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WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

A meeting of the WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL will be held in the COUNCIL CHAMBER, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA on TUESDAY 6 AUGUST 2019 at 1.00PM.

Sarah Nichols
GOVERNANCE MANAGER

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

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
   Conflicts of interest (if any) to be reported for minuting.

3. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

   COMMUNITY SERVICE AWARD PRESENTATION
   Mr Gavin Reed will receive an Award for Services to the Community.

4. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
   4.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on 2 July 2019

   RECOMMENDATION

   THAT the Council:
   (a) Confirms as a true and correct record the circulated minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Tuesday 2 July 2019.

5. DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS
   5.1 Pegasus Community Centre Subcommittee (Roger Rule, Ronel Stephens and Rhonda Mather)

   The presenters will convey information on the Pegasus Community Centre usage and proposed expansion plans.
6. **ADJOURNED BUSINESS**
Nil.

7. **REGENERATION REPORTS**
Nil

8. **REPORTS**

8.1 **Pegasus Community Centre – Grant MacLeod (Community Greenspace Manager)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190725104368.

(b) **Approves** that staff engage with a contractor to enable the list of works as identified in attachment i Trim 190725104368 to proceed.

(c) **Notes** that this list is to be agreed with lessor prior to any work being undertaken.

(d) **Notes** that the list of works exceeds the $10,000, however, this is a contribution from Council to enable the works to happen. The Pegasus Residents Group also currently holds funding received from previous bookings to assist with this building fit out.

(e) **Circulates** this report to the Woodend Sefton Community Board.

8.2 **Waimakariri Public Arts Trust – Chris Brown (Manager Community and Recreation)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190724103838.

(b) **Notes** that the Community was consulted on the establishment of a Public Arts Trust as part of the 2018 LTP.

(c) **Approves** the Waimakariri Public Arts Trust Deed (Trim 190730106137).

(d) **Approves** the formation of a Public Arts Trust.

(e) **Approves** staff calling for expressions of interest from the Community for Trustees.

(f) **Notes** that a report will be prepared for the new Council to consider the appointment of Trustees and legally forming the Trust.

(g) **Circulates** this report to the Community Boards.

8.3 **Smith Street Well 5 – Rangiora Water Supply – Colin Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:
Receives report No. 190701092611.

Notes that the 5th bore drilled at Smith Street in Kaiapoi for the Rangiora water supply was successful in finding a water supply source of sufficient quality to meet the DWSNZ, but that the manganese levels were close to the guideline value which warrant further consideration.

Notes that the operation of the well can be managed to minimise the risk of any aesthetic issues resulting from this source, while still ensuring it provides its primary intended function of providing for growth on the Rangiora scheme while still having the required level of resilience.

Notes that it is estimated that a further $200,000 will be required to complete the project, which is allowed for within existing budgets.

Approves staff proceeding with the final stages of physical works for the project, which is budgeted and programmed for completion in the current financial year.

Circulates this report to the Rangiora-Ashely Community Board and the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board for their information.

8.4. Tuahiwi to Ashley River Speed Limit Review Approval to Consult – Bill Rice (Senior Transportation Engineer) and Nick Rochford (Graduate Engineer)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190723103362

(b) Approves consultation being carried out on the proposed speed limit changes summarised below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Current (km/h)</th>
<th>Proposed (km/h)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coldstream Road, from the end of the existing 50km/h limit to the eastern end of the Multi-Use Sports Facility.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coldstream Road from the eastern end of the Multi-Use Sports Facility to Smarts Road.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf links Road entire length</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marchmont Road entire length</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smarts Road entire length</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulls Road entire length</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wards Road entire length</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus Boulevard from SH1 to the Infinity Drive Roundabout</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preeces Road entire length</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Pa Road entire length</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Recommended Speed Limits, Tuahiwi Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Current (km/h)</th>
<th>Proposed (km/h)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td>Proposed Speed limits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuahiwi Road from Boys Road to a point 100m north west of Turiwhaia Road</td>
<td>80 80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuahiwi Road from a point 100m north west of Turiwhaia Road for a length of 500 m</td>
<td>80 60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuahiwi Road from a point 130m South of Greens Road to a point 100m North of Bramleys Road.</td>
<td>50 40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okahau Road entire length</td>
<td>80 80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikoruru Road entire length</td>
<td>100 80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsh Road entire length</td>
<td>100 80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camside Road entire length</td>
<td>100 80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngs Road entire length</td>
<td>100 80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turiwhaia Road entire length</td>
<td>100 80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topito Road entire length</td>
<td>80 80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greens Road entire length</td>
<td>100 80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Pouapatuki Road entire length</td>
<td>100 80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Bush Road entire length</td>
<td>100 80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa Road entire length</td>
<td>100 80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cox Road entire length</td>
<td>100 80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Road entire length</td>
<td>100 80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bramleys Road entire length</td>
<td>100 80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revells Road entire length</td>
<td>100 80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) **Notes** the consultation on this proposal will be carried out between 7 August and 9th September 2019.

(d) **Notes** that this report will be presented to the Community Boards at their August meetings.

(e) **Notes** that the results of the consultation, and the final speed limit proposals will be presented to the Community Boards prior to coming to Council for approval.

(f) **Notes** that any submissions on the proposal will be taken into account before the final speed limit change proposals are presented to the Council for approval.
8.5 **Regional Policy Statement Change – Trevor Ellis (Development Planning Manager)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190729105732.

(b) Supports draft changes to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement as set out in Attachments (i) (Trim 190730105991) and (ii) (Trim 190730105993)

(c) Supports application to the Minister for the Environment to agree to use of the Streamlined Planning Process to make these amendments to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement

(d) Delegates to the Mayor and Chief Executive to provide any specific comments on the pre-notification draft changes to the RPS by Friday 16 August 2019.

8.6 **Silverstream Subdivision – Floor Level Issue Outcome – Gerard Cleary (Manager Utilities and Roading)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190726104786.

(b) Notes that the purpose of the building consents has been achieved in relation to floor levels for all properties in the Silverstream subdivision.

(c) Notes that all affected property owners have been advised of the outcome of this issue.

(d) Notes that staff will continue to work to amend the consent notices for the 40 properties that have floor levels lower than the current consent notice. When this has been completed Staff will report this to Council.

(e) Circulates a copy of this report to the Kaiapoi Tuahiwi Community Board.
8.7 Clarification of “One-Up” approval to Procurement and Contract Management Policy – Jeff Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190710097054

(b) Approves the following clause to be included in the Procurement and Contract Management Policy (Trim 190516069552)

   Our Procurement practices should demonstrate objectivity and integrity in the sourcing and approval of goods or services. One up approval is also taken to include one sideways - that is as long as the approver has appropriate Delegated Financial Authority, has adequate knowledge of the transaction, and is not the initiator then they can approve the award of the provision for goods or services and also approve acceptance of the price. They do not need to be the next level up in terms of the staff structure.

(c) Notes that the Policy will undertake a further post review and submitted to the Council by February 2020, once the Policy has been in operation for this time.

8.8 Draft submission in response to the Productivity Commission’s Draft Report on Local Government Funding and Financing – Geoff Meadows (Policy Manager)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No.190723103023;

(b) Approves the draft submission in response to the Productivity Commission’s Draft Report on Local Government Funding and Financing;

(c) Circulates the submission to Community Boards for their information.

8.9 Glyphosate – Review of Council practices – Grant MacLeod (Greenspace Manager) and Sophie Allen (Water Environment Advisor)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190702093110.

(b) Notes that WDC staff will scope the creation of an online herbicide usage map for the general public to view information of where, and when, herbicide is used in public areas.

(c) Notes that the online herbicide map creation, if progressed, will be prioritised by the Geospatial Team.

(d) Notes that signage requirements are based on the manufacturer’s instructions regarding the withholding period.
(e) **Notes** that all Council departments will use a joint 'No Spray' register, where private landowners who sign up do not receive spray in the close vicinity of their property.

(f) **Notes** that specific Health and Safety spray audits are to be carried out by contractors, with external auditing by Council staff, for signage and Personal Protective Equipment usage with glyphosate and other herbicide spraying.

(g) **Notes** that WDC staff intend to include conditions in Service Contracts for required use by contractors of the online herbicide usage map (if progressed), and the 'No Spray' register.

(h) **Notes** that WDC staff will continue to carefully consider options for reduction of the use of glyphosate, as a precautionary principle.

(i) **Notes** the update on glyphosate alternatives and feasibility of their use.

(j) **Circulates** this report to the Community Boards, Drainage Advisory Groups and the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee for their information.

### 8.10 Mayoral Forum decision on the Canterbury Water Management Strategy (CWMS) Fit for the Future Project – Geoff Meadows (Policy Manager)

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No.190724103611;

(b) **Notes** the recommendations of Canterbury Mayoral Forum resolved on 24 May 2019 on the CWMS Fit for Future Project, in particular to:

1. **note** that the Canterbury Mayoral Forum has approved CWMS goals for 2025 and 2030;

2. **note** that the Canterbury Mayoral Forum has asked Environment Canterbury to work with territorial authorities, Ngāi Tahu, industry and community partners to develop a Regional Work Programme, with an implementation plan and monitoring framework to deliver the goals;

3. **note** that implementation to deliver the goals will have resource implications that Councils will need to consider in adopting Annual Plans for 2020/21 and Long Term Plans for 2021–31.

(c) **Circulates** this report to Community Boards for their information.

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No 190515068678.

(b) Adopts the reviewed policies:

- S-CP 5505 Vandalism Intelligence Reward Policy
- S-CP 1040 Council Director/Trustee/Representation, Appointment and Remuneration Policy
- S-CP 4460 Political Hoardings on Council owned or administered Land and Buildings Policy

(c) Notes the amended policies become Council policy on adoption.

8.12 **Solid Waste Contracts Implementation – Kitty Waghorn (Solid Waste Asset Manager)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190724104090.

(b) Notes that around 10,660 rubbish bins and 8,400 organics bins have been delivered as part of the initial bin roll-out.

(c) Notes that 1,500 bins (8% of the 19,060 bins delivered) were requested between 1 March and 30 June 2019.

(d) Notes that a further 520 bins have been requested for 325 properties between 1 and 23 July, which are subject to a delivery charge of $65 including GST.

(e) Notes that bin cancellations will not incur a removal fee provided they are cancelled by 30 September 2019.

(f) Notes that a bin removal fee will be charged for bins cancelled from 1 October 2019 onwards.

(g) Notes that when the bin service is cancelled the bin collection rate is not refunded for the current year, and the bin collection rate will not be charged from 1 July in the following year.

(h) Notes that the 3 month “free” bin swap timeframe for requests is still in place from 1 July to 30 September 2019, but the contractor will be in a position to begin swapping bins from early August rather than the initially signalled starting date of October 2019.

(i) Approves staff continuing to charge existing approved commercial collection customers the ‘high user’ discount gate fee of $231.90/tonne including GST until 30 June 2020.

(j) Circulates report No. 190724104090 to the Community Boards.
8.13. Local Government Excellence Programme (LGEP) – Second Assessment – Simon Markham (Manager Strategy and Engagement)

RECOMMENDATION
THAT the Council:
(a) Receives report No. 190725104186.
(b) Notes the work that has been progressed in relation to the recommended areas for improvement, intended to be substantially completed by March 2020.
(c) Advises LGNZ it is recommending to the incoming Council that it take part in a second assessment in March 2020.

9. HEALTH AND SAFETY
9.1 Health and Safety Report to Council July 2019 – Jim Palmer (Chief Executive)

RECOMMENDATION
THAT the Council:
(a) Receives report No 190723102734.
(b) Notes that there are no significant Health and Safety issues at this time, and that WDC is, so far as is reasonably practicable, compliant with the PCBU duties of the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015.

10. MATTERS REFERRED FROM COMMITTEES AND COMMUNITY BOARDS
Nil.

11. REPORTS FOR INFORMATION

11.1 Review of the Gambling Venue and Board Venue Policies – Lynley Beckingsale (Policy Analyst) and Nick Harrison (Manager Planning and Regulation)
(refer to attached copy of report no. 190606080102 to the District Planning and Regulation Committee meeting of 18 June 2019).

RECOMMENDATION
(a) THAT the information in Item 11.1 be received.

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council

(a) Receives for information, the approved Statement of Intent beginning 1 July 2019, Approved Enterprise North Canterbury’s Business Plan and Promotion of Waimakariri District Business Plan for 2910/20.

12. COMMITTEE MINUTES FOR INFORMATION

12.1 Minutes of meeting of the Utilities and Roading Committee held on 18 June 2019

356 – 368

12.2 Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri Youth Council held on 2 July 2019

369 - 373

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the information in items 12.1 to 12.2 be received.

13. COMMUNITY BOARD MINUTES FOR INFORMATION

13.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board held on 4 July 2019

374 - 380

13.2 Minutes of a meeting of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board held on 7 July 2019

381 - 387

13.3 Minutes of a meeting of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board held on 10 July 2019

388 - 395

13.4 Minutes of a meeting of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board held on 15 July 2019

396 - 403

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the information in items 13.1 to 13.4 be received.

14. CORRESPONDENCE
15. MAYOR’S DIARY

15.1 Mayor’s Diary 25 June – 29 July 2019

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report no. 190619086528.

16. COUNCIL PORTFOLIO UPDATES

16.1 Iwi Relationships – Mayor Ayers
16.2 Canterbury Water Management Strategy – Councillor Stewart
16.3 International Relationships – Deputy Mayor Felstead
16.4 Regeneration (Kaiapoi) – Councillor Blackie

17. QUESTIONS

(under Standing Orders)

18. URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS

(under Standing Orders)

19. MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Minutes/Report of</th>
<th>General subject of each matter to be considered</th>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>Minutes Public Excluded Portion of Council meeting of 2 July 2019</td>
<td>Confirmation of Minutes</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>Minutes Public Excluded Portion of Council meeting of 16 July 2019</td>
<td>Confirmation of Minutes</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>Minutes Public Excluded Portion of Utilities and Roading Committee meeting 18 June 2019</td>
<td>Minutes received for information</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This resolution is made in reliance on section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, and the particular interest or interests protected by section 6 or section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Reason for protection of interests</th>
<th>Ref NZS 9202:2003 Appendix A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19.1 – 19.3</td>
<td>Protection of privacy of natural persons. To carry out commercial activities without prejudice</td>
<td>A2(a) A2(b)ii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CLOSED MEETING**

See Public Excluded Agenda

**OPEN MEETING**

20. **NEXT MEETING**

The next scheduled ordinary meeting of the Council is at 1.00pm on Tuesday 3 September 2019 in the Council Chambers.
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA, ON TUESDAY 2 JULY 2019 COMMENCING AT 1.10PM

PRESENT:

Mayor D Ayers, Deputy Mayor K Felstead, Councillors N Atkinson (until 2.56pm), K Barnett, A Blackie, D Gordon, J Meyer, S Stewart and P Williams.

IN ATTENDANCE:

S Markham (Acting Chief Executive), C Brown (Manager Community and Recreation), C Sargison (Manager Special Projects), J McBride (Roading and Transport Manager), M Harris (Customer Service Manager), T Ellis (Development Planning Manager), S Nichols (Governance Manager), C Wood (Principal Policy Analyst – District Development), S Nichols (Governance Coordinator).

BLESSING AND UNVEILING OF ARTWORK IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER

Te Maire Tau was present to perform a blessing on the new artwork in the Council Chambers. The artwork was then unveiled by the designer Nathan Pohio, who spoke on its origins and significance to Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga. This artwork has been placed in the Chambers by the Waimakariri Art Collection Trust, who retain ownership. Also present for the blessing and unveiling were Brian Houtl (Art Collection Trust Administrator), and Kathy Anderson (Trustee). Mayor Ayers and Councillor Blackie are also Trustees of the Art Collection Trust.

Following the unveiling, the Council Waiata group sang “Toia Mai Te Waka Nei”.

1. APOLOGIES

Moved Mayor Ayers seconded Councillor Blackie

THAT an apology for absence be received and sustained from Councillor Doody and from Councillor Atkinson for early departure (at 3.30pm).

CARRIED

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

There were no conflicts of interest.

3. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There were no acknowledgements.

4. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

4.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on 4 June 2019

Moved Councillor Felstead seconded Councillor Williams

THAT the Council:

(a) Confirms as a true and correct record the circulated minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Tuesday 4 June 2019.

CARRIED
4.2 Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on 18 June 2019

Moved Councillor Barnett seconded Councillor Felstead

THAT the Council:

(b) Confirms as a true and correct record the circulated minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Tuesday 18 June 2019.

CARRIED

MATTERS ARISING

There were no matters arising.

5. DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

There were no deputations or presentations.

6. ADJourned BUSINESS

There was no adjourned business.

7. REGENERATION REPORTS

Nil

8. REPORTS

8.1 Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update Whakahangai O Te Horapa Nohoanga – Cameron Woods (Principal Policy Analyst – District Development)

Cameron Wood presented this report for the Council to consider the recommendations of the Hearings Panel for Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update Whakahangai O Te Horapa Nohoanga. The significance of the stage that this project has reached coming to Council was acknowledged. The report and attachments were taken as read.

Councillor Barnett asked about the possibility of growth extending beyond the projections in the district, and what is planned for in relation to adequate future housing. C Wood noted that under the National Policy Statement, there are some safeguards in place and with minimum targets being specified there is some flexibility in place. Under the NPS there has to be a housing capacity assessment done at least every three years and this must be done in this district by the end of 2020.

Moved Councillor Atkinson seconded Mayor Ayers

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190613083249.

(b) Receives the Recommendations from the Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee to:

ii. Adopt the final version of Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update Whakahāngai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga as recommended by the Hearings Panel as the joint future development strategy for Greater Christchurch for the purposes of meeting the Council’s obligation to produce a future development strategy under policies PC12 to PC14 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity; and

iii. Set and incorporate the territorial authority housing targets for the district as identified in Table 2 of Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update Whakahāngai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga within respective district plans, in accordance with policies PC9 and PC11 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity at the Council meeting that considers adopting Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update Whakahāngai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga.


(d) **Adopt** the final version of Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update Whakahāngai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga as recommended by the Hearings Panel on Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update Whakahāngai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga and endorsed by the Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee as the joint future development strategy for Greater Christchurch for the purposes of meeting the Council’s obligation to produce a future development strategy under policies PC12 to PC14 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity.

(e) **Set and incorporate** the territorial authority housing targets for the district as identified in Table 2 of Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update Whakahāngai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga within the Operative Waimakariri District Plan, in accordance with policies PC9 and PC11, of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity.

(f) **Delegate** to the Chief Executive to make changes of minor effect to the final version of Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update Whakahāngai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga following approval from the Independent Chair of the Greater Christchurch Partnership.

**CARRIED**

Councillor Atkinson said that there has been a significant amount of work by a large group of people to get this matter to this point. There have been many contributions from people with a wide range of thoughts. Councillor Atkinson noted that there is a matrix of further work which has been agreed by all the partners in this agreement. Matters noted were the density figures of housing, and also the downstream effects. Councillor Atkinson is very pleased to support this recommendation.

Mayor Ayers, in seconding the recommendation, thanked staff and also Councillor Atkinson for the work that has been put into this matter. Thanks were also extended to Councillor Felstead as a committee member of the Greater Christchurch Partnership. Noted that there is no new land beyond the agreed
infrastructure boundary that has been identified, while the District Development Strategy does address this long term matter. It is clear through this process, the Council need to think about the impacts on transport in terms of roading and public transport. Mayor Ayers commented on the new subdivisions in the district, with higher density housing that this can have implications on the Council, and the services to be provided.

Councillor Gordon also extended thanks to staff and the Mayor and Councillors for the work undertaken on this matter to this point. Councillor Gordon noted his involvement in the early stages of this Greater Christchurch partnership in 2005, and that it is important to maintain the relationships with the partners.

Councillor Barnett supports this recommendation, believing this is a sensible planning framework going forward. Connectivity between districts is important. Councillor Barnett noted the change in the growth patterns and traffic patterns following the 2010/2011 earthquakes and believes there needs to be flexibility should there be any need for change in the future.

In reply, Councillor Atkinson noted that this will be looked at again in 2022. He noted the importance of the original Urban Development Strategy document which was valuable at the time of the earthquakes and this document was even acknowledged by central government. Working collectively is so important for this partnership. Councillor Atkinson believes this Council has superior staff and acknowledged the support provided by them, without question. He thanked Simon Markham, Trevor Ellis and Cameron Wood for their support. He sincerely thanked all the other people involved especially the CE and the Independent Chair of the Partnership, and emphasised the importance for the Greater Christchurch partnership to stand strong.

Mayor Ayers also acknowledged the Chair of the Greater Christchurch Partnership Bill Wasley and his Chairmanship and mediation skills in running the meetings of the partnership.

8.2. Canterbury Museum Standing Committee Membership – Jeff Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support)

Sarah Nichols (Governance Manager) presented this report in the absence of J Millward. The report is seeking additional membership to the Canterbury Museum Trust Board Standing Committee that will be established to discuss how $3.7m funding shortfall can be achieved prior to the 2020/21 draft Annual Plan. This request is for one Councillor and one staff member to join the standing committee.

There were no questions.

Moved Councillor Gordon seconded Councillor Atkinson

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190618085379.

(b) Appoints Deputy Mayor Kevin Felstead (Finance portfolio holder) to the Standing Committee being established by the Canterbury Museum Trust Board to discuss how the $3.7m funding shortfall can be achieved prior to the 2020/21 draft Annual Plan.

(c) Appoints Jeff Millward, Manager Finance & Business Support to the Standing Committee being established by the Canterbury Museum Trust Board to discuss how the $3.7m funding shortfall can be achieved prior to the 2020/21 draft Annual Plan.
(d) **Notes** the appointments are also being requested independently from the other contributing authorities, the Christchurch City Council, Hurunui District Council and Selwyn District Council.

CARRIED

Councillor Gordon in support of this recommendation, notes that Councillor Felstead has already represented the Council when presenting the Council's submission to the Museum.

8.3. **Renewal of the DVR and Rates Collection Agreement with Environment Canterbury – Maree Harris (Customer Services Manager)**

Maree Harris (Customer Service Manager) presented this report requesting an extension of the agreement of the Council to the renewal of the Council's rates collection agreement with Environment Canterbury (ECan). This agreement has been in existence since the Regional Council was set up in 1989.

Moved Councillor Williams seconded Councillor Atkinson

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190619086630.

(b) **Agrees** to the extension of the DVR and Rates Collection Agreement with Environment Canterbury for a term of 10 years from 1 July 2019, and authorises the Manager Finance and Business Support to sign the agreement on behalf of the Waimakariri District Council.

CARRIED

8.4. **Pre-Election Report 2019 – Jim Palmer (Chief Executive)**

Sarah Nichols (Governance Manager) presented this report to the Council, in the absence of Chief Executive Jim Palmer. The Pre-Election Report is required by law to be prepared and be available for electoral candidates and is presented here for the information of the Council. This document will be available next week for the candidates information evening and available on the Council website.

Moved Councillor Barnett seconded Councillor Brine

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190618085424.

(b) **Notes and receives** the 2019 Pre-Election Report (Trim 190620086739)

(c) **Notes** the 2019 Pre-Election Report is required to be prepared and available for potential electoral candidates two weeks prior to nomination closure. It will be available from 8 July 2019, noting a Candidate Information Evening is being held on 9 July 2019.

CARRIED
8.5. **Review of Register of Interests – Sarah Nichols (Governance Manager)**

S Nichols presented this report, which is a twice yearly review of the Register of Interests for the Mayor and Councillors. It was noted that this is a living document and each Councillor can decide if they wish to disclose membership of committees or groups.

Moved Councillor Meyer seconded Councillor Atkinson

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190618085401.

(b) **Reviews** the Register of Interests content, recording any amendments.

(c) **Notes** a Register of Interests will be republished in the August 2019 agenda and notes the Register of Interests is listed on the Council website.

(d) **Notes** the Register will be next reviewed by the new Council in December 2019.

(e) **Notes** a Register of Interests will be activated for the Community Boards in December 2019.

**CARRIED**

8.6. **Submission to the Environment Select Committee on the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Bill – Geoff Meadows (Policy Manager)**

S Markham (Manager Strategy and Engagement) presented this report on behalf of G Meadows. This matter was workshopped with the Council in recent weeks, and this report seeks to get Council approval to make the submission to the Environment Select Committee on the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Bill. Any reservations or concerns of Council on where costs lie, is still a significant issue to be worked through and could take some time.

Councillor Gordon noted that from the discussion held in the Council workshop recently, there should be the inclusion of the support from this Council of the by-partisan approach and that there is a panel of experts.

Moved Mayor Ayers seconded Councillor Gordon

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No.190612082497.

(b) **Approves** the submission on the *Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Bill*.

(c) **Circulates** the submission to Community Boards for their information.

**CARRIED**

Mayor Ayers supports the comments of Councillors Gordon and Barnett relating to the submission.

Councillor Barnett said is probably the most important report on the agenda today, with the future effects of climate change and would like to make it clear that all local government needs to be having the conversation about climate change.

9. **HEALTH AND SAFETY**

S Markham presented this report on behalf of J Palmer, highlighting the work-related incidents that were noted in the report.

Moved Councillor Felstead seconded Councillor Barnett

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No 190617085189.

(b) Notes that there are no significant Health and Safety issues at this time, and that WDC is, so far as is reasonably practicable, compliant with the PCBU duties of the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015.

CARRIED

10. MATTERS REFERRED FROM COMMITTEES AND COMMUNITY BOARDS

10.1 Kaiapoi Town Centre – Request to Undertake Footpath Improvements on Williams Street at the Charles Street intersection – Joanne McBride (Roading and Transport Manager) and Gerard Cleary (Manager Utilities and Roading)

J McBride presented this report which had previously gone to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board seeking funding for footpath improvements adjacent to the Riverview development.

Councillor Atkinson questioned the source of budget for this work and suggested that it should be coming from the Roading budget, rather than the Kaiapoi Town Centre budget. J McBride said this matter had been investigated and this is where the budget should be coming from for the high amenity footpath. It was agreed that there will be further workshop discussion with the Community Board on this matter.

Moved Councillor Atkinson seconded Mayor Ayers

THAT the Council:

(a) Approves the extension of the high amenity paving to tie in with the new Riverview development boundary;

(b) Approves $22,000 of budget for the extension of the high amenity footpaths outside Riverview Development from the Kaiapoi Town Centre budget;

(c) Notes that following this allocation there will be $572,000 unallocated in the Kaiapoi Town Centre Budget and that future projects have been identified to be carried out from this unallocated budget;

(d) Notes that the timing of the work will need to be carried out to prior to the opening of the new development on 1 September 2019;

(e) Circulates this report to the Utilities and Roading Committee for information.

CARRIED

Councillor Atkinson noted there is already this high amenity footpath in other areas in Kaiapoi, but suggests it is important for the whole town centre to be consistent with any upgrades. Businesses have invested millions of dollars in our towns and the Council needs to be keeping up with this investment, noting the higher level of service that is now expected.
10.2 **Risk Assessment of arsenic in groundwater for the wider Kaiapoi area – Sophie Allen (Water Environment Advisor)**

S Allen and K Simpson presented this report, which had previously been presented to the Utilities and Roading Committee June meeting. Funding for the cost of this work is not included in the current budget and staff are looking at a sole source supplier for this contract to test private well water supplies.

Councillor Stewart questioned how are people with private wells on their properties going to know that there have been changes in arsenic levels in the water, if they are not showing any health symptoms. S Allen responded that it has been modelled where the reduced (low oxygen) groundwater areas are, which are generally along the coastal part of our District. People in this area should therefore be aware in this reduced groundwater zone that they should test for arsenic regularly. K Simpson also said there could be a broader approach for people to have their wells tested more regularly. People need to be more mindful of how susceptible private wells are to contaminants.

Councillor Stewart noted that the Council has been instructed to test for arsenic levels which is not budgeted for. What does the Council have in mind should there be a need in future for testing for nitrate levels in water supplies. K Simpson noted that the Council’s role under these circumstances would need to be in line with the Canterbury Land and Water Plan.

Councillor Blackie noted the reference to the report which states that Council would tell people not to drink water out of their own wells. K Simpson noted that this wording is a direct quote from the Medical Officer of Health. The Council can warn people not to use it, but can’t say don’t use it. It is about providing community based advice as well – including suggesting options for water treatment on their own wells, or there could be the possible solution of changing to a community water supply.

Councillor Barnett said the testing of the water and advice given comes from this Council and the consent for taking the water comes from ECAn. K Simpson noted there is a “grey area” as to who is responsible for private water supplies, as a consent to take water from ECAn does not mean the Regional Council need to look at whether the water is potable. The Medical Officer of Health is also involved in this matter. With the involvement of multiple organisations, staff believe it is the role of the District Council to coordinate this.

Moved Councillor Stewart seconded Councillor Williams

**THAT** the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190527075121.

(b) Notes the scope of the risk assessment, which aims to define an area(s) where any elevated risk of arsenic in groundwater exists, which includes testing for arsenic in 50 private wells and geochemical data interpretation for the wider Kaiapoi area.

(c) Approves an additional budget of $37,000 from the general rate to be allocated under the Environmental Health account, against the Environmental Surveys GL (10.571.829.2465), for a risk assessment of arsenic in groundwater for the wider Kaiapoi area.

(d) Notes that approximately $12,000 of the allocated budget will be for Water Unit sampling and laboratory analysis of 30 private wells. Approximately $15-20,000 of the allocated budget is for a consultant to undertake data analysis, existing geochemical data review, report writing and recommendations. The remaining $5,000 is for project contingency.
(e) **Notes** that specific communication will be undertaken by WDC staff with individual landowners and general communication with the wider community following obtaining test results and the risk assessment.

(f) **Notes** that a sole source supplier will be approached for the data analysis role, due to the limited market of suppliers for the service, and existing knowledge about arsenic within groundwater in the District.

CARRIED

Councillor Stewart is in support of this well water testing, endorses the additional budget and encourages others to support this recommendation. Councillor Stewart would also like to see some testing of the impact of contaminated water on stock and also welcomes clarification on who is responsible for the keeping of a potable water supply to a potable standard.

Councillor Williams believes it is important to keep the members of the community safe.

Councillor Barnett has concerns with the three authorities involved in water supplies and sought clarification on the responsibilities of these three different organisations. Councillor Barnett said there is also a need to be sure that this is funded by the right authority for the right amount.

In response, Councillor Stewart also endorses that the Council needs to clarify upfront who is responsible for what, before this issue expands.

11. REPORT FOR INFORMATION FROM KAIAPOI-TUAHIWI COMMUNITY BOARD

11.1 **Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan – Update Report – Simon Hart (Business and Centres Manager)**

Moved Councillor Meyer seconded Councillor Gordon

(a) **THAT** report no. 190606079809 be received for information.

CARRIED

12. COMMITTEE MINUTES FOR INFORMATION

12.1. **Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri Youth Council held on 30 April 2019**

12.2. **Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri Youth Council held on 28 May 2019**

12.3. **Minutes of a meeting of the Audit and Risk Committee held on 21 May 2019**

12.4. **Minutes of meeting of the Community and Recreation Committee held on 21 May 2019**

12.5. **Minutes of meeting of the District Planning and Regulation Committee held on 18 June 2019**

Moved Councillor Felstead seconded Councillor Brine

**THAT** the information in items 12.1 to 12.5 be received.
13. COMMUNITY BOARD MINUTES FOR INFORMATION

13.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board held on 6 June 2019

13.2 Minutes of a meeting of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board held on 10 June 2019

13.3 Minutes of a meeting of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board held on 12 June 2019

Councillor Barnett noted the Board had allocated all its Discretionary Grant.

13.4 Minutes of a meeting of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board held on 17 June 2019

Moved Councillor Barnett seconded Councillor Felstead

THAT the information in items 13.1 to 13.4 be received.

CARRIED

14. CORRESPONDENCE

There was no correspondence.

15. MAYOR’S DIARY

15.1 Mayor’s Diary 28 May – 24 June 2019

Moved Councillor Felstead seconded Councillor Brine

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report no. 190619086528.

CARRIED

16. COUNCIL PORTFOLIO UPDATES

16.1. Iwi Relationships – Mayor Ayers

Mayor Ayers noted the presence of Te Maire Tau at the blessing of the artwork at the meeting today. It is hoped that the Runanga appointments to the Mahi Tahi Committee will be made at an Executive meeting this weekend.

16.2. Canterbury Water Management Strategy – Councillor Stewart

There has been no meeting of the committee in the past month. A Committee workshop was held to discuss what worked and didn’t work with the ZIP Addendum process. Comments from members indicated that the process was too rurally focused and there should be more urban focused.

There has been a refresh of committee members with new members recommended for appointment. A report will come to Council seeking approval of these appointments.
Noted the film produced by Frank Films with Alistair Humphreys talking on water quality.

16.3. International Relationships – Deputy Mayor Felstead

Councillor Felstead noted a meeting of the Waimakariri-Passchendaele Advisory Group was held in June. The Enshi Advisory Group will meet soon and noted that the children’s art exhibition will go on display from 15 August.

16.4. Regeneration (Kaiapoi) – Councillor Blackie

Councillor Blackie advised the July meeting of the Regeneration group was cancelled. An update was provided on the dredging in the Kaiapoi River. There has been problems with the bund in the downstream dredging, with the recent heavy rainfall.

There has been an issue with the development of the playgrounds and some additional work with the soil has needed to be undertaken by the contractors.

17. QUESTIONS
(under Standing Orders)

There were no questions.

18. URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS
(under Standing Orders)

There was no urgent general business.

Councillor Atkinson departed the meeting at this time. The meeting adjourned at 2.56pm and resumed again at 3.15pm.

19. MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

Moved Mayor Ayers seconded Councillor Felstead

THAT the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting.

The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter and the specific grounds under section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution, are as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Minutes/Report of</th>
<th>General subject of each matter to be considered</th>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>Deputation</td>
<td>Waikuku Beach Campground proposal</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>Report of Craig Sargison (Manager Special Projects)</td>
<td>Potential land purchase</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Reason for protection of interests</th>
<th>Ref NZS 9202:2003 Appendix A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19.1 – 19.2</td>
<td>Protection of privacy of natural persons. To carry out commercial activities without prejudice</td>
<td>A2(a) A2(b)ii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CARRIED

**CLOSED MEETING**

Resolution to resume in open meeting

Moved Mayor Ayers seconded Councillor Blackie

THAT open meeting resumes and the business discussed with the public excluded remains public excluded.

CARRIED

**OPEN MEETING**

20. **NEXT MEETING**

The next scheduled ordinary meeting of the Council is at 1.00pm on Tuesday 6 August 2019 in the Council Chambers.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 5.00pm.

CONFIRMED

_______________________
Chairman

_______________________
Date
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT FOR DECISION

FILE NO and TRIM NO: GOV-01-11 / 190725104368

REPORT TO: Council

DATE OF MEETING: 6th August 2019

FROM: Grant MacLeod Community Greenspace Manager

SUBJECT: Pegasus Community Centre

1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report is for staff to come back to Council on item (e) from the 2nd April Council meeting regarding Pegasus Community Centre. This recommendation requested staff to prepare a report on the list of requirements for Council to consider for its spend of $10,000. The recommendation from that report is listed below.

a. Approves a provisional sum of $10,000 in the buildings capital account, in 2019/20 Annual Plan for fit out for the additional space. Note that staff will prepare a report on the requirements for Council’s consideration prior to expenditure.

Attachments:
   i. List of works. (190725104470)
   ii. Layout plan. (190730106062)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190725104368

(b) Approves that staff engage with a contractor to enable the list of works as identified in attachment i Trim 190725104368 to proceed.

(c) Notes that this list is to be agreed with lessor prior to any work being undertaken

(d) Notes that the list of works exceeds the $10,000, however, this is a contribution from Council to enable the works to happen. The Pegasus Residents Group also currently holds funding received from previous bookings to assist with this building fit out.

(e) Circulates this report to the Woodend Sefton Community Board

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 On April 2nd 2019 the Council agreed to an extended footprint of the former Doctor’s rooms of approximately 158sqm next to the currently leased Pegasus Community Centre (PCC). As part of this Council approved a provisional sum of $10,000 for capital works to take
place which would enable the operation of the new lease area. Council also requested that prior to this work taking place that staff report back on what this work entailed for consideration.

3.2 Staff have been working with Todd properties to have the lease signed which has now occurred and also on the list of works which would be required in order for the PCC to reach its intended operational use.

3.3 Staff have also been working with the Pegasus Residents Group to ensure that this list of works meets the expectations they have for how the rooms will be utilised for the community.

3.4 The estimate for the building works has come back to be approximately $15,500. While this work is over the $10,000 provisional sum from Council, the works sit within the combined total that includes funding available to the Pegasus Residents Group. The items that sit outside of the this include furniture which staff will work with the Residents Group to source for fit out.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. Option 1 – is to undertake the building works listed as this is within combined budget that both Council have made provision for and what the Pegasus Residents Group have available to them. This will allow the building to be adjusted to meet the needs of the community and maximise the buildings potential as a community centre.

4.2. Option 2 – lease the space as is. This will restrict the ability for the Pegasus Residents Group to provide a community space that maximises the opportunity within the building. This will create sub optimal work around focus and ongoing request for assistance as the building struggles to meet the requirements of the community with its current layout. The building works will also address building consent requirements for this kind of activity. A full list of works is available within Attachment i.

4.3. By enabling Option 1 above the Council will be assisting the function of the community centre for the purpose in which it was leased. Option 2 does not achieve this outcome and will leave staff and Pegasus Residents Association with further work to do to secure funding to enable this centre.

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

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

5.1.1. There will be support from the Pegasus Residents for additional community facility space at Pegasus. The Pegasus Residents Associated are in support of the temporary additional community facility provision.

5.2. **Wider Community**

5.2.1. The wider community were consulted as part of the report prepared by Sue Sutherland, which identified the temporary lease of additional community facilities in Pegasus.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**
6.1.1. The immediate impact on the budget for 19/20 financial year in the Greenspace buildings operating budget is a one off provision of $10,000 as agreed by Council on 2nd April 2019.

6.1.2. Staff are currently working with the Pegasus Resents Association regarding the bookings of the current and future community centre space. Responsibility for the booking will be shortly transferred to Council staff.

6.2. Community Implications
There will be considerable community interest in new or extended community facilities and groups/individuals are already showing interest in making bookings once they are given the go ahead.

