

S Farrell commented that if it removed dog walkers from the Pearson Park area it would be an improvement.

8 CORRESPONDENCE

M Brown advised he had received a letter as a member of the Community Board regarding the need for a bridge crossing at a local ford. This had been passed on to staff.

9 CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT

9.1 Chairperson’s Report for November 2018

D Nicholl added that the Community Board Chairs had had a meeting with the recipients of the Youth Development Grant and commented that they were switched on well organised young people.

Moved M Brown seconded W Doody

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No 181128139705.

CARRIED
The meeting adjourned for a workshop from 8.19pm to 8.45pm.

10 MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

10.1 Youth Council meeting minutes – 25 September 2018.

10.2 Adoption of Reviewed Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan – 2028 and Beyond – report to Council 6 November 2018 (Trim No 181001113553).


10.4 Annual Report for Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust for the Year Ended 30 June 2018 – report to Audit and Risk Committee 20 November 2018 (Trim No 181109132152).

10.5 Capital Projects Report for the period ended 30 September 2018 – report to Audit and Risk Committee 20 November 2018 (Trim No 181109128611).

10.6 Community Facilities – User applications for exemption from fees – report to Community and Recreation Committee 20 November 2018 (Trim No 181109132237).

10.7 Library Update to 31 October 2018 – report to Community and Recreation Committee 20 November 2018 (Trim No 181108131993).

S Farrell asked K Straw about the issues with LED lights in Oxford. K Straw noted that there had been a preliminary investigation. Mainpower had advised there was insufficient space. He was writing a memo to the Community Board looking at possible steps to remedy.

S Farrell asked if the old bulbs could be replaced, K Straw commented the majority of old bulbs had been scrapped however some in good condition had been retained for spares. The cost was $530 to switch to LED, half of which was labour cost. It was potentially feasible to replace.

W Doody asked if bigger LED bulbs could be used. K Straw commented the light behaved differently from LED as there was not the same spill light. Light levels in the street were comparable. The issue was with the pole spacing which had not been flagged by Mainpower.

It was noted a memo would be going to the Community Board.

Moved J Lynn seconded M Brown

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board receives the information in items 10.1-10.7

CARRIED

11 MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE

J Lynn

- Attended All Boards - was interested to hear about the number of social services agencies in the Waimakariri.
- Attended North Canterbury Neighbourhood Support monthly meeting.
- Commented the Swannanoa Cricket Pavilion looked amazing.
• Gatekeepers Lodge Open Day was successful.

T Robson
• Attended Community Board workshop.
• Attended Pearson Park meeting.

S Farrell
• Oxford Promotions Action Committee had been asked by ENC where they thought the charging stations should be and the Committee indicated the Oxford Farmers Market carpark.
• Attended Museum meeting – they would be getting keys shortly. Looking at options around lowering trees in front.
• Attended Pearson Park Advisory Group meeting – A member of the Oxford Farmers Market commented to one of the Pearson Park Advisory Group members some time ago they would like a representative but were told that was unnecessary.
• Expressed concerns regarding monitoring at CLS composting site. The consent was very ‘loose’ on requirements. There was uncertainty around the fire plan. Residents had provided a map showing concerns.

M Brown
• Commented the lights installed at a Tram Road intersection were fantastic.
• Attended a joint meeting of Summerhill and Poyntz Road Advisory Groups. Concerns were raised regarding nitrate levels and there was a request for data on the last round of scientific testing for nitrate levels.
• Asked if there was an update on the Forestry reserve – C Brown would update the Board in February.

K Felstead
Noted Council agenda:
• Deputation M Bate on herbicide spraying.
• Deputation J Holcroft on 5 crossroads concerns.
• Notice of Motion raised by Councilor Williams regarding ban on fireworks. Commented it would be a difficult bylaw to enforce.
• Funding for earthquake repairs
• Additional budget for upgrade of water reservoirs in Kaiapoi.
• Commented Earthquake Prone Buildings were a minimal issue in the Waimakariri District. There were 9 buildings identified with 7 already being worked on.
• Reduced speed limits Rangiora Woodend Road area approved.
• Site layout for Multi-Use stadium approved.
• Adopted ZIPA with some controversy. Some considered rules were not were not far enough fast enough.
• Local Alcohol Policy approved with few changes to the precious policy.
• Rating proposal to aggregate costs of water supply. Treatment was expensive and for example Garrymere scheme had very few ratepayers. The approval to aggregate costs to go forward the Annual Plan was not unanimous.
• Waimakariri / Passchendaele Advisory Group formalised.
• Register of Interests Policy to be updated.
• H & S – no issues to report.
• Regeneration committee would continue to Local Government elections.

W Doody
Tabled her Councillor's Report (Trim No 181210145547). Points noted were:
• Raised Lime scooters as an upcoming issue.
• Commented on the issues with flooding in Oxford during the recent wet weather. Had met with staff and local residents.
• Commented on the importance of the Used Car Safety Rating Guide.
Members also discussed the low light levels of the LED street lighting.

K Straw was able to respond.

S Farrell asked K Straw about the issue of low light levels from the LED street lights in Oxford. K Straw noted that there had been a preliminary investigation and that advice had been received from Mainpower.

S Farrell asked if the old bulbs could be restored. K Straw commented the majority of old bulbs had been scrapped however some in good condition had been retained for spares. The cost was $530 to switch to LED, half of which was labour cost. It was potentially feasible to replace.

W Doody asked if bigger LED bulbs could be used. K Straw commented the light behaved differently from LED as there was not the same spill light. Light levels in the street were comparable. The issue was associated with the pole spacing.

It was noted a memo would be going to the Community Board with further details of the issues and options to resolve the situation.

12 CONSULTATION PROJECTS

13 BOARD FUNDING UPDATE

13.1 Board Discretionary Grant
   Balance as at 31 October 2018: $1,727.

13.2 General Landscaping Fund
   Balance as at 31 October 2018: $12,038.

14 MEDIA ITEMS
   Allocated General Landscaping funds and Oxford Community Trust attendance.

15 MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED

   Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

   Moved W Doody  seconded M Brown
   THAT  the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting.

   CARRIED

   The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter and the specific grounds under section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution, are as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Minutes/Report of:</th>
<th>General subject of each matter to be considered</th>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>Minutes of the Public Excluded Portion of a meeting of the Oxford Ohoka Community Board 8 November 2018 meeting.</td>
<td>Confirmation of Minutes</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Reason for protection of interests</th>
<th>Ref NZS 9202:2003 Appendix A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>Protection of privacy of natural persons</td>
<td>A2(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CLOSE MEETING**

See Public Excluded Agenda (blue papers)

**OPEN MEETING**

16 **QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**

17 **URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**

**NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board is scheduled for Thursday 7 February 2019 commencing at 7.00pm, in the Ohoka Community Hall.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 9.25pm.
CONFIRMED

__________________________
Chairperson

__________________________
Date

Workshop

- Bill Rice (Senior Roading Engineer) – Cycleways and Walkways
- Members Forum