6.3. Risk Management
This will be addressed through the design and construction processes.

6.4. Health and Safety
This will be addressed through the design process of proposed building alterations/extensions.

7. CONTEXT

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

7.2. Legislation
Building Act 2004

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

7.4. Delegations
The Council is the appropriate decision making body.
### PEGASUS COMMUNITY CENTRE EXPANSION

#### Building Modifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cut door between existing Community Centre and expansion area</td>
<td>Engineer review 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building Work 2000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plaster &amp; Paint 3146.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove wall between Treatment Room &amp; Consult Rm 3</td>
<td>Engineer review 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building Work 3300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Work</td>
<td>750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing Work</td>
<td>400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>2005.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move air conditioning unit in consult 3</td>
<td>598.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modify reception desk cabinet</td>
<td>850.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove sundry fittings</td>
<td>635.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace Carpet Tiles</td>
<td>1750.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Furniture & Fitting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Book Shelves for book cave area</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelves for community book room</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteboard (fixed to wall in `Todd Room?)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noticeboard for wall in Infinity Room (main reception/entrance)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer desk for public computer in foyer and chair - have desk</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer desk for PRGI office (have chair already)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cutlery and crockery / Jugs</td>
<td>Crockery 680.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultery 240.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fridge 0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Furniture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14x Chairs</td>
<td>1440.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4x Tables - Folding</td>
<td>2120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2x Tables - Round</td>
<td>1080.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1x Couch</td>
<td>350.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brochure display stand / Materials Only</td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Writing / Branding on Front Windows</td>
<td>3000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create photo wall in front area</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Estimated Costs*: **24994.11**
Pegasus Community Centre Extension Development Changes

ROOM NAMES
- Storage
- Kitchen
- Toilets
- Southern Capital Room
- PRGI Office
- Todd Room
- Community Book Cave
- Infinity Room

- Change door locks
- Remove Heat Pump
- Remove wall, vanity units and services. Repair, plaster and paint.
- Remove curtain rails
- Remove reception desk
- Remove large frame and re-paint foyer
- Remove glass partition
- Add 1500mm double opening door to the existing community facility
- Add WDC window decals

Date: 29/07/19
Scale
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WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT FOR DECISION

FILE NO and TRIM NO: RES 23 /190724103838

REPORT TO: Council

DATE OF MEETING: 6 August 2019

FROM: Chris Brown, Manager Community and Recreation

SUBJECT: Waimakariri Public Arts Trust

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is for the Council to consider supporting the establishment of a Public Art Advisory Trust and to approve Staff seeking expressions of interest from the Community in being Trustees.

1.2. This was first considered by Council in 2016 and there was a recommendation for the incoming Council to consider forming a Waimakariri Public Arts Trust and to consider the proposed funding for the Trust.

1.3. The proposal to establish a Waimakariri Public Arts Trust was included in the 2018 Draft LTP and there were three submissions in support and none against the formation.

1.4. The Council included $5,000 to cover servicing costs of the proposed Trust but in order to minimise the impact on rates did not include any provision for any cash grant to the Trust which was originally discussed as $25,000 pa.

Attachments:

i. Report to Council Waimakariri Public Art Advisory Trust January 2018 (Trim: 180118003966)

ii. Waimakariri Public Arts Trust Deed (TRIM:190730106137)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190724103838

(b) Notes that the Community was consulted on the establishment of a Public Arts Trust as part of the 2018 LTP.

(c) Approves the Waimakariri Public Arts Trust Deed (Trim 190730106137)

(d) Approves the formation of a Public Arts Trust

(e) Approves staff calling for expressions of interest from the Community for Trustees.
3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1. In June 2015 Council approved the development of an Art in Public Places Policy prompted in part by an initiative from the Kaiapoi Community Board (KCB), to recommend the Council establish an art in public places policy for the District and to propose a process for its development. It was intended the policy should provide a framework for the acquisition, installation/placement and maintenance of public space art works in the District.

3.2. Council also approved the establishment of a working party to provide advice to staff and facilitate community engagement as part of the policy development. The working party has met three times, and developed the attached draft policy and trust deed.

3.3. The model decided on by the working party involves setting up of a charitable trust to administer the policy with a mandate to foster a wide range of art in public places. The trust may also facilitate funding applications and can commission art work. The trust will seek to minimise cost to ratepayers by seeking independent funding via donations and applications to funding agencies.

3.4. The Council considered a report in January 2018 (Trim:180118003966) as part of the preparation of the Draft LTP and the following is an extract from the Minutes of the Meeting:

Moved: Councillor Gordon  Seconded: Councillor Doody

THAT the Council
(a) Receives report No. 180118003966
(b) Receives the Art in Public Places Policy and Waimakariri Public Arts Trust Deed.
(c) Approves the inclusion in the Draft LTP of the Proposal to establish a Waimakariri Public Art Advisory Trust.
(d) Notes that the expectation is that the Trust will externally source funds for art installations
(e) Approves funding of $5,000 in the Recreation Account for the Servicing of the Art Trust. – Note that this is included in the Draft LTP Recreation Budget.

3.5. The proposal was included in the Draft LTP and there were three submissions received all in support of the establishment of the Trust.

3.6. In the response to the Submitters the Council:

Thanks the submitters for their support of the Public Art Advisory Trust and looks forward to establishing the Trust with the support of the Community.

3.7. The next step was for staff to prepare a report for Council seeking the approval of the formation of the Trust and seeking expressions of Interest from the Community for people willing to serve as Trustees.

3.8. This report is the first follow up to the June 2018 meeting and Staff acknowledge that this should have been undertaken in a more timely manner.
4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. The Trust Deed provides for the Board of Trustees (the Board) to have a minimum of 5 trustees and a maximum of 7 trustees and include 2 Councillors as Council appointed Trustees.

4.2. The Deed also allows for the Landscape Architect, from the Council’s Greenspace Team, to be an advisory Trustee.

4.3. The initial Board shall be the signatories of the Trust Deed.

4.4. The Deed provides for the appointment of the Trustees, other than Councillors, to be made based on “a call for expressions of interest”. This report is seeking approval for Staff to commence this expression of interest process.

4.5. The criteria for considering suitability for appointment of a trustee is detailed in Schedule A of the Trust Deed. The Council may consider the following attributes:

1. Enthusiasm and/or expertise in the arts and a willingness to champion public art in the Waimakariri District.
2. Integrity of member.
3. A commitment to the trust and its objectives.
4. An understanding and accepted of the legal duties, responsibilities and liability of the trusteeship.
5. A willingness to devote the necessary time and effort to their duties as a trustee.
6. Good independent judgment.
7. An ability to think creatively.
8. The ability to work effectively as a member of a team and a willingness to state personal conviction and, equally, to accept a majority decision and be tolerant of the views of other people.
9. A belief in equal opportunities and diversity.
10. Not have any orders under the Protection of Personal and Property Rights Act 1988 or otherwise relating to the mental capacity of the member.
11. Have no convictions for fraud or any fraud related activities.

4.6. If Council approves, Staff will call for registrations of interest from Mid-August till Mid-September and prepare a report for the new Council to consider at its first business meeting. That report will recommend appointments for the initial trustees to be signatories to the Trust Deed.

4.7. The Management Team have reviewed this report and support the recommendations.
5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**
These were consulted during the LTP process and many were involved in the 2015 Working Party that recommended the formation of the Trust.

5.2. **Wider Community**
An opportunity for input was provided in the Draft LTP in 2018.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**
   6.1.1. The proposed Trust will be considered to be a Council Controlled Organisation (CCO) and that will require statutory reporting on a similar basis to that for the Waimakariri Libraries Trust.
   6.1.2. The Council has currently budgeted $5,000 per annum to meet the necessary administrative compliance costs for the Trust.
   6.1.3. The Council has currently not budgeted any funding for the acquisition of future public art beyond the annual Grant of approximately $2,360 that it makes to the Arts Collection Trust.
   6.1.4. It is not envisaged that there will be any payment to Trustees for their services.

6.2. **Community Implications**
   6.2.1. The Community was consulted during the 2018 LTP and supported the establishment of a Trust as did the Community Boards.

6.3. **Risk Management**
   6.3.1. N/A

6.4. **Health and Safety**
   6.4.1. Not applicable for seeking expressions of interest for the Public Art Advisory Trust.

7. **CONTEXT**

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

7.2. **Legislation**
Local Government Act

7.3. **Community Outcomes**
The community's cultures, arts and heritage are conserved and celebrated
   - Different cultures are acknowledged and respected.
   - There are wide ranging opportunities to participate in arts and cultural activities.

7.4. **Delegations**
The Council is the appropriate decision making body.
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT

FILE NO and TRIM NO: RES - 23 / 180118003966

REPORT TO: Council

DATE OF MEETING: 30 January 2018

FROM: Craig Sargison, Manager Community and Recreation

SUBJECT: Waimakariri Public Art Advisory Trust

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is for the Council to consider potential funding for art in public spaces and the establishment of a Public Art Advisory Trust.

1.2. This was considered by Council in 2016 and there was a recommendation for the incoming Council to consider forming a Waimakariri Public Art Advisory Trust and to consider the proposed funding for the Trust.

1.3. Staff have included funding of $5,000 for this in the Draft LTP to cover servicing costs of the proposed Trust but to help to keep the proposed rate increase as low as feasible have not included any provision for any cash grant to the Trust which was originally discussed as $25,000 pa.

1.4. A copy of the 2016 report is attached for background information.

Attachments:

   i. Art in Public Places Policy (draft) (TRIM No: 150922133742)
   ii. Waimakariri Public Art Advisory Trust Deed (draft) (TRIM No: 151216164871)
   iii. Art in Public Places Policy and Waimakariri Public Art Advisory Trust Deed Report (TRIM 160623059826)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180118003966

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

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

(d) Notes that the expectation is that the Trust will externally source funds for art installations

(e) Approves funding of $5,000 in the Recreation Account for the Servicing of the Art Trust. – Note that this is included in the Draft LTP Recreation Budget.
3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

3.1. In June 2015 Council approved the development of an Art in Public Places Policy prompted in part by an initiative from the Kaiapoi Community Board (KCB), to recommend the Council establish an art in public places policy for the District and to propose a process for its development. It was intended the policy should provide a framework for the acquisition, installation/placement and maintenance of public space art works in the District.

3.2. Council also approved the establishment of a working party to provide advice to staff and facilitate community engagement as part of the policy development. The working party has met three times, and developed the attached draft policy and trust deed.

3.3. The model decided on by the working party involves setting up of a charitable trust to administer the policy with a mandate to foster a wide range of art in public places. The trust may also facilitate funding applications and can commission art work. The trust will seek to minimise cost to ratepayers by seeking independent funding via donations and applications to funding agencies.

3.4. At their meeting on 24 November the working party agreed that the draft policy and trust deed should go to the Board for comment. This was undertaken in February 2016 along with consultation with the Runanga Executive of Ngai Tuahuriri who asked that the policy be reviewed by Matapopore. Subsequently Dr Areta Wilkinson provided feedback on the policy and her comments have been incorporated into the policy document.

3.5. Formation of a Trust will require specific consultation with the community and this will need to be done through a LTP or Annual Plan process because of the commitment of initial and ongoing funding for the Trust.

3.6. While the working group is of the opinion that without sufficient funding the Trust would not be able to meet its objectives and suggest initial seed funding of $25,000 with provision for annual grants of $25,000 thereafter, it would still be possible to form the Trust to advise on installation of externally funded art and also the Trust will have the ability to seek external funding and support artists in their application for external funds.

3.7. The Waimakariri Public Art Advisory Trust is intended to be a charitable trust set up as a council controlled organisation.

3.8. Charitable Trusts may be set up for the advancement of education, or other purposes beneficial to the community. Set up as a discretionary trust, it may call on publicly listed charities and organisations to apply for funds. A charitable trust is exempt from paying tax on income.

3.9. Registering as a charity has other benefits such as: detailed information about the Trust is available on the Register which is particularly useful for applying for public funding; provides proof of charitable status through registration; there is the potential for greater public confidence and trust about the Trust through the information available on the register.

3.10. Setting up the Trust as a council controlled organisation means that there are clear lines of reporting and accountability to the council regarding the operation of the Trust. Before the trust can be established consultation must be undertaken in accordance with Section 82, Local Government Act 2002.

3.11. The Working party also developed the Art in Public Places Policy which has also been supported by the Community Boards. The policy will be referred separately to the
Council for adoption once a final decision on the formation of the Trust has been made by Council.

3.12. The Management Team/CE has reviewed this report and supports the recommendations.

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. Representatives from the Community and Ward Advisory Boards, Runanga Executive of Ngai Tuahuriri, and the wider arts community have been consulted via the working party in developing this policy and trust deed.

4.2. The working party included representatives of: Waimakariri Arts Trust, Creative Communities Arts Funding Committee, Waimakariri Community Arts Council, Oxford Arts Trust and the Waikuku Artists Incorporated as well as Community Board members and Councillors Doody and Allen.

4.3. If Council agrees to this proposal further consultation, particularly around funding, will be undertaken with the community through the Annual Plan and Long Term Plan processes.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. It is expected that associated compliance and audit costs, including secretarial servicing will be in the order of $5,000 per annum which has been incorporated into the Draft LTP budget.

5.2. The proposed Trust could be considered to be a Council Controlled Organisation (CCO) and that will require statutory reporting on a similar basis to that for the Waimakariri Libraries Trust.

5.3. The only allocation the Council currently makes in this area is to the Arts Collection Trust which buys artworks for display in public buildings and for 2016/17 year the Council granted $2,360.

6. CONTEXT

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

6.2. Legislation
Local Government Act 2002

6.3. Community Outcomes
The community’s cultures, arts and heritage are conserved and celebrated

- Different cultures are acknowledged and respected.
- There are wide ranging opportunities to participate in arts and cultural activities.
ART IN PUBLIC PLACES POLICY

1 Introduction

Artworks are commonly used in public outdoor spaces as a means to enhance the environment, reinforce the cultural and community identity and promote cities and towns as centres of artistic and cultural excellence.

In her article on ‘creative place-making’ Cynthia Nikitin suggests that “Public art projects will be most effective when they are part of a larger, holistic, multidisciplinary approach to enlivening a city or neighbourhood”.1

2 Why have an ‘Art in Public Places’ policy?

The purpose is:
- To demonstrate an open and enabling approach to the concept of public art.
- To provide a consistent approach and clarity around the process of acquisition, siting and ongoing management of art works in the District.
- To set clear Council expectations for any provider/proposer/funder of public art work in the consideration of potential future installations.

3 What are the benefits of having art in public places?

Public Art:
- Reflects our identity as a community
- Makes art accessible to all
- Promotes civic pride and a sense of “place” by supporting and showcasing creativity
- Challenges perceptions, community ideas and feelings
- Enriches the cultural life of our District
- Enhances public spaces
- Celebrates and promotes an understanding of our cultural diversity and identity

4 Policy Objectives

- Enabling art in public places will promote the Waimakariri District’s sense of community, civic pride, recognition of other cultures and our distinctive identity. The Treaty of Waitangi is honoured and practises of partnership are respected through the arts.
- Where feasible, public art will be integrated into the design and landscape of selected open spaces.
- Public art will be installed where it will enhance the public’s enjoyment of public spaces.
- Installations will increase understanding and enjoyment of public art.
- Public art will contribute to the development of cultural tourism in the District
- To support the Waimakariri Public Art Trust (WPAT).

5 What are the principles that Waimakariri District Council will apply to public art?

- Art reflects a celebration of the uniqueness of the District’s environment, history and cultural identity.
- Art enhances the experience by our community and visitors of the built and natural environment.
- The Council will respect the recommendations of the Waimakariri Public Art Trust as it recognises that art can be contentious

---

1 Project for Public Spaces, Cynthia Nikitin (http://www.pps.org/reference/collaborative-creative-placemaking-good-public-art-depends-on-good-public-spaces/)
Public Art Process

The WPAT evaluates and commissions potential public art works (including gifts and bequests) according to the following considerations:

- Standards of excellence and innovation
- Durability of artwork
- Ownership structure and conditions for movement or disposal of the art works
- Potential of artwork to capture the public’s imagination and to help create a sense of place and identity for the Waimakariri District
- Fit with the topography and character and use of the relevant public places
- Cost implications including on-going maintenance costs and insurance where appropriate.

The WPAT will, in particular, consult with mana whenua at the earliest stages of planning new projects to identify and work together on areas of shared interest.

6 Maintenance and care of public art works

The Waimakariri District has a number of art works displayed in public places throughout the District that have arisen over time by a variety of processes. The Council is committed to ensuring that all public art works are identified and labelled and that each artwork’s status and condition is recorded and regularly reviewed.

Council, through the WPAT, will ensure the collection of public art is properly cared for and maintained. It will seek advice and work closely with mana whenua in the care and maintenance of Māori taonga and Māori art in public space. Any additional cost associated with this will need to be considered and approved through the Council’s Annual Plan process.

7 Re-siting, removal and deaccessioning of public art works

While the Council understands and values the need to retain the integrity of art works and their relationship to their sites, from time to time as the District changes and evolves, there may be reasons to review the location or retention of a public art work. If the result of this review is not to move the artwork the Council, through the WAPT, may also consider deaccessioning the work.

Re-siting, removal or deaccessioning of a public art work may be requested by the Council and/or the WAPT if one or more of the following criteria apply.

Note: these criteria may prompt a review, but they are not the criteria upon which a final decision is made.

- the artwork requires temporary removal for treatment or safe-guarding during redevelopment or works being carried out in its immediate vicinity;
- the art work is irreparably damaged or deteriorated;
- the public art work endangers public health and safety and remedy is impractical, unfeasible or would undermine the integrity of the public art work;
- Council is unable to reasonably guarantee the condition or security of the public art work in its present location;
- the public art work requires a high level of maintenance/or conservation, rendering unsustainable asset management expenses;
- the public art work possesses serious or dangerous faults in design or workmanship and repair or remedy is impractical, not feasible or undermines the integrity of the art work.

The WAPT will follow the same process as if the artwork was offered for the first time. The decision will also be made on consideration of consultation with the artist(s) (or the family of the artist(s) if necessary) and other relevant people or organisations involved in its establishment. If an artwork needs to be moved or altered in any way, consideration will be given to the moral rights of an artist under the Copyright Act 1994.
Options for deaccessioning artworks will include:

- selling or gifting the artwork back to the artist
- donating to a community group or facility, or organisation that operates for public benefit
- open sale or auction

Decisions on the above options will be made by the WAPT with guidance from the Council, based on criteria that include:

- resale value
- sensitivities around how Council came to own the artwork
- condition of the artwork.

8 Māori

The Council acknowledges Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri as mana whenua (people) of the Waimakariri District. Mana whenua have an interest in all Public Arts evaluations, commissions and placement in their takiwā (tribal area) regardless of the artworks maker, concept or installation protocols. The special position and interests of Ngāi Tahu generally and mana whenua specifically in relation to public land, waterways and sites of cultural importance are recognised.

Through this Public Art Policy the Council and the Trust will respect and promote Māori culture in partnership with Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga.

Any artist creating art work referencing Māori must demonstrate consultation with iwi. Any art work referencing Māori will involve consultation regarding the installation e.g. karakia (prayer).
Appendix

9 Definitions

Public Art:
- Includes but is not limited to: sculpture, murals, sculptural architecture, water features
- Includes works of a permanent or temporary nature located in public places
- Does not include cemetery or war memorial architectural features (reference to agreement with RSA to maintain and restore war memorials)
- Does not include privately owned works of art on private property that simply happen to be visible or accessible to the public; or publically owned works on New Zealand Transport Agency Land.

Public Place:
- A place that is owned or administered by the Council where the public has free access.
1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to advise the Council of the progress that has been made in developing the Art in Public Places Policy and associated Waimakariri Public Art Advisory Trust Deed and to receive feedback on the options presented in this report to bring into effect the policy.

1.2. A working party of representatives of the Boards and established arts organisations in the District was convened in September 2015, and met to develop the policy.

1.3. As development of the policy progressed it was decided that a model where the Art in Public Places Policy is administered by a Charitable Trust would be most appropriate for this District. A trust deed was developed by the working party and a legal draft of the Deed completed by Corcoran French, Solicitors.

1.4. At their meeting on 27 November 2015 the working party agreed the policy and trust deed should now go to the Community and Ward Advisory Boards for comment. This was undertaken in February 2016. The Runanga Executive was included in this consultation and asked for the draft policy to be sent to Matapopore for comment from a policy perspective. Dr Areta Wilkinson subsequently provided comments on the policy which have been incorporated into the document.

1.5. Setting up a charitable trust to implement the policy will require initial and ongoing funding. The working party suggest $25,000 per annum to be considered by Council for seed funding and ongoing top-up to ensure the success of the trust.

1.6. The only allocation the Council currently makes in this area is to the Arts Collection Trust which buys artworks for display in public buildings and for 2016/17 year the Council granted $2,360.

Attachments:

i. Art in Public Places Policy (draft) (TRIM No: 150922133742)

ii. Waimakariri Public Art Advisory Trust Deed (draft) (TRIM No: 151216164871)
2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 160623059826.

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

(c) Requests the incoming Council to consider the formation of the Waimakariri Public Art Advisory Trust as a charitable trust and a council controlled organisation.

(d) Requests the incoming Council to consider the proposed funding for the Waimakariri Public Art Trust.

3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

3.1. In June 2015 Council approved the development of an Art in Public Places Policy prompted in part by an initiative from the Kaiapoi Community Board (KCB), to recommend the Council establish an art in public places policy for the District and to propose a process for its development. It was intended the policy should provide a framework for the acquisition, installation/placement and maintenance of public space art works in the District.

3.2. Council also approved the establishment of a working party to provide advice to staff and facilitate community engagement as part of the policy development. The working party has met three times, and developed the attached draft policy and trust deed.

3.3. The model decided on by the working party involves setting up of a charitable trust to administer the policy and with a mandate to foster a wide range of art in public places. The trust may also facilitate funding applications and can commission art work. The trust will seek to minimise cost to ratepayers by seeking independent funding via donations and applications to funding agencies.

3.4. At their meeting on 24 November the working party agreed that the draft policy and trust deed should go to the Boards for comment. This was undertaken in February 2016 along with consultation with the Runanga Executive of Ngai Tuahuriri who asked that the policy be reviewed by Matapopore. Subsequently Dr Areta Wilkinson provided feedback on the policy and her comments have been incorporated into the policy document.

3.5. Formation of a Trust will require specific consultation with the community and this will need to be done through an LTP or Annual Plan process because of the commitment of initial and ongoing funding for the Trust.

3.6. The working group is of the opinion that without sufficient funding the Trust would not be able to meet its objectives and suggest initial seed funding of $25,000 with provision for annual grants of $25,000 thereafter.

3.7. The Waimakariri Public Art Advisory Trust is intended to be a charitable trust set up as a council controlled organisation.

3.8. Charitable Trusts may be set up for the *advancement of education, or other purposes beneficial to the community*. Set up as a discretionary trust, it may call on publicly listed charities and organisations to apply for funds. A charitable trust is exempt from paying tax on income.
3.9. Registering as a charity has other benefits such as: detailed information about the Trust is available on the Register which is particularly useful for applying for public funding; provides proof of charitable status through registration; there is the potential for greater public confidence and trust about the Trust through the information available on the register.

3.10. Setting up the Trust as a council controlled organisation means that there are clear lines of reporting and accountability to the council regarding the operation of the Trust. Before the trust can be established consultation must be undertaken in accordance with Section 82, Local Government Act 2002.

3.11. The Management Team/CE has reviewed this report and supports the recommendations.

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. Representatives from the Community and Ward Advisory Boards, Runanga Executive of Ngai Tuahuriri, and the wider arts community have been consulted via the working party in developing this policy and trust deed.

4.2. The working party included representatives of: Waimakariri Arts Trust, Creative Communities Arts Funding Committee, Waimakariri Community Arts Council, Oxford Arts Trust and the Waikuku Artists Incorporated as well as Community Board members and Councillors Doody and Allen.

4.3. If Council agrees to this proposal further consultation, particularly around funding, will be undertaken with the community through the Annual Plan and Long Term Plan processes.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. Developing an art in public places policy will incur costs in staff time and public consultation, although these are accounted for in approved budgets.

5.2. Other than through the grant to the Waimakariri Arts Trust there is no provision in the Council’s Long Term Plan for the purchase of art works. There is a risk that in itself the policy will be seen as a commitment to fund artworks.

5.3. Initial funding of $25,000.00 is proposed with ongoing funding on an annual basis as part of the Annual Plan and Long Term Plan processes. In addition it is expected that associated compliance and audit costs, including secretarial servicing will be in the order of $5-$10,000 per annum.

5.4. The proposed Trust could be considered to be a Council Controlled Organisation (CCO) and that will require statutory reporting on a similar basis to that for the Waimakariri Libraries Trust.

5.5. The only allocation the Council currently makes in this area is to the Arts Collection Trust which buys artworks for display in public buildings and for 2016/17 year the Council granted $2,360.

6. CONTEXT

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

*Local Government Act 2002*

6.3. **Community Outcomes**

The community’s cultures, arts and heritage are conserved and celebrated

- Different cultures are acknowledged and respected.
- There are wide ranging opportunities to participate in arts and cultural activities.
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL
("the Settlor")

[name, address and occupation of trustees]
("the Trustees")

Waimakariri Public Arts Trust Deed
PARTIES
1. WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL at Rangiora ("the Settlor")
2. [name, address and occupation of trustees] ("the Trustees")

BACKGROUND
A. The Settlor wishes to establish a charitable trust to develop public art projects in the Waimakariri district that are of enduring quality, are accessible to the public and stimulate public interest. The aim is to educate the public about art and artists and support artistic endeavours.
B. The parties have agreed to enter into this deed specifying the purposes of the trust and providing for its control and governance.
C. The Trustees have agreed to act as initial Trustees of the trust.
D. The Settlor proposes that in due course additional property may fall into and form part of the assets of the trust and the trustees will own the assets of the trust and will, along with certain advisory trustees (in this deed referred to as the charitable trustees) manage these within the framework of the trust.
E. The Settlor intends the charitable trustees be appointed to give appropriate guidance and instruction to the Trustees and to perform certain specific functions in relation to this trust.

OPERATIVE PROVISIONS
1. NAME
   The name of the Trust shall be the "Waimakariri Public Arts Trust".

2. OFFICE
   The office of the Trust shall be such place in North Canterbury or the Waimakariri district as the Board of Trustees may determine.

3. PURPOSES
   The purposes of the Trust are as follows:
   (a) To promote art and culture in the Waimakariri district including but not limited to the matters set out in Schedule C;
   (b) To encourage public art in all new developments and redevelopments in the Waimakariri district;
   (c) Establish and support a Waimakariri Arts Fund to commission art works and promote the arts;
   (d) To apply for independent funding to secure art works and commission art works for specific sites.
   (e) To educate the public about art and artists.
   (f) To support artistic endeavours in the community.
   (g) To benefit the public and local community with art works and events.
4. TANGATA WHENUA
In attaining its purposes the Trust shall recognise the views and expectations of tangata whenua.

5. MEMBERS OF THE BOARD
5.1 Numbers
The Board of Trustees ("Board") shall consist of no fewer than five (5) nor more than seven (7) members. The initial members of the Board shall be the signatories to this deed.

5.2 Term of Board
Trustees shall be appointed on a rotational basis as follows:

(a) Two of the initial trustees will retire at the end of a two year term
(b) Two of the initial Trustees will expire at the end of a four year term.
(c) The remaining initial Trustee(s) shall retire at the end of a three year term.
(d) Each subsequent term of the Trustees shall be for a period of three years.

Unless otherwise specified in this deed each member of the Board shall hold office for a term of three years or until he or she dies, or is declared bankrupt, or shall have his or her property affairs managed under the Protection of Personal and Property Rights Act 1988 upon the grounds of lack of competency to manage those affairs, or is a "patient as defined in s2 of the Mental Heath (Compulsory Assessment and Treatment) Act 1992, or indicates in writing that he or she wishes to resign from the Board. Any retiring member shall be eligible for re-appointment.

5.3 Appointment and Removal of Trustees
The Waimakaririri District Council shall have the power to appoint and remove all Trustees to the Board of the Trust. The Trustees shall include people of the Waimakaririri District Council and representatives from the art community in the Waimakaririri or North Canterbury district at the Council's discretion.

The Trust Board is to comprise of a minimum of five (5) and up to seven (7) Trustees and include two elected member representatives ("Councillors") who may be the Council appointed Trustees. The Trustees (other than the Councillors) are appointed by the Council based on a "call for expressions of interest". The Council's landscape architect will be an advisory trustee but may also serve as a Trustee of the Board. The Trust Board may include a professional advisor to be called upon for professional or cultural advice then required.

5.4 Appointment of further trustees
The Council may at any time appoint up to two (2) further Trustees for terms which shall expire no later than the time when the terms of the members of the then current Board expire. Such trustees may be advisory Trustees referred to as "Charitable Trustees".

5.5 Termination of trusteeship
The Board may, by a motion decided by a two-thirds majority of votes to recommend to the Waimakaririri District Council that a Trustee's membership in the Board be considered for termination if they believe on reasonable grounds that such action is in the best interests of the Trust.
5.6 Recording trustee appointments, resignations and removals
The appointment of a trustee and the cessation of the appointment of any trustee shall not be effective until recorded by resolution recorded in the Council’s meeting minutes or by deed.

5.7 Name of the Board
The name of the Board shall be the Waimakariri Public Arts Trust Board.

6. POWERS
6.1 General and specific powers
In addition to the powers implied by the general law of New Zealand or contained in the Trustee Act 1956, the powers which the Board may exercise in order to carry out its charitable purposes are as follows:

(a) to use the funds of the Trust as the Board thinks necessary or proper in payment of the costs and expenses of the Trust, including the employment of professional advisers, agents, officers and employees as appears necessary or expedient; and

(b) to purchase, take on lease or in exchange or hire or otherwise acquire any land or personal property and any rights or privileges which the Board thinks necessary or expedient for the purpose of attaining the objects of the Trust and to sell, exchange, bail or lease, with or without option of purchase, or in any manner dispose of any such property, rights or privileges as aforesaid; and

(c) to carry on any business; and

(d) to invest surplus funds in any way permitted by law for the investment of trust funds and upon such terms as the Board thinks fit; and

(e) to borrow or raise money from time to time, with or without security, and upon such terms as to priority and otherwise as the Board thinks fit; and

(f) to pay, apply or appropriate from income or capital such amount as the Trustees may decide for or towards one or more of the objectives of the trust; and

(g) to do all things as may from time to time be necessary or desirable to enable the Board to give effect to and to attain the charitable purposes of the Trust.

6.2 Trustee Person Specification
The Council shall consider the matters set out schedule A when deciding on the appointment of initial, new, additional or replacement trustees.

6.3 Incorporation
The Board is empowered to seek incorporation in accordance with the provisions of the Charitable Trusts Act 1957.

6.4 Employment
Under clause 6.1(a) the Board may employ as agents, officers, and employees, persons who are members of the Board.

7. INCOME, BENEFIT OR ADVANTAGE TO BE APPLIED TO CHARITABLE PURPOSES
7.1 Application
Any income, benefit or advantage shall be applied to the charitable purposes of the Trust and may take into account the matters set out in Schedule B.
7.2 **Influence**
No member of the Trust or person associated with a member of the Trust shall participate in, or materially influence, any decision made by the Trust in respect of the payment to or on behalf of that member or associated person of any income, benefit or advantage whatsoever, except where that income, benefit or advantage is derived from:

(a) professional services to the trust rendered in the course of business charged at no greater rate than current market rates; or
(b) interest on money lent at no greater rate than current market rates.

7.3 **Reasonableness required**
Any such income paid shall be reasonable and relative to that which would be paid in an arm's length transaction (being open market value).

7.4 **Entrenchment**
The provisions and effect of this clause shall not be removed from this document and shall be included and implied into any document replacing this document.

8. **PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD**
8.1 **Meetings**
The Board shall meet at such times and places as it determines, and shall elect a chairperson from amongst its members at its first meeting and at every subsequent annual general meeting.

8.2 **Chairperson**
The chairperson shall preside at all meetings of the Board at which she or he is present. In the absence of the chairperson from any meeting, the members present shall appoint one of their number to preside at that meeting.

8.3 **Quorum**
At any meeting of the Board a majority of members shall form a quorum and no business shall be transacted unless a quorum is present.

8.4 **Voting**
All questions before the Board shall be decided by consensus. However, where a consensus decision cannot be reached on a question, it shall, unless otherwise specified in this deed, be put as a motion to be decided by a majority of votes. If the voting is tied, the motion shall be lost.

8.5 **Reports**
The Board shall report regularly on its activities to the Waimakariri District Council and, in particular, shall present a detailed annual report to the Council if required.

8.6 **Guidance**
The Board shall be guided in its decisions by the views of the Waimakariri District Council and may take into account the matters set out in Schedules A, B and C.

9. **ACCOUNTS**
9.1 **True and fair accounts**
The Board shall keep true and fair accounts of all money received and expended.

9.3 **Audit**
The Board shall, as soon as practicable after the end of every financial year of the Board, cause the accounts of the Board for that financial year to be audited by an accountant appointed for that purpose and the audited accounts shall be made available to the public.

10. **POWER TO DELEGATE**

10.1 **Power to delegate**
The Board may, from time to time, appoint any committee and may delegate any of its powers and duties to any such committee or to any person, and the committee or person, as the case may be, may without confirmation by the Board exercise or perform the delegated powers or duties in like manner and with the same effect as the Board could itself have exercised or performed them.

10.2 **Delegate bound**
Any committee or person to whom the Board has delegated powers or duties shall be bound by the charitable terms of the Trust.

10.3 **Delegation revocable**
Every such delegation shall be revocable at will, and no such delegation shall prevent the exercise of any power or the performance of any duty by the Board.

10.4 **Delegate need not be trustee**
It shall not be necessary that any person who is appointed to be a member of any such committee, or to whom any such delegation is made, be a member of the Board.

11. **COMMON SEAL**
The Board shall have a common seal which shall be kept in the custody of the secretary, or such other officer as shall be appointed by the Board, and shall be used only as directed by the Board. It shall be affixed to documents only in the presence of, and accompanied by the signature of, two members of the Board.

12. **ALTERATION OF DEED**
The Board may, by consensus or pursuant to a motion decided by a two thirds majority of votes, by supplemental deed, make alterations or additions to the terms and provisions of this deed provided that no such alteration or addition shall:

(a) take effect unless it is confirmed by resolution of the Board;
(b) detract from the exclusively charitable nature of the Trust or result in the distribution of its assets on winding up or dissolution for any purpose that is not exclusively charitable; or
(c) be effective until registered with and accepted under the Charities Act 2005 by the Charities Board;
(d) be approved by the Waimakariri District Council.

13. **DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS ASSETS**
If, either on the winding up, failure or dissolution of the Trust, or in the case of the Board having incorporated in accordance with the provisions of the Charitable Trusts Act 1957 (or other Act passed in substitution for the same) on the liquidation of the
Board or on its dissolution by the Registrar, there remains, after payment of all of the trust debts and liabilities, any property or assets whatsoever, they shall be given or transferred to the Trustees of such trusts or organizations in the Waimakariri or North Canterbury District in New Zealand as the Board with the support of the Waimakariri District Council considers in its discretion carry out charitable purposes within New Zealand similar to those set out in this deed, or be applied for such charitable purposes or be applied for such charitable purposes in the Waimakariri or North Canterbury District as the Board with the support of the Waimakariri District Council considers in its discretion, by resolution, determine at, before, or during the winding up, failure, dissolution or liquidation. If the Board is unable to make such decision, such property shall be disposed of in accordance with the directions of a Judge of the High Court pursuant to section 27 of the Charitable Trusts Act 1957 on the application of any member of the Board.

14. WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL
The Waimakariri District Council may provide ongoing technical administration support through (but not limited to) providing resource management advice, secretarial support, and covering resource consent costs where the Waimakariri District Council considers it appropriate to do so.

The Waimakariri District Council may also assist with physical work such as site preparation and maintenance through the Waimakariri District Council's Green Space team where the Waimakariri District Council considers it appropriate to do so.

SIGNED BY
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL
by its Authorised Representative
............................................................

SIGNED BY
in the presence of:
............................................................
Signature of Witness......................................
Full Name...................................................
Address......................................................
Occupation................................................

SIGNED BY
in the presence of:
............................................................
Signature of Witness......................................
Full Name...................................................
Address......................................................
Occupation................................................
SCHEDULE A

Trustee Person Specification

In considering suitability for the appointment of a Trustee, the Council may consider the following attributes:

1. Enthusiasm and/or expertise in the arts and a willingness to champion public art in the Waimakariri District.
2. Integrity of member.
3. A commitment to the trust and its objectives.
4. An understanding and accepted of the legal duties, responsibilities and liability of the trusteeship.
5. A willingness to devote the necessary time and effort to their duties as a trustee.
6. Good independent judgment.
7. An ability to think creatively.
8. The ability to work effectively as a member of a team and a willingness to state personal conviction and, equally, to accept a majority decision and be tolerant of the views of other people.
9. A belief in equal opportunities and diversity.
10. Not have any orders under the Protection of Personal and Property Rights Act 1988 or otherwise relating to the mental capacity of the member.
11. Have no convictions for fraud or any fraud related activities.

SCHEDULE B

Basis for decision-making

1. The trustee will evaluate and commission potential public art works (including gifts and bequests) taking into account (but not limited to) the following:-
   a) Standards of excellence and innovation
   b) Durability of the art work.
   c) Ownership structure and conditions for movement or disposal of the artworks.
   d) Potential of artwork to capture the public’s imagination and to help create a sense of place and identity for the Waimakariri District.
   e) Fit with the topography and character, and use of the relevant public places.
   f) Cost implications including ongoing maintenance costs.

2. All proposed installations will be consulted with the local Community Board before any decisions are made. This will ensure no conflicts are likely to arise in terms of land use, will ensure Council has no significant concerns and to check that Council does not foresee any risk, liability or unscheduled costs associated with any potential installation.

3. All artwork is subject to the provisions of the Resources Management Act 1991 (treated as a structure potentially required resource consent) and must comply with the provisions of the Waimakariri District Plan, Resource Management Plans and policies.

SCHEDULE C

Roles and Responsibilities
1. Public Art Programme
   - Develop a public art project and opportunities programme and budget

2. Public Works of Art
   - Evaluate and approve opportunity and sit in accordance with the Waimakariri Public Art policy.
   - Approval consent and site
   - Approval budget

3. Gifts
   - Ensure all gift offers are considered in a fair, transparent and consistent manner
   - Approval consent and site
   - Approval budget

4. Re-siting and Removal
   - Approval decision to re-site or remove art work in accordance with the original intentions, consistent with the rights afforded by contractual agreement and copyright legislation
   - Undertake careful and robust evaluation and consider re-siting or removal only when no other option exists

5. Renewals, care and maintenance
   - Ensure all public works or art are identified and catalogues and their location and condition are recorded and reviewed regularly
   - Ensure all works of art are cared for and maintained in accordance with the artistic and cultural protocols appropriate to their origin, intended purpose and location
   - Develop a programme of renewals and care and maintenance plans
   - Maintain the integrity of public works of art through their useful life
1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report is to seek approval from the Council to proceed with the construction of the well head, electrical works and associated commissioning for the 5th Smith Street well that has recently been drilled for the Rangiora water supply.

1.2 The well was drilled with the intention of allowing for growth while providing the required level of redundancy on the Rangiora water supply.

1.3 The chemical test for the new well showed a difference in water quality compared to the other wells in the well field. Specifically manganese was detected at close to the guideline value within the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand. While this is not a concern in terms of the safety of the water, this introduces a risk of aesthetic issues such as discolouration of the water resulting from biofilm that can build up over time.

1.4 It is recommended that further testing be conducted to help quantify the risk, which will help inform how this well can be operated going forward. The options considered are either using the source on usual rotation as with the other sources if the risk of discolouration is deemed to be very low, or using the source only as a backup if there are deemed to be risks of discoloration if it is used frequently.

1.5 The level of redundancy required for any Council water supply is that there is one more source present than is required at any given time, in order to allow a failure of any source at any time without a loss of supply.

1.6 As a worst case, the well would only be run during the peak hours of a peak day, and only if there was also an issue with another of the primary sources at the same time. This would mean that overall the well would only contribute a very small proportion of the total water supplied to the Rangiora scheme. However, when it is used it would be providing a very critical role in ensuring there is not a total loss of supply.

1.7 This strategy would allow the well to fulfil its primary objective of allowing for growth on the scheme while maintaining the required level of resilience, while still minimising the risk of biofilm accumulation due to the small volume of water the well would supply overall.

Attachments:

i. Chemical Test Result
2. **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council;

(a) **Receives** report No. 190701092611.

(b) **Notes** that the 5th bore drilled at Smith Street in Kaiapoi for the Rangiora water supply was successful in finding a water supply source of sufficient quality to meet the DWSNZ, but that the manganese levels were close to the guideline value which warrant further consideration.

(c) **Notes** that the operation of the well can be managed to minimise the risk of any aesthetic issues resulting from this source, while still ensuring it provides its primary intended function of providing for growth on the Rangiora scheme while still having the required level of resilience.

(d) **Notes** that it is estimated that a further $200,000 will be required to complete the project, which is allowed for within existing budgets.

(e) **Approves** staff proceeding with the final stages of physical works for the project, which is budgeted and programmed for completion in the current financial year.

(f) **Circulates** this report to the Rangiora-Ashely Community Board and the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board for their information.

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1. A project was commenced in the previous financial year to establish a 5th bore in the Smith Street bore field in Kaiapoi, which supplies the Rangiora water supply.

3.2. This driver for this project is to allow for growth on the Rangiora water supply and ensure the required level of resilience for the scheme. The minimum required level of resilience in terms of number and capacity of wells is that there shall be sufficient well capacity to run the scheme with any one of the wells out of service at any time.

3.3. Previously a total of three wells were required to run the scheme at a given time, so there were four wells to give this level of resilience. Due to growth on the scheme, up to four wells are now required to meet demand, which means a fifth well is required to provide an adequate level of resilience during these times of high demand. Without this fifth well, there would be a risk of loss of supply on the Rangiora scheme during times of high demand.

3.4. The existing four Smith Street wells found suitable water sources at a depth of approximately 150m below ground level. These wells produce high quality and secure groundwater that is compliant with the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand (DWSNZ) currently.

3.5. When the fourth well was drilled the pipework to connect this well was extended to the fifth well site, so that it would be ready when for this project. The fifth well is on a Council owned parcel of land set aside for this purpose when the surrounding commercial development was established, and this well was allowed for within the original consent for the other wells in this field.

3.6. The fifth well was drilled with the intention to strike water at a similar depth and of the equivalent quality as the first four wells. It did not strike water at the expected depth of 150m, but did find a water source at approximately 190m.
4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. Well 5 has some similarities with the first four wells, but also some differences which warranted further consideration before committing to the next steps of the project. Key points on the similarities and differences are below:

- All wells have a positive artesian head.
- Microbiologically the wells are equivalent (absent of microbiological contaminants).
- In terms of the chemical profile, Well 5 showed manganese at a level just below the guideline value within the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand. This is an aesthetic guideline, as it can cause discoloration and potential taste / odour issues rather than presenting a health risk. The other four wells showed manganese at less than detectable levels.
- Well 5 has an expected yield in the order of 35 L/s, while the capacity of the other four wells is in the order of 50 to 90 L/s per well.

4.2. While the manganese limit is only a guideline value, the risk with manganese is that over time if it builds up in the pipework it can cause aesthetic issues such as discoloration of the water. The level of manganese in Well 5 is similar to some of the wells feeding the Woodend and Pegasus water supply which has a filter to remove manganese.

4.3. This potential risk of biofilm or discoloration has raised the question as to whether the remaining infrastructure should be installed to complete the physical works with this project, or whether the source should be abandoned and an alternative source found.

4.4. The value of assets which have been invested in to date are estimated at $350,000 (well drilling, development, testing, consent, pipeline to well site, and land for well site). The cost to complete the project is estimated at up to $200,000 (well head and associated electrical works).

4.5. In order to better understand the risk of manganese biofilm growth with this source, further testing is proposed to simulate an environment where biofilm growth can be accelerated, quantified and compared to other sources such as the Woodend and Pegasus wells which do have biofilm issues if untreated, as well as sources which don’t.

4.6. There are several different potential outcomes to this testing, however all would still result in the recommendation that the remaining infrastructure be installed. Rather than dictate whether or not the project be proceeded with, it will however inform how the well should be operated going forward.

4.7. The two potential outcomes of the testing and resultant courses of action are summarised below:

- The testing may show the chemical parameters of the water is unlikely to lead to any measurable biofilm growth in the reticulation. In this event the project could be completed, and the well used in equal rotation with the other wells. In this event the well would contribute approximately 10 - 20% of Rangiora’s total water used.

- The testing may show that biofilm growth could be a risk if this well is used routinely. In this event, the well would still provide its primary objective of being a back-up source to give resilience and redundancy to the scheme in the event that there is an issue with one of the other wells during a period of peak demand. In
this scenario the well would be used only for the peak hours of peak days in summer, and only if there was another issue putting another well out of service. This would mean that it would only be contributing a very minor percentage of overall volume of water to Rangiora. As biofilm is something that builds up over time, using the well in this manner would minimise the total volume of water supplied from this well and therefore minimise the risk of biofilm build up. In the rare events in which the well was used, it would provide a very critical function of ensuring enough safe water is supplied to avoid the risk of a total loss of supply.

4.8. Other mitigating factors or benefits with the new well are summarised below:

- Having sources from a combination of different aquifers or different layers within an aquifer can provide greater resilience to a scheme overall than having all sources within the same aquifer.

- The same anoxic ground conditions which can lead to manganese coming out of solution also minimise the risk of nitrate in solution in the water. This could be a benefit in the very long term, if nitrate levels rise in the wider Canterbury area.

- UV disinfection that is proposed for the Rangiora water supply has been shown to reduce the rate of biofilm growth, although not eliminate it entirely. While the operation of the fifth well would still need to be managed, UV disinfection would help further mitigate the risk of future biofilm growth.

- Chlorination also reduces the risk of biofilm growth. While chlorination is not planned to be implemented, it is possible that this may be mandated in the future. If this were the case, this would further reduce the risk of biofilm becoming an issue as a result of this source.

4.9. It is noted that the yield from the 5th well is less than the other four wells with early estimates at 35 L/s, compared to the other four wells which have yields in the order of 50 to 90 L/s. While ideally this yield would be within the range of the first four wells, this is still enough flow to make a significant difference during times of peak demand. Given the investment made to date versus the required investment to connect this source, this is still considered a preferential option to abandoning the source.

4.10. The alternative option would be to abandon the fifth well due to the risk of biofilm and undertake an options assessment for an alternative site. Given the investment already made in the current site, the relatively low additional cost to complete the project, the time and extra expense in establishing a new location without a site already set aside, this is not recommended.

4.11. By connecting the 5th well now, this will address the immediate need to provide additional resilience to the scheme. The overall scheme capacity and future planning for any additional source flow required can be reviewed again as part of the next Long Term Plan.

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

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

5.2. No groups or organisations have been consulted formally regarding the contents of this report. The Rangiora Ashley Community Board has discussed this matter at a briefing at their August 2019 meeting.
5.3. **Wider Community**

5.4. The wider community has not been consulted regarding the water quality from this well, however the project as a whole was consulted as part of the wider 2018-28 Long Term Plan consultation.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

6.2. The additional cost to complete the project is $200,000 from the current point in time. This is allowed for within existing budget.

6.3. The value of existing assets that would become a sunk cost if the project is not completed at this site is estimated at $350,000.

6.4. Under the alternative option of abandoning this site and developing an additional source elsewhere, a total budget of at least $600,000 is estimated to be required (depending on where is recommended for an alternative site). This is greater than the budget remaining currently, and additional budget would be required.

6.5. **Community Implications**

6.6. The community implications of the project being completed are that the Rangiora water supply would be more resilient, the risk of a loss of supply reduced, and growth on the scheme would be able to continue.

6.7. **Risk Management**

6.8. As covered in the Issues and Options section, the presence of manganese in the water close to the guideline level introduces a risk of a biofilm accumulating in the supply causing potential discolouration or taste and odour issues. These risks are however able to be managed through future testing, and adjustments to the operation of the well depending on the outcome of the testing.

6.9. **Health and Safety**

6.10. The new well is expected to provide an equivalent level of water in terms of microbiological safety as the other wells.

6.11. The health and safety for future construction works to complete the contract will be managed through Council’s health and safety management systems for construction works.

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

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

7.2. **Legislation**

The Health and Safety (Drinking-water) Amendment Act is relevant in this matter.

7.3. **Community Outcomes**
The following community outcomes are relevant in this matter:

- Core utility services are provided in a timely and sustainable manner.

7.4. **Delegations**

The Council has the delegated authority to make decisions on matters such as those covered in this report.
### Attachment I – Chemical Test Result

#### Analytical Report

**Report Number:** 19/23631  
**Issue:** 1  
**Date:** 13 May 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Map Ref.</th>
<th>Date Sampled</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
<th>Order No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19/23631-01</td>
<td>Domestic Water Supply</td>
<td>Notes: Waimakariri District Council Smith St Kaipoi</td>
<td>08/05/2019 10:10</td>
<td>09/05/2019 08:23</td>
<td>BW240437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0001</td>
<td>pH</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0002</td>
<td>Alkalinity - Total</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0005</td>
<td>Conductivity at 25°C</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0055B</td>
<td>Total Dissolved Solids</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0089</td>
<td>Saturation Index</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0070</td>
<td>Bioanionate</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0074</td>
<td>Carbonate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0076</td>
<td>Free CO2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0078</td>
<td>Nitrate - Nitrogen</td>
<td>&lt; 0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0077</td>
<td>Sulphate</td>
<td>&lt; 0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1602</td>
<td>Arsenic - Acid Soluble</td>
<td>&lt; 0.005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1608</td>
<td>Boron - Acid Soluble</td>
<td>&lt; 0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1610</td>
<td>Calcium - Acid Soluble</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1615</td>
<td>Copper - Acid Soluble</td>
<td>&lt; 0.006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1619</td>
<td>Iron - Acid Soluble</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1622</td>
<td>Magnesium - Acid Soluble</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1623</td>
<td>Manganese - Acid Soluble</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1029</td>
<td>Potassium - Acid Soluble</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1034</td>
<td>Sodium - Acid Soluble</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1041</td>
<td>Zinc - Acid Soluble</td>
<td>&lt; 0.005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1042</td>
<td>Total Hardness</td>
<td>04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1044</td>
<td>Calcium Hardness</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M0403</td>
<td>Total Coliforms</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M0404</td>
<td>E. coli</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z06026</td>
<td>Overall Compliance</td>
<td>NZDWS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Signatory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Passes GV of 7.0 to 8.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alkalinity - Total</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not a NZDWS test</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conductivity at 25°C</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not a NZDWS test</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Dissolved Solids</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
<td>Below GV of 1000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturation Index</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td></td>
<td>Passes GV of 1.5 to 0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bioanionate</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not a NZDWS test</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbonate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not a NZDWS test</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free CO2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not a NZDWS test</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrate - Nitrogen</td>
<td>&lt; 0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>Below GV of 0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulphate</td>
<td>&lt; 0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>Below GV of 250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arsenic - Acid Soluble</td>
<td>&lt; 0.005</td>
<td></td>
<td>Below GV of 250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boron - Acid Soluble</td>
<td>&lt; 0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>Below GV of 0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcium - Acid Soluble</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Below GV of 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper - Acid Soluble</td>
<td>&lt; 0.006</td>
<td></td>
<td>Below GV of 0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron - Acid Soluble</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td></td>
<td>Below GV of 0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnesium - Acid Soluble</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Below Total Hardness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manganese - Acid Soluble</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td></td>
<td>Below Total Hardness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potassium - Acid Soluble</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not a NZDWS test</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodium - Acid Soluble</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Below GV of 200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zinc - Acid Soluble</td>
<td>&lt; 0.005</td>
<td></td>
<td>Below GV of 1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Hardness</td>
<td>04</td>
<td></td>
<td>Below Moderate Hardness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcium Hardness</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td>Below Total Hardness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Coliforms</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
<td>MPN/100ml</td>
<td>Passes MAV Limit of 0.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. coli</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
<td>MPN/100mL</td>
<td>Passes MAV Limit of 0.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Signatory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cadmium - Acid Soluble</td>
<td>&lt; 0.0002</td>
<td>g/μL</td>
<td>Passes MAV Limit of 0.004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chromium - Acid Soluble</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>g/μL</td>
<td>Passes MAV Limit of 0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead - Acid Soluble</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>g/μL</td>
<td>Passes MAV Limit of 0.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercury - Acid Soluble</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>g/μL</td>
<td>Passes MAV Limit of 0.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nickel - Acid Soluble</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>g/μL</td>
<td>Passes MAV Limit of 0.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Notes:**

- **Color Coding:**  
  - Green: Passed limits  
  - Yellow: Limit exceeded  
  - Red: Sample failed

**Sample Notes:**  

- **Water Source:** Domestic Water Supply  
- **Sample Location:** Waimakariri District Council Smith St Kaipoi
1. SUMMARY

1.1. This report seeks Council's approval to consult on the proposed speed limit change as shown on attachment ii, and attachment iii and summarised in Table 1 and Table 2.

1.2. This speed limit review covers an area generally bounded by The Ashley River, State Highway 1, Lineside Road, and the Rangiora urban area. However, it excludes those roads included in the 2018/19 speed limit review.

1.3. The Utilities and Roading committee approved a speed limit review in the wider Tuahiwi area at its June Meeting. The area between Rangiora Woodend Road and the Ashley River has been added to that review for the following reasons:

- NZTA is reviewing speed limits on State Highway 1 between Lineside Road and Waikuku. It is considered desirable that speed limits on local roads coming off the State Highway are consistent with the limits on the State Highway.
- The construction of the proposed multi-use sport facility on Coldstream Road will extend the urban area further east, and increase traffic volumes on Coldstream and Golf Links Roads.

Attachments:

i. Report to Utilities and Roading Committee 18 June 2019 Tuahiwi Speed Limit Request to review. (Trim 190606079692)
ii. Proposed speed limit changes Rangiora to Waikuku Map. (Trim 190725104684)
iii. Proposed speed limit changes Tuahiwi Map. (Trim 190725104682)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190723103362
(b) Approves consultation being carried out on the proposed speed limit changes summarised below
### Table 1: Recommended Speed Limits, Rangiora to Waikuku

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Current (km/h)</th>
<th>Proposed (km/h)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coldstream Road, from the end of the existing 50km/h limit to the eastern end of the Multi-Use Sports Facility.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coldstream Road from the eastern end of the Multi-Use Sports Facility to Smarts Road.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf links Road entire length</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marchmont Road entire length</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smarts Road entire length</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulls Road entire length</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wards Road entire length</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus Boulevard from SH1 to the Infinity Drive Roundabout</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preecees Road entire length</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Pa Road entire length</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) **Notes** the consultation on this proposal will be carried out between 7th August and 9th September 2019

### Table 2: Recommended Speed Limits, Tuahiwi Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Current (km/h)</th>
<th>Proposed (km/h)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuahiwi Road from Boys Road to a point 100m north west of Turiwhaia Road</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuahiwi Road from a point 100m north west of Turiwhaia Road for a length of 500 m</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuahiwi Road from a point 130m South of Greens Road to a point 100m North of Bramleys Road.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okaiahu Road entire length</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikoruru Road entire length</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsh Road entire length</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camside Road entire length</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngs Road entire length</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turiwhaia Road entire length</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topito Road entire length</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greens Road entire length</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Pouapatuki Road entire length</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Bush Road entire length</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa Road entire length</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cox Road entire length</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Road entire length</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bramleys Road entire length</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revells Road entire length</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(d) **Notes** that this report will be presented to the Community Boards at their August meetings

(e) **Notes** that the results of the consultation, and the final speed limit proposals will be presented to the Community Boards prior to coming to Council for approval.
Notes that any submissions on the proposal will be taken into account before the final speed limit change proposals are presented to the Council for approval.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 A meeting was held at Tuahiwi Marae on 3rd May 2019 where a number of issues were discussed including road safety and speed in the wider Tuahiwi area.

3.2 The meeting was facilitated by Mahaanui Kurataiao Ltd and involved a number of residents from the Tuahiwi area. There were a number of concerns discussed including the following:

- Speed through the village and the wider MR873 area
- Safety for people using the footpaths including elderly and children
- Volumes of traffic increasing
- Pedestrian and cycling facilities

3.1. Staff considered this request and agreed that a review of road safety including speed limits should be undertaken within the wider area. This is likely to result in safety improvements being undertaken and changes to speed limits.

3.2. The Utilities and Roading committee approved a speed limit review in the wider Tuahiwi area at its June 2019 Meeting.

NZTA projects

3.3. NZTA has projects underway to provide safer access across and onto State Highway 1 in Woodend, and to improve safety on the remainder of the State Highway between the Ashley River and Belfast.

3.4. Speed limit reviews are an integral part of those projects. NZTA is consulting on the following speed limit changes on SH1 from August 5th 2019 through until September 6th 2019:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Current (km/h)</th>
<th>Proposed (km/h)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lineside Road to south of 50km/h at southern end of Woodend</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South of existing 50km/h at southern end of Woodend to existing 50km/h</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through Woodend</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing 70km/h at northern end of Woodend to north of Pegasus Roundabout</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North of Pegasus Roundabout to southern end of Waikuku</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through Waikuku</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern end of Waikuku to Ashley River Bridge</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5. Council proposes to construct a multi-use sports facility to the east of the existing hockey fields on the southern side of Coldstream Road. There is also a proposal to urbanise the section of Coldstream Road from the railway line to the end of the proposed sports facility.

3.6. As a result of NZTA’s speed limit review on SH1 and of the proposed sports hub and Coldstream Road urbanisation, it was considered appropriate to add local roads in the area between Rangiora Woodend Road and the Ashley River to this speed limit review.
3.7. This speed limit review has been based on the 2017 Speed Limit Setting rule, and the 2016 Speed Management Guide.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. Megamaps is NZTA’s desk top Speed Management Framework assessment tool. This tool provides Road Controlling Authorities with a large amount of speed management information, including a coarse assessment of the Safe and Appropriate Speed on roads throughout New Zealand, and information on mean operating speeds based on Tom Tom GPS data.

4.2. The Safe and Appropriate speeds identified in Megamaps on each of the roads being reviewed has been reviewed using more detailed and specific manual assessment.

4.3. A proposed speed limit on each of the roads under review has been identified based on the Speed limit setting rule, and using all of this data.

4.4. The current speed limits, mean operating speeds from the Tom Tom data, the assessed safe and appropriate speeds from both Megamaps and the manual assessment, and the resulting proposed speed limits are shown in Table 3. Unsealed roads are highlighted in yellow on this table.

*Table 3 Speed Limit Assessments*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Current Speed Limit (km/h)</th>
<th>Mean Operating Speed (km/h)</th>
<th>Assessed Safe and Appropriate Speed (km/h) –</th>
<th>Proposed Speed Limit (km/h)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coldstream Road, from the end of the existing 50km/h limit to the eastern end of the Multi-Use Sports Facility.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>40 (Megamaps) 50 (Manual)</td>
<td>50 (Manual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coldstream Road from the eastern end of the Multi-Use Sports Facility to Smarts Road.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>80 (Megamaps) 80 (Manual)</td>
<td>80 (Manual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf links Road entire length</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>80 (Megamaps) 80 (Manual)</td>
<td>80 (Manual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marchmont Road entire length</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>80 (Megamaps) 80 (Manual)</td>
<td>80 (Manual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smarts Road entire length</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>80 (Megamaps) 80 (Manual)</td>
<td>80 (Manual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulls Road entire length</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>60 (Megamaps) 80 (Manual)</td>
<td>80 (Manual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wards Road entire length</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>&lt;30 (Manual)</td>
<td>60 (Megamaps) 60 (Manual)</td>
<td>80 (Manual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus Boulevard from SH1 to the Infinity Drive Roundabout</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>50 (Megamaps) 80 (Manual)</td>
<td>60 (Manual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preeces Road entire length</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>60 (Megamaps) 60 (Manual)</td>
<td>80 (Manual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Pa Road entire length</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>60 (Megamaps) 80 (Manual)</td>
<td>80 (Manual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuahiwi Road from Boys Road to a point 100m north west of Turiwhaia Road</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>80 (Megamaps) 80 (Manual)</td>
<td>80 (Manual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuahiwi Road from a point 100m north west of Turiwhaia Road for a length of 500 m</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>80 (Megamaps) 60 (Manual)</td>
<td>60 (Manual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuahiwi Road from a point 130m South of Greens Road to a point 100m North of Bramleys Road.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>60 (Megamaps) 40 (Manual)</td>
<td>40 (Manual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okahau Road entire length</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>60 (Megamaps) 80 (Manual)</td>
<td>80 (Manual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikoruru Road entire length</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>60 (Megamaps) 80 (Manual)</td>
<td>80 (Manual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsh Road entire length</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>60 (Megamaps) 80 (Manual)</td>
<td>80 (Manual)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unsealed Roads

4.5. The assessed safe and appropriate speed on the unsealed rural roads varies between 50km/h and 80km/h. This assessment generally depends on the geometry of the road and the roadside hazards.

4.6. A regional speed management plan is proposed across the Canterbury region. It is expected that this will include a consistent approach for unsealed roads across the region. Until that regional approach is formulated, it is recommended that a consistent limit of 80km/h is adopted when unsealed roads are reviewed in the District.

4.7. If the regional approach recommends limits on unsealed roads of less than 80km/h, then those limits can be reduced as appropriate.

**Differences between Megamaps, the Manual Assessment and Proposed Speed Limit**

4.8. There is some variation between the safe and appropriate speeds as assessed by Megamaps, and the manual assessment, and the proposed speed limits in some locations. These differences are discussed below.

4.9. The manual assessment has concluded that **Tulls Road** is less windy than Megamaps. This has resulted in an assessed safe and appropriate speed of 80 km/h from the manual assessment rather than 60 km/h from megamaps.

4.10. The manual assessment has concluded that **Pegasus Boulevard** is less windy than Megamaps. Megamaps also appears to have assumed that there are more properties accessing Pegasus Boulevard than the manual assessment has. This has resulted in an assessed safe and appropriate speed of 80 km/h from the manual assessment rather than 50 km/h from megamaps.

4.11. The current posted speed limit on Pegasus Boulevard is 70km/h. Pegasus Boulevard is an unusual road environment. It passes through an urban environment, but has no property accesses from it. Whilst 80km/h is theoretically the safe and appropriate speed for this road, it is not considered appropriate in this specific environment.

4.12. Pegasus Boulevard is currently sign posted at 70 km/h. Given NZTA’s desire to move away from speed limits of 70 km/h and 90 km/h a change to 60 km/h is considered an appropriate speed limit if it was to change.

**Urban Areas to Change (60 km/h, 50 km/h and 40 km/h)**
4.13. **Tuahiwi Road** currently has a section of urban area that is sign posted at 50 km/h. The speed management guide recommends that a speed limit of less than 50 km/h is suitable for Tuahiwi Road through the township. Given the rural town nature of Tuahiwi a speed limit of 40 km/h would be appropriate to replace the existing 50 km/h speed limit. To accompany the adjusted 40 km/h, a speed limit of 60 km/h extending 500 m to the north of the existing urban zone to ensure driver behaviour complies with the proposed 40 km/h speed limit in the Tuahiwi village.

4.14. Operating speeds within the Tuahiwi village are in the range of 55 to 60km/h. If the speed limit through the village is reduced to 40km/h, then traffic calming measures are likely to be required to ensure reasonable compliance with the new speed limit. Options such as alternative line markings, and stronger threshold treatments may be considered.

4.15. Further investigation to traffic flows and speed counts is set to be undertaken through Tuahiwi Village, Greens Road, Revells Road, Te Pouapatuki Road, Marsh Road and Turiwhaia Road are programmed to be completed by the end of August. The observations from this investigation will be used to determine what the current traffic volumes and operating speeds are within the vicinity of Tuahiwi.

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

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

5.2. A meeting was held at Tuahiwi Marae on 3rd May 2019. The meeting was facilitated by Mahaanui Kurataiao Ltd and attended by Ngāi Tūāhuriri members. Issues of concern raised at the meeting included road safety and speed in the wider Tuahiwi area.

5.3. Seven service requests have also been formally lodged during the last two years regarding speed.

5.4. During the proposed consultation process the views of the following key stakeholder groups will be sought:

- The local community that is considered to be affected by the proposed speed limit
- Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga
- The Commissioner of Police
- The Chief Executive Officer of NZ Transport Agency
- The Chief Executive Officer of the NZ Automobile Association Inc
- The Chief Executive Officer of the Road Transport Forum NZ

5.5. **Wider Community** the views of the wider community on these specific speed limit changes will be sought through the consultation process. The wider community, including users of the affected roads, will be informed of the consultation process through social media, advertisements in the local newspapers, Variable Message Signs on the affected roads, and a drop in session.

5.6. In addition, residents on the affected roads will be informed of the consultation through a letterbox drop.

5.7. Feedback has been sought from the wider community regarding the wider question of whether speed limits on these roads should be lowered. The feedback process did not
propose any specific speed limits. Full details of the feedback received are included in the previous report to Council (Attachment i)

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications** There are no financial implications in consulting on this

6.2. **Community Implications** The views of the community are being sought

6.3. **Risk Management** The risks associated with consulting on this are considered low

6.4. **Health and Safety** There are considered to be few health and safety implications associated with consulting on this.

7. **CONTEXT**

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

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

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

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

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

**Governance**

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

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

7.4. **Delegations**

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

REPORT FOR DECISION

FILE NO and TRIM NO: RDG-31 / 190606079692

REPORT TO: Utilities & Roading Committee

DATE OF MEETING: 18 June 2019

FROM: Joanne McBride - Roading & Transport Manager
Bill Rice – Senior Transportation Engineer

SUBJECT: Request for Approval to Undertake a Speed Limit Review in the Tuahiwi Area.

SIGNED BY: (for Reports to Council, Committees or Boards)
Department Manager
Chief Executive

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to seek approval to undertake a speed limit review process in the wider Tuahiwi area, within the perimeter of Lineside Road / Main North Road / Rangiora Woodend Road and Boys Road.

1.2. A meeting was held at Tuahiwi Marae on 3rd May 2019 where a number of issues were discussed including road safety and speed in the wider Tuahiwi area. This meeting was requested and facilitated by Mahaanui Kurataiao Ltd.

1.3. There have also been a number of service requests received requesting a review of or changes to speed limits in the area which supports these wider concerns.

1.4. Nationally there is a move towards more consideration being given to safe and appropriate speeds within the roading network. This is just one of the measures being used to help reduce deaths and serious injuries because the results of all crashes are strongly influenced by impact speed.

1.5. It is proposed that staff undertake a review of the speed limits in the area including undertaking speed counts and a review of any physical works which would be required prior to going out to wider consultation on proposed speed limits.

1.6. Consideration will also be given to road safety initiatives in the area to support safe and appropriate speed limits.

1.7. The safe and appropriate speed for these roads will be assessed using NZTA’s Speed Management Guide (2016).

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Utilities & Roading Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 190606079692;
(b) Approves staff undertaking a review of speed limits in the wider Tuahiwi area generally within the boundary of (but excluding) Lineside Road / Main North Road / Rangiora Woodend Road and Boys Road;

(c) Notes that a further report will be brought to the Rangiora-Ashley, Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi and Woodend-Sefton Community Boards on the proposed changes and requesting approval from Council to consult prior to going out to the community;

(d) Notes that speed limits will be assessed using NZTA’s Speed Management Guide (2016);

(e) Circulates this report to the Rangiora-Ashley, Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi and Woodend-Sefton Community Boards for information.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 A meeting was held at Tuahiwi Marae on 3rd May 2019 where a number of issues were discussed including road safety and speed in the wider Tuahiwi area.

3.2 The meeting was facilitated by Mahaanui Kurataiao Ltd and involved a number of residents from the Tuahiwi area. There were a number of concerns discussed including the following:

- Speed through the village and the wider MR873 area
- Safety for people using the footpaths including elderly and children
- Volumes of traffic increasing
- Pedestrian and cycling facilities

3.3 Staff have considered this request and it is agreed that a review of road safety including speed limits should be undertaken within the wider area. This is likely to result in safety improvements being undertaken and changes to speed limits.

3.4 Previously a speed limit review has been carried out for Rangiora Woodend Road / Gressons Road / Boys Road and as such these are not included within the speed limit review area.

3.5 Lineside Road and Main North Road (Woodend to Pine Ares corner) are controlled by NZTA and as such they are responsible for the setting of speed limits on these roads. Staff will liaise with NZTA about wider effects as part of this project.

3.6 Staff are working to develop a ‘Speed Management Implementation Plan’ which will outline the proposed phasing for review of speed limits across the wider district. This will be brought to the Utilities & Roading Committee and Council before the end of the year.

3.7 The speed limit review in Tuahiwi is being carried out ahead of the completion of the ‘Speed Management Implementation Plan’ to address ongoing concerns raised by Ngai Tūāhuriri and through service requests.

3.8 A memo has been sent to all Community Boards outlining this issue and the proposed timeline for consultation.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. It is acknowledged that there has been an increase in traffic using the Tuahiwi area due to a number of factors including; traffic shortcutting the roadworks on Rangiora Woodend Rd, traffic shortcutting to avoid congestion in Southbrook and drivers shortcutting due to difficulties turning out onto the State Highway.
4.2. There are plans for increased development in the MR873 Maori Reserve area and it is acknowledged that this will result in an increase in traffic and demand for walking and cycling.

4.3. Nationally through the Safer Journeys programme there has been a move towards ensuring safe and appropriate speed within the roading network. This is just one of the measures being used to help reduce deaths and serious injuries because the results of all crashes are strongly influenced by impact speed.

4.4. Expectation is that by 2020 all Road Controlling Authorities apply a nationally consistent approach to speed limits that considers the Safe System approach. This approach will be reinforced by a consistent set of messages about what the appropriate speed is for different kinds of routes/situations and taking into account all road users (e.g. pedestrians and cyclists).

4.5. Staff have considered the feedback from Ngāi Tūāhuriri, service requests, the road environment and reviewed NZTA Safe and Appropriate speeds information. A review of speeds is considered to be appropriate in this area, supported by safety improvements.

4.6. The following is the proposed timeline for reviewing speed limits and complementary traffic calming measures in the area:

**June 2019**
- 18th June - U&R Committee Meeting – Report seeking approval to undertake a speed limit review in the wider area.
- Carry out speed surveys in the area identified for a speed limit review. This is to be done once the road works are complete on Rangiora Woodend Road, and traffic volumes revert to a normal flows. These surveys will include the following information:
  - Total vehicle numbers
  - Speeds
  - Proportion of heavy vehicles

**July 2019**
- Technical / design work and speed limit review to be carried out.

**August 2019**
- Reports to the Rangiora-Ashley, Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi and Woodend-Sefton Community Boards seeking a recommendation to Council to consult on proposed speed limits, and speed limits for approval prior to formal speed limit change consultation.

**September 2019**
- 3rd September – Approval sought from Council to consult on proposed speed limits, and speed limits for approval prior to formal speed limit change consultation, including a preliminary outline of physical works to support speed limits.

**November 2019**
- 5th November - Briefing to the new Council prior to formal consultation beginning.
- 10th November – Formal speed limit consultation starts and is open for 4 weeks.

**December 2019**
- Consultation closes mid-December
- Review feedback and prepared report to Council late December

**February 2020**
- Report to Council for adoption at the first meeting of the year.

4.7. The area of speed limit review proposed is as shown in the diagram below.
4.8. The Management Team have reviewed this report and support the recommendations.

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

5.2. A meeting was held at Tuahiwi Marae on 3rd May 2019. The meeting was facilitated by Mahaanui Kurataiao Ltd and attended by Ngāi Tūāhuriri members. Issues of concern raised at the meeting included road safety and speed in the wider Tuahiwi area.

5.3. Seven service requests have also been formally lodged during the last two years regarding speed.

5.4. **Wider Community**

5.5. No specific wider community views have been sought at this time however this would be carried out through the formal consultation process.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

6.2. The costs of undertaking the review and implementation of signage changes can be managed from within existing Roading budgets.
6.3. There are likely to be physical works which will need to be undertaken to help improve safety and reinforce slower speeds through the area. Some minor works can be accommodated within existing Road Safety budgets however there is no budget if more significant work is required.

6.4. Community Implications

6.5. The community will be consulted through the next phase of the speed limit review process.

6.6. Road safety and speed have been raised as issues by Ngāi Tūāhuriri at the annual hui for a number of years. Any changes will need to be done in consultation with Ngāi Tūāhuriri.

6.7. Risk Management

6.8. There is a risk with this process being undertaken over a period when local body elections are taking place, as this could cause further delays.

6.9. There is a risk that the process outcomes may not meet expectation.

6.10. Health and Safety

6.11. Reviewing and implementing safety improvements helps promote and maintain public health & safety.

6.12. Any field work required will be undertaken under the guidelines of the Safe Working in the Field manual.

7. CONTEXT

7.1. Policy

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

7.2. Legislation

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

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

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

7.3. Community Outcomes

This report consider the following outcomes:

There is a safe environment for all

- Harm to people from natural and man-made hazards is minimised.
- Our district has the capacity and resilience to quickly recover from natural disasters and adapt to the effects of climate change.
- Crime, injury and harm from road crashes, gambling, and alcohol abuse are minimised.
Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable and sustainable

- The standard of our District’s roads is keeping pace with increasing traffic numbers.
- Communities in our District are well linked with each other and Christchurch is readily accessible by a range of transport modes.

7.4. Delegations

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

REPORT FOR DECISION

FILE NO and TRIM NO: DDS-06-10-02-07-01 / 190729105732

REPORT TO: Council

DATE OF MEETING: 6 August 2019

FROM: Trevor Ellis, Development Planning Manager

SUBJECT: Regional Policy Statement Change

SIGNED BY: (for Reports to Council, Committees or Boards)

1. SUMMARY

1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Council to receive and consider making comments under Schedule 1 clause 3 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) on pre-notification draft changes to Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS).

1.2 The changes are targeted changes to Chapter 6. These changes implement a specific action from Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update Whakahângai O Te Hôrâpa Nohoanga (‘Our Space’, being a future development strategy under the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity) that was recently adopted by Council, on 2 July 2019, and the Greater Christchurch Partnership.

1.3 Specifically, Our Space provides direction to amend the CRPS to identify future urban development areas and enable the Selwyn and Waimakariri District Councils to re-zone, subject to demonstrated need in a current capacity assessment, additional land for housing within the existing defined infrastructure boundary on Map A.

Attachments:
i. Draft proposed change to the RPS (190730105991)
ii. Draft proposed amendments to Map A. (190730105993)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190729105732.

(b) Supports draft changes to the CRPS as set out in Attachments (i) and (ii).

(c) Supports application to the Minister for the Environment to agree to use of the Streamlined Planning Process to make these amendments to the CRPS.

(d) Delegates to the Mayor and Chief Executive to provide any specific comments on the pre-notification draft changes to the RPS by Friday 16 August 2019.
3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 The Greater Christchurch Partnership (GCP) has been working collaboratively to undertake a review of the Settlement Pattern for Greater Christchurch. This project has been structured to ensure that it enables the partner councils (being the Canterbury Regional Council, Waimakariri District Council, Christchurch City Council, and Selwyn District Council) to meet the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity (NPS-UDC), and reviews and advances the existing strategic planning context outlined in the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy (UDS) and Chapter 6 (Recovery and Rebuild of Greater Christchurch) of the RPS.

3.2 A key of the project has been the preparation of a Future Development Strategy during 2018/19. The NPS-UDC directs local authorities to provide sufficient, feasible development capacity for housing and business growth to meet demand in the short (1 to 3 years), medium (3 to 10 years) and long term (10 to 30 years).

3.3 A Future Development Strategy is required to:

- demonstrate that there will be sufficient, feasible development capacity in the medium and long term;
- set out how minimum housing targets will be met;
- identify the broad location, timing and sequencing of future development capacity in new urban environments and intensification opportunities within existing urban environments;
- balance the certainty regarding the provision of future urban development with the need to be responsive to demand for such development;
- be informed by a Capacity Assessment, the relevant Long Term Plans and Infrastructure Strategies required under the Local Government Act 2002, and any other relevant strategies, plans and documents; and
- have particular regard to NPS-UDC Policy PA1 requiring that local authorities ensure that at any one time there is sufficient housing and business land development capacity.

3.4 National guidance on producing a Future Development Strategy, in reference to existing growth strategies, also encourages “amending, refreshing, and building on existing strategies to meet the particular NPS-UDC requirements rather than developing an entirely new strategy”. This can include the CRPS, which was made operative in 2013.

3.5 Following an extensive consultation process, *Our Space* was adopted by the Greater Christchurch councils (being the Christchurch City Council, Selwyn District Council, Waimakariri District Council and Environment Canterbury) in June and July 2019. Our Space includes a direction to identify future urban development areas and enable the Selwyn and Waimakariri District Councils to re-zone, subject to demonstrated need in a current capacity assessment, additional land for housing within the existing defined infrastructure boundary on Map A of the CRPS.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

**Housing Targets**

4.1. The Canterbury Regional Council, Christchurch City Council, Selwyn District Council and Waimakariri District Council are also required by the NPS-UDC to set minimum targets for sufficient, feasible development capacity for housing and incorporate these minimum
4.2. The minimum housing targets have been consulted on as part of Our Space because the NPS-UDC requires a future development strategy to set out how the minimum targets set in accordance with policies PC5 and PC9 will be met. The targets are set out in Table 2 of Our Space.

4.3. Council resolved at its meeting of 2 July 2019 to set minimum housing targets in accordance with the targets contained in Table 2 in Our Space and incorporate its housing targets within the Waimakariri District Plan in addition to the resolution adopting Our Space.

4.4. Our Space identifies that after considering the remaining housing capacity, there is a shortfall of 1,600 households in the medium term, and a further 7,060 households in the long term. Our Space identifies the location of where the housing shortfall will be addressed (shown below in yellow). These locations are subject to a structure planning process which Council is currently developing (for East / West Rangiora and Kaiapoi) and will be completed in time to be included into the notified version of the proposed District Plan (mid 2020).

Change to RPS Chapter 6

4.5. Now that Our Space is adopted by partner councils, Environment Canterbury have coordinated the collaborative preparation of a change to Chapter 6 of the CRPS as outlined in Our Space. Waimakariri District Council staff have been extensively involved in the preparation of the draft Change.

4.6. The draft Proposed Change to Chapter 6 seeks to make the following amendments to Chapter 6 and Map A of the operative CRPS (see attachments):

4.6.1. Amend Map A to identify Future Development Areas in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi as shown in above.

4.6.2. Insert a new policy (Policy 6.3.12), to enable land within these Future Development Areas to be re-zoned by the Selwyn and Waimakariri District Councils if required to meet their medium-term housing needs.

4.6.3. Make consequential changes to objectives, policies, text and definitions within Chapter 6 of the CRPS.

4.7. Not all of the land within the proposed Future Development Areas would be zoned for urban development immediately. The need to re-zone land within these areas would be informed by housing capacity assessments carried out jointly by the Christchurch City Council, Selwyn District Council, Waimakariri District Council, Environment Canterbury.
and Ngāi Tahu at least every three years. Structure planning is currently underway for these areas and those plans, which finalised ahead of the release of the District Plan in 2020 will guide zoning and development.

4.8. To inform the preparation of the change, Environment Canterbury is consulting with local and central government agencies, tangata whenua (through the iwi authority), and landowners within the Future Development Areas proposed to be identified on Map A in the CRPS, under Schedule 1 clause 3 of the RMA.

Process to progress Chapter 6

4.9. The Canterbury Regional Council is considering making a request to the Minister for the Environment for a direction to use a streamlined planning process (SPP) to implement the proposed change. This is an alternative plan making process under the RMA, intended to increase flexibility and provide a shortened process in certain circumstances, and which could be appropriate for this targeted change.

4.10. The streamlined planning provisions in the RMA allow plan making processes to be tailored to specific issues and circumstances. Unlike the standard RMA Part 1 Schedule 1 process, under a streamlined planning process the Minister for the Environment is the decision maker (not the Council) and there are no rights of appeal, only judicial review. The streamlined planning process still provides opportunities for public and stakeholder participation, including through formal submissions.

4.11. This process and alternatives have been discussed by the Greater Christchurch Partnership (GCP) and subject to consideration by the Chief Executive Advisory Group (CEAG) for the partnership. The process steps and timeframes are set by the Minister and can be tailored to suit the planning issues involved. Early discussions have occurred with MFE staff as to the process and its use. The SPP will be important to expeditiously progress the Proposed Change in a timely manner, relative to the timing of the proposed notification of the Council’s Reviewed District Plan in July 2020.

4.12. The Chief Executive has reviewed this report and supports the recommendations.

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations / Wider Community

Consultation on Our Space has been undertaken in accordance with Part 6 of the Local Government Act 2002. As part of this, Waimakariri District Council also separately notified landowners within their proposed future development areas by letter. This has occurred again as part the pre-notification consultation process under Schedule 1 clause 3 of the Resource Management Act 1991, although this is not specifically required.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

There are no financial implications directly associated with the pre-notification comments phase on the RPS change. Existing budgets apply to the implementation of Our Space.

6.2. Community Implications

Significant opportunities for community engagement have occurred to date. Further opportunities are now available to land owners within identified areas. Other stakeholders
and submitters on Our Space will have opportunities to submit on the notified change, schedule for later in the year, as will the general public.

6.3. Risk Management

No new risks are identified in relation to the recommendations.

6.4. Health and Safety

Not applicable.

7. CONTEXT

7.1. Policy

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

7.2. Legislation


7.3. Community Outcomes

- There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision making that effects our District.
- There is a healthy and sustainable environment for all.
- There are areas of significant indigenous vegetation and habitats for indigenous fauna.
- Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality.
- The distinctive character of our takiwā – towns, villages and rural areas is maintained.
Draft Proposed Change to Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement

July 2019
Draft Proposed Change to Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement

How amendments to Chapter 6 are shown

The draft proposed amendments to Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement are shown as follows:

- Content proposed to be changed is located within a blue dashed box.
- Proposed insertions are underlined.
- Proposed deletions are in strikethrough.

The draft proposed amendments to Map A can also be viewed in higher resolution on a separate map titled ‘Draft Proposed Amendment to Map A: Identification of Future Development Areas’ available at www.ecan.govt.nz/crps.

Comments on the potential use of a Streamlined Planning Process

As part of this consultation we are also inviting your feedback on the potential to use a Streamlined Planning Process under Part 5 of Schedule 1 and sections 80B and 80C of the Resource Management Act 1991.
CHAPTER 6- RECOVERY AND REBUILDING OF GREATER CHRISTCHURCH

Introduction

The insertion of this chapter into the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS) was directed by the Minister for Canterbury Earthquake Recovery in the Land Use Recovery Plan for Greater Christchurch and under section 27 of the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Act 2011.

The chapter is consistent with the Recovery Strategy for Greater Christchurch and the Christchurch Central Recovery Plan, and supports their implementation.

This chapter focuses on the metropolitan urban area of Greater Christchurch and towns stretching from Lincoln, Prebbleton and Rolleston in the south to Kaiapoi, Rangiora and Woodend/Pegasus in the north and the rural areas between Rangiora, Rolleston and Lincoln. The geographic extent of Greater Christchurch, for the purposes of this chapter, is shown in Map A (page 6-27). The Ashley River/Rakahuri lies to the north, the Waimakariri River cuts through the centre, the Port Hills and Selwyn River lie to the south and Pegasus Bay and Lyttelton Harbour/Whakaraupo are to the east. It excludes the area of Banks Peninsula as indicated in Map A. In Waimakariri District, Two Chain Road is the western boundary of the sub-region and in Selwyn District the western boundary follows Highfield and Station Roads (shown on Map A). It does not extend to the coastal waters adjoining this area.

Chapter 6 provides a resource management framework for the recovery of Greater Christchurch, to enable and support earthquake recovery and rebuilding, including restoration and enhancement, for the area through to 2028. Recovery in Greater Christchurch is also supported by provisions in Chapter 5 – Land use and infrastructure that are notated “Entire Region”. The provisions in the remainder of the CRPS also apply.

The purpose of Chapter 6 is to enable recovery by providing for development in a way that achieves the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991.

For discussion and provisions regarding specific resource matters (for example, energy, biodiversity and landscape), further reference should be made to other chapters in the CRPS.

6.1 ISSUES

6.1.1 ENABLING RECOVERY, REBUILDING AND DEVELOPMENT

How to provide certainty to the community and businesses around how Greater Christchurch will accommodate expected population and household relocation and growth, housing needs and economic activity during the recovery period in an efficient and environmentally sustainable manner. This includes providing for a diverse community with a range of incomes, needs and business types.

Explanation

While the needs for Greater Christchurch in the long term are important, recovery and rebuilding in the short term are critical.

The community requires certainty around where recovery development will take place during the recovery period to enable planning for delivery of infrastructure and protection of key resources such as strategic transport networks, water supply, and other significant natural and physical resources. In particular, it is important that resources are directed to specific geographic areas, to enable efficient and effective public investment in strategic, network and social infrastructure. Without certainty and forward planning, recovery for the Central City, Key Activity Centres and neighbourhood centres will be slower, and will result in inefficient investment decisions being made by infrastructure providers and developers, and incur unnecessary additional costs for local authorities.

When making decisions around accommodating residential and business relocation and growth over the recovery period, it is recognised that there is a range of needs among the community, in terms of both residential accommodation and business provision. A spectrum of housing types needs to be available to accommodate people on different levels of
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income and with different requirements, including a possible temporary working population, as well as providing for diversity among the different business types that operate within Greater Christchurch, from small offices and retail through to large industrial sites. It is important that the functions of different types of business zones are protected to ensure that lower-value industrial land is not competing with potentially higher-value office and retail development.

6.1.2 ADVERSE EFFECTS ARISING FROM DEVELOPMENT

Development can result in adverse effects on the environment, which if not identified and avoided, remedied or mitigated where appropriate, could result in inappropriate outcomes for the region’s natural and physical resources, and reduce Greater Christchurch’s resilience and ability to provide for the needs of people and communities. Poorly planned development can increase risk from natural hazards and the effects of climate change, create resource use conflicts, increase community isolation, prevent the efficient and effective delivery of infrastructure and services, reduce economic viability and result in greater overall energy consumption.

Explanation

There are a number of environmental challenges to providing for recovery, rebuilding and development in Greater Christchurch. These need to be recognised and provided for through a clear planning framework. For Greater Christchurch, the key resource management issues include:

a. The potential for contamination of Christchurch City’s drinking water as a result of inappropriate development over the unconfined aquifer to the west of the city;

b. The negative effects of stormwater being discharged directly into waterways without land-based or wetland treatment;

c. The potential to compromise or lose significant natural resources, character and amenity, and lost opportunities for enhancement;

d. The potential to undermine the role and function of the Central City and Key Activity Centres together with the investment made in these centres;

e. Risks to people and property from natural hazards such as flooding, coastal inundation, earthquakes, rockfall, rock roll or coastal erosion;

f. Sea-level rise and the effects of climate change;

g. Conflicts between legitimately established activities and sensitive activities which seek to locate in proximity to these (reverse sensitivity);

h. Efficient and effective provision for maintenance, upgrade and delivery of services and infrastructure, in particular strategic infrastructure;

i. Minimising energy consumption;

j. Providing for development in the right place, at the right time, to meet the needs of the community.

Within these issues lies an opportunity to plan for better outcomes and make better decisions about the resources that are used for Greater Christchurch to rebuild and recover.

A key element in successful recovery and rebuilding is the recognition of existing infrastructure and service delivery. It is important that relocation and growth during the recovery period do not compromise the efficient operation of infrastructure, particularly strategic infrastructure.

Recovery can be more effectively and efficiently achieved if it supports existing centres of activity, such as the Central City, Key Activity Centres and neighbourhood centres. Some recent urban development has not utilised the opportunities available to integrate effectively with existing urban centres.

The links between the size of a future urban footprint and the level of energy used need to be given weight. Urban growth occurred before the earthquakes across Greater Christchurch in a way that resulted in accelerated energy use, in particular where development has created a more dispersed and fragmented urban form. Smaller and consolidated urban footprints encourage the use of less energy, especially those areas where travel patterns can be reduced through optimum relationships between residential, employment, shopping, educational and recreational activities. They also provide better opportunity and choice for people in terms of transport modes.

The costs of the infrastructure necessary to sustain rebuilding and recovery are significant. There are advantages in extending existing services and encouraging a scale of growth sufficient to promote servicing economies rather than meeting the demands of dispersed development.

Costs of growth must be factored into location decisions, as unplanned growth can impact on the rural land resource, existing rural industries and rural character.
Chapter 6 - Recovery and Rebuilding of Greater Christchurch

6.1.3 TRANSPORT EFFECTIVENESS

Urban land use and development in inappropriate locations, or that is poorly integrated with transport networks, can adversely affect the efficient use, development and recovery of transport infrastructure and services, through:

a. the location of residential and other sensitive activities close to strategic transport networks;

b. high energy use associated with private car dependency and the need to travel greater distances;

c. inefficient development and operation of strategic transport networks;

d. less opportunities for modal choice for transport;

e. adverse public health outcomes;

f. reduced safety; and

g. a failure to optimise the use of available capacity within the existing transport network.

Explanation

An efficient and effective transport system through the period of the Greater Christchurch rebuild, and continuing on through its recovery, will deliver much greater economic returns to Canterbury. This period will be challenging, and it is acknowledged that there are likely to be reduced levels of service which new development is likely to exacerbate.

Helping ensure environmental sustainability from a transport perspective means that existing key transport hubs such as airports and ports must be safeguarded. Land use patterns need to be organised so that energy requirements are minimised and the efficient functioning of strategic transport networks is not compromised by traffic associated with local development or reverse sensitivity concerns. Reduced efficiency in the transport network will increase costs for businesses, as well as commuters. Poorly integrated development, or development in inappropriate locations, can also affect the accessibility and uptake of public transport and active modes of transport, and combined with increased air pollution can reduce the potential for improved public health.

Well-designed development that integrates with transport networks, and that makes efficient use of existing capacity, is essential to providing for business growth and access to community services, as important components of rebuilding and recovery.

6.1.4 AMENITY AND URBAN DESIGN

While the speed of recovery is important, so too is the quality of the built form. Poorly designed development can adversely affect urban amenity values, rural amenity values, historic heritage, health and safety, integration with community, educational, social and commercial facilities, and overall liveability. These matters are important for retaining population and attracting skilled workers and new business opportunities. They will affect the timing and the success of recovery.

Explanation

Sometimes the desire to rebuild quickly competes with the desire to build well or build back better. Enabling timely and appropriate development during the recovery period in a manner that does not compromise the key values of either existing or future communities is a challenge that must be recognised at Greater Christchurch, city, district and neighbourhood levels. Rebuilding can also impact on issues of significance to Ngāi Tahu, affecting their relationship with ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga. In particular, good urban design will contribute to vibrant and renewed centres and help support wider wellbeing objectives such as quality of life, economic vitality and crime reduction.
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6.1.5 RURAL RESIDENTIAL IMPACTS

Rural residential development, if unconstrained, has the potential to change the character of rural areas and to create adverse effects on established rural, farming (including agricultural research farms) and quarrying activities through reverse sensitivity. It also can result in dispersed settlement patterns, and inefficient forms of development and provision of services.

Explanation

Many of the rural western areas of Greater Christchurch remained undamaged during the earthquakes and are also located out of the area identified as being prone to liquefaction, making them more desirable locations to live. However, rural residential development is associated with reverse sensitivity effects and can give rise to requests for the extension of urban services and exacerbates dispersed settlement patterns, leading to inefficient use of infrastructure and impacts on rural production. This can lead to pressures for future urbanisation, which is difficult to achieve in an effective manner given that the land use pattern has been established for a different purpose.

6.2 OBJECTIVES

6.2.1 Recovery framework

Recovery, rebuilding and development are enabled within Greater Christchurch through a land use and infrastructure framework that:

1. identifies priority areas for urban development within Greater Christchurch;
2. identifies Key Activity Centres which provide a focus for high quality, and, where appropriate, mixed-use development that incorporates the principles of good urban design;
3. avoids urban development outside of existing urban areas or greenfield priority areas for development, unless expressly provided for in the CRPS;
4. protects outstanding natural features and landscapes including those within the Port Hills from inappropriate subdivision, use and development;
5. protects and enhances indigenous biodiversity and public space;
6. maintains or improves the quantity and quality of water in groundwater aquifers and surface waterbodies, and quality of ambient air;
7. maintains the character and amenity of rural areas and settlements;
8. protects people from unacceptable risk from natural hazards and the effects of sea-level rise;
9. integrates strategic and other infrastructure and services with land use development;
10. achieves development that does not adversely affect the efficient operation, use, development, appropriate upgrade, and future planning of strategic infrastructure and freight hubs;
11. optimises use of existing infrastructure; and
12. provides for development opportunities on Māori Reserves in Greater Christchurch.

The following policies implement this objective:
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Policies 6.3.1, 6.3.2, 6.3.3, 6.3.4, 6.3.5, 6.3.6, 6.3.7, 6.3.8, 6.3.9, 6.3.10, 6.3.11

Principal reasons and explanation

The purpose of this objective is to provide for an outcome where appropriate urban development is enabled within specified spatial areas around Greater Christchurch, so that resources can be focused on rebuilding, and delivering growth and recovery to those priority areas. This provides certainty to all resource users as to locations for development, enabling long-term planning and funding for strategic, network and social infrastructure (such as schooling and healthcare), and protection of Greater Christchurch’s natural and physical resources.

The recognition of existing constraints in terms of natural and physical resources is a critical part of successful growth management. This objective identifies the key elements of natural and physical resources in Greater Christchurch that must be protected in order to ensure that harm to the natural environment is minimised.

6.2.1a Targets for sufficient, feasible development capacity for housing [Inserted in accordance with sections 55(2) and 55(A) of the Resource Management Act 1991, from the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity 2016]

For the period 2018-2048, sufficient, feasible development capacity for housing is enabled in Greater Christchurch in accordance with Table 6.1.

Table 6.1 Targets for housing development capacity in Greater Christchurch, 2018-2048

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Development capacity to be enabled (number of dwellings)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium Term(^1) (2018-2028)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch City</td>
<td>17,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selwyn</td>
<td>8,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri</td>
<td>6,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Christchurch</td>
<td>32,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) NPS-UDC, Policy PA1: Development capacity must be feasible, zoned and either serviced with development infrastructure, or the funding for the development infrastructure required to service that development capacity must be identified in a Long Term Plan required under the Local Government Act 2002 (NPS-UDC, PA1).

\(^2\) NPS-UDC, Policy PA1: Development capacity must be feasible, identified in relevant plans and strategies, and the development infrastructure required to service it must be identified in the relevant Infrastructure Strategy required under the Local Government Act 2002 (NPS-UDC, PA1).

The following policies implement this objective:

Policies 6.3.1, 6.3.2, 6.3.3, 6.3.7, 6.3.8, 6.3.11

Principal reasons and explanation

The National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity 2016 (NPS-UDC) requires local authorities that have part, or all of a high-growth urban area within their district or region to set minimum targets for development capacity for housing over the medium (next 10 years) and long term (10 to 30 years).

The targets in Table 6.1 refer to the development capacity for housing that must be enabled, rather than the amount of housing that is built in any given period. They represent the
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development capacity that the Christchurch City Council, Selwyn District Council and Waimakariri District Council will, over the medium term, zone and otherwise enable through their relevant planning processes and mechanisms, including district plans, structure plans and outline development plans and over the long term, identify in relevant plans and strategies.

6.2.2 Urban form and settlement pattern

The urban form and settlement pattern in Greater Christchurch is managed to provide sufficient land for rebuilding and recovery needs and set a foundation for future growth, with an urban form that achieves consolidation and intensification of urban areas, and avoids unplanned expansion of urban areas, by:

1. aiming to achieve the following targets for intensification as a proportion of overall growth through the period of recovery:
   a. 35% averaged over the period between 2013 and 2016
   b. 45% averaged over the period between 2016 to 2021
   c. 55% averaged over the period between 2022 and 2028;

2. providing higher density living environments including mixed use developments and a greater range of housing types, particularly in and around the Central City, in and around Key Activity Centres, and larger neighbourhood centres, and in greenfield priority areas, Future Development Areas and brownfield sites;

3. reinforcing the role of the Christchurch central business district within the Greater Christchurch area as identified in the Christchurch Central Recovery Plan;

4. providing for the development of greenfield priority areas, and of land within Future Development Areas where the circumstances set out in Policy 6.3.12 are met, on the periphery of Christchurch's urban area, and surrounding towns at a rate and in locations that meet anticipated demand and enables the efficient provision and use of network infrastructure;

5. encouraging sustainable and self-sufficient growth of the towns of Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend, Lincoln, Rolleston and Prebbleton and consolidation of the existing settlement of West Melton;

6. Managing rural residential development outside of existing urban and priority areas; and

7. Providing for development opportunities on Māori Reserves.

The following policies implement this objective:

Policies 6.3.1, 6.3.2, 6.3.3, 6.3.4, 6.3.5, 6.3.6, 6.3.7, 6.3.8, 6.3.9, 6.3.10, 6.3.11

Principal reasons and explanation

The rebuilding and recovery of Greater Christchurch rely on appropriate locations, quantity, types, and mixes of residential and business development to provide for the needs of the community.

Consolidation of existing urban settlements is the form of development most likely to minimise the adverse effects of travel for work, education, business and recreation, minimise the costs of new infrastructure and avoid adverse effects of development on sensitive landscapes, natural features and areas of high amenity. This will enable Greater Christchurch to build back better, and support the recovery of central Christchurch. Greater intensification within Christchurch’s urban area through infill (particularly in the Central City, and around Key Activity Centres, and neighbourhood centres) and brownfield redevelopment will reduce the need for further expansion of peripheral areas, and some
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Intensification of the centres of smaller towns is also expected to meet changing needs. A significant proportion of intensification will take place in the city rather than Selwyn and Waimakariri; however, the contribution of these areas to the overall growth pattern is important. The objective sets targets for the contribution of infill and intensification as a proportion of overall growth, and aligns with the growth management approach in the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy. Where monitoring indicates that these levels are not being achieved, further policy responses may be required to increase intensification within existing urban areas.

Changing demographic patterns, including an ageing population and smaller households, are expected to increase the desirability of higher density housing. The demolition and ageing of housing stock provides an opportunity for redevelopment at higher densities and an increased range of housing types that provides not only choice for those needing to relocate, but also for future generations. Increased intensification is anticipated to occur over time as rebuild opportunities are realised, requiring appropriately located and designed greenfield development that also provides for medium density housing during the time of transition.

Following the earthquakes and the subsequent damage and red zoning of properties, a number of Māori have sought to return to and live on the Māori Reserves set aside by the Crown in the 19th century for the then present and future needs of local Ngāi Tahu. Providing for development opportunities on those reserves will enable the descendants of the original grantees to return and realise the original intent of those reserves.

6.2.3 Sustainability

Recovery and rebuilding is undertaken in Greater Christchurch that:

1. provides for quality living environments incorporating good urban design;
2. retains identified areas of special amenity and historic heritage value;
3. retains values of importance to Tāngata Whenua;
4. provides a range of densities and uses; and
5. is healthy, environmentally sustainable, functionally efficient, and prosperous.

The following policies implement this objective:

Policies 6.3.1, 6.3.2, 6.3.3, 6.3.4, 6.3.5, 6.3.6, 6.3.7, 6.3.8, 6.3.9, 6.3.11

Principal reasons and explanation

Intensification and consolidation of residential development in Christchurch needs to protect areas of special amenity and historic heritage value, as these contribute to the area’s identity and character. For Greater Christchurch particular attention should be paid to the provision of open space, maintenance and promotion of a sense of identity and character, and the availability of community and recreation facilities and appropriately located business centres, so as to ensure the maintenance and/or provision of high quality living environments.

The focus on quality living environments also necessitates giving consideration to environmental aspects that contribute to health and wellbeing, such as energy efficiency in housing and sunlight access.

6.2.4 Integration of transport infrastructure and land use

Prioritise the planning of transport infrastructure so that it maximises integration with the priority areas and new settlement patterns and facilitates the movement of people and goods and provision of services in Greater Christchurch, while:
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1. managing network congestion;
2. reducing dependency on private motor vehicles;
3. reducing emission of contaminants to air and energy use;
4. promoting the use of active and public transport modes;
5. optimising use of existing capacity within the network; and
6. enhancing transport safety.

The following policies implement this objective:
Policies 6.3.1, 6.3.2, 6.3.3, 6.3.4, 6.3.5, 6.3.6, 6.3.7, 6.3.8, 6.3.9, 6.3.11

Principal reasons and explanation
Land use patterns that are integrated with transport infrastructure minimise energy use through network optimisation, operation and maintenance, and provide for the social and economic wellbeing of the community, and people’s health and safety. Land use patterns that are integrated with transport infrastructure create a network with shorter journey times for all modes. This integration enables greater travel mode choice. Recovery development that is not well integrated with transport infrastructure can result in increased car dependency, higher energy use, greater traffic volumes, and inefficient freight movement.

6.2.5 Key activity and other centres
Support and maintain the existing network of centres below as the focal points for commercial, community and service activities during the recovery period:
1. The Central City
2. Key Activity Centres
3. Neighbourhood centres.

These centres will be high quality, support a diversity of business opportunities including appropriate mixed-use development, and incorporate good urban design principles.

The development and distribution of commercial activity will avoid significant adverse effects on the function and viability of these centres.

The following policies implement this objective:
Policies 6.3.1, 6.3.2, 6.3.4, 6.3.5, 6.3.6, 6.3.7, 6.3.8, 6.3.11

Principal reasons and explanation
It is important to maintain the existing network of Key Activity Centres and the Central City as focal points for commercial, community and service activity during the recovery phase and to support the identified priority areas. This recognises the investment made in these places, and their preference as a location for future development as businesses shift around the city over the period of recovery. In addition, by virtue of their density, mix of activities and location on strategic transport networks, Key Activity Centres support the provision of public transport and intensification of residential activity within surrounding residential areas. This intensification will provide housing choice for those households needing to relocate, and will accommodate growth during the recovery period. Inappropriate development outside of Key Activity Centres may undermine the community’s
investment in these existing centres and weaken the range and viability of the services they provide.

It is important to note that the Key Activity Centres are not homogeneous, especially within Christchurch City. The extent that business and residential intensification is directed to occur across these Christchurch City centres is dependent on their scale and function.

The role of neighbourhood centres is also recognised for the service role they play to local communities and as a location for appropriate business development.

6.2.6 Business land development

Identify and provide for Greater Christchurch’s land requirements for the recovery and growth of business activities in a manner that supports the settlement pattern brought about by Objective 6.2.2, recognising that:

1. The greenfield priority areas for business in Christchurch City provide primarily for the accommodation of new industrial activities;
2. Except where identified for brownfield redevelopment, areas used for existing industrial activities are to be used primarily for that purpose, rather than as a location for new commercial activities;
3. New commercial activities are primarily directed to the Central City, Key Activity Centres, and neighbourhood centres;
4. A range of other business activities are provided for in appropriate locations; and
5. Business development adopts appropriate urban design qualities in order to retain business, attract investment and provide for healthy working environments.

The following policies implement this objective:

Policies 6.3.1, 6.3.2, 6.3.3, 6.3.4, 6.3.5, 6.3.6, 6.3.8, 6.3.11

Principal reasons and explanation

The provision of adequate land for recovery and future business activities is important for long-term economic growth and the provision of both employment and services for the sub-region’s existing and future communities. Enabling appropriate new business activity close to existing and future residential development helps achieve a greater range of travel options, promote accessibility and reduce energy usage. The locations selected for industrial business land development are also key for rebuilding and the forward planning of the transportation network and associated freight hubs. While there is some capacity for the demand for further industrial business land to be met through the redevelopment of existing zoned land, particularly within Christchurch City, the greenfield priority areas for business provide for the accommodation of new, primarily industrial business activities. There may also be requirements for relocation of business activities to better land, or areas with potential for expansion where land is currently constrained.

In relation to different types of business land, it is important for recovery of the Central City, Key Activity Centres and neighbourhood centres that certain types of business are directed to certain locations. This will ensure that markets compete fairly for similar uses, rather than lower cost land being developed for higher value uses and reducing availability of land for activities such as industrial use. There will, however, be circumstances where redevelopment of brownfield industrial land is appropriate for a range of uses, without impacting on recovery of the Central City or Key Activity Centres as sought in Objective 6.2.5. Some commercial activities will have particular locational constraints and are not suitable for centres, such as yard-based retailers and car-yards, and the need to identify a place for these activities is recognised.

Achieving high quality urban design is as important in business areas as in other areas of the city, but there may be some business areas that require greater design focus depending on their role and function.

6.3 POLICIES
6.3.1 Development within the Greater Christchurch area

In relation to recovery and rebuilding for Greater Christchurch:

1. give effect to the urban form identified in Map A, which identifies the location and extent of urban development that will support recovery, rebuilding and planning for future growth and infrastructure delivery;
2. give effect to the urban form identified in Map A (page 6-27) by identifying the location and extent of the indicated Key Activity Centres;
3. enable development of existing urban areas and greenfield priority areas, including intensification in appropriate locations, where it supports the recovery of Greater Christchurch;
4. ensure new urban activities only occur within existing urban areas or identified greenfield priority areas as shown on Map A, unless they are otherwise expressly provided for in the CRPS;
5. provide for educational facilities in rural areas in limited circumstances where no other practicable options exist within an urban area;
6. provide for a metropolitan recreation facility at 466-482 Yaldhurst Road; and
7. avoid development that adversely affects the function and viability of, or public investment in, the Central City and Key Activity Centres.

This policy implements the following objectives:

Objectives 6.2.1, 6.2.1a, 6.2.2, 6.2.3, 6.2.4, 6.2.5, 6.2.6

Methods

The Regional Council:

Will

1. Have regard to Policy 6.3.1 in relation to any consents relating to urban activities outside of existing urban areas or greenfield priority areas in Greater Christchurch, and consider deferral under s91 where other consents are required from another local authority, so that the effects of a proposal can be considered together.
2. Initiate any changes required to Map A of the CRPS where monitoring indicates a need for further greenfield priority areas to be included to enable the release of new greenfield land, prior to the review of the CRPS.

Territorial authorities:

Will

3. Provide for the rebuilding and recovery of Greater Christchurch in accordance with the Land Use Recovery Plan for Greater Christchurch, Policy 6.3.1 and Map A, by including in district plans objectives, policies and rules (if any) to give effect to the policy.
4. Investigate and implement methods in district plans for promoting development and enhancement of Key Activity Centres.

Should

5. Consider appropriate administrative and financial methods to enable and encourage Key Activity Centres to fulfil their function, and to promote intensification of identified urban areas and brownfield redevelopment.

Local authorities:

Should

6. Provide for sequencing, provision and funding of infrastructure that supports the pattern of settlement in Map A, including through changes to the CRPS, provisions in district

Principal reasons and explanation

Map A shows existing urban areas and priority areas for development for Greater Christchurch. These areas are identified as being required to provide sufficient land zoned for urban purposes to enable recovery and rebuilding through to 2028. The Policy and Map A provide a clear, co-ordinated land use and infrastructure framework for the recovery of Greater Christchurch.

To ensure that recovery resources are managed efficiently and sustainably, the provisions identify where certain types of development can take place, and where they cannot take place. The provisions also recognise that specific activities are provided for outside of urban areas elsewhere in the CRPS, such as papakainga housing and marae under Policy 5.3.4; educational facilities where no other practicable options for locating the facility exist; and a metropolitan recreation facility at 466-482 Yaldhurst Road that serves the urban population. New residential development is provided for within Future Development Areas, where the circumstances set out in Policy 6.3.12 are met. It is anticipated that established urban activities located outside of the identified urban area will be able to continue to operate their activities, with any expansion considered on a case-by-case basis.

Within the existing urban area, Key Activity Centres are also indicated. These provide a focus for commercial activities and residential intensification. While post-earthquake business growth has increased in many of the Key Activity Centre areas, inappropriate non-centre growth has also occurred. Moving towards 2016, when the Order in Council that enables businesses to be run from residential locations expires, it will be important to refocus commercial activities to the Central City and Key Activity Centres, and where appropriate neighbourhood centres, so that the function of these centres as a focus for economic activity is reinforced.

6.3.2 Development form and urban design

Business development, residential development (including rural residential development) and the establishment of public space is to give effect to the principles of good urban design below, and those of the NZ Urban Design Protocol 2005, to the extent appropriate to the context:

1. Tūrangawaewae – the sense of place and belonging – recognition and incorporation of the identity of the place, the context and the core elements that comprise the Through context and site analysis, the following elements should be used to reflect the appropriateness of the development to its location: landmarks and features, historic heritage, the character and quality of the existing built and natural environment, historic and cultural markers and local stories.
2. Integration – recognition of the need for well-integrated places, infrastructure, movement routes and networks, spaces, land uses and the natural and built environment. These elements should be overlaid to provide an appropriate form and pattern of use and development.
3. Connectivity – the provision of efficient and safe high quality, barrier free, multimodal connections within a development, to surrounding areas, and to local facilities and services, with emphasis at a local level placed on walking, cycling and public transport as more sustainable forms of
5. Choice and diversity – ensuring developments provide choice and diversity in their layout, built form, land use housing type and density, to adapt to the changing needs and circumstances of the population.
6. Environmentally sustainable design – ensuring that the process of design and development minimises water and resource use, restores ecosystems, safeguards mauri and maximises passive solar gain.
7. Creativity and innovation – supporting opportunities for exemplar approaches to infrastructure and urban form to lift the benchmark in the development of new urban areas in the Christchurch region.
This policy implements the following objectives:

Objectives 6.2.1, 6.2.1a, 6.2.2, 6.2.3, 6.2.4, 6.2.5, 6.2.6

Methods

Territorial authorities:

Will:

1. Include in district plans objectives, policies and rules (if any) to give effect to Policy 6.3.2.

Should:

2. Develop urban design guidelines to assist developers with addressing the matters set out in Policy 6.3.2.
3. Consider the principles of good urban design as reflected in the New Zealand Urban Design Protocol (2005) in urban design processes.

Principal reasons and explanation

Good urban design is critical to the rebuilding and recovery of Greater Christchurch. Urban design ranges in scale from the design and layout of the whole city, to the suburb, block, street and section design, or even to the architecture of the building and surrounding landscape. It becomes particularly important in the development of the street and block structure, at the interface between buildings/structures and spaces, and between public and private space. Urban design input can take place through the development of outline development plans, creation of development controls for zones, or at a finer-grained level through a resource consent process.

Good urban design can increase the functionality, amenity and efficiency of urban areas in Greater Christchurch. It will support the economic performance of Greater Christchurch, its attractiveness as a tourist destination, and its ability to attract and retain new or returning residents and increase the quality of life of its existing residents. In particular, addressing the matters listed will:

1. assist with reducing crime;
2. reduce travel times, fuel usage and therefore greenhouse gas emissions, and dependence on private motor vehicles;
3. provide for a high standard of physical amenities;
4. minimise adverse effects on other areas such as flooding, traffic congestion and degraded water;
5. protect important features of the natural environment;
6. provide protection of historic heritage from inappropriate development, and enhance its values;
7. improve the mental and physical wellbeing of its residents; and
8. create efficient development patterns.

It is recognised that urban design is also about a process, where ideally collaboration takes place. Local authorities need to be clear about their expectations for development, to ensure efficient management through resource consent or plan change processes. As such, the development of clear, user friendly guides, developed in consultation with the development industry and professional institutes, for different types of development are a necessary means of achieving good design outcomes that will support the rebuilding and recovery of Greater Christchurch.

6.3.3 Development in accordance with outline development plans

Development in greenfield priority areas or Future Development Areas and rural residential development is to occur in accordance with the provisions set out in an outline development plan or other rules for the area. Subdivision must not proceed ahead of the incorporation of an outline development plan in a district plan. Outline development plans and associated rules will:
1. Be prepared as:
   a. a single plan for the whole of the priority area or Future Development Area; or
   b. where an integrated plan adopted by the territorial authority exists for the whole of the priority area or Future Development Area and the outline development plan is consistent with the integrated plan, part of that integrated plan; or
   c. a single plan for the whole of a rural residential area; and
2. Be prepared in accordance with the matters set out in Policy 6.3.2;
3. To the extent relevant show proposed land uses including:
   a. Principal through roads, connections with surrounding road networks, relevant infrastructure services and areas for possible future development;
   b. Land required for community facilities or schools;
   c. Parks and other land for recreation;
   d. Land to be used for business activities;
   e. The distribution of different residential densities, in accordance with Policy 6.3.7;
   f. Land required for stormwater treatment, retention and drainage paths;
   g. Land reserved or otherwise set aside from development for environmental, historic heritage, or landscape protection or enhancement;
   h. Land reserved or otherwise set aside from development for any other reason, and the reasons for its protection from development;
   i. Pedestrian walkways, cycleways and public transport routes both within and adjoining the area to be developed;
4. Demonstrate how Policy 6.3.7 will be achieved for residential areas within the area that is the subject of the outline development plan, including any staging;
5. Identify significant cultural, natural or historic heritage features and values, and show how they are to be protected and/or enhanced;
6. Document the infrastructure required, when it will be required and how it will be funded;
7. Set out the staging and co-ordination of subdivision and development between landowners;
8. Demonstrate how effective provision is made for a range of transport options including public transport options and integration between transport modes, including pedestrian, cycling, public transport, freight, and private motor vehicles;
9. Show how other potential adverse effects on and/or from nearby existing or designated strategic infrastructure (including requirements for designations, or planned infrastructure) will be avoided, remedied or appropriately mitigated;
10. Show how other potential adverse effects on the environment, including the protection and enhancement of surface and groundwater quality, are to be avoided, remedied or mitigated;
11. Show how the adverse effects associated with natural hazards are to be avoided, remedied or mitigated as appropriate and in accordance with Chapter 11 and any relevant guidelines; and
12. Include any other information that is relevant to an understanding of the development and its proposed zoning.

This policy implements the following objectives:
Objectives 6.2.1, 6.2.1a, 6.2.2, 6.2.3, 6.2.4, 6.2.6

Methods

The Regional Council:

Will

1. Establish a protocol and guidelines to assist all parties involved in the preparation of outline development plans to ensure Policy 6.3.3 is efficiently and effectively applied.
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Territorial authorities:
Will
2. Require an outline development plan to be developed and incorporated into district plans, prior to, or at the same time as, rezoning land for urban use in greenfield priority areas or Future Development Areas.
3. Include in district plans objectives, policies and rules (if any) to give effect to Policy 6.3.3.

Should
4. Ensure that financial provision is made for delivery of infrastructure to greenfield priority areas for development.

Principal reasons and explanation
The use of outline development plans for residential and business greenfield development is necessary for the recovery of Greater Christchurch. They will assist with the efficient use of resources when planning land uses, provide for sustainable urban development, and ensure adequate housing supply and choice to facilitate earthquake recovery. Background information provided through the process provides the necessary background evaluation work before or at the same time as the land is rezoned.

Outline development plans provide a mechanism for integrating urban development with infrastructure, making the best use of existing infrastructure, and identifying and providing for the additional infrastructure required to meet the needs of incoming residents and businesses. They also provide the mechanism for integrating new development with existing urban areas, and of achieving the type and form of development necessary to accommodate urban growth in a sustainable way. Staging may be required to allow for infrastructure upgrades, enabling parts of a development to be delivered earlier.

In addition, these plans help to provide certainty for the community, developers, network utility providers and territorial authorities, and ensure that all constraints associated with the development of an area are investigated, addressed or protected at the time of initial zoning for urban purposes. By identifying opportunities for low impact urban design and development early on in the land development process, recovery will be enabled by building new developments in a better way.

6.3.4 Transport effectiveness
Ensure that an efficient and effective transport network that supports business and residential recovery is restored, protected and enhanced so that it maintains and improves movement of people and goods around Greater Christchurch by:

1. avoiding development that will overload strategic freight routes;
2. providing patterns of development that optimise use of existing network capacity and ensuring that, where possible, new building projects support increased uptake of active and public transport, and provide opportunities for modal choice;
3. providing opportunities for travel demand management;
4. requiring integrated transport assessment for substantial developments; and
5. improving road user safety.

This policy implements the following objectives:
Objectives 6.2.1, 6.2.2, 6.2.3, 6.2.4, 6.2.5, 6.2.6

Methods
Territorial authorities:

Will

1. Include in district plans objectives, policies and rules (if any) to give effect to Policy 6.3.4.
2. Include objectives and policies, and may include rules in district plans to ensure that, where possible, development provides for, and supports increased uptake of active and public transport; and provides opportunities for modal choice, including walking and cycling.
3. Include trigger thresholds in district plans for development where an integrated transport assessment is required.
4. Identify strategic freight routes.

Local authorities:

Should

5. Give consideration to any transport projects that may be needed to give effect to Policy 6.3.4 and include them in their Annual Plans, the Three Year Plan, Long Term Plans, the Regional Land Transport Programme or other infrastructure plans, as appropriate.
6. Provide options for travel demand management.

Principal reasons and explanation

Changing travel patterns since the earthquakes have placed significant stress on Christchurch’s transport infrastructure. With pressure on to enable more land development in response to the earthquakes, there will inevitably be a tension on how to respond to transport needs with limited funds. The Councils and New Zealand Transport Agency will look to prioritise transport improvements where they provide greatest return on the investment. This means that the usually expected levels of service for future development may be lower in the interim until the transport maintenance and improvement can catch up. It is recognised that efficient and effective movement of goods within Greater Christchurch is important for the rebuild of the city and outlying townships, and also important for future wellbeing and energy efficiency.

One way to achieve this is through provision for active forms of transport, such as cycling and walking. Other forms of travel demand management may also lead to efficient transport and encourage a compact urban form. The earthquakes resulted in a significant reduction in public transport use. With new routes in place and travel patterns more settled, public transport use in Christchurch is increasing and is on track to return to pre-earthquake levels. A compact urban form and travel demand management will build upon the natural return to public transport use in Christchurch.

It is also important that Christchurch is able to protect its key transport infrastructure including the airport, rail networks, transport hubs and strategic routes from reverse sensitivity effects. These infrastructure services play a critical role in the functioning and economic wellbeing of the region.

The policy also requires development of integrated transport assessments for substantial developments. By focusing on large developments that have the potential to impact on strategic transport networks, territorial authorities will be able to fully consider all of the transport impacts together, and developers will be able to develop better responses to contribute to an efficient transport system.

An efficient and effective transport network that meets the changed needs of people and businesses, and enables accessible, sustainable, affordable and safe travel choices, is necessary for recovery.

6.3.5 Integration of land use and infrastructure

Recovery of Greater Christchurch is to be assisted by the integration of land use development with infrastructure by:
1. Identifying priority areas for development and Future Development Areas to enable reliable forward planning for infrastructure development and delivery;

2. Ensuring that the nature, timing and sequencing of new development are co-ordinated with the development, funding, implementation and operation of transport and other infrastructure in order to:
   a. optimise the efficient and affordable provision of both the development and the infrastructure;
   b. maintain or enhance the operational effectiveness, viability and safety of existing and planned infrastructure;
   c. protect investment in existing and planned infrastructure; and
   d. ensure new development does not occur until provision for appropriate infrastructure is in place;

3. Providing that the efficient and effective functioning of infrastructure, including transport corridors, is maintained, and the ability to maintain and upgrade that infrastructure is retained;

4. Only providing for new development that does not affect the efficient operation, use, development, appropriate upgrading and safety of existing strategic infrastructure, including by avoiding noise sensitive activities within the 50dBA Ldn airport noise contour for Christchurch International Airport, unless the activity is within an existing residentially zoned urban area, residential greenfield area identified for Kaiapoi, or residential greenfield priority area identified in Map A (page 6-28); and

5. Managing the effects of land use activities on infrastructure, including avoiding activities that have the potential to limit the efficient and effective, provision, operation, maintenance or upgrade of strategic infrastructure and freight hubs.

This policy implements the following objectives:
Objectives 6.2.1, 6.2.2, 6.2.3, 6.2.4, 6.2.5, 6.2.6

Methods
Territorial authorities:
Will

1. Include in district plans objectives, policies and rules (if any) to give effect to Policy 6.3.5.
2. Include objectives, policies and rules in district plans to manage reverse sensitivity effects between strategic infrastructure and subdivision, use and development, including for residential and rural-residential activities.

Local authorities:
Should

3. Give consideration to any infrastructure projects that may be needed to give effect to Policy 6.3.5 and include them in their Annual Plans, the Three Year Plan, Long Term Plans, the Regional Land Transport Programme or other infrastructure plans, as appropriate to enable the orderly and efficient development of priority areas.

Principal reasons and explanation
In order to achieve a co-ordinated and efficient recovery, development of urban areas must be integrated with the provision of infrastructure, including ensuring that existing strategic infrastructure can continue to operate efficiently and effectively. Access for freight movements to and from the major ports in Greater Christchurch must be maintained and enhanced, and not compromised by the location of new urban development.

Priority areas for development are generally clustered to the north, west and south-west of existing urban areas. These areas are all close to existing major infrastructure corridors which connect to the growth areas in the north and Waimakariri District, and to the south and on to Selwyn District. The growth areas have been assessed as having the best potential to accommodate residential and business growth through to 2028 whilst achieving a consolidated urban form and an efficient and orderly provision of infrastructure.
important that timing and sequencing of development are aligned with funding and implementation of infrastructure.

Strategic infrastructure represents an important regional and sometimes national asset that should not be compromised by urban growth and intensification. Strategic infrastructure such as Christchurch International Airport, the Lyttelton Port of Christchurch, the State Highway and strategic road networks and rail corridors is required to support Greater Christchurch’s recovery through transporting such things as building materials, equipment and personnel. The locational requirements and existing investment in strategic infrastructure means that it is extremely inefficient for them to relocate, and effects of land use on their operation can significantly reduce efficiency and attractiveness as transport options. The operation of strategic infrastructure can affect the livability of residential developments in their vicinity, despite the application of practicable mitigation measures to address effects, which in turn exerts pressure on the infrastructure to further mitigate their effects. It is better to instead select development options where such reverse sensitivity constraints do not exist.

The only exception to the restriction against residential development within the 50dBA Ldn airport noise contour is provided for at Kaiapoi.

Within Kaiapoi land within the 50dBA Ldn airport noise contour has been provided to offset the displacement of residences as a result of the 2010/2011 earthquakes. This exception is unique to Kaiapoi and also allows for a contiguous and consolidated development of Kaiapoi.

### 6.3.6 Business land

To ensure that provision, recovery and rebuilding of business land in Greater Christchurch maximises business retention, attracts investment, and provides for healthy working environments, business activities are to be provided for in a manner which:

1. Promotes the utilisation and redevelopment of existing business land, and provides sufficient additional greenfield priority area land for business land through to 2028 as provided for in Map A;
2. Recognises demand arising from the relocation of business activities as a result of earthquake-damaged land and buildings;
3. Reinforces the role of the Central City, as the city’s primary commercial centre, and that of the Key Activity Centres;
4. Recognises that new commercial activities are primarily to be directed to the Central City, Key Activity Centres and neighbourhood centres where these activities reflect and support the function and role of those centres; or in circumstances where locating out of centre, will not give rise to significant adverse distributional or urban form effects;
5. Recognises that new greenfield priority areas for business in Christchurch City are primarily for industrial activities, and that commercial use in these areas is restricted;
6. Recognises that existing business zones provide for a range of business activities depending on:
   i. the desired amenity of the business areas and their surrounds; and
   ii. the potential for significant distributional or urban form effects on other centres from new commercial activity.
7. Utilises existing infrastructure availability, capacity and quality;
8. Ensures reverse sensitivity effects and conflicts between incompatible activities are identified and avoided or mitigated against;
9. Ensures close proximity to labour supply, major transport hubs and passenger transport networks;
10. Encourages self-sufficiency of employment and business activities within communities across Greater Christchurch;
11. Promotes, where appropriate, development of mixed-use opportunities, within Key Activity Centres provided reverse sensitivity issues can be appropriately managed; and
12. Incorporates good urban design principles appropriate to the context of the development.

**This policy implements the following objectives:**

Objectives 6.2.1, 6.2.2, 6.2.3, 6.2.4, 6.2.5, 6.2.6

### Methods

### Territorial Authorities:

**Will**
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1. Include in district plans objectives, policies and rules (if any) to give effect to Policy 6.3.6.
2. Identify trigger thresholds for office and retail commercial activities in industrial areas where these activities are likely to give rise to distributional effects, particularly on larger commercial centres, or result in reverse sensitivity effects.

Should

3. Consider appropriate administrative and financial arrangements to enable and encourage business land provision to occur.
4. Identify neighbourhood centres in district plans.

Principal reasons and explanation

The provision of adequate land for future business activities is a key requirement for successful rebuilding and recovery, and for the economic wellbeing of Greater Christchurch. There was significant damage to industrial and other business land and buildings throughout Greater Christchurch, resulting in a shift of business both from the eastern side of the city to the west, and also from the Central City out into the suburbs. Ongoing insurance issues may continue to place pressure on further demands to relocate. In addition to this, an Order in Council that enables residential land to be used for business activities will expire in 2016, creating further demand for developed business land. Through the rebuilding process, commercial development needs to focus on reinforcing the Central City and Key Activity Centres, as well as the network of neighbourhood centres, so that these areas can regenerate quickly.

Provision of new business land should be focused around existing infrastructure to minimise public costs and in particular to achieve integration with transport networks. Locating appropriate business land close to existing and future residential development helps to achieve a greater range of travel options as well as reducing energy usage. Greater self-sufficiency of employment within districts, suburbs and settlements is also desirable in terms of community development and social sustainability. It will be important that, as time passes, the use of industrial land for short-term accommodation for retail and offices is discouraged, and existing and recovering centres that cater for these uses are reinforced.

6.3.7 Residential location, yield and intensification

In relation to residential development opportunities in Greater Christchurch:

1. Subject to Policy 5.3.4 and Policy 6.3.12, residential greenfield priority area development shall occur in accordance with Map A. These areas are sufficient for both growth and residential relocation through to 2028.
2. Intensification in urban areas of Greater Christchurch is to be focused around the Central City, Key Activity Centres and neighbourhood centres commensurate with their scale and function, core public transport routes, mixed-use areas, and on suitable brownfield land.
3. Intensification developments and development in greenfield priority areas shall achieve at least the following residential net densities averaged over the whole of an ODP area (except where subject to an existing ODP with specific density provisions):
   (a) 10 household units per hectare in greenfield areas in Selwyn and Waimakariri District;
   (b) 15 household units per hectare in greenfield areas in Christchurch City;
4. Intensification development within Christchurch City to achieve an average of:
   (a) 50 household units per hectare for intensification development within the Central City;
   (b) 30 household units per hectare for intensification development elsewhere.
5. Provision will be made in district plans for comprehensive development across multiple or amalgamated sites.
6. Housing affordability is to be addressed by providing sufficient intensification and greenfield priority area land to meet housing demand during the recovery period, enabling brownfield development and providing for a range of lot sizes, densities and appropriate development controls that support more intensive developments such as mixed use developments, apartments, townhouses and terraced housing.
This policy implements the following objectives:
Objectives 6.2.1, 6.2.1a, 6.2.2, 6.2.3, 6.2.4, 6.2.5

Methods
Territorial authorities:

Will

1. Include in district plans objectives, policies and rules (if any) to give effect to Policy 6.3.7.
2. Identify areas in district plans that are suitable for urban intensification, including brownfields redevelopment.
3. Include objectives, policies and rules in district plans for comprehensive development across multiple or amalgamated sites in appropriate locations.

Should

4. Consider incentives to encourage intensification and brownfields redevelopment.
5. In relation to Christchurch City, continue to promote medium to high density residential development, particularly within the Central City.
6. Co-ordinate the sequencing, provision and funding of infrastructure in Annual Plans, the Three Year Plan, Long Term Plans, the Regional Land Transport Programme or other infrastructure plans, as appropriate, to enable the orderly and efficient development of priority areas.

Principal reasons and explanation

The earthquakes have resulted in some significant short-term impacts on the housing market, pushing up demand in the short term for temporary accommodation during the recovery and rebuilding period, and relocation of residents from red-zoned areas. This short-term demand is expected to slowly return to normal growth.

Accommodating the increased demand for households can be achieved in two ways, through greenfield expansion into priority areas and Future Development Areas, and through intensification within existing urban areas. To support a sustainable urban form, this intensification is ideally located around the Central City, Key Activity Centres and neighbourhood centres consistent with their scale and function, and core public transport routes, within mixed use areas where residential activities can support business activities, and on brownfield sites. Further work will be required to increase intensification, and work towards accommodating future growth within existing urban areas.

Certain areas in Christchurch City have been identified for more intensive residential use for many years. Other suitable areas may be identified, including the redevelopment of brownfields sites for residential or mixed-use activities. Providing for intensification in and around the Central City and Key Activity Centres will help ensure good access to commercial, community and recreational facilities and to public transport. Councils have the ability to encourage greater uptake of intensification in selected areas through investment such as the provision of land improvements to open space and the streetscape.

In order to efficiently utilise the identified priority areas and Future Development Areas to accommodate recovery and rebuild development, minimum densities are to be achieved. This will help to create a compact urban form that supports existing centres and can be served efficiently by infrastructure, including public transport. It will also help to ensure that housing supply and housing choice, including affordable housing options, meet demand and enable recovery.

6.3.8 Regeneration of brownfield land

To encourage and provide for the recovery and regeneration of existing brownfield areas through new comprehensive residential, mixed-use or business developments, provided such activities will ensure the safe and efficient functioning of the transport network and will not have significant adverse distributional or urban form effects on the Central City, Key Activity Centres and neighbourhood centres, or give rise to significant reverse sensitivity effects.
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This policy implements the following objectives:

Objectives 6.2.1, 6.2.1a, 6.2.2, 6.2.3, 6.2.4, 6.2.5, 6.2.6

Methods

Territorial authorities:

Will

1. Include in district plans objectives, policies and rules (if any) to give effect to Policy 6.3.8.

Should

2. Identify in district plans brownfield sites that are appropriate for redevelopment.
3. Give consideration to appropriate administrative and financial arrangements to enable and encourage brownfield redevelopment to occur.

Principal reasons and explanation

Brownfield redevelopment will support the efficient reuse and recovery of underutilised or abandoned land. This will support the recovery of these areas and their wider neighbourhoods by bringing higher intensity and often more appropriate activities into these locations, and enhance the amenity of the area.

Redevelopment will also help to reduce the adverse effects of travel for work, business and recreation, limit the costs of new infrastructure, and avoid the adverse effects of development on sensitive landscapes, natural features and areas of high amenity. Significant adverse effects such as reverse sensitivity, distributional or urban form impacts on the Central City, Key Activity Centres and neighbourhood centres, and impacts on the transport network, need to be avoided or mitigated.

Such regeneration projects should occur in a comprehensive manner to ensure that good urban design and amenity outcomes are achieved. Councils have the ability to encourage redevelopment in selected areas through investment such as the provision of and improvements to open space and the streetscape.

6.3.9 Rural residential development

In Greater Christchurch, rural residential development further to areas already zoned in district plans as at 1st January 2013 can only be provided for by territorial authorities in accordance with an adopted rural residential development strategy prepared in accordance with the Local Government Act 2002, subject to the following:

1. In the case of Christchurch City, no further rural residential development is to be provided for within the Christchurch City Plan area;
2. The location must be outside the greenfield priority areas, Future Development Areas and existing urban areas;
3. All subdivision and development must be located so that it can be economically provided with a reticulated sewer and water supply integrated with a publicly owned system, and appropriate stormwater treatment and disposal;
4. Legal and physical access is provided to a sealed road, but not directly to a road defined in the relevant district plan as a Strategic or Arterial Road, or as a State highway under the Government Roading Powers Act 1989;
5. The location and design of any proposed rural residential development shall:
   a. avoid noise sensitive activities occurring within the 50 dBA Ldn air noise contour surrounding Christchurch International Airport so as not to compromise the future efficient operation of Christchurch International Airport or the health, well-being and amenity of people;
   b. avoid the groundwater protection zone for Christchurch City's drinking water;
This policy implements the following objectives:
Objectives 6.2.1, 6.2.2, 6.2.3, 6.2.4

Methods

The Regional Council:

Will

1. Have regard to Policy 6.3.9 in relation to any consents relating to rural-residential activities in Greater Christchurch, and consider deferral under s91 where other consents are required from another local authority, so that the effects of a proposal can be considered together.

Territorial authorities:

Will

2. Include in district plans objectives, policies and rules (if any) to give effect to Policy 6.3.9.

Should:

3. Develop a rural residential strategy for the district to inform the extent of rural residential activity and outcomes sought for this form of development within the district.

Principal reasons and explanation

An important aspect of residential capacity includes the contribution of rural residential development, which is provided for in Waimakariri and Selwyn Districts where it accords with a relevant rural residential strategy. Many of the rural western areas of Greater Christchurch remained undamaged during the earthquakes and are also located out of the area identified as being prone to liquefaction, making them more desirable locations to live.

At the same time, it is also important to manage the extent of rural residential activity due to the pressure it places on infrastructure, its impact on transport efficiency, and the maintenance of rural character and rural land use for production. In the case of Christchurch City, further rural-residential activity also has the potential to constrain future urban expansion options through to 2028, or otherwise be affected by noise contours for the airport, and so it is not provided for within the area covered by the Christchurch City Plan.
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Rural residential development can have significant effects disproportionate to the numbers of households living within this form of development, and more than limited provision would undermine the achievement of recovery.

Rural residential development is therefore provided for to a limited extent during the recovery period in recognition of the desirability of providing a range of choice in housing types for those needing to relocate, without compromising the overall intent of consolidation in the CRPS. Policy 6.3.11 requires that the supply and update of rural residential activity will be monitored, and this will inform any future changes to the provisions, or areas provided for rural residential use.

6.3.10 Māori Reserves

Recognise and provide for the relationship of local Ngāi Tahu with their ancestral lands, waters, wāhi tapu and taonga by enabling Māori Reserves within the Greater Christchurch area to be developed and used for their intended purposes for which they were originally reserved, taking into account the following matters where relevant:

1. a. flooding, inundation and other natural hazards;
   b. rural amenity and outlook;
   c. compact urban form;
   d. range of housing options;
   e. provision of appropriately sized local retail/commercial centres;
   f. any outline development plan; and
   g. the range of lot sizes and densities.

This policy implements the following objectives:

Objectives 6.2.1, 6.2.2

Methods

Territorial authorities:

Will

1. Include in district plans objectives, policies and rules (if any) in relation to Māori Reserve Land in Greater Christchurch that recognise and provide for their intended purpose, and give effect to Policies 6.3.2, 6.3.3 (except 6.3.3(1) and (4)) and 6.3.4.
2. Consult with Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu and Papatipu Rūnanga to develop those plan provisions.
3. In relation to development at Māori Reserve 873, provide for development opportunities for Ngāi Tūāhuriri by the inclusion of objectives, policies, rules and an Outline Development Plan within the District Plan to give effect to Policy 6.3.10.
4. In relation to Māori Reserve 873, include objectives, policies and/or rules, within the District Plan, that place appropriate controls on the size and scale of Tuahiwi.
5. Monitor and report on, at two yearly intervals, growth within Māori Reserve 873 to determine whether amendments to district plan objectives, policies and rules are required to either limit inappropriate growth and development or facilitate further growth and development.

Should

6. Co-ordinate the sequencing, provision and funding of infrastructure in Long Term Plans, or other infrastructure plans, to enable the orderly and efficient development of Māori Reserves.

Principal reasons and explanation

The earthquakes and the subsequent damage and red zoning of properties in Waimakariri District and Christchurch City has led to a number of Māori seeking opportunities to
return to ancestral lands, including land at Māori Reserve 873 (Tuahiwi) and Māori Reserve 875 (Rāpaki). This policy recognises the original intent of the land purchase deeds of the 19th century to provide for the present and future needs of local Ngāi Tahu landowners and their descendants.

It is important that any development of Māori Reserves is enabled in a way that meets the needs of Māori and other residents, whilst protecting natural and physical resources through maintaining and enhancing the environmental qualities and rural amenity of the area.

Māori Reserves in Greater Christchurch have not been identified as priority areas, nor as rural residential as development of this land is seen as something that will likely take a more dense form in certain areas and this could result in a more closely settled development pattern. However, it is considered important that any development is of a size and scale appropriate for the surroundings and that rural amenity and outlook is maintained. For these reasons it is considered important that an Outline Development Plan is prepared in consultation with the landowners within those reserves to guide and manage development.

6.3.11 Monitoring and Review

In relation to development in Greater Christchurch:

1. The Canterbury Regional Council, in conjunction with the territorial authorities, shall undertake adequate monitoring to demonstrate both in the short term and the long term that there is an available supply of residential and business land to meet the Objectives and Policies of this Chapter.

2. The Canterbury Regional Council, in conjunction with the territorial authorities, shall undertake monitoring of the supply, uptake and impacts of rural residential land use and development.

3. Prior to initiating a review of this chapter, for the purposes of information the Canterbury Regional Council may request the organisation or agency responsible for the operation of Christchurch International Airport to undertake a remodelling of the air noise contours relating to the airport.

4. The Canterbury Regional Council, following relevant territorial authority input, shall initiate a review of the extent and location of land for development if any of the following situations occur:
   a. a shortfall in available land is identified by monitoring under Policy 6.3.11; or
   b. it is identified that altered circumstances have arisen or will arise either in one or more parts of Greater Christchurch, in relation to the expected availability of sub-regional infrastructure, and a reconsideration of the extent, location and timing of land for development is necessary to achieve the objectives and policies of this chapter; or
   c. Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessments undertaken to meet the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity 2016 indicate insufficient feasible development capacity to meet demand in the short to medium term.

5. Any change resulting from a review of the extent, and location of land for development, any alteration to the Greenfield Priority Areas, or provision of new greenfield priority areas, shall commence only under the following circumstances:
   a. infrastructure is either in place or able to be economically and efficiently provided to support the urban activity;
   b. provision is in place or can be made for safe, convenient and sustainable access to community, social and commercial facilities;
   c. the objective of urban consolidation continues to be achieved;
   d. urban land use, including industrial and commercial activities, does not increase the risk of contamination of drinking water sources, including the groundwater recharge zone for Christchurch’s drinking water;
   e. urban development does not lie between the primary and secondary stopbanks south of the Waimakariri River which are designed to retain floodwaters in the event of flood breakout;
   f. the landscape character of the Port Hills is protected;
   g. sufficient rural land is retained to maintain the open space landscape character either between or surrounding the areas of urban activity within Greater Christchurch; and
   h. the operational capacity of strategic infrastructure is not compromised.
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This policy implements the following objectives:
Objectives 6.2.1, 6.2.1a, 6.2.2, 6.2.3, 6.2.4, 6.2.5, 6.2.6

Methods

1. The monitoring for Policy 6.3.11 may include but is not limited to:
   o any information published by or sought from Statistics New Zealand.
   o annual surveys of business and residential land uptake, including Greenfield Priority Area development and redevelopment.
   o annual surveys of the development capacity of zoned and serviced land.
   o obtaining and analysing a range of information to assist with the understanding and prediction of future needs, including information on market behaviour and social and economic trends.

2. The monitoring for Policy 6.3.11 shall include such matters as the councils consider relevant and appropriate.

3. The Canterbury Regional Council shall prepare a comprehensive monitoring report in relation to Policy 6.3.11 at least every three years, and make it publicly available.

4. Any remodelling in terms of Policy 6.3.11(3) shall:
   o involve an assessment of projected future airport business growth and operation, and shall take into account, but not be limited to aircraft movements, flight tracks, fleet mix and runway utilisation; and
   o be accompanied by the report of an independent panel of airport noise experts who have undertaken a peer review of the inputs, assumptions and outcomes of the remodelling; and
   o shall be provided to the Canterbury Regional Council in the form of a comprehensive report along with an executive summary or summary report.

5. The Canterbury Regional Council shall make the summary report of any remodelling under Method 4 publicly available as soon as practicable after receiving it.

6. Any amended growth pattern shall be given effect through the provisions of any relevant regional plan, changes to the Regional Policy Statement, district plans, the Regional Land Transport Strategy, the Regional Land Transport Programme, Annual Plans, Three Year Plans, Long Term Plans and any relevant strategic planning process, as appropriate.

7. Territorial authorities shall make appropriate arrangements to enable the achievement of any changes resulting from a review under Policy 6.3.11.

Principal reasons and explanation
Relocation, population, household and business growth can be affected by a wide range of variables. The policy framework should be responsive to this variation in order to meet any changes in circumstances. Policy 6.3.11 is intended to ensure enough land is available and in the right locations to facilitate recovery through to 2028. Monitoring a range of statistics and trends is a key factor in this management. Anticipating the number of relocated or new households and the business activity to be accommodated, as well as the form that these are likely to take, indicates the land areas required for successful recovery.

Policy 6.3.11 also provides that the circumstances for altering the priority area provisions of this chapter are:

a. There is determined to be insufficient land within the Priority Areas over the recovery period;

b. Altered circumstances have arisen in relation to anticipated timing of the infrastructure required to support the development planned by this chapter;

c. There are changes to the relocation and growth management assumptions upon which the objectives and policies of this chapter are based.
Enable urban development in the Future Development Areas identified on Map A, only in the following circumstances:

1. It is demonstrated, through monitoring of housing and business development capacity and sufficiency carried out collaboratively by the Greater Christchurch Partnership, that there is a need to provide further feasible development capacity through the zoning of additional land in a district plan to address a shortfall in the sufficiency of feasible residential development capacity to meet the medium term targets set out in Table 6.1, Objective 6.2.1; and
2. The development would support the pattern of settlement and principles for future urban growth set out in Objectives 6.2.1 and 6.2.2 and related policies; and
3. The timing and sequencing of development is appropriately aligned with the provision of infrastructure, in accordance with Objective 6.2.4 and Policies 6.3.4 and 6.3.5; and
4. The development would occur in accordance with an outline development plan and the requirements of Policy 6.3.3; and
5. The circumstances set out in Policy 6.3.11(5) are met; and
6. The effects of natural hazards are avoided or appropriately mitigated.

This policy implements the following objectives:
Objectives 6.2.1, 6.2.1a, 6.2.2, 6.2.3, 6.2.4, 6.2.5, 6.2.6

Methods

Territorial authorities:
Will
1. Include in district plans objectives, policies and rules (if any) to give effect to Policy 6.3.12.

Local authorities:
Will
2. Undertake regular monitoring of housing and business development capacity and sufficiency and core urban development indicators in accordance with Policy 6.3.11.
Should
3. Co-ordinate the sequencing, provision and funding of infrastructure in Long Term Plans, or other infrastructure plans, to enable the orderly and efficient development of Future Development Areas.

Principal reasons and explanation

In 2019 the Christchurch City Council, Selwyn District Council, Waimakariri District Council and Canterbury Regional Council adopted Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update Whakahāngai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga (Our Space), as a joint future development strategy for Greater Christchurch under the...
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National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity 2016 (NPS-UDC). Our Space describes how future growth will be provided for in Greater Christchurch over the next 30 years to 2048 and how the targets for housing development capacity as set out in Objective 6.2.1a will be met.

The NPS-UDC requires the Greater Christchurch councils (being the Christchurch City Council, Selwyn District Council, Waimakariri District Council and the Canterbury Regional Council) to ensure that, at any one time, there is sufficient development capacity to support housing and business growth across Greater Christchurch. Collectively, the district plans for Christchurch City, Selwyn District and Waimakariri District already provide for a substantial amount of development capacity in Greater Christchurch, both within greenfield priority areas and through redevelopment opportunities in existing urban areas. The Future Development Areas are important in providing certainty that additional residential development capacity is available to accommodate population and household growth over the medium and long term.

Policy 6.3.12 provides for the re-zoning of land within the Future Development Areas, through district planning processes, in response to projected shortfalls in feasible residential development capacity over the medium term. Addressing longer term needs will be further considered as part of a comprehensive review of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement scheduled for 2023.

It is anticipated that, as required by the NPS-UDC, the Greater Christchurch councils will collaboratively prepare a joint housing and business development capacity assessment at least every three years and monitor market indicators on a frequent basis. This will ensure an up to date base of information is available and enable spatial planning decisions to be responsive to changing population and household projections as well as changes in market conditions and other relevant factors. The housing and business development capacity assessments will provide a clear evidence base for understanding the amount of feasible development capacity that has been enabled and what additional capacity is required.

It is essential that development takes place in a coordinated way and the staging and timing of future development is managed to ensure transport and other infrastructure planning is integrated with the provision of additional housing. More detailed planning to determine the specific staging of development within the Future Development Areas will be required before land is re-zoned through district planning processes. Outline development planning is one of the main methods set out in the Regional Policy Statement to ensure the required detailed planning is undertaken within identified growth areas.

6.4 ANTICIPATED ENVIRONMENTAL RESULTS

1. Recovery and rebuilding is enabled within Greater Christchurch.
2. Priority areas, Future Development Areas and existing urban areas identified provide the location for all new urban development.
3. Significant natural resources are protected from inappropriate development.
4. People are protected from unacceptable risk from natural hazards.
5. Infrastructure, and urban and rural development, are developed in an integrated manner.
6. The use of existing infrastructure is optimised.
7. Development opportunities are provided for on Māori Reserves.
8. Growth is provided for through both greenfield and brownfield development opportunities.
9. Higher density living environments are provided.
10. Greenfield development is provided for at a rate that meets demand and enables the efficient provision and use of infrastructure.
11. Growth of rural towns within Greater Christchurch is sustainable and encourages self-sufficiency.
12. Rural residential development is appropriately managed.
13. Development incorporates good urban design.
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- Areas of special amenity, heritage value, or importance to Ngāi Tahu are retained.
- Residential development contains a range of densities.
- Transport infrastructure appropriately manages network congestion, dependency of private vehicles is reduced, emissions and energy use from vehicles is reduced, and transport safety is enhanced.
- The function and role of the Central City, the Key Activity and neighbourhood centres is maintained.
- Sufficient business land is provided for, and different types of business activity take place in appropriate locations, adopting appropriate urban design qualities.
- Development opportunities for a metropolitan recreation facility at 466-482 Yaldhurst Road are provided for.
- Sufficient opportunities for development are provided to meet the housing and business needs of people and communities - both current and future.
Map A – Greenfield Priority Areas (viewable in more detail at www.ecan.govt.nz)
Map A - Greenfield Priority Areas (viewable in more detail at www.ecan.govt.nz)
## Glossary and Definitions

### DEFINITIONS FOR GREATER CHRISTCHURCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area plan</td>
<td>see definition of structure plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownfield</td>
<td>means abandoned or underutilised business land, or land no longer required by a requiring authority for a designated purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business or business activities</strong></td>
<td>means land or activities that include commercial and industrial and any ancillary activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central City</td>
<td>means the area covered by the Christchurch Central Recovery Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial activities</td>
<td>means retail, office and other commercial service activities but does not include industrial activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development capacity</td>
<td>has the same meaning as Development capacity as defined in the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District development strategy</strong></td>
<td>see definition of structure plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational facilities</td>
<td>means facilities used for primary, secondary or tertiary education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feasible</strong></td>
<td>has the same meaning as Feasible as defined in the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Development Areas</td>
<td>means an area identified on Map A as a Future Development Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity transmission network</td>
<td>means the national grid as defined in the National Policy Statement on Electricity Transmission 2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Christchurch</td>
<td>means the area shown on Map A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenfield Priority Areas</td>
<td>means an area identified on Map A for greenfield development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenfield development</td>
<td>means subdivision, use and/or development of land identified on Map A as a Greenfield Priority Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic heritage</td>
<td>has the same meaning as in s2 of the Resource Management Act, and includes historic cultural and historic heritage landscapes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing and business development capacity assessment</strong></td>
<td>means the assessment required by Policy PB1 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glossary and Definitions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industrial</strong> means the manufacturing, assembly, packaging, wholesaling or storage of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>products or the processing of raw materials and other ancillary activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intensification</strong> means an increase in the residential household yield within existing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>urban areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Activity Centres</strong> Key existing and proposed commercial centres identified as focal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>points for employment, community activities, and the transport network; and which are</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suitable for more intensive mixed-use development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The following centres shown on Map A are the existing KACs within Greater Christchurch:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Papanui</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Shirley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Linwood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- New Brighton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Belfast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Riccarton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Halswell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Spreydon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Hornby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Kaiapoi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rangiora</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Woodend / Pegasus Lincolen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rangiora</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rolleston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long term</strong> means between ten and thirty years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium term</strong> means between three and ten years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metropolitan recreation facility</strong> Means a single or multi-purpose recreation facility,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whether indoor or outdoor, used for the purposes of participating in or viewing sports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and active recreation and which is of a size, function and character typical of those</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>located in urban areas and/or serving the urban population. Such a facility may include:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- large scale indoor sports and recreation facilities;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- multiple outdoor playing fields and courts;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- stadia;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- athletics complexes;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- aquatic facilities;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ancillary facilities such as club rooms, spectator seating, and lighting with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>associated support structures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net density</strong> is the number of lots or household units per hectare (whichever is the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>greater). The area (ha) includes land for:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Residential purposes</strong></th>
<th><strong>means</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential purposes, including all open space and on-site parking associated with residential development;</td>
<td>Residential activities other than those in conjunction with rural activities that comply with the rules in the relevant district plan as at 23 August 2008;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local roads and roading corridors, including pedestrian and cycle ways, but excluding State Highways and major arterial roads;</td>
<td>Education activities including pre-school places or premises, but not including flight training, trade training or other industry related training facilities located within the Special Purpose (Airport) Zone in the Christchurch District Plan;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local (neighbourhood) reserves.</td>
<td>Travellers’ accommodation except that which is designed, constructed and operated to a standard that mitigates the effects of noise on occupants;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The area (ha) excludes land that is:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater retention and treatment areas;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geotechnically constrained (such as land subject to subsidence or inundation);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set aside to protect significant ecological, cultural, historic heritage or landscape values;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set aside for esplanade reserves or access strips that form part of a larger regional or sub-regional reserve network;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For local community services and retail facilities, or for schools, hospitals or other district, regional or sub-regional facilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noise sensitive activities</th>
<th>means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noise sensitive activities</td>
<td>Noise sensitive activities other than those in conjunction with rural activities that comply with the rules in the relevant district plan as at 23 August 2008;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>means</td>
<td>Education activities including pre-school places or premises, but not including flight training, trade training or other industry related training facilities located within the Special Purpose (Airport) Zone in the Christchurch District Plan;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>means</td>
<td>Travellers’ accommodation except that which is designed, constructed and operated to a standard that mitigates the effects of noise on occupants;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>means</td>
<td>Hospitals, healthcare facilities and any elderly persons housing or complex.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Outline development plan | means a plan prepared for the development of a Greenfield Priority Area, Future Development Area, or Rural Residential Development in the manner outlined in Policy 6.3.9. It shall include maps, plans, and other descriptive and illustrative material as necessary to convey the information referred to in Policy 6.3.9. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rural activities</th>
<th>means activities of a size, function, intensity or character typical of those in rural areas and includes:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>means</td>
<td>Rural land use activities such as agriculture, aquaculture, horticulture and forestry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>means</td>
<td>Businesses that support rural land use activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>means</td>
<td>Large – footprint parks, reserves, conservation parks and recreation facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>means</td>
<td>Residential activity on lots of 4 ha or more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>means</td>
<td>Quarrying and associated activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>means</td>
<td>Strategic infrastructure outside of the existing urban area and priority areas for development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Rural residential activities | means residential units outside the identified Greenfield Priority Areas and Future Development Areas at an average density of between 1 and 2 households per hectare. |

<p>| Rural residential strategy | means a strategy or plan developed for the purpose of identifying a territorial authority’s approach to management of rural residential |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Glossary and Definitions</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic transport networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure plan; or area plan; or district development strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban form effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban intensification plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Glossary and Definitions

| • How the residential density targets contained in Policy 6.3.7 will be met.  
| • A range of transport options, including pedestrian, cycling, passenger transport, motor vehicles. |
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1 This report is to update the Council on the issues relating to a survey error in the Silverstream development and advise on an outcome that has been reached in this matter.

1.2 The issue came to light in 2016 when it became evident that there had been an error by the Surveyor setting out the survey benchmark levels in the Silverstream Subdivision. This resulted in 138 houses having floor levels constructed lower than the level required by the building consent and 40 of these also being lower than the level required by the consent notice.

1.3 Staff have organised surveying, flood modelling and a peer review. These demonstrated that all 138 properties have now confirmed compliance with the original purpose of the Building Consent and the Consent notice.

1.4 For all 138 properties no further action is required by either property owner or the Council in relation to building consent. The property files now have clear information in relation to each property that demonstrates compliance.

1.5 For the remaining 40 properties with the consent notice issue there is a process that will take several months to correct the information on the title. This will involve matching the consent notice for each of these titles to newly modelled flood levels to bring these into full compliance.

1.6 Staff will work with property owners, planning and legal experts to amend the consent notices for the remaining 40 properties. This will be at Council’s expense.

1.7 The total cost to Council relating to the survey error, including all costs to date and the estimated cost to amend the consent notice levels on the remaining 40 properties, is $325,000. Staff will request that Davis Ogilvie reimburse this cost.

**Attachments:**

i. Opus Flood Modelling report (TRIM 190624088257)

ii. Beca Peer Review (TRIM 190624088259)
2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190726104786.

(b) **Notes** that the purpose of the building consents has been achieved in relation to floor levels for all properties in the Silverstream subdivision.

(c) **Notes** that all affected property owners have been advised of the outcome of this issue.

(d) **Notes** that staff will continue to work to amend the consent notices for the 40 properties that have floor levels lower than the current consent notice. When this has been completed Staff will report this to Council.

(e) **Circulates** a copy of this report to the Kaiapoi Tuahiwi Community Board.

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 **Survey Error**

3.2 The Silverstream development had minimum floor level requirements set as part of the subdivision and building consent process. The minimum floor level requirements were specified by consent notices on the property titles and also as part of the approved building consent plans.

3.3 In 2016, Waimakariri District Council became aware that the developer’s surveyor, Davis Ogilvie Partners, had made an error in setting out the survey benchmarks for the subdivision. This error had resulted in the finished floor levels for the houses which were set out from the erroneous benchmarks being constructed approximately 150mm lower than intended.

3.4 There were 138 houses constructed lower than the minimum floor level requirement of the building consent.

3.5 Of these 138 houses, 40 of them were also lower than the minimum floor level required by the Consent Notice registered on their property title.

3.6 **Council role**

3.7 As a regulatory authority the Waimakariri District Council had discharged it duties in a responsible manner as it relied on the best available information at the time of making decisions.

3.8 The Council position has always been that it does not have any financial or legal responsibility for this error or any subsequent issues. However the issue has had an impact on a significant portion of the community. As such it was appropriate for the Council to become involved to support the community.

3.9 The rationale for this approach is that leaving it for all of the individual property owners to resolve would have been very challenging for them on an individual basis. The Council had resources and expertise to help coordinate and manage a solution on behalf of the community. The Council also had access to external surveying, engineering, modelling and legal expertise at a fraction of the cost than would have been available to individual property owners.
3.10 Avoiding litigation was another reason. If matters remained unresolved then litigation between a range of parties including Waimakariri District Council and property owners could occur. If it did this would be an inefficient use of Council resources and could exacerbate conflict in the community.

3.11 Re-Survey

3.12 When the issue came to the attention of the Waimakariri District Council staff engaged an independent surveyor, Opus International Consultants (OPUS), to check the floor levels of all houses in the subdivision that had been built or were under construction.

3.13 The Council also had the benchmarks throughout the subdivision resurveyed by OPUS and confirmed the correct levels with Davis Ogilvie Partners (DOP). For the houses that complied with the original minimum floor levels, property owners were sent letters showing their properties floor level with a clear statement confirming that they complied with the consent floor level requirements.

3.14 For those houses that did not comply, the property owners were sent a copy of the surveyed level for their house along with a letter explaining that their floor level does not comply.

3.15 In all cases the Council confirmed that the CCC (Code Compliance Certificate confirming compliance with the building consent) for the house remained valid. The Council had used the best information available at the time of issuing the CCC and therefore the CCC would not be withdrawn.

3.16 Original PDP Flood Modelling

3.17 In 2012 modelling by Pattle Delamore Partners (PDP) was used to set the original finished floor levels on building consents and resource consents (beyond stage 1 of the subdivision).

3.18 This modelling was based on 2012 hydrology (storm and river flows). It was also based on design ground levels for the subdivision. As these were only design levels they had limited accuracy. The modelling also used coarse estimation of waterways near the development.

3.19 This original modelling was adequate at the time and if there had not been a survey error later there would have never been any need to revisit this modelling in relating to the finished floor levels.

3.20 DHI Modelling

3.21 The insurers for Davis Ogilvie engaged DHI to carry out further flood modelling for Silverstream in 2017. This flood modelling included extensive resurvey of the ground levels at Silverstream, detailed survey of the river cross section, as-built ground levels, and the New Arterial Road (NAR). This gave a far more accurate model of the physical ground levels for the flood modelling.

3.22 The DHI modelling also used updated 2017 hydrology (flood flow information). This hydrology had a higher water flow than the original 2012 hydrology as included the major rain events in 2014. While being an interesting set of results they were not relevant to gaining an understanding of the original consenting requirements for the development which needed to be based on the 2012 hydrology.
3.23 The DHI modelling missed an important scenario. Waimakariri District Council (WDC) considered that the scenario that needed to be modelled to test whether the purpose of the original consent had been met was the new more accurate ground model and the 2012 hydrology. Essentially the 2012 flood modelling on which consent was granted needed to be applied to the actual as-built subdivision.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. OPUS Modelling

4.2. In 2019, when it became apparent that there was not going to be any further modelling by DOP or their insurers WDC engaged Opus International Consultants (OPUS) to undertake modelling of the critical scenario. This modelling used the new ground geometry from the DHI model (Including the NAR) and the original hydrology from the 2012 model.

4.3. This modelling work demonstrated that the original purpose of the consents had been achieved for all of the 138 properties. It demonstrated compliance with the purpose of the building consent floor level. It also demonstrated that the purpose of the 40 non-compliant consent notices had been achieved.

4.4. Specifically it demonstrated in all cases that the constructed floor levels complied with the 2% AEP flood with 300mm freeboard for all building consents. It also showed that for the 40 properties that did not have levels compliant with the consent notice that they also had constructed floor levels greater than or equal to the 0.5 % AEP flood event.

4.5. BECA Peer review

4.6. The OPUS modelling work has been peer reviewed by BECA consultants who confirmed it to be appropriate.

4.7. This peer review gives a high level of confidence that the new modelling work is robust and can be relied on.

4.8. Communication with property Owners to date

4.9. Letters have been sent to all 138 property owners to advise them of the outcome of the OPUS modelling and BECA peer review. This has given each property owner specific information that relates to their specific circumstances.

4.10. For 98 of the property owners our advice to them is that the work has demonstrated compliance with the purpose of the Building Consent. For these properties they were always in compliance with their consent notice on their title. No further action is required for these properties.

4.11. For the remaining 40 property owners we have advised them that there are further steps to resolve the consent notice issue. This is a two-step process. Step one involves obtaining a resource consent variation based on the new OPUS modelling. The second step involves a process that needs to be completed by a lawyer to update the minimum floor level shown on the consent notice on the property file.

4.12. All 138 property owners were invited to a meeting on 18 July at the Urban Revival Café in Silverstream. Council staff gave an update on the modelling work and the next steps in the process. The presentation was followed by a Q&A session to allow property owners to ask questions and have these answered.

4.13. Resource Consent
4.14. Staff have engaged an external planning consultant to prepare a resource consent application on behalf of the 40 property owners based on the new modelling. This application requests that the minimum floor level be lowered to match that shown in the OPUS modelling for each affected property.

4.15. An external consultant has been used so that there is a level of independence from the Council.

4.16. The consent application will be decided by an independent commissioner. It is important that an independent commissioner is used to carry out this assessment as there could be a perception that Council staff processing a consent application where the Council is the applicant would be a conflict of interest.

4.17. In order for the Council to initiate this process staff will need to obtain written approval from each of the 40 property owners. If all property owners do not give approval, the process can still progress for those that do give approval. Every reasonable effort will be made to get all property owner’s approval.

4.18. Consent Notices

4.19. If the resource consent application is successful and a consent approved the next step will be to register the new consent notices.

4.20. The letter sent out by WDC to property owners on 26 June 2019 advised them that they would be required to cover the cost of this themselves. Staff received feedback from property owners that this was going to be difficult and expensive for property owners to do on an individual basis when the matter was also not of their making.

4.21. Staff approached Corcoran French Lawyers to obtain a quote for doing all 40 of the consent notices. Corcoran French have offered to do this at a heavily discounted rate. The cost to do it this way was substantially lower than it would cost each property owner individually. As a result it was decided that the Council would offer, on a no admission of liability basis, to organise and pay for this service.

4.22. In order for Corcoran French to carry this out staff have decided to obtain the approval of the 40 property owners. This can be the same approval used for the resource consent application.

4.23. LIMS and property files

4.24. There has been significant concern raised by the community that this issue will create a problem for people when they go to sell their property, or when they are obtaining insurance.

4.25. Staff will include a copy of the final letters confirming compliance on each property file. There will also be a clear statement on property file with words similar to ‘The Council considers based on the model report and its peer review, both of which are available for your independent assessment that this property is in compliance with the purpose of the minimum requirements for the finished floor level.’

4.26. The previous letters outlining the issue and other relevant information including the earlier flood modelling reports will still be included in LIMs. Any intending purchaser will have access to this information prior to purchase and can evaluate it.

4.27. The Management Team have reviewed this report and support the recommendations.
5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

5.2. This matter relates to properties within the Silverstream subdivision. Staff have engaged with the developer and the surveyor through this process.

5.3. Wider Community

5.4. This issue has attracted wider interest in the community and in the media. Information showing how this issue has been brought to a resolution will be circulated via a letter to all property owners in the development. Information has also been put up on the WDC website and has been circulated to media.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

6.2. The total cost of this issue has been approximately $325,000 for the Council. This includes the anticipated cost for the resource consent and registering the new consent notices.

6.3. When the final costs have been determined staff will talk to and write to DOP requesting that they reimburse this cost. DOP have not given an admission of faulty or liability, nor have they given any indication that they will cover any of Council’s costs.

6.4. While this has been a significant unbudgeted cost, if the matter had been left to individual property owners, the cost would likely be higher for the community.

6.5. Community Implications

6.6. This has been a significant issue for the Silverstream community that has taken 3 years to bring to a conclusion. Staff consider that they have acted in the best interests of the Community in the steps that have been taken to bring about the solution.

6.7. Some members of the community have incurred legal costs in seeking advice through this time. Staff have given an undertaking that we will request that DOP consider reimbursing these costs.

6.8. To date there has been no admission from DOP, nor has there been any indication that they would consider covering this cost.

6.9. Risk Management

6.10. Some people have expressed view WDC was at fault. This was not the case as WDC decisions were made on the best available information at the time.

6.11. The flood modelling has shown that the level of flood protection has been demonstrated to achieve the purpose of flood protection in the original consent. This is a very good level of protection with 300mm freeboard above the modelled 2% AEP flood level for all of the development and at or above the 0.5% AEP flood level for most of the development.

6.12. Health and Safety

6.13. There have been no specific health and safety concerns or issues relating to this issue.

6.14. Building houses above predicted flood levels helps provide a safe community.
7. CONTEXT

7.1. Policy

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

7.3. Legislation

7.4. The Building Act 2004 and Resource Management Act 1991 are relevant. Council has duties under both of these acts in relation to subdivisions, buildings and flood levels.

7.5. Community Outcomes

7.6. To make Waimakariri a great place to be, in partnership with our Communities guided by our outcomes, through the following roles:
   3. As an advocate on behalf of our community;
   4. As a regulator under legislation.

7.7. There is a safe environment for all.

7.8. Harm to people from natural and man-made hazards is minimised.

7.9. Delegations

7.10. The responsibility for fulfilling the Resource Management and Building Consent functions is given by the Council to the Manager Regulation.
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See disclaimer at end of Section 1.4
1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of Study

WSP Opus were appointed by Waimakariri District Council (WDC), over several stages between November 2018 and the present date, to model specific scenarios and assess flood risk at the Silverstream subdivision property development (see Figure 1-1). The work was undertaken in five key stages as outlined in Section 1.4, in brief these being:

- Review of the previous (Tuflow) model boundaries, prepared by Pattle Delamore Partners Ltd (PDP), against the latest MIKE FLOOD model to assess the best approach to make a (hydrologically) comparable model;
- Adjustment of the boundary conditions of the latest MIKE FLOOD model such that it is representative of the 2012 (PDP Tuflow) modelling and present comparative results;
- Completion of modelling of all scenarios (as per earlier work for consenting);
- GIS flood risk analysis to provide property freeboard values (i.e. property floor threshold heights above flood level) for relevant scenarios; and
- Reporting of the above, ready for peer review.

The purpose of the present study is to understand, based on this current refinement of the model, what level of protective freeboard above flood level is available for dwellings located within the subdivision. The assessment is based on the relevant statutory consenting requirements, regarding acceptable flood risk in terms of flood event probabilities and freeboard, as provided for by the Resource Management Act, the Building Act, and Building Code.

The Building Code sets out a simple performance standard for property flood protection, requiring that surface water resulting from a flood event having a 2% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP), that is to say approximately a 1 in 50 chance of occurring or being exceeded in any one year, shall not enter buildings (in this case dwellings). The purpose of that standard is to ensure dwellings are built to protect or adequately limit the risk of danger to the health and safety of those occupying the dwelling from a flood event.

It is therefore generally accepted that in order to achieve the functional requirements set out by the Building Code, the finished floor level (FFL) of the dwelling must be constructed to such a level/height that the dwelling will be free from entry of surface water in a 2% (1 in 50) AEP flood event. Commonly the difference in height between the predicted 2% AEP flood level and the FFL of the dwelling is described as the property freeboard. The requirement to meet a specific FFL can be included in a Building Consent.

Relevant to the Silverstream subdivision, the Resource Management Act consent conditions for the subdivision resource consent included minimum FFLs which were in turn carried through and included in consent notices. These were then registered against the land title upon which a dwelling was to be erected.

In assessing the freeboard to FFLs achieved by a dwelling, the Council has adopted a tolerance of ±40mm based on tolerances for the survey equipment builders use to establish the level for the foundation and foundation boxing set up. It has therefore been accepted that FFLs within 40mm of the required consented level effectively comply with that consented FFL.

The above requirements are referenced within the tables appended to this report, to demonstrate that (given the findings of this report) the requirements for the Silverstream subdivision are met at each property. The FFL of each dwelling is either above that required to meet the consent condition or, in a single case by an extremely small margin, it sits within acceptable tolerances.
In order to understand how flood level predictions relate to actual property FFLs, based on the consenting requirements and the best available tools, a new analysis has been undertaken using the latest MIKE FLOOD model as compared to the relatively high-level PDP Tuflow modelling carried out in 2012. The new model incorporates more detail and so results in greater accuracy, providing an improved level of confidence.

This assessment also includes the West Kaiapoi New Arterial Road (NAR) which has the benefit within the subdivision of diverting some flow around the subdivision. The NAR was not accounted for in the 2012 PDP model.

For the purposes of this report, the new MIKE FLOOD model uses hydrological boundaries (e.g. model inflows) that are closely comparable with those used for the 2012 modelling at the time of the consents. While flow volumes are the same, the model setups differ slightly, due to the limitations of the different software used and the differing modelling approaches.

This report now forms the key deliverable from the study. It summarises the flood risk assessment work carried out, but is focused specifically on the protective freeboard above flood level available for dwellings located within the subdivision, as set by the statutory consenting requirements. The report outlines the analysis undertaken, key assumptions and uncertainties and identifies how the results of the property flood risk analysis perform against the relevant consent requirements across the development area.

The outcomes of the study are shown for the scenarios appraised, for the 2% AEP event (often referred to as ‘1 in 50 year’) with climate change allowance (2% AEP +CC), and for the larger 0.5% AEP +CC event (often referred to as ‘1 in 200 year’). For the 0.5% AEP +CC event, a range of scenarios are considered (based on the assessments and assumptions within the 2012 work) that include for different flow contributions into the development catchment from the Waimakaririri Water Race and from an Eyre River breakout flow.

The relevant prior assessments and assumptions have not been reviewed in any detail at this point, having been previously accepted for consenting purposes. However, they appear to be appropriate and in any case provide for a conservative approach since the combination of events that would be required to occur would in fact have a lower annual exceedance probability than that applied (i.e. a lower likelihood of occurring).

Figures are included in this report that summarise the new (MIKE FLOOD) model predictions of flood risk around the development site, both in general and at the individual properties. As noted above, the outputs shown arise from the application of the hydrological conditions (rainfall, river and tidal information) from the 2012 work, which formed the basis of the consent applications, to the new model. There has not been any detailed review of the hydrological work at this point, though the 2012 Tuflow hydraulic model was previously peer reviewed as outlined further below in Section 1.3.
1.2 Study Location

The Silverstream subdivision is located on both banks of the Kaiapoi River (Silverstream) between Island Road and the New Arterial Road (NAR), as shown in Figure 1-1. The Kaiapoi River (Silverstream) passes through the site from south to north, before being joined by the Ohoka River and the Cust Drain downstream of Island Road. From here the Kaiapoi River continues to the east through Kaiapoi to join the Waimakariri River near to the coast. As shown in Figure 1-1, within the development site there are three bridge crossings over the Kaiapoi River (Silverstream):

- The NAR Bridge, at the upstream end of the subdivision;
- The Island Road Bridge, at the downstream end of the subdivision; and
- The Hayson Drive Bridge in the centre of the subdivision.

Because of the subdivision layout, the development can be divided into three parts as reflected by the surface water drainage layout. These are:

- The left bank of the river, between the Kaiapoi River (Silverstream) and NAR;
- The right bank of the Kaiapoi River (Silverstream) downstream of Hayson Drive; and
- The right bank of the Kaiapoi River (Silverstream) upstream of Hayson Drive.

1.3 Background

The development was built in four stages, but consented in two phases under the Resource Management Act (RMA) and then under the Building Act. For Stage 2 onwards of the subdivision, which mostly covered properties on the right bank (n.b. this includes a few riverside properties built in the first stage development on the left bank), an additional consent requirement was for floor levels to be above a more extreme 0.5% AEP + CC flood event scenario. All phases were required to provide at least a 300mm freeboard above the 2% AEP +CC event.

Habitable floor levels were initially based on flood modelling work undertaken using the Tuflow software by PDP. This modelled the development area in 2D only (i.e. a surface grid based on a
digital terrain model or DTM), with the Cust Drain river channel downstream modelled in 1D. Therefore the development area modelling was relatively high level (i.e. simplified) in that it did not make use of any 1D channel cross-section data, relying only on the 2D DTM for representation of the channel shape, which can underestimate the channel size (and thus capacity) depending on the 2D grid resolution. The DTM was created from LiDAR data, using the reflections of light from a laser mounted on an aeroplane. This is a common method of gathering generally reliable survey data over large areas.

There has been concern that, due to a survey error, some properties may have been constructed with less freeboard than that required by the appropriate subdivision consent and/or Building Consent. This would potentially reduce their level of flood risk protection below that intended. A survey of the built property finished floor levels has since been carried out, to form the basis of the freeboard assessment undertaken in this report. Note that the survey may not cover all properties as some may have been built since.

The PDP model was later updated to support the consenting of the NAR around the subdivision. At this time, the modelling work was peer reviewed by WSP Opus.

Following on from this, DHI New Zealand built an updated and more detailed flood model for the area using the MIKE FLOOD modelling software. This uses additional 1D cross section data for the Kaiapoi (Silverstream) and Ohoka rivers through the development area to represent channel capacity, as well as some additional and more up to date DTM data. It therefore uses a linked 1D-2D approach that provides more detail of the ground surface, and thus a better hydraulic representation of the flood flow and floodplain hydraulics. This modelling work was peer reviewed by WSP Opus.

The flood flows used in the prior 2012 model were also updated by DHI, who carried out a new hydrological assessment using additional gauged flow data that became available following the original work (i.e. after 2012). However, as this is after the consent provisions it therefore cannot be applied in retrospect to the requirements therein.

The MIKE FLOOD model has now been used as the basis of subsequent work by WSP Opus, as documented within this report, to assess flood level and resulting freeboard for the scenarios quoted in the applicable consents. Therefore, the results outlined herein use the available hydraulic model to represent the physical reality of the development river channels and floodplain, together with the hydrological boundaries that were used to represent design flood flows at the time of subdivision and building consents.

The design scenarios used for the consenting process are summarised in the PDP report for Maxim Projects and the related subsequent memorandum to WDC:

- ‘Silverstream Estates Flood Hazard Assessment’ report, March 2012, and

The Addendum outlined what are now referred to as Scenarios 1-6, as outlined in Table 1-1 below (copied from the PDP Addendum Report Table 1), with their resulting peak flood levels in the development area used to indicate floor level requirements. In summary the March 2012 report, as amended by the 2012 Addendum, concluded the following:

- The (2012) model was suitable for the assessment carried out (representing ‘current day’, at the time of the consent application), in particular with inclusion of climate change (through addition of 16% to peak flows and an increase in mean sea level at the downstream boundary of 0.5m) and having been verified to a 10% AEP event;
- The (2012) modelling showed higher design flood levels at the site than those previously determined from an Ashley River breakout scenario, thus covering the worst case scenario;
• From a range of sensitivity testing undertaken, the model is most sensitive to changes in the channel roughness and bridge loss assumptions, with a maximum increase of 0.13m being accounted for within the range of freeboard provided.
• The modelling work reported, including a range of breakout scenarios for the 0.5% AEP (+CC) event, allows for a conservative view of flood risk at the site.

The following key relevant recommendations emerge from the reports:

• Minimum floor levels for the development residential dwellings should be between 4.3 - 4.4m amsl, based on the predicted 0.5% AEP (+CC) event flood levels including the Eyre River breakout scenario (assuming 20% of the total Eyre flow contributes) on top of 90% of flow from the Waimakariri Water Race contributing; this provides 0.10m freeboard above the 0.5% AEP (+CC) event levels (no breakout – Scenario 3), such that the dwellings are unlikely to be flooded by any 0.5% AEP event.
• Minimum floor levels for the development residential dwellings should be between 4.3 - 4.4m amsl, based on the predicted 2% AEP (+CC) event, with 300mm freeboard (Scenario 2), in line with the Building Code E1/AS requirements, and in accordance with WDC Engineering Code of Practice.

### Table 1-1: Copy of PDP Addendum (Table 1) Showing Basis for Scenario Floor Level Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PDP Scenario (2012)</th>
<th>Return Period Flood Event</th>
<th>2012 Consent Floor levels (m amsl)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>50YR (2% AEP)</td>
<td>4.0 to 4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>50YR (2% AEP) with 300mm freeboard</td>
<td>4.3 to 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>200YR (0.5% AEP), 0% breakout from Eyre River, 100% contribution from Waimakariri Water Race</td>
<td>4.2 to 4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>200YR (0.5% AEP), 15% breakout from Eyre River, 80% contribution from Waimakariri Water Race</td>
<td>4.2 to 4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>200YR (0.5% AEP), 25% breakout from Eyre River with 80% of the water reaching the Silverstream area, 90% contribution from Waimakariri Water Race</td>
<td>4.3 to 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>200YR (0.5% AEP), 25% breakout from Eyre River, 100% contribution from Waimakariri Water Race</td>
<td>4.4 to 4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.4 Scope of Work

The scope of work reported here can be summarised as to:

• Collate the 2012 PDP model (and any relevant reporting), compare to the current MIKE FLOOD model and make an assessment of the differences in the hydrological boundaries between the two models, in order to scope out the development of a MIKE FLOOD model that would then be reasonably representative of the PDP (Tuflow) model hydrological setup, highlighting any key differences;
• Carry out the development of a MIKE FLOOD model that is representative of the earlier PDP (Tuflow) model hydrological setup. To extract Tuflow boundary data, build and run a new MIKE FLOOD model (50yr and 200yr events, including climate change) and present comparative results;
• Complete the modelling of all scenarios as per the original (2012 PDP) study.
- Carry out further GIS analysis to assess property flood risk (i.e. freeboard to the finished floor level thresholds) for all the model scenarios based on the original PDP study scenario hydrology (except for the final Scenario 6, not required for consenting purposes);
- Report on all the above, illustrating development flood risk and finished floor level freeboard using the latest survey and hydraulic model data, for the design flood flow scenarios highlighted.

As noted in Section 1.1 this report sets out the current understanding of what level of protective freeboard above flood level is achieved for the development properties, and whether this complies with the relevant consent requirement and/or is within accepted tolerance levels of compliance. The data used and knowledge of flooding at the site are summarised in Section 2, with the general flooding predicted by the model and our understanding of the flood mechanisms, depths and likely sensitivities outlined in Section 3. The assessment of specific property flood risk and FFL freeboard is set out in Section 4. The key conclusions of the study are summarised in Section 5.

The scope of work excludes:

- The collation of any new data;
- Any further MIKE FLOOD model development, or updates to the existing hydraulic model components, apart from those necessary for the inclusion of the original (PDP) Tuflow model hydrological boundary conditions; and
- Sensitivity testing of the model results.

Disclaimer

This report has been prepared by Opus International Ltd (Opus) for Waimakariri District Council (Client) in respect of the flood risk assessment for Silverstream Subdivision Property Development for the purpose/s agreed between the Client and Opus (Purpose) as set out above. Opus has provided the report based on the various assumptions contained in this report, and accepts no responsibility for the validity, appropriateness, sufficiency or consequences of the Client using the report for purposes other than for the Purposes. Opus disclaims all risk and all responsibility to any third party.
2 Modelling Approach

2.1 Data Available for Study

The following data have been used for this study:

- Hydraulic model of Kaiapoi River and surrounding catchment network (assumed to be complete and accurate for the purpose of this study, and to run without error in a stable manner) - supplied directly by DHI New Zealand, referred to below as ‘the MIKE FLOOD model’;
- The 2012 (PDP) Tuflow model, referred to below as ‘the Tuflow model’;
- Silverstream development property listing with actual thresholds - supplied by WDC;
- Parcel data - downloaded from LINZ.

It is understood from WDC that the MIKE FLOOD model provided has been updated by DHI for the developer to include the latest merged DTM data (ref. DHI Model Build report), including subdivision topography collected by Eliot Sinclair.

2.2 Understanding of Flood Risk Issues

The Silverstream development subdivision lies just upstream of the confluence of three watercourses, namely the Kaiapoi (Silverstream), Cust Drain and Ohoka River, which join about 200m downstream of Island Road (see Figure 1-1). The Kaiapoi River is then joined from the north by the Cam River, before passing through the urban development area of Kaiapoi and joining the Waimakariri River 2.5km from the river mouth. Through the town of Kaiapoi the river is tidally influenced, as well as having backwater effects from flows in the Waimakariri River.

The development area is generally flat, typical of the lower Canterbury plains. At the development area, high flows in the Ohoka River have historically been able to flow overland and pass to the south-east into the Kaiapoi River (Silverstream). The NAR embankment runs across and thus constrains most of this flow path, but the current flow regime maintains the lateral flow between the Ohoka and Kaiapoi (Silverstream) rivers via a swale adjacent to the NAR. Three box culverts beneath the NAR allow this flow to pass along a lateral connecting channel to join the Kaiapoi River (Silverstream) just upstream of Island Road Bridge. This bridge is also considered a constraint during larger flood flows.

Upstream of the development area there is also potential for overland flow from ‘contained’ rural land upstream to the west (e.g. Waimakariri Water Race) and the risk of overflow from the Eyre River to the south-west. The risk from the Waimakariri River itself is low, based on modelling carried out in 2008 by Environment Canterbury.

Within the subdivision itself, a drainage network is provided for day to day management of stormwater runoff, including treatment of the ‘first flush’. The construction of the NAR to the north-west is raised above the 2% (1 in 50) AEP +CC flood event levels on the Ohoka River. This prohibits overflow into the development area up to the 0.5% (1 in 200) AEP +CC flood event levels (without Eyre River breakout), based on the MIKE FLOOD model results discussed in this report.

The development of the subdivision therefore has been carried out to take account of these risks by raising ground levels and requiring minimum FFLs.

2.3 Amendments to MIKE FLOOD Model

As outlined in Section 1.4, the boundaries of the latest MIKE FLOOD model were amended to represent the same hydrological boundaries as the Tuflow model, or as close as possible with the...
differences in software and focusing on the flows influencing the flood peak as this is the key criteria being tested. The Tuflow model boundaries are summarised in Figure 2-1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1D</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Database file reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QT</td>
<td>CustDrain</td>
<td>CD_ARI.csv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QT</td>
<td>CamRiver</td>
<td>CA_ARI.csv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QT</td>
<td>PumpStations</td>
<td>PS.csv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HT</td>
<td>KaiapoiOutlet</td>
<td>KP_Tidal_CC.csv</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2D</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Database file reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QT</td>
<td>Ohoka</td>
<td>OH_ARI.csv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QT</td>
<td>EyreRiver</td>
<td>ER.csv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QT</td>
<td>SilverStream</td>
<td>SS_ARI.csv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QT</td>
<td>WaimakRace</td>
<td>WR_ARI.csv</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2-1: Summary of Tuflow 1D and 2D model boundaries

The various amendments carried out to the MIKE FLOOD model (MIKE FLOOD - version release 2016, service pack 3) are as outlined below.

2.3.1 Upstream flow boundaries (2D in Tuflow)

The upstream inflow boundaries to the Kaiapoi (Silverstream) and Ohoka rivers form the key flows contributing to flooding in the development area. The area covering the Kaiapoi (Silverstream) and Ohoka River floodplain down to their confluence was modelled in 2D only in the Tuflow model, and so the upstream flow boundaries to this were input direct to the Tuflow model domain, as shown in blue in Figure 2-2 (model domain area in red), for the four 2D model boundaries listed above (Figure 2-1): Ohoka River, Kaiapoi (Silverstream) River, and contributions from the Eyre River breakout and Waimakariri Water Race.

The MIKE FLOOD model has the Kaiapoi (Silverstream) and Ohoka rivers as 1D cross-sections, which were originally connected to the river inflow boundaries. However, to remain as close as possible to the Tuflow model set up, the MIKE FLOOD model boundaries were input to the 2D (MIKE21) domain in the same locations as the Tuflow model (the 1D model inflows being removed). The MIKE FLOOD software does not allow inflows to be spread along a line, and so the flow was distributed between points along the same lines as in Tuflow, as shown in Figure 2-3. This comes very close to replicating the same effect.

By comparing Figures 2-2 and 2-3, it can be seen that the MIKE FLOOD model 2D domain (the area covered) is a little larger than the Tuflow model domain, such that these inflow points (as described above) sit within it rather than at the domain boundary. However, with the ground sloping away from the domain edge, almost perpendicular to the inflow lines, a very similar effect is still achieved in terms of the flows entering the model.

2.3.2 Downstream inflow boundaries (1D in Tuflow)

The downstream inflow boundaries consist of the 1D model boundaries in Figure 2-1 above. These contribute to the downstream conditions influencing the development site, along with the downstream boundary at the Waimakariri River (see Section 2.3.5 below). This area of the Tuflow model is covered by a linked 1D-2D (Estry-Tuflow) model and so here the inflows were connected direct to the 1D component. This was therefore replicated in the MIKE FLOOD model, with inflows connected into MIKE11, and while the Cust Drain and Cam River inflows are a little further upstream (than in the Tuflow model) the impact of this will be negligible.
Figure 2-2: Location of Tuflow model boundaries

Figure 2-3: Extent of MIKE FLOOD 2D model and replicated inflow points
2.3.3 Local inflows around the development area

Around the development site, the Tuflow model has two ‘rain on grid’ areas of hydrology, one over the development itself and one on the right bank rural area just upstream, where direct rainfall was input spread over the defined 2D model domain areas. These areas were labelled ‘development’ and ‘surrounds’ respectively (see Figure 2-2). Consideration was given to replication of these, but on inspection they were found to be relatively minor in terms of the peak flows created and also occur much earlier in the event simulation than the peak flood from upstream (see Section 3.4). Therefore, the flows resulting from these boundaries were instead input direct to the Kaiapoi River (Silverstream) 1D model, near the upstream end of the related rainfall area. Any development areas shown to be flooding are therefore only those impacted by peak flood levels in the river (i.e. the work reported here does not show any flooding from the stormwater infrastructure within the development, due to local runoff within the site).

2.3.4 Local detail around the development area

As noted above, the whole development area in the Tuflow model is covered by a 2D model domain with no separate or linked 1D channel components. There is no separate representation of the urban drainage systems. In the MIKE FLOOD model, the piped drainage systems were covered by a MIKE URBAN component. However, for the present comparison, this element has been turned off, as it was felt that this added unnecessary complexity and could cause confusion between local flooding (from the drainage systems) and river flooding (from upstream flows), with the latter being the one of interest here (see also the above section related to the local inflows).

2.3.5 Downstream boundary

The Tuflow model has a downstream boundary at the confluence of the Kaiapoi River with the Waimakariri River, whereas the MIKE FLOOD model includes a length of the Waimakariri River downstream. To match the original (PDP) model, the MIKE FLOOD model was amended to replicate the Tuflow model, by cutting it at the confluence and using the boundary data from the original model.

2.3.6 New Arterial Road (NAR)

The key difference between the new DHI model and the prior PDP model that has not been modified is the inclusion of the NAR (West Kaiapoi New Arterial Road). The DHI model includes topographical representation of the road embankment and the associated drainage, whereas the 2012 version of the PDP model used to support the consenting and setting of floor levels for the Silverstream subdivision would not have included the road. The inclusion of the NAR has the benefit, within the subdivision, of diverting some flow around the subdivision area. This has the effect of lowering flood elevations along the Kaiapoi River (Silverstream) through the development area, to some extent.
3 Predicted Flooding for Design Scenarios

3.1 Modelled Scenarios

The scenarios to be modelled are based on the 2012 PDP work for the consenting (see Section 1.3). As part of the addendum to the report, a range of 0.5% AEP events were modelled as described above to give the following set of scenario results from which development levels were finally prescribed (see Table 1-1).

- Scenario 1 – 2% AEP +CC event
- Scenario 2 – 2% AEP +CC event (as Scenario 1), but with 300mm freeboard allowance
- Scenario 3 – 0.5% AEP +CC event with Waimakariri Water Race 100%, Eyre River breakout 0%
- Scenario 4 – 0.5% AEP +CC event with Waimakariri Water Race 80%, Eyre River breakout 15%
- Scenario 5 – 0.5% AEP +CC event with Waimakariri Water Race 90%, Eyre River breakout 20%
- Scenario 6 – 0.5% AEP +CC event with Waimakariri Water Race 100%, Eyre River breakout 25%

Scenario 5 was interpolated by PDP between Scenarios 4 and 6, stating that the assumption for this scenario was that the 25% breakout from the Eyre River would be attenuated (by 80%) as it passes through the intervening floodplain to give an effective contribution at the development equivalent to a 20% breakout flow. This scenario (Scenario 5) was effectively the one selected for the property floor level requirement in the development second phase, providing 300mm freeboard over the 2% AEP event flood levels (Scenario 1), and 100mm freeboard over the 0.5% AEP base event (Scenario 3) and Scenario 4, based on the Tuflow model results (Table 1-1). It can be seen that the Scenario 4 results given by PDP were the same as for Scenario 3.

3.2 Flood Peak Levels

The 2012 PDP work indicated the maximum flood levels from the modelled scenarios at four key locations on the river network (PDP Report Table 5-1). The peak flood levels from the new (MIKE FLOOD) simulations are now compared with those results, and the new scenario results compared in order to define the key scenarios for the setting of minimum FFLs for the different stages of the subdivision development. The key locations are:

- Upstream of Island Road Bridge on the Kaiapoi River downstream of the development;
- Upstream of Island Road Bridge on the Ohoka River downstream of the development;
- Upstream of the Hayson Drive Bridge within the development (Kaiapoi River); and
- Downstream of the NAR Bridge (Kaiapoi River), at what was called the ‘Ford Crossing’.

3.2.1 No Eyre Breakout Flow 2% AEP +CC and 0.5% AEP +CC Event Results

The modelled peak flood levels are tabulated below in Table 3-1 at the key locations, for the 2% AEP +CC and 0.5% AEP +CC baseline (no Eyre breakout) conditions.

The two scenarios tabulated represent Scenarios 1 and 3, and the table shows how these ‘base’ condition results have changed from the 2012 Tuflow model results. It can be seen in Table 3-1 that the difference (M-T) between the new MIKE FLOOD (M) results and those from the 2012 Tuflow model (T) are very similar for both scenarios (2% and 0.5% AEP +CC) events without Eyre breakout flows. The MIKE FLOOD model shows a fairly consistent reduction in predicted peak flood levels of between 0.2-0.4m. It can be noted that this is similar to the 300mm freeboard that is added to the Scenario 1 results to create those for Scenario 2 (see Table 3-3 below).

The lower peak levels achieved by the MIKE FLOOD model are not unexpected, in that the new model incorporates a significant additional level of detail (compared to the Tuflow model) that would be likely to reflect the conveyance capacity of the river channels more completely, also with better representation of the bridge losses.
### Table 3-1: Peak Flood Level Comparisons, no Breakout Flow Scenario (MIKE FLOOD vs Tuflow)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>2% AEP (+CC) Scenario 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>0.5% AEP (+CC) Scenario 3</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIKE FLOOD (M)</td>
<td>Tuflow (T)</td>
<td>M - T</td>
<td>MIKE FLOOD (M)</td>
<td>Tuflow (T)</td>
<td>M - T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka (Island Rd) Bridge</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi (Island Rd) Bridge</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayson Drive Bridge (within development)</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAR Bridge downstream (ford crossing)</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.2.2 0.5% AEP +CC Event Results with Eyre Breakout Flows

The modelled peak flood levels are tabulated below in Table 3-2 at the key locations, for the 0.5% AEP +CC conditions with varying assumptions for the Eyre River breakout flow and Waimakariri Water Race contributions. These represent Scenarios 4 and 5, with increasing breakout flows which can be compared to the 0.5% AEP (+CC) event Scenario 3 without Eyre breakout flow above, and show the change (M-T) from the 2012 Tuflow model results.

### Table 3-2: Peak Flood Level Comparison, 0.5% AEP Breakout Scenarios (MIKE FLOOD vs Tuflow)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>0.5% AEP (+CC) Scenario 4</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>0.5% AEP (+CC) Scenario 5</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIKE FLOOD (M)</td>
<td>Tuflow (T)</td>
<td>M - T</td>
<td>MIKE FLOOD (M)</td>
<td>Tuflow (T)</td>
<td>M - T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka (Island Rd) Bridge</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi (Island Rd) Bridge</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayson Drive Bridge (within development)</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAR Bridge downstream (ford crossing)</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be seen from Table 3-2 that the difference (M-T) between the new MIKE FLOOD (M) results and those from the 2012 Tuflow model (T) are between 0.23-0.29m at the Kaiapoi River (Silverstream) locations, showing increases in peak levels of up to 0.17m from Scenario 3 above. However, it can be seen from the MIKE FLOOD results that the higher 0.5% AEP (+CC) event breakout flow assumptions raise the flood level more significantly on the Ohoka River at the Island Road bridge (by up to 0.28m in Scenario 5). This is due to the breakout flow contributions passing more to the Ohoka River than the Kaiapoi River (Silverstream).

The flood levels on the Ohoka side (also not receiving benefit as a result of the NAR construction) therefore show a smaller reduction in flood level and are now higher than at the NAR bridge crossing (4.21 vs 4.14). The Ohoka River floodwater then interacts with the Kaiapoi River (Silverstream), with flows passing through the NAR flood culverts as well as spilling over the road towards Island Road. This raises flood levels on the Kaiapoi River (Silverstream) back up through the development area.
At the centre of the development area (e.g. Hayson Drive Bridge), the reduction in predicted flood levels (compared to the Tuflow model) remains fairly consistent at over 0.2m. As above in Section 3.2.1, these lower peak levels achieved by the MIKE FLOOD model are not unexpected, due to the significant additional level of detail incorporated.

3.2.3 Critical scenarios for the setting of minimum FFLs

The checking of minimum FFLs from the latest modelling work relies on the MIKE FLOOD (M) scenarios 1, 2 and 5 peak flood heights, these being the critical ones. For calculating the differences below, and annotating the tabulation clearly, these have therefore been referred to as Scenarios M1, M2 and M5.

Stage 1 of the development had minimum FFLs set based on Scenario 2 (M2) (i.e. Scenario 1 (M1) plus 300mm freeboard), while the FFLs for Stage 2 onwards were required to adopt a minimum value from the most conservative of either Scenario 2 (M2) or Scenario 5 (M5). It can be noted from Table 3-2 that Scenario 5 will always be more critical than Scenario 4.

The above is illustrated by the comparison at the key model output locations in Table 3-3 below. The results suggest that in most cases (except possibly near to the NAR Bridge crossing where the Scenario 5 level (M5) is 0.06m lower than in Scenario 2 (M2)) the critical level to be used to define minimum FFLs will be from Scenario 5 (as M5 – M2 in Table 3-3 is normally positive as shown in the final column).

Table 3-3: Peak Flood Level Comparison, Scenario 5 (0.5% AEP) to Scenarios 1 & 2 (2% AEP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Scenario 1 (M1) and Scenario 2 (M2) Peak Flood Level (m)</th>
<th>Scenario 5 (M5) Peak Flood Level and Difference M5 – M2 (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIKE FLOOD (M1) M1 + 0.3m (M2)</td>
<td>MIKE FLOOD (M5) Tuflow M5 – M2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka (Island Rd) Bridge</td>
<td>3.73 4.03</td>
<td>4.21 4.3 0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kairapoi (Island Rd) Bridge</td>
<td>3.63 3.93</td>
<td>4.01 4.3 0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayson Drive Bridge (within development)</td>
<td>3.70 4.00 4.07 4.3 0.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAR Bridge downstream (ford crossing)</td>
<td>3.90 4.20 4.14 4.4 -0.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 Flood Peak Extents

The flood extent (maximum flood depth) maps for the key modelled scenarios are shown in Figure 3-1 for the 2% AEP +CC event (Scenario 1), and Figure 3-2 and Figure 3-3 for the key 0.5% AEP +CC events (Scenario 3 without Eyre breakout, and Scenario 5 with 20% Eyre River breakout contribution). These maps are based on the 2D model output only.

Stage 1 of the development had minimum FFLs set based on Scenario 2 (M2) (i.e. Scenario 1 (M1) plus 300mm freeboard), while the FFLs for Stage 2 onwards were required to adopt a minimum value from the most conservative of either Scenario 2 (M2) or Scenario 5 (M5). This is illustrated by the comparison at the key model output locations in Table 3-3 below. It can be noted from Table 3-2 that Scenario 5 will always be more critical than Scenario 4 (always at least 0.1m higher). Furthermore, the results in Table 3-3 suggest that in most cases (except possibly near to the NAR Bridge crossing where the Scenario 2 level is higher) the critical level to be used to define minimum FFLs from Stage 2 onwards will be from Scenario 5 (M5 – M2 in Table 3-3 is normally positive).
Figure 3-1: Flood extent (maximum depths) for 2% AEP +CC event (Scenario 1)

Figure 3-2: Flood extent (2D maximum depths) for 0.5% AEP +CC event (Scenario 3)

Figure 3-3: Flood extent (2D maximum depths) for 0.5% AEP +CC event (Scenario 5)
3.4 Model Stage Hydrographs and Flood Peak Timing

The flood stage hydrographs at the four model key locations (Section 3.2) for the Tuflow model 2% AEP (+CC) event are shown in Figure 3-4 (taken from the PDP Report Figure 5-2). The comparative results for the MIKE FLOOD model are shown in Figure 3-5 for the 2% AEP (+CC) event.

Figure 3-4: PDP Scenario 1 (from PDP Fig. 5-2) Peak Level Hydrographs (2% AEP (+CC) Event)

Figure 3-5: MIKE FLOOD Scenario 1 Peak Level Hydrographs (2% AEP (+CC) Event)
The flood stage hydrographs at the four model key locations (Section 3.2) for the Tuflow model 0.5% AEP (+CC) event is shown in Figure 3-6 (taken from the PDP Report Figure 5-4). The comparative results for the MIKE FLOOD model are shown in Figure 3-7 and Figure 3-8 for the key 0.5% AEP (+CC) events (Scenarios 3 and 5).
Figure 3-8: MIKE FLOOD Scenario 5 Peak Level Hydrographs (0.5% AEP (+CC) Event)

It can be seen that, similar to the 2012 (PDP scenario) outputs, the flood peak levels in the MIKE FLOOD scenarios are all occurring during the final rise in the flow hydrograph. An initial small hydrograph rise (over the first two hours, not shown) is due to the local rainfall runoff around the site, followed by a larger peak (at about 18 hours) which results mostly from the Kaiapoi (Silverstream) and Ohoka catchment river inflows. The final (highest) peak (at about 36 hours) results from the addition of the two breakout flows (from Eyre River and the Waimakariri Water Race), building on top of the earlier inflows. For Scenario 1 there is no Eyre River breakout flow, though it still has 85% contribution from the Waimakariri Water Race, and this still results in the largest flood peak, possibly also influenced by the Cust Drain downstream.

From the above, it is concluded that the local inflows (2hr peak) will have negligible influence on the highest flood peak some 34 hours later.

For the Scenario 5 event (Figure 3-8) it can be seen that the Ohoka flooding (shown in blue) is more prominent (compared with Figure 3-5 and Figure 3-7), due to the additional Eyre breakout flows.

3.5 Model Long-Section Plots (Kaiapoi River)

The peak flood level comparisons along the Kaiapoi River (Silverstream) are also illustrated in long-section plots in Figures 3-9 and 3-10, for the 2% AEP (Scenario 1) and 0.5% AEP (Scenario 3) events. The Kaiapoi River (Silverstream) peak level points from the (PDP) Tuflow model are marked for comparison, illustrating how the latest MIKE FLOOD modelling sits comfortably beneath those points as detailed in Section 3.2.
Figure 3-9: Scenario 1 (2% AEP event) Kaiapoi River Peak Flood Levels

Figure 3-10: Scenario 3 (0.5% AEP event) Kaiapoi River Peak Flood Levels
A comparison of how things change between 0.5% AEP event scenarios, from the original (Scenario 3) to the Scenario 5 is shown in Figure 3-11 below. The Kaiapoi River peak flood level points from the (PDP) Tuflow model are marked for comparison, illustrating again how the latest MIKE FLOOD modelling sits comfortably beneath those points as detailed further in Section 3.2.

Figure 3-11: Scenarios 3 and 5 (0.5% AEP events) Kaiapoi River Peak Flood Levels
4 Reassessment of Consent Compliance

4.1 Key Consenting Scenarios

The scenarios used to assess property threshold level (or finished floor level, FFL) requirements, based on the 2012 PDP work for the consenting (see Section 1.3), and the freeboard provided to the property FFLs relative to these, are as listed below.

- Stage 1 – Scenario 1 (2% AEP (+CC) event) with a 0.3m freeboard, or effectively Scenario 2;
- Stage 2 and onwards – Scenario 5 (0.5% AEP (+CC) event), or Scenario 4 (0.5% AEP (+CC) event) with a 0.1m freeboard, or Scenario 1 (2% AEP (+CC) event) with a 0.3m freeboard.

In the new MIKE FLOOD results, the Scenario 5 peak flood levels remain at least 0.1m above the Scenario 4 peak levels (see Table 3-2) and so here we can focus just on the need for the Stage 2 and onwards of the subdivision to have FFLs above the Scenario 5 peak flood level.

- Scenario 2 – 2% AEP +CC event (as Scenario 1), with 0.3m freeboard allowance
- Scenario 5 – 0.5% AEP +CC event with Waimakariri Water Race 90%, plus Eyre River breakout 20%

The property freeboard is a measure of the property FFL compared to the peak flood level for consenting purposes. The results outlined below (and in Appendix A), for the two scenarios above, compare each (surveyed) property FFL with the peak flood level taken to be appropriate for that specific property location (noting that not all buildings have been surveyed). It determines the peak flood level by taking the worst case (highest flood level) from the nearest peak river level (1D model) and nearest peak surface water level (2D model). In comparing each FFL, with the worst case flood level the extent of flooding is extended to cover all properties (i.e. beneath ground level), so the freeboard is in effect assessed from an extended flood water surface. The assessment was manually adjusted where necessary to give the most appropriate flood level for each property, such as for example properties along Hayson Drive taking their flood level data from upstream of Hayson Drive bridge rather than downstream.

The results shown in Appendix A show whether the property (surveyed) FFL is in compliance with the consenting requirements. The results are summarised and discussed further below.

4.2 Revised Level of Consent Compliance

The (surveyed) properties are listed in Appendix A, showing revised values for the required FFL to meet the relevant consenting requirements and whether the most recent surveyed property floor levels meet this requirement. It can be seen that the results of the property flood risk analysis indicate that the relevant consent requirements across the development area have been met for all (surveyed) dwellings. It would therefore appear that the earlier survey error, at the time of construction, has been offset by the conservative nature of the high level modelling that was carried out in 2012, resulting in required freeboards still being met based on the more detailed modelling now completed.

The updated FFL requirements shown in Appendix A are based on the new scenario modelling completed as described in Sections 2 and 3 above. The relevant scenarios are those outlined above in Section 4.1.

For the Building Consent requirement, which applies to all stages of development, this includes the necessary 0.3m property freeboard on top of the Scenario 1 (2% AEP (+CC) event) peak flood levels (i.e. Scenario 2). It can be seen that all (surveyed) properties meet the consent requirements, with only one (surveyed) property FFL sitting within the 0.04m tolerance, though this is extremely marginal. The property FFL tolerance of 0.04m has previously been applied by Council and is
based on tolerances for builder’s survey and set up as well as from information from other agencies. It should be noted that the surveyed levels will also have a margin of error, and so it is reasonable to state that all (surveyed) properties have a freeboard of 0.3m and that the modelling evidence identifies that these properties therefore comply with the required 2% AEP (+CC) event Building Consent criteria.

For the additional (RMA) consent requirement, the most recent surveyed property floor levels are compared with the Scenario 5 (0.5% AEP (+CC) event) peak flood levels to assess compliance. This applies to properties from Stage 2 onwards of the subdivision, but also a few properties from Stage 1 and so these have been included in the results shown in Appendix A. It can be seen that all (surveyed) properties meet the consent requirements and so it is reasonable to state that all (surveyed) properties comply with the required 0.5% AEP (+CC) event RMA additional consent criteria.
5 Assumptions, Limitations and Constraints

The MIKE FLOOD model has been used as supplied by DHI and is the most appropriate information available for this study. The DHI model build report documents the data sources and assumptions relating to the model itself. WSP Opus have relied solely on the model as supplied for analysis documented within this report.

The results of the model are subject to uncertainty. In terms of relative level comparisons (as summarised in Section 3), DHI have estimated the hydraulic model component of the uncertainty to be in the range of +/-0.06m. Other uncertainties existing within the data, hydrological analysis, etc, will also apply to absolute level values quoted.

There has not been any detailed review of the hydrological work at this point, though the 2014 update of the original Tuflow hydraulic model was previously peer reviewed by WSP Opus.

For the ‘present’ day scenario (climate as of 2012), the flood risk illustrated by the tables and figures in the report will be conservative, due to the inclusion of an allowance for climate change (see Section 1.3). The Scenario 4 and 5 results are more extreme (relative to Scenario 3), in that there is an element of combined probability inherent in their assumptions, e.g. that breakout flows from the Eyre River will occur on top of a flood peak within the local catchment.

It should also be noted that this modelling work has been done to provide an assessment of flooding using the more recent DHI model in line with knowledge at the time of the developments consenting e.g. 2012. The modelling therefore does not reflect the current state of knowledge as of 2019 in terms of the latest flow gauging data available and changes to the hydrological flood frequency for this site.

The assessment of consent compliance is limited to those properties for which FFL surveyed levels have been made available (as listed in Appendix A).
6 Conclusions

A process of investigation and analysis of the flood risk at the Silverstream Subdivision property development, on the Kaiapoi River (Silverstream) upstream of Island Road, has been completed. This aims to assess whether the consenting requirements set during 2012 for the site have in fact been met, with the refinement of the model that was available at the time. The work has taken the latest MIKE FLOOD model created by DHI as the most appropriate representation of the physical layout of the rivers and floodplain, and applied hydrological inflows that are comparable (within the limitations of the different software used and different modelling approaches) with those used at the time of the consents (i.e. the 2012 modelling). These 2012 hydrological inputs form the basis of the consenting requirements drawn up, for finished floor levels (FFLs) to be provided to specific heights (or freeboards) relative to the specified scenario peak flood levels and were the best available at that time.

All property FFLs are required (under the Building Consent) to have 0.3m freeboard (ref Scenario 2) above the 2% AEP +CC peak flood levels (Scenario 1). Properties on the right bank (and a few on the left bank) are required by an additional Consent Notice to not be flooded above FFL for the specified 0.5% AEP +CC peak flood levels (taken as Scenario 5, based on scenarios with the addition of various breakout flows).

Key main conclusions of the study can be summarised as:

- Predicted flood levels using the MIKE FLOOD model are generally between 0.2-0.4m lower than the 2012 Tuflow model results on the Kaiapoi River (Silverstream), this not being considered too unexpected due to the additional level of detail in the newer model better reflecting the river channel depression within the surrounding topography, this giving rise to an improved representation of channel conveyance;
- From the data available at this time, all (surveyed) property FFLs are considered to have sufficient freeboard (required to be 0.3m under the Building Consent) above the 2% AEP +CC peak flood levels, and so meet this consenting requirement;
- From the data available at this time, FFLs for the (surveyed) properties falling under the additional Consent Notice are considered to all meet the requirement that under the 0.5% AEP +CC peak flood levels (taken as Scenario 5 based on the 2012 work) no above floor level flooding will occur;
- It would therefore appear that the earlier survey error, at the time of construction, has been offset by the conservative nature of the high level modelling that was carried out in 2012, resulting in required freeboards still being met;
- It may be worth clarifying that in producing the latest model outputs reported here, no iterations of the model runs were carried out, the results presented simply being the result of running the latest model with the hydrology representing the flood flows agreed as appropriate at the time of the consents;
- It is further worth noting that new estimates of flood flow peaks at the Silverstream Subdivision (with further gauge data available, together with high flow events occurring in the intervening years) are likely to differ from the estimates from 2012 here reported on;
- The results of the property flood risk analysis indicate that the relevant consent requirements across the development area have been met for all (surveyed) dwellings.
Appendix A
Silverstream (Surveyed) Properties
Revised Level of Consent Compliance

Stage 1 onwards: Consenting to 2% AEP Event Scenario (plus freeboard) – Building Consent
Stage 2 onwards: Consenting to 0.5% AEP Event Scenario – Additional Consent Notice
## Appendix A - Silverstream (Surveyed) Properties

### Revised Level of Consent Compliance

#### Summary of Compliance to Consent Notice and to Building Consent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Property Address</th>
<th>Consent Notice (RMA) Required FFL</th>
<th>Complies with CN</th>
<th>Building Consent (Building Act) Required FFL</th>
<th>Complies with BC</th>
<th>Property Surveyed Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 Hayson Dr</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>4.117</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>4.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>21 Storer St</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>3.960</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2B Keating St</td>
<td>4.148</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>3.958</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>4.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15 Friesian Cr</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>3.958</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>4.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>21 Friesian Cr</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>3.955</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>4.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8 Friesian Cr</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>3.958</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 Friesian Cr</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>27 Storer St</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>3.959</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>4.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>31 Storer St</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>3.957</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>4.254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35 Storer St</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>3.955</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>4.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>44 Storer St</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>3.957</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>4.243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14 Tyson Cr</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>3.958</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>4.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>38 Storer St</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>3.959</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>4.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10 Tyson Cr</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>3.958</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>4.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8 Tyson Cr</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>3.959</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>4.244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6 Hayson Dr</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>4.117</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>4.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>23 Peak Cr</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>4.117</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>4.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>21 Peak Cr</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>4.117</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>4.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>19 Peak Cr</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>4.117</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>4.245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>17 Peak Cr</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>4.117</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>4.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11 Peak Cr</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>4.117</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>4.263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 Storer St</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>4.117</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>4.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4 Peak Cr</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>4.117</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>4.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5 Storer St</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>4.117</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>4.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 Peak Cr</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>4.117</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>4.222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4 Storer St</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>4.117</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6 Storer St</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>4.034</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>4.197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8 Storer St</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>4.034</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>4.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12 Storer St</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>4.117</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>4.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>16 Storer St</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>4.117</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>4.258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18 Storer St</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>4.117</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>4.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20 Storer St</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>4.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>Property Address</td>
<td>Consent Notice (RMA) Required FFL</td>
<td>Complies with CN</td>
<td>Building Consent (Building Act) Required FFL</td>
<td>Complies with BC</td>
<td>Property Surveyed Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26 Storer St</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.009</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 Norrie Way</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.009</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10 Norrie Way</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12 Norrie Way</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.012</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 Norrie Way</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.006</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>45 Storer St</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.949</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2A Keating St</td>
<td>4.115</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.928</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 Friesian Cr</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.931</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2C Keating St</td>
<td>4.121</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.929</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5 Friesian Cr</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.931</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2D Keating St</td>
<td>4.122</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.929</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7 Friesian Cr</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.931</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2E Keating St</td>
<td>4.121</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9 Friesian Cr</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11 Friesian Cr</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.929</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>17 Friesian Cr</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.927</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>23 Friesian Cr</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.923</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>39 Storer St</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.922</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>33 Storer St</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.926</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>40 Storer St</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.928</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12 Tyson Cr</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.928</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6 Tyson Cr</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 Tyson Cr</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4 Tyson Cr</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.931</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5 Keating St</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15 Hayson Dr</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.929</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13 Hayson Dr</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.929</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4 Hayson Dr</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.087</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>33 Peak Cr</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.087</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>31 Peak Cr</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.087</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>29 Peak Cr</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.087</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>27 Peak Cr</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.087</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25 Peak Cr</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.087</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15 Peak Cr</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.087</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9 Peak Cr</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.087</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5 Peak Cr</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.087</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6 Peak Cr</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.085</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12 Peak Cr</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.087</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>Property Address</td>
<td>Consent Notice (RMA) Required FFL</td>
<td>Complies with CN</td>
<td>Building Consent (Building Act) Required FFL</td>
<td>Complies with BC</td>
<td>Property Surveyed Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11 Storer St</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.087</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9 Storer St</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.087</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7 Storer St</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.087</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 Storer St</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.087</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14 Storer St</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.087</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4 Norrie Way</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.979</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6 Norrie Way</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.979</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8 Norrie Way</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14 Norrie Way</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.004</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>16 Norrie Way</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.004</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7 Norrie Way</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.979</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 Norrie Way</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.977</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8 Keating St</td>
<td>4.127</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.931</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>23 Storer St</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>27 Friesian Cr</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.953</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>41 Storer St</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.952</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14 Friesian Cr</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.955</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4 Friesian Cr</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>29 Storer St</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.958</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 Tyson Cr</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7 Keating St</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 Keating St</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.959</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11 Hayson Dr</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.959</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 Peak Cr</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.117</td>
<td>(in tolerance)</td>
<td>4.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10 Storer St</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.117</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>43 Storer St</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.958</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>19A Hayson Dr</td>
<td>4.132</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.959</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>19B Hayson Dr</td>
<td>4.129</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.959</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>19C Hayson Dr</td>
<td>4.105</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.959</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>19D Hayson Dr</td>
<td>4.096</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.959</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13 Friesian Cr</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.928</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>19 Friesian Cr</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.926</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25 Friesian Cr</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.922</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12 Friesian Cr</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.926</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10 Friesian Cr</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.927</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6 Friesian Cr</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.929</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>Property Address</td>
<td>Consent Notice (RMA) Required FFL</td>
<td>Complies with CN</td>
<td>Building Consent (Building Act) Required FFL</td>
<td>Complies with BC</td>
<td>Property Surveyed Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>30 Storer St</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>38 Footbridge Tc</td>
<td>4.083</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.021</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>53 Footbridge Tc</td>
<td>4.077</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>61 Footbridge Tc</td>
<td>4.076</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.007</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>67 Footbridge Tc</td>
<td>4.075</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.005</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>75 Footbridge Tc</td>
<td>4.076</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.005</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>79 Footbridge Tc</td>
<td>4.076</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.006</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>19 Silverstream Bv</td>
<td>4.051</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.987</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>22 Footbridge Tc</td>
<td>4.082</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.087</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>46 Footbridge Tc</td>
<td>4.045</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.976</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>47 Footbridge Tc</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.985</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>51 Footbridge Tc</td>
<td>4.048</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.982</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>73 Footbridge Tc</td>
<td>4.045</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.975</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>49 Footbridge Tc</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.985</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>55 Footbridge Tc</td>
<td>4.047</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>57 Footbridge Tc</td>
<td>4.047</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>59 Footbridge Tc</td>
<td>4.046</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.979</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>63 Footbridge Tc</td>
<td>4.046</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.977</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>65 Footbridge Tc</td>
<td>4.046</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.977</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>69 Footbridge Tc</td>
<td>4.045</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.975</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>71 Footbridge Tc</td>
<td>4.045</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.975</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>77 Footbridge Tc</td>
<td>4.046</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.976</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>47 Silverstream Bv</td>
<td>4.072</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.999</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>33 Candy Cr</td>
<td>4.071</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.997</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>19 Candy Cr</td>
<td>4.028</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.958</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>9 Candy Cr</td>
<td>4.025</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.955</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>7 Candy Cr</td>
<td>4.025</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.953</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>5 Candy Cr</td>
<td>4.023</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.952</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>18 Streamside Tc</td>
<td>4.027</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.957</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>16 Streamside Tc</td>
<td>4.028</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.958</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>2 Streamside Tc</td>
<td>4.041</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.967</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>8 Candy Cr</td>
<td>3.997</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.927</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1 Introduction and Scope

Beca has been engaged by Waimakariri District Council to undertake a peer review of the updated Silverstream Flood Model and report which has been developed by WSP-Opus.

A model was originally developed (Pattle Delamore Partners, PDP, 2012) to assist in consenting and design of the Silverstream subdivision in Kaiapoi. The PDP model was constructed using Tuflow software. The PDP model has since been superseded by a model constructed in DHI MIKE software by DHI. The DHI MIKE model includes more detail in both the river and flood plain and forms the basis of the update completed, for which this review is focused.

Beca have been provided the Silverstream Flood Modelling, Property Flood Risk Assessment Report (WSP-Opus, 23/5/2019) to be reviewed and to provide background to the modelling and is assumed to be correct. This review does not extend to a review of the 2012 model and inputs, which has been previously peer reviewed. Following review comments, an updated version of the report was provided on 21 June 2019 and reviewed on the same day, with the comments captured in this peer review document.

A series of model files for MIKE 11, MIKE 21, MIKE Urban and MIKE Flood were also delivered for review.

Key to this review is that the model and report reviewed do not reflect the current state of knowledge of the catchment but is rather a conscious assessment of the flooding using 2012 information and knowledge, but in a model with a greater level of detail than the original PDP model.

This review notes the scope of work undertaken by WSP-Opus as the following:

- Collate the 2012 PDP model (and any relevant reporting), compare to the current MIKE FLOOD model and make an assessment of the differences in the hydrological boundaries between the two models, in order to scope out the development of a MIKE FLOOD model that would then be reasonably representative of the PDP (Tuflow) model hydrological setup, highlighting any key differences;
- Carry out the development of a MIKE FLOOD model that is representative of the earlier PDP (Tuflow) model hydrological setup. To extract Tuflow boundary data, build and run a new MIKE FLOOD model (50yr and 200yr events, including climate change) and present comparative results;
- Complete the modelling of all scenarios as per the original (2012 PDP) study;
- Carry out further GIS analysis to assess property flood risk (i.e. freeboard to the finished floor level thresholds) for all the model scenarios based on the original PDP study scenario hydrology (except for the final Scenario 6, not required for consenting purposes);
- Report on all the above, illustrating development flood risk and finished floor level freeboard using the latest survey and hydraulic model data, for the design flood flow scenarios highlighted.

This review has been split into the Hydraulic Model review and report review.

2 Model Review and Checklist

2.1 Hydrological modelling

The hydrological modelling undertaken during the 2012 model build has been replicated in the new model. No checks have been made on the original assumptions used in the hydrological modelling. Instead checks have been made in the model of the application of the hydrology. It is understood the hydrology was peer reviewed as part of the 2012 modelling by WSP-Opus.
2.2 Hydraulic modelling

Elements of the modelling were reviewed and rated using a 0-3 scoring system (described in Table 2-1), which flags up issues that will affect model use.

Table 2-1 - Model review rating scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Audit rating</th>
<th>Fit for use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No issue: The element or parameter being reviewed is modelled acceptably</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor issue: There is an issue, but it is unlikely to significantly affect model results</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major issue: Failure to resolve the issue compromises the model and should be rectified, but may be resolved by explanation or acceptance of model limitations.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes, No, Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatal flaw: Failure to resolve this issue severely compromises the model, and should be rectified before the model is accepted.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2-2 Hydraulic Modelling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Auditor’s Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Software</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MIKE DHI MIKE11, MIKE21, MIKE Urban, MIKE Flood&lt;br&gt;Review comment: Report should state software version and service pack for future reference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary conditions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Numerous boundary conditions have been applied across the models.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Location of M11 boundaries appear accurate: Inflows for Kaiapoi, Cust, Ohoka and Cam (dummies at culverts)&lt;br&gt;● M21 has a series of sources points which have been used to input hydrological flows. Due to software limitations flow have been inserted at point to replicate the Tuflow where flow is distributed along a line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ohoka d/s Dalleys recorder&lt;br&gt;Ohoka 1&lt;br&gt;Ohoka 2&lt;br&gt;Ohoka 3&lt;br&gt;Cust Lower South&lt;br&gt;Burgess1&lt;br&gt;Burgess2&lt;br&gt;Ohaka 002 1&lt;br&gt;WaimakRace 2&lt;br&gt;WaimakRace 1&lt;br&gt;Ohaka 002 2&lt;br&gt;SilverStream 1&lt;br&gt;Ohaka 002 3&lt;br&gt;SilverStream 2&lt;br&gt;Ohaka 002 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Yes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Auditor’s Comment</th>
<th>Audit rating</th>
<th>Fit for Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local runoff from the development itself has been applied directly to the river (rather than the Rain on Grid (ROG) in the Tuflow model). This means any flooding that is shown in flood maps is a result of a river flood and not local network constraints.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Design events are based on the work completed in 2012. The 2012 work is not part of this review although the report does note that the Scenarios run match those undertaken in 2012, with the exception of the inclusion of the new arterial road (NAR).</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Climate change used to match 2012 method</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Extent seems reasonable based on screenshots captured in the report and surface files provided. No 2D results were delivered and no full flood maps of model extent have been developed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>The DHI model has been trimmed at the downstream end to match the extent of the 2012 model and 2012 boundary conditions used.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>The model uses M11 cross-sections to represent in-channel flow (rather than 2D Ohoka and Silverstream in the Tuflow model). These appear to be a mixture of LiDAR and survey. One cross-section uses Resistance Radius rather than Total Area Hydraulic Radius, Cust CH. 20682.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>M11 has been coupled to MIKE21 surface using lateral and standard couplings. Shape file extraction of lateral coupling shows good coverage of the later weirs to cross-sections. Coupling parameters seem reasonable.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Auditor’s Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stream channel roughness coefficients</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Roughness values vary between ( n=0.026-0.05 ) with most cross-sections close to 0.03. This figure is acceptable for the stream. It is noted that the Tuflow model was sensitive to the channel roughness but testing sensitivity was not part of the update scope.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipe Network</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>The updated model does not contain any pipe network as it was not present at the time of the 2012 build.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Auditor’s Comment</td>
<td>Audit rating</td>
<td>Fit for Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 12   |     | Roughness maps have been created using the following Mannings:  
       ● Flood plain = 0.05  
       ● Road = 0.014  
       ● Residential areas = 0.08  
       ● Heavy cropping = 0.125  
       The NAR has been accounted for in the roughness maps also: | 0 | Yes |
| 13   |     | The mesh appears to be of adequate detail to represent flood plain obstructions. | 0 | Yes |
| 14   |     | 6 culverts are included in the M11 model. All with appropriate roughness and inlet headloss. No overflow weirs are associated with the culverts.  
       Some culverts only allow positive flow or negative flow. Have these been checked on site? | 1 | Yes |
<p>| 15   |     | 7 Bridges are also included in the model and appear to have been represented correctly | 0 | Yes |
| 16   |     | Parnhams and Dudley pumps are also included | 0 | Yes |
| 17   |     | No blockage has been tested in the model, not covered in the scope. | 0 | Yes |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Auditor’s Comment</th>
<th>Audit rating</th>
<th>Fit for Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calibration and validation</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>No calibration has been undertaken as part of the scope but may have been completed during the 2012 model build. As this is an update, validation of the inputs was undertaken to represent the 2012 inputs to the model.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model freeboard</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Review comment: It is unclear how finished floor levels (FFL) for properties just outside of the Scenario 1 flood extent are accounted for. For those within the Scenario 1 extents, the FFL is defined as the Scenario 1 flood level plus 300 mm (this is called Scenario 2). However, there will be properties just outside the Scenario 1 flood extent that have ground levels that are less than the Scenario 2 level. Is flood risk ignored when setting FFL, or is the FFL based on extending the Scenario 2 level out until it intersects with ground level? This is described on the sketch below. Modeller response: The latter, with extended flood surface, using a nearest neighbour type approach with manual input to ensure that the flood level is the most appropriate for each property. Text added to Section 4.1. Reviewer response: Additional text checked. It provides a reasonable explanation, and so the issue is closed.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Initial review rating – 2 Review
2.3 Model Report

Table 2-3 - Report review rating scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Audit rating</th>
<th>Fit for use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No issue: The element or parameter being reviewed is reported clearly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor issue: There is an issue, but it is unlikely to significantly affect understanding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major issue: Failure to resolve the issue compromises the effectiveness of the report, or flags a potential issue with the model behind the report. The issue should be rectified, but may be resolved by further explanation.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes, No, Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatal flaw: Failure to resolve this issue severely compromises the report (or underlying model), and should be rectified before the report is accepted.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2-4 Model Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Auditor’s Comment</th>
<th>Audit Rating</th>
<th>Fit for use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>The last sentence of section 2.3.3 states “any development area shown to be flooding are therefore only those impacted by peak flood levels in the river”. This may explain why subdivision stormwater infrastructure is not shown as flooding in the flood extent diagrams. This should be made clear.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer comments: The naming and referencing of the modelled scenarios are confusing. For example:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● The PDP/TUFLOW and MIKE scenarios are very similar; Scenario 5 differs slightly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● An ‘M’ appears on the front of scenarios from section 3.2.3 of the report onwards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Initial review rating – 2 Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Modeller’s response:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● <em>Re Scenario 5. The Eyre River breakout is effectively 20% at the site as per Table 1-1 (i.e. 80% of 25%)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● <em>The M (and T) notation is introduced in preceding tables, but we can make the introduction to the scenario naming clearer</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Text added to Section 3.2 onwards.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer’s response: The explanation provided for Scenario 5 and the additional report text addressing notation allows this issue to be closed out.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Auditor’s Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>The modelled hydrograph shapes are explained at the end of section 3.4. All hydrographs peak at about the 40-hour mark, and this is explained as being due to the breakout flows from the Eyre River and Waimakariri Water Race, yet Scenario 1 also peaks at the same time and doesn’t include breakout flows. Is some other explanation required?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Initial review rating – 2 Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Modeller’s response: TBC - the 50yr Scenario 1 still has a (85%) contribution from the Waimak Water Race, which is influencing this, along with some effect from the Cust Main Drain downstream. Text added at the end of Section 3.4 to clarify.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer’s response: Text in report checked and accepted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>The conclusion of the report is that the improved model detail has lowered flood levels in the new MIKE model when compared to the PDP TUFLOW model: Modeller’s response: We note (Sections 3.2.1 and 6) that this is because of better (more complete) representation of channel/bridge conveyance. Text added to Section 6 (first bullet) to make this clearer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Initial review rating – 2 Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Improved model detail can increase modelled flood levels, depending on the detail added Modeller’s response: Yes, agreed (ref above)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The new MIKE model includes the NAR embankment, unlike the PDP TUFLOW model. The effect of this on reducing sub-division flood level is not identified, but generates two questions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– With the NAR included, does the new MIKE model meet the second bullet point of the scope in section 1.4, which says “Carry out the development of a MIKE FLOOD model that is representative of the earlier PDP (Tuflow) model hydrological setup”? The answer is probably yes, as the NAR is part of the hydraulics (not hydrological) setup; Modeller’s response: We believe it is, NAR is hydraulics (including influencing flow splits)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Is it fortuitous that the effect of NAR (not included in the PDP model) results in reduced flood levels through the sub-division, which allows (just) the freeboard criteria to be met? Modeller’s response: Yes it is - there were no iterations in creating the results, they are simply what comes from the hydrology update within the MIKE FLOOD model.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer’s Response: text checked and explanations accepted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 Conclusions

Overall the model is sound and appears to be fit for purpose. The responses supplied by WSP-Opus to the draft review report address the issues raised in our draft review. The WSP-Opus report has been updated and is fit for purpose.
1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report is to seek endorsement from the Council about how the terminology “one-up approval” in the Procurement and Contract Management Policy should be interpreted.

Attachments:

i. Procurement and Contract Management Policy (Trim 190516069552)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190710097054.

(b) Approves the following clause to be included in the Procurement and Contract Management Policy (Trim 190516069552)

Our Procurement practices should demonstrate objectivity and integrity in the sourcing and approval of goods or services. One up approval is also taken to include one sideways - that is as long as the approver has appropriate Delegated Financial Authority, has adequate knowledge of the transaction, and is not the initiator then they can approve the award of the provision for goods or services and also approve acceptance of the price. They do not need to be the next level up in terms of the staff structure.

(c) Notes that the Policy will undertake a further post review and submitted to the Council by February 2020, once the Policy has been in operation for this time.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 The Procurement and Contract Management Policy states in Clause 6.1 Contract approval thresholds,

One up approval must be used for all purchases. This means that there needs to be more than one person involved in the purchasing decision and approval. That is, an Initiator and an Approver with the appropriate delegation to approve a purchase.
3.2 While the definition of one-up is not specifically detailed, the common usage of language would indicate the intent that the Approver is ‘higher’ than the Initiator – i.e. is further up the staff reporting structure. This may be a direct manager, or another staff member on the same level as the direct line manager.

3.3 The advantage of this definition is that it more readily fits a common understanding. It also provides a higher level of financial probity in terms of mitigating against potential fraud and eradicating maverick purchasing behaviour.

3.4 However, there are some practical issues with this interpretation as detailed below.

   a. In instances where one staff member is implementing works for a budget holder who is at a similar level, the one up requirement means that it is necessary to bypass the budget holder to gain approval (for example where the Senior Engineering Advisor was requesting works on behalf of the 3 Waters Manager, approval can only be given by the Manager U&R)

   b. In instances where the Initiator’s direct line manager is unavailable, approval would be required from an equivalent manager who is unlikely to be familiar with the work or the effectiveness or efficiency of spend being requested.

   c. In the case of the Water Unit, purchases are initiated and approved multiple times a day. Requiring a one-up approval for each one will adversely affect the timing and efficiency of spend.

   d. Compliance with the policy can be achieved by getting an administration person to initiate the request, allowing the ‘real’ initiator to act as Approver. This is a work-around that complies with the wording of the policy, but doesn’t provide a high degree of accountability from a financial perspective.

   e. For the majority of Level 4 or Level 5 staff, this policy has effectively removed their delegated authority. If there is no-one below them on the staff structure, there will not be an opportunity for them to approve any expenditure.

   f. Within Customer services, it hinders the efforts to respond to low value service request work, where sub-delegation is provided to respond to urgent low value servicing.

   g. A ‘one-sideways’ approval provides a suitable and acceptable level of accountability and probity, as it requires two staff who have been trusted sufficiently to have been granted an approved financial delegation to make the purchasing decision.

   h. Please note that while the recommended clause refers to ‘one-sideways’ it could equally refer to ‘one-down’, provided the Approver had delegated authority. For example a manager could initiate the process on behalf of the Asset Manager, who then approves. It is suggested that this is quite appropriate, as it involves two people being involved in the decision, and both Initiator and Approver have appropriate financial delegation.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1 In order to remedy any misinterpretation and to clarify the intent of the Procurement and Contract Management Policy, there are two options available

   4.1.1 Confirm the interpretation of “one-up” as meaning a person at a higher organisational tier, and instruct staff to implement accordingly.

   4.1.2 Confirm the definition as proposed above as being an acceptable interpretation of the policy.
4.2. The Management Team has previously considered this issue, and recommends the definition as included in the Recommendations.

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

This matter has been discussed at the Management Team who requested it be endorsed by the Council.

5.2. Wider Community

The community has an expectation that the Council will carry out our works fairly and equitably with appropriate systems to safeguard against bias or potential fraud, but also efficiently without undue barriers.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

6.2. There are no direct financial implications to this decision. However there are indirect risks as below.

6.3. Community Implications

6.4. As noted in 5.2 above.

6.5. Risk Management

6.6. The possible risks to be considered are

- The Council could dilute the intent of adherence to Delegated Financial Authority and the objectivity test and be subject to criticism on this front, or

- The Council could place unnecessary delays in a process where the Council is already stretched to deliver timely outcomes.

6.7. Health and Safety

6.8. There are no health and safety implications with these recommendations.

7. CONTEXT

7.1. Policy

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

7.2. Legislation

This matter comes under the Local Government Act 2002.

7.3. Community Outcomes

This discussion relates to our Te Matou Mauri values that we will ‘Act with integrity honesty and trust’ and ‘Do better every day’
7.4. **Delegations**

The Council has authority to amend or clarify previously adopted policy.
1 Introduction
The Waimakariri District Council (the “Council”) is a territorial local authority with obligations to its rate
payers and the public, defined under the Local Government Act 2002 as: “to meet the current and future
needs of communities for good-quality local infrastructure, local public services, and performance of
regulatory functions in a way that is most cost-effective for households and businesses”. ¹
Delivering good public service to the community starts with good procurement. How well money is spent
has a direct impact on the quality of services the community experience, and reflects Council’s efficiency
and effectiveness. Waimakariri District Council is committed to open and transparent procurement that
delivers the best value for money (which isn’t always the cheapest price), ensures impartiality in decision-
making, and meets international standards of public scrutiny and accountability.

2 Policy Context
Procurement plays a vital role in the delivery of Council outcomes, with a significant variety of goods,
services and works being purchased from third party suppliers.

The Council recognises that rigorous procurement and contract management practices:
(a) ensure the Council delivers value for money and quality outcomes for the community
(b) underpin the performance and delivery of the Council’s strategic and business objectives
(c) provide opportunities for business sustainability, strategic growth and improvement.

2.1 Definitions
Approved Contractor: prior to undertaking any work for the Council, all contractors must apply for
and be approved against a set of eligibility requirements, including insurance cover, Health and
Safety (H&S) and relevant codes of practice.
Bribe or inducement: the giving or receiving, whether directly or indirectly, of something of value to
influence a (procurement or contract management) transaction.
Contract: a formal, documented agreement between the Council and a supplier or contractor that
commits Council in legal or financial terms to the acquisition of goods and services.
Contract management: the process of systematically and efficiently managing contract creation,
exection and analysis for maximising operational and financial performance and minimising risk.
Contract Owner: a designated Council staff member who is responsible for the ongoing
management and delivery of contracted goods or services, and who has the authority to contract on
the Council’s behalf.
Contract variation: an addition or alteration to the terms of contract that is mutually agreed to by
both parties to the contract. A contract variation can be documented by letter or a deed of variation.


This Policy identifies the authority, responsibilities and operational parameters for prudent procurement
decision-making, and the effective management of contracts and associated legally binding agreements.
PROCUREMENT AND CONTRACT MANAGEMENT

**Contracted staff:** non-permanent employees of the Council, including consultants and contractors employed on fixed or short-term contracts who are undertaking business activities on behalf of the Council.

**Direct purchase:** means the procurement of goods and/or services by placing an order with the supplier of choice, without seeking other bids.

**Emergency situation:** a situation that threatens life, property or equipment, or has a significant impact on services or the public.

**Invited Tenders:** Invited or Restricted tenders, restricted calls for tenders, or invited tenders are only open to selected prequalified vendors or contractors. Invited or Restricted tenders can come about because essentially only one suitable supplier of the services or product exists, of confidentiality issues or of the need for expedience (as in emergency situations)

**Market:** all potential providers of a good or service that may be available to the Council.

**Open tender:** the process of publicly inviting offers to supply goods or provide services involving specifications and detailed documentation.

**Price:** the total price of a procurement for the total period of the contract, including extensions.

**Procurement:** the process of securing goods and services, including but not limited to purchase planning, standards or specifications determination, supplier and sector research, review and selection, pricing negotiation, making the purchase, supply contract administration, disposals and other related functions.

**Services:** the whole of the services, tasks, work and requisites to be supplied, rendered, provided or performed by a contractor under a contract and any variations provided for by the contract, and includes all and any goods, materials, plant, machinery or equipment supplied, provided or used by the contractor in performance of the contract.

**Sustainable Procurement:** procurement principles that allow the Council to secure goods and services in a way that recognises the whole of life costs and/or benefits of the goods or service, as well as delivers benefits for the local Waimakariri community, economy and environment.

**Tender:** a document in the form of an offer to supply goods and/or services, usually submitted in response to a public or selective invitation such as a RFQ, RFT or RFP.

**Tendering** - Tendering is the process of making an offer, bid or proposal, or expressing interest in response to an invitation or request to supply goods or services. As a contestable process other businesses are invited to respond to a particular need, such as the supply of goods and services, and will select an offer or tender that meets the needs and provides the best value for money.

**Tender request documents** - Also referred to as invitations to tender, Requests for Tender (RTF), and Requests for Proposal (RFP) which outline what is required and set out the Council’s requirements. These documents also outline the particular needs, criteria, and instructions that are to be followed.

**Total contract value:** the estimated total value of the contract for the entire life of the contract, including extensions.

**Verbal quotation:** a verbal process of inviting offers to supply goods and/or services involving a limited number of potential suppliers.
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Quotations – Quotations are a formal statement setting out the cost of particular goods or services.

Whole of Life: an assessment of the total costs and/or benefits of purchasing goods or services – from concept to disposal. This includes purchase outcomes, operating costs spanning the useful life of the good or service, as well as any impacts associated with (product) manufacture, transport, delivery and disposal. Consideration may also be given to sustainable procurement, i.e. assessing the local social, economic and environmental costs and/or benefits associated with the procurement.

Written quotation: a written process of inviting tenderers to supply goods and/or services involving simple documentation and a limited number of potential suppliers.

3 Principles
Council procurement and contract management practices shall ensure that the Council plans for, enters into and manages its procurement and contract management activities in a manner that maximises value for money and quality service delivery, as well as realises business, strategic and community expectations.

The following ten principles shall be reflected in all procurement and contract management practices:

1. Procurement and contract management processes will comply with all applicable statutory obligations, recognise Council's business, strategic and community expectations, and reflect relevant sector, central and local government good practice standards and guidelines.

   Such processes shall at all times foster a safe working environment for staff, contractors and the general public and support the intent laid down within the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015.

2. The purchasing power of the Council will be harnessed for the realisation of its strategic and business objectives, as well as the benefit of the local community.

3. Planning and managing for great results. All purchasing decisions will consider what the most appropriate procurement options are, and select from a range of delivery processes to achieve the best outcome for Council and the community.

   This provides the flexibility for Council to identify the most appropriate procurement option for obtaining goods and services. The decision about what option to be used will be based on the type of expenditure being incurred as well as other appropriate procurement objectives. Available tools for procurement include:
   - Full external service delivery;
   - Collaboration between Council and external organisations;
   - Public/private partnerships;
   - Fully resourced from internal sources.

4. The Council shall be fair to all suppliers. Where Open tendering applies, procurement practice will demonstrate integrity by all parties and enable all potential suppliers to have equal access through the use of open and contestable processes.

   All Council procurement for goods and services shall be open and competitive. However, there are circumstances when Council may decide to restrict or limit supplier involvement in a procurement process, based on matters of scale or relevance, such as in an emergency and/or by allocating work directly to its own operating departments. When this principle of open and
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competitive purchasing is subject to deviation, Council will document the justification for such actions. Suppliers may be disqualified from tendering for Council goods and services for a period of not less than 12 months if they lobby or contact Councillors or staff (other than contacting staff named in the tender documents) regarding a tender while the tendering process is in progress.

5. The Council shall ensure full probity in its procurement practices and decision-making processes. All procurement decisions will be appropriate and transparent, fair and equitable, and free from any real or undisclosed bias or conflict of interest.

6. The Council shall take into consideration the whole of life costs and/or benefits associated with procurement – spanning design, manufacture, delivery, operation and disposal.

7. Consideration will be given to sustainable procurement principles whenever possible, i.e. assessing the whole of life social, economic and environmental impact of the procurement.

8. All contracts shall clearly identify the functional, performance and/or technical deliverables and key performance indicators that reflect Council's expectations and quality standards, and establish effective means to measure, monitor and manage their delivery.

9. All contracts will be actively managed in a manner that fosters collaboration with suppliers and contractors, maximises value for money, supports the Ta Matou Mauri principles as well as supporting continuous innovation and improvement; including the use of 'All of Government Contracts' and N3-GSB where appropriate.

10. All procurement and contract management risks will be identified and managed effectively throughout the life cycle of the goods or service.

These principles are designed to ensure that the procurement of goods and services are an open, selective and transparent process that achieves value for money by delivering the desired outcome at the best possible quality and price. These principles also promote a procurement and contract management process that is impartial, open and ethical, ensuring that all Council procurement and contract management is undertaken in a fair and unbiased way.

Procurement processes should be designed to ensure that purchasing and contract management practice is proportionate to the value, risk and complexity of the purchase. This policy provides a context for sound commercial judgement to achieve the best value for money, which isn't always the cheapest price, to drive innovation and high performance without compromising health and safety.

4 Policy Objective

The purpose of the Council Procurement Policy (the 'Policy') is to articulate Council's commitment to the responsible, effective and fit-for-purpose procurement of goods and services.

The Policy establishes the guiding principles for Council's procurement and contract management practices, and seeks to ensure that:

(a) a robust framework is adopted across the Council for procurement, and the subsequent management and reporting of goods and services contracts;

(b) the Council plans for, enters into and manages all contracts in a manner which facilitates Council strategic and business objectives, and optimises risk transfer;
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(c) staff understand their roles and responsibilities with regards procurement and contract management, and are appropriately skilled and trained to do so;

(d) the Council achieves quality performance and cost-effective service delivery.

Procurement should involve proactively managing supplier and other key stakeholder relationships throughout the sourcing process and for the duration of the contract. This embraces the development of relationships with suppliers, and driving value for money through ongoing efficiency gains.

All suppliers must meet Council’s minimum standards to ensure health and safety is maintained.

5 Organisational Scope

This policy applies to:

All Council employees, including temporary employees and contracted staff.

(a) Any person who is involved in the operation of the Council, including elected members, volunteers and those people with honorary or unpaid staff status.

(b) Every business, service or activity of the Council – with the exception of employment contracts.

6 Contract approval

All staff involved in the procurement of goods and services must have appropriate knowledge of, and comply with all relevant Council policies, procedures and guidelines, as well as applicable legislation and professional standards of practice with regards the procurement and contract management process.

All procurement results must be approved by the relevant reporting authority) Delegated Staff, Management Team, Committee or Council) and then signed by the relevant Delegated Authority. No external parties are authorised to sign contracts on behalf of Council.

The Contract Administrator shall maintain a full (physical and/or electronic) record of all procurement preparation, negotiation and award activities, in accordance with this Policy and all (Council records management practices).

All contracts entered into by the Council must be in writing, signed by all relevant parties, and held securely on file in accordance with Council document management practices.

All contracts prepared by the Council shall utilise approved and standardised contract templates whenever possible. If no applicable template exists, the Contract Administrator shall seek assistance from the PDU Manager or their delegate to prepare a contract

No contractual arrangement entered into by the Council shall be greater than 10 years in its entirety, including rights of renewal. Council shall not enter into contracts that include more than two rights of renewal or that are “evergreen” (i.e. of indefinite length).

Market scoping and the evaluation of potential goods or service suppliers shall be in accordance with the Purchase Authority requirements stated at 6.1 below.

6.1 Contract approval thresholds

Quotations and tenders are not required when contracting through the all-of-government supplier network (N3-GSB) since the processes of procurement for a preferred supplier have already been undertaken.

For amounts under $20,000, the necessity for obtaining three quotations is at the Contract Owner’s discretion. Verbal contracts cannot be made for any value of purchase. All purchases should be confirmed with supply of a purchase order.
Where a decision is made not to put out to tender a contract for goods and services to an amount greater than $100,000 approval must be gained from the Management Team, and the reasons for the decision shall be reported to the relevant Standing Committee.

Purchasing directly from a supplier without an open and competitive process is acceptable for goods and services below an expected value of $5,000 based on the following principles:

(a) the value of the goods or services is relatively low;
(b) the purchase of these goods or services is on an as-required basis;
(c) it is not practical to aggregate separate orders for the goods or services;

The cost of seeking quotations or tenders would be out of proportion to the value of the benefits likely to be obtained, or impractical in the circumstances.

For goods and services with an expected cumulative annual price of more than $100,000 a public contestable tender process is required. Contracts/tenders with an expected annual expenditure of greater than $1,000,000 and total project cost of greater than $2,000,000 may only be authorised by the relevant standing committee or the Council.

The following table sets out Council’s procurement thresholds.

Note: Guidelines to be used in conjunction with N3 and All of Government pricing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dollar value</th>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>Purchase Authority</th>
<th>Value Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $5,000</td>
<td>Direct from supplier</td>
<td>Per delegations</td>
<td>One up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000 to $20,000</td>
<td>3 quotations or direct from supplier</td>
<td>Per delegations</td>
<td>One up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000-$100,000</td>
<td>3 quotations</td>
<td>Per delegations</td>
<td>One up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;$100,000</td>
<td>Public tender</td>
<td>Per delegations</td>
<td>Tender criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;$1,000,000 pa</td>
<td>Public tender</td>
<td>Committee/Council</td>
<td>Tender criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;$2,000,000 total</td>
<td>Public tender</td>
<td>Committee/Council</td>
<td>Tender criteria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One up approval must be used for all purchases. This means that there needs to be more than one person involved in the purchasing decision and approval. That is, an Initiator and an Approver with the appropriate delegation to approve a purchase.

The Chief Executive shall appoint a tender secretary who shall be responsible for the management and security of electronic tenders as well as the tender box and the tenders deposited therein. The tender secretary has responsibility for opening the tenders received, either electronically or hard copy and recording the tender prices at the conclusion of the tender process.

All tenders shall close at a time nominated in the tender documents and must be received either electronically or in the tender box by the closing time. The tender box shall be fixed in one place in the foyer of the Rangiora Service Centre and shall remain locked until the closing time for tenders. Electronic tenders will only be received via tenderlink.com/waimakariri, or GETS - Government Electronic Tenders Service www.gets.govt.nz

Tenders will be opened in public. All tenders with an expected price of $100,000 (GST exclusive) or less shall be opened in the presence of the tender secretary and at least one member of the management team. Tenders with an expected price over $100,000 shall be opened in the presence of the tender secretary and two others from the management team or Council. An elected representative should be present for tenders expected to exceed $500,000.

Council is accountable to the community through the Long term Plan and Annual Plan. All purchases (including tenders) of any goods and services which commits expenditure from the current year’s Annual...
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Plan shall be accepted by an officer with sufficient contractual authority as described in the delegations manual S-DM 1044. Monitoring of the procurement process will be undertaken by the Audit Committee and management team.

Variations within existing contracts, and committing council to an increase in the scope of works, may be authorised in accordance with the delegations manual S-DM 1044.

7 Sustainable Procurement

The Council recognises that procurement and contract management practices provide a key opportunity to maximise value for money and quality service delivery, as well as deliver tangible benefits for the local community, economy and environment – as articulated in the Council’s Strategic Framework.

As such, the principles of sustainable procurement shall be recognised whenever possible in the assessment of the costs and benefits of procurement on a whole of life basis, as follows:

(a) *Think Local*: The Council shall preference those suppliers that can evidence a positive economic footprint in the region. This includes contributing to the vibrancy and sustainability of the local economy, supporting job or market growth, as well as fostering opportunities for small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs).

(b) *Think Environmental*: The Council shall encourage procurement decisions that have a positive impact on the natural environment and biodiversity, including the prudent use of natural resources, the minimisation of waste or hazardous substances, and efforts to reduce carbon or Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions.

(c) *Think Social*: The Council shall encourage procurement decisions that maximise community benefits in terms of personal wellbeing, social cohesion, capital and inclusion, equal opportunities and participation.

Whenever practicable, the Council shall give conscious consideration to sustainable procurement principles, including when undertaking cost-benefit analyses or weighted attributes assessments of potential goods and service suppliers.

8 Conflict of Interest

The Council shall ensure that procurement and contract management processes cannot be justifiably challenged on the basis of any real or undisclosed bias or conflict of interest.

All procurement and contract management decision-making processes shall include careful consideration of any actual, potential or undisclosed conflicts of interest.

Under no circumstances shall a staff member influence, advise or participate in a procurement or contract management activity where that employee has an actual, or undisclosed conflict of interest.

Every person on the Tender Evaluation Team (TET) must complete a declaration in writing that they have no actual or undisclosed conflict of interest. This includes those involved directly in procurement and contract management activities, as well as anyone who has the ability to influence key decisions (e.g. those holding delegated financial authority or monitoring performance).

Where there is uncertainty about whether there is a conflict, employees should discuss the potential conflict with the Contract Owner, Line or Group Manager or Chief Executive Officer. If in doubt, employees should at all times fully disclose a potential conflict or bias. Refer also to the Council Conflict of Interest Policy for further details.

Where the CEO is involved with procurement and/or contract management and identifies a potential conflict of interest, escalation shall be to elected members.
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It is never acceptable for a Council staff member to accept a bribe or inducement. Any such instances will be dealt with in strict accordance with the (Staff Code of Conduct Policy) and other applicable guidelines - see also the Council (Fraud Prevention Policy).

As part of the procurement process the Council (Gifts and Hospitality Register) shall be reviewed to identify gifts and/or hospitality received by any person involved in a procurement process. Should these exceed a cumulative value of $500 in the preceding 12 months the person will be precluded from taking any part in the procurement process.

9 Contract Management

The Council shall maintain a central database of all approved and/or active contractors, and ensure comprehensive records are held, including all third- party vetting; H&S approval; insurance coverage; contract review, renewal or expiration dates; deviations and variations.

All Council contracts shall have a delegated Contract Owner, who acts as the dedicated single point of contact and is responsible for the effective management and delivery of the contract in line with this Policy and all associated processes or guidelines. Duties include, but are not limited to:

9.1 Contract Negotiation

(a) All contracts shall include measurable, relevant and robust key deliverables, measures and performance indicators (i.e. 'SMART' key performance indicators that are Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-bound).

(b) All contracts shall establish effective and robust monitoring and reporting activities that ensure delivery of pre-determined deliverables and levels of performance.

(c) All contracts shall comply with Council, professional regulatory body and statutory obligations, as required.

(d) Contract Owners shall be alert to, and address any provisions in contracts that expose the Council to unsuitable or unacceptable risk. This includes a review of prior service delivery or performance by potential third party suppliers.

9.2 Contract Delivery

(a) Contract Owners shall regularly monitor, audit and review contractor delivery against agreed milestones, deliverables or performance expectations over the life of the contract, including maintaining a regular audit programme, as required.

(b) All contractor payments, performance bonds and other financial transactions shall be made in accordance with the terms of the contract and appropriate assurance of agreed performance delivery, in accordance with relevant Council financial delegations and authority.

(c) Contract Owners shall engage relevant parties and establish variations or re-negotiate contract terms where appropriate.

(d) Full records of all contract evaluations and performance monitoring activities (including any variations, renewals and cancellations) shall be held in accordance with the (Council document management guidelines and practices.)
9.3 Escalation and Exit

(a) The Council shall ensure appropriate and effective processes and mechanisms are in place for the reporting, escalation and resolution of performance issues or contract delivery failure.

(b) Contract Owners shall monitor contract schedules for renewal or expiry, and effectively manage the business impacts arising from exiting the agreement, including ensuring all relevant Intellectual Property, data or property is returned to Council.

10 Risk Management

The Council shall ensure that the costs, benefits and risk presented by procurement are identified, and appropriately reflected in the procurement and contract management methodology utilised.

Contract Owners shall work collaboratively with engaged providers to identify, assess and manage all risks associated with the goods or service procured, throughout the length of the contracted period.

All critical issues must be escalated and resolved appropriately to ensure the continued quality delivery of service expectations.

All risk management and mitigation strategies must be clearly documented as part of the procurement and contract management process.

11 Deviations

Deviation from the Council’s procurement and contract management processes may be necessary due to circumstances beyond the control of Council. Such instances include:

(a) A limited number of suppliers available in the market.

(b) A different procurement methodology or process is stipulated by legislation or a professional/regulatory body.

(c) An exceptional, urgent or emergency situation where immediate Council decision-making is required and is in the best interests of ratepayers.

In such instances, two members of the Management Team shall authorise the deviation prior to adoption, and if appropriate the decision ratified retrospectively by the CEO.

In such instances where a staff member has a conflict of interest, but also possesses specific expertise that is deemed essential to the procurement decision-making process and which is not available from any other sources, including those external to the Council, two members of the Management Team may sanction that person's involvement in writing, provided they:

(a) ensure the staff member's involvement is limited as much as possible; and;

(b) closely supervise the staff member's role and takes personal responsibility for the fairness and equity in the decision-making.

12 Record Keeping

All procurement and contract document management processes shall adhere to relevant statutory and regulatory obligations, including the Public Records Act 2005.

Clear and comprehensive written records of all procurement and contract management activity shall be retained in accordance with Council document management policies and protocols. This includes market,
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tender and evaluation material, contracts and variations, performance reporting, correspondence and associated service delivery records

Procurement and contract management records shall provide a clear, transparent and accessible audit trail so that Council staff, auditors and/or legal advisors may readily establish the process and rationale for any procurement decisions made and actions taken.

At a minimum, records shall be retained that demonstrate:

(a) Council procurement and contract management processes have been followed, as outlined in this Policy and all associated procedures and practice guidelines.

(b) Procurement adheres to appropriate budget allocations through the Long Term Plan, the Annual Plan, or an approved Business Case.

(c) Approval for procurement has been obtained from the relevant holder of delegated financial authority.

(d) The Council has identified key contract performance expectations and deliverables, and undertaken appropriate measures and audit/monitoring activities that provide assurance of performance.

(e) All risks are identified, assessed and effectively managed in collaboration with the contractor, including Health and Safety assessments, site planning and maintaining appropriate insurance cover.

(f) All members of the tender evaluation team involved in decision-making have affirmed that they are free from any real or undisclosed conflicts of interest.

13 Confidentiality

Employees involved in procurement and contract management activities shall take all due precautions when handling commercially sensitive information. This includes ensuring information is not passed between parties entering into a tender or other competitive procurement process, as well as maintaining the rights of Council and third-party intellectual property.

Confidentiality obligations continue throughout the procurement and contract management process, as well as after the contract has terminated or expired.

14 Health and Safety

The Health & Safety at Work Act 2015 requires that an organisation must ensure the health and safety of workers (including contractors), and that organisations must consult, co-operate and co-ordinate activities with all other organisations who have health and safety duties in relation to the same matter (overlapping duties); so far as is reasonably practicable. WDC maintains contract health and safety management systems in order to achieve compliance with these requirements.

Suppliers for all contracts shall be required to meet a range of health and safety requirements throughout the life-cycle of the contract, which, depending on the nature of the contract, may include (but are not limited to):

- Health and safety pre-qualification
- Site specific safety plans
- Site inductions
- Incident reporting
- Site safety audits
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- Contract close outs

In particular, all suppliers for contracts involving physical works shall be health and safety pre-qualified. This will mean that they are assessed at >50% via the SiteWise health and safety pre-qualification system as a minimum, or meet the requirements of another externally-audited pre-qualification system of equivalent or superior standard (this will be approved on a case-by-case basis by the WDC Health & Safety Team).

Suppliers can achieve health and safety prequalification before or during the tender period, but pre-qualification must be achieved prior to work commencing.

Where a decision is made to select a supplier who is not health and safety prequalified as the preferred tenderer (or who has a SiteWise score lower than any minimum score indicated in the tender documents), approval must be gained from the Management team. The reasons for the decision shall be reported (such as emergency works, or a sole supplier situation).

All further health and safety requirements for the duration of the contract shall be clearly defined within the contract documentation.

15 Links to legislation, other policies and community outcomes

WDC Ta Matou Mauri – Our Principles

Controller and Auditor-General Procurement Guidance for Public Entities June 2008


*Local Government Act 2002* S3(c) promotes the accountability of local authorities to their communities, and S10 (b) has the purpose of local government as meeting the current and future needs of communities for good-quality local infrastructure, local public services, and performance of regulatory functions in a way that is most cost-effective for households and businesses

All tenders which are subject to a New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) subsidy must comply with the requirements of NZTA. If there is any conflict between this policy and the NZTA requirements, then the NZTA requirements will take precedence to the extent of the inconsistency

*Health and Safety at Work Act 2015*

*WDC Contract Admin Guidelines*

QP-C1030 – Physical Works – Preparation of Request for Tenders
QP-C1031 – Physical Works – Inviting Tenders
QP-C1032 – Physical Works – Tender Evaluation
QP-C1042 – General Purchase – Inviting Tenders
QP-C1043 – General Purchase – Tender Evaluation

*WDC Quality Policy*

QP-C387 – Purchasing Procedures – Selection of Suppliers
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WDC Standard Contract Forms

QP-C494-AG Evaluation Appendices – Our standard document for lowest price conforming contracts

16 Adopted
Adopted by Council on 5 February 2019.

8 Review
Reviewed every three years or earlier on request.
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT FOR DECISION

FILE NO and TRIM NO: EXT-30 /TRIM Number 190723103023

REPORT TO: Council

DATE OF MEETING: 6 August 2019

FROM: Geoff Meadows, Policy Manager

SUBJECT: Draft submission in response to the Productivity Commission’s Draft Report on Local Government Funding and Financing

SIGNED BY: (for Reports to Council, Committees or Boards) Department Manager Chief Executive

1. SUMMARY

1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek Council’s approval to submit the attached draft response to the Productivity Commission’s Draft Report on Local Government Funding and Financing.


1.3 The Draft Report asks 8 questions, concludes 67 findings, and makes 30 recommendations. The attached draft submission responds to 4 of those questions and 10 of those recommendations.

1.4 One motivation for the Inquiry was a concern that Local Government revenues and especially rates are outstripping the ability of local communities to pay. A key finding of the Inquiry however, is that over a long period, the ratios of revenue (and rates) to national and household income have remained in relatively narrow bands. These ratios show no evidence of any recent upward trend.

Attachments:


2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No.190723103023;

(b) Approves the draft submission in response to the Productivity Commission’s Draft Report on Local Government Funding and Financing;
(c) Circulates the submission to Community Boards for their information.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 Productivity Commission Inquiries usually take 18 months from the time referring Ministers set Terms of Reference for an Inquiry, to the presentation of the Final Report to Government. An opportunity for public input into these Inquiries is provided at both the Issues Paper stage and the Draft Report stage.

3.2 Terms of Reference for the Inquiry into Local Government Funding and Financing were issued on 16 July 2018, and an Issues Paper inviting individuals and organisations to participate in the Inquiry was released on 6 November 2018. The Draft Report was released on 4 July 2019 with public submissions due on 29 August 2019. The Final Report to Government is due on 30 November 2019.

3.3 This Draft Report asks 8 questions, concludes 67 findings, and makes 30 recommendations. The attached draft submission responds to 4 of those questions and 10 of those recommendations.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1 Not all of the 8 questions and 30 recommendations have been responded to in this submission. Rather this submission focuses on specific questions and recommendations in which Council has a particular interest. The numbering in the response follows the numbering in the Commission’s Draft Report.

4.2 Responses to questions from the Draft Report are provided on the frequency of Long Term Plans, incorporating inflation when setting rates, taxing vacant residential land, and payments to Councils on new building works.

4.3 Responses to recommendations from the Draft Report include mandatory Audit and Risk Committees, streamlining the required content of Long Term Plans, and phasing out the Rates Rebate Scheme.

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

The Society of Local Government Managers (SOLGM) circulated their proposed position on the Draft Report in early July 2019, and intend to make a submission.

5.2. Wider Community

The wider community has not been engaged about the Draft Report.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

The Draft Report acknowledges that in many other countries, a much larger proportion of Local Government revenues are sourced from Central Government. The Inquiry has not explored tax-sharing arrangements with Central Government.

6.2. Community Implications

The Draft Report's conclusion that a property-based tax system should continue, is likely to entrench rating land and property for many years into the future.
6.3. **Risk Management**

The opportunity to raise public discussion about Local Government tax-sharing arrangements with Central Government is likely to be lost now for many decades.

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

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

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

7.2. **Legislation**

The *Local Government (Rating) Act 2002* sets out the methods by which Councils raise revenue through rates.

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

- The Council makes known its views on significant proposals by others affecting the District’s wellbeing.

7.3. **Delegations**

N/A

Geoff Meadows, Policy Manager
To the Productivity Commission

Submission by
Waimakariri District Council

In the matter of the
Local Government Funding and Financing Draft Report

6 August 2019
Person for Contact: Geoff Meadows, Policy Manager
Introduction

The Waimakariri District Council considered the Productivity Commission’s draft report into Local Government Funding and Financing at a Council briefing session on 9 July 2019, and approved this submission to the draft report at a Council meeting on 6 August 2019.

Not all of the 8 questions and 30 recommendations have been responded to in this submission. Rather this submission focuses on specific questions and recommendations in which Council has a particular interest. The numbering in this response follows the numbering in the Commission’s draft report.

Questions

Question 5.1 - Frequency of Long Term Plans to > 3 Years

While the Local Government election cycle remains at 3 yearly intervals, the refresh of the Long Term Plan should also remain at 3 yearly intervals. It would be unreasonable for a newly elected Council not to have opportunity to review the forecast 10 year budget in the term of Council following the triennial election.

Question 5.2 - Incorporating Inflation When Setting Rates

Accounting for inflation when setting rates is reasonable in the short term, but with longer-range planning such as for the 30 Year Infrastructure strategy, inflationary forecasts are fraught, with both forecasting accurately, and with communicating inflated figures to the public.

Question 6.1 - Tax on Vacant Residential Land

While there is merit in developing policy settings that discourage land banking, a tax on vacant residential land may have more administrative costs and burdens than any benefits gained. Defining “vacant” would be difficult, for example if vacant meant at the time title was issued, developer delays could be anticipated, holding off titling with LINZ or seeking extensions of time to progress Section 224 matters. There is also a risk that the tax is taken on by the developer and passed on to the buyer. On balance a tax on vacant residential land is not supported.

Question 6.2 - Payments to TAs on new building work

In situations where Development Contributions take a number of years to be paid, payments to Territorial Authorities for new building work would seem to take the place of Council’s collecting Development Contributions, and would appear to impinge on local government’s powers of general competence, making growth Councils dependent on a Central Government discretion. It is likely to lead to fertile ground for dispute between Central and Local Government.

Recommendations

Recommendation 5.3 - Mandatory Audit and Risk Committees, with an Independent Chair

It is noted that this Council’s long-standing Audit and Risk Committee is mentioned in the draft report (page 98), however this Council has decided not to have an independent chair, notwithstanding the CouncilMARK assessors recommendations. This is a decision that should remain with elected representatives, and not be prescribed in legislation. This Council
supports the recommendation that the *Local Government Act 2002* should be amended to require all Councils to have an Audit and Risk Committee, but whether or not Council’s decide to have an independent chair is a matter for elected representatives.

**Recommendation 5.4 - A Fist Principles Review of Funding Impact Statement and Performance Measures**

The sector has long argued that some of the financial disclosures and performance measures do not add to the public’s understanding. A first principles review is supported. However the Department of Internal Affairs may not be appropriate to lead a review, since that Department is the architect of the current financial disclosures and mandatory performance measures.

**Recommendation 5.7 - Streamline the Required Content of LTPs**

This Council supports revision of the *Local Government Act 2002* to clarify and streamline the required contents of LTPs, to reduce duplication, ease compliance costs, and help make them more accessible to the public. The Act is currently quite prescriptive, and limits Council’s ability to meaningfully engage with the public in a debate about rates and forecast expenditure.

**Recommendation 6.1 - Develop Standardised Templates for DC Policies and Charges**

There is some merit is standardising guidance to Councils on Development Contributions Policies, however the content and format of Development Contribution Policies is a policy decision for Councils.

**Recommendation 6.6 - Consider Economies of Scale for 3 Waters Reform**

Economies of scale do not necessarily equal better value for money or an improved level of service for small water supply schemes.

**Recommendation 6.9 - Central Government Should Not Expect Local Government to Act Simply as its Regulatory Agent**

The Productivity Commission have been making this point in successive inquiries, and this recommendation is fully supported by this Council. The two levels of government should seek a regulatory partnership, based on mutual respect and an agreed protocol. Despite this point being a core thrust of the *Towards Better Local Regulation* Inquiry (May 2013), there has been no demonstrable action in this space from Central Government.

**Recommendation 7.1 - Amend the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 to Remove Rates Differentials and Uniform Annual General Charge**

Rates differentials are an important tool for this Council to share the rating load in a peri-urban District, which experiences both rapid urban growth, and has a significant productive rural sector. Councils should still have the ability to assess different levels of rates to different types of properties. Retention of the Uniform Annual General Charge is part of this rating mix. On the other hand, removal of the UAGC wouldn’t have too much of an impact if the ability to have fixed charges as targeted rates was still available. (This Council utilises fixed charges extensively).

**Recommendation 7.5 - Remove the Statutory Cap on Uniform Charges**

The current statutory cap on uniform charges is a legacy from a previous Rating Act. It is reasonable for a Council with the powers of general competence to determine its rating practices, and so the cap should be removed.
Recommendation 7.6 - Phase out the Rates Rebate Scheme

The Rates Rebate Scheme is well used in this District. While the system is administratively cumbersome, and not well targeted, an ageing population on fixed incomes rely on this scheme for rates relief. Having said that, it is likely that some households are being under declared, and despite publicity, there are a number of people in this District who would qualify for a rebate but do not apply. The system could be made more efficient with on-line applications and linking with Central Government agencies that hold data on household incomes. There is a place for direct targeted assistance for low income households who pay rates.

A national rates postponement scheme is not likely to be a useful replacement for the Rates Rebate Scheme. It could well be viewed by property owners as Local and Central Government eroding into home owner’s equity. Given how dearly New Zealanders value home ownership, it is noteworthy that the voluntary rates postponement scheme currently available has not had a high support from property owners.

Recommendation 8.6 - Establishment of a Local Government Resilience Agency to Meet Adaptation to Climate Change

The Council supports the establishment of a national fund for Climate Change adaptation initiatives. It may be that this function could be carried out through the Climate Change Commission, but it is not currently structured to deliver it.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit on the draft report.
1. SUMMARY

1.1. This report provides an update on previous reports regarding the use of the herbicide glyphosate by the Council, and presents recommendations on where further improvements to current glyphosate practices could be made, taking into consideration feedback from the community.

1.2. Glyphosate is used by the Greenspace, 3 Waters, Roading, Water Unit, and Property teams for Council work, primarily by contractors. The Council has worked to reduce glyphosate usage in recent years, based on the precautionary principle and on-going debate to what degree glyphosate could cause health issues. There are other users of glyphosate in public spaces in the District, such as the New Zealand Transport Agency.

1.3. It is recommended that an online herbicide usage map is scoped by Council staff for feasibility. The map would be made accessible on the Council website, to show public areas that have been recently sprayed, or shortly scheduled to be sprayed with herbicide.

1.4. Signage requirements for spraying are recommended to continue to follow manufacturer’s instructions, based on the withholding period.

1.5. A ‘No Spray’ register is recommended to be kept across all Council Departments, where landowners may register their property to not have glyphosate sprayed by Council contractors within the close vicinity (e.g. 5m) of their property.

1.6. It is recommended for Council to alter conditions in Service Contracts to require Health and Safety and signage audits specifically for spraying herbicide. The audit will check that manufacturer’s instructions are followed, and that there is correct usage of Personal Protective Equipment (PPE).

1.7. Service Contracts are recommended to be updated when renewed, to include conditions detailed in this report, such as a requirement to update the online herbicide usage map, if progressed.

1.8. It is recommended that use of glyphosate by Council staff and contractors continues to be carefully considered for reduction of use, as a precautionary principle. Good management
practices and good design principles, such as use of shading or mulch to minimise weeds, should also continue to be considered.

1.9. Alternatives to glyphosate include; smart design and shading; mechanical and manual clearing; and the use of organic sprays, such as fatty acid sprays. These alternatives have been examined for feasibility and cost, and are also used by the Council. A three-yearly review of alternative options is recommended, and/or if there are any new products that come to market.

Attachments:
i. Report to Council – Herbicide Glyphosate use for weed control. GOV-01-11 (Trim 180111001840[v1])

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190702093110.

(b) **Notes** that WDC staff will scope the creation of an online herbicide usage map for the general public to view information of where, and when, herbicide is used in public areas.

(c) **Notes** that the online herbicide map creation, if progressed, will be prioritised by the Geospatial Team.

(d) **Notes** that signage requirements are based on the manufacturer's instructions regarding the withholding period.

(e) **Notes** that all Council departments will use a joint ‘No Spray’ register, where private landowners who sign up do not receive spray in the close vicinity of their property.

(f) **Notes** that specific Health and Safety spray audits are to be carried out by contractors, with external auditing by Council staff, for signage and Personal Protective Equipment usage with glyphosate and other herbicide spraying.

(g) **Notes** that WDC staff intend to include conditions in Service Contracts for required use by contractors of the online herbicide usage map (if progressed), and the ‘No Spray’ register.

(h) **Notes** that WDC staff will continue to carefully consider options for reduction of the use of glyphosate, as a precautionary principle.

(i) **Notes** the update on glyphosate alternatives and feasibility of their use.

(j) **Circulates** this report to the Community Boards, Drainage Advisory Groups and the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee for their information.

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1. Community concerns regarding the use of glyphosate by Council in public places has been brought to the Council’s attention. Specifically, a resident of Pines Beach has raised concerns regarding signage of spraying in parks. The resident created a petition asking for Council to stop the use of glyphosate in public places. Another community member has recently raised questions of what is correct Personal Protective Equipment to be worn when spraying glyphosate. A resident of Kaiapoi also expressed concerns in 2015 that the dieback of submerged weeds in the Kaiapoi River was caused by glyphosate.

3.2. Glyphosate was re-classified as a ‘probable carcinogen' by the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), a unit of the World Health Organisation, in 2015. However
the US Environmental Protection Agency and European agencies have concluded that glyphosate has “low toxicity to humans”. Guidance on the use of glyphosate within New Zealand is provided by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). A report entitled “Review of the Evidence Relating to Glyphosate and Carcinogenicity” was published in August 2016 by the toxicologist Dr Wayne Temple. The report found that, “based on a weight of evidence approach, taking into account the quality and reliability of the available data – glyphosate is unlikely to be genotoxic or carcinogenic to humans and does not require classification under HSNO as a carcinogen or mutagen”.

3.3. In January 2018, WDC staff presented to Council (Trim 180111001840[v1]) on the continued use of the herbicide glyphosate and potential alternatives. It was noted that, based on information available, it was unlikely that the use of glyphosate by the Council would pose a risk to public health and the environment. It was noted, however, that there is on-going scientific debate. The Council approved the decision that, provided glyphosate is used appropriately, for it to continue to be used by Waimakariri District Council.

3.4. In order for the Council to take a precautionary approach to glyphosate usage, the January 2018 report outlined options that limit the use of glyphosate in certain circumstances. The use of glyphosate and other herbicides has been limited to essential areas and is recognised as one of a range of options, including the use of mechanical weeding, mowing, organic sprays and shading for example.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

Online herbicide usage map

4.1. The production of an online herbicide usage map is recommended to be scoped for feasibility by Council Departments that use herbicide, and prioritised for creation by the Geospatial Team. A condition for contractors to update the map would be included when a new Service Contract becomes operative.

4.2. WDC staff are recommended to review if there are exemptions of Council-owned or Council-managed public spaces, where spray usage would not be feasible or practicable to show on the online map. These exemptions should be clearly stated to users of the online map. Pensioner flats and other housing owned by Council are not considered public, and therefore would not have herbicide usage reported on an online map. Restricted access areas owned by the Council, such as wastewater treatment plants, are not also recommended for visualisation and listing on the online map.

4.3. The map is recommended to show a one-month window of when spraying will, or has, occurred. An advantage of an online map, as opposed to a static published notice, i.e. in a newspaper, is that it can be regularly updated. For example, reactive (unscheduled) spraying could be added to the online map as required.

4.4. It is recommended that each contractor has an appointed staff member with Citrix access, as the primary agents to upload and edit herbicide usage data, possibly with a secondary approval or check by WDC staff before finalising edits. This is to minimise double-handling of data and potential data errors.

Signage

4.5. The Council is recommended to continue with current signage requirements as set out in existing Service Contracts. In the Service Contract with the contractor Delta, who carry out maintenance in urban areas, and rural parks and reserves, it is stated: ‘Signs indicating that spraying operations are in progress shall be positioned so that persons entering the area receive adequate warning that spraying is being undertaken.’
The signs shall remain in place at the conclusion of spraying until the withholding period recommended by the manufacturer in order to avoid direct contact with spray material has been met.'

For most glyphosate formulations, the withholding period is generally very short, with a mobile spraying unit able to comply with signage instructions with signage on the mobile unit, with no fixed signage left on site. Compliance of signage requirements is recommended to be checked during spray audits.

In the Resource Consent CRC120402 that WDC holds for spraying over waterways, there is a condition stating:

‘If persons are encountered in a spraying location, the spraying personnel shall approach the people, explain their activity and request they leave the area before continuing spraying.’

The Service Contract with Sicon Ltd, who maintain district-wide roading and rural drainage and assets on behalf of the Council, states in Part D 12.4 that the contractor must supply the methodology and equipment for chemical application.

Sicon Ltd. requires appropriate signage to be clearly displayed to warn public of chemical usage in public areas, under their Work Instruction 360. Such signage is generally displayed via a mobile unit, i.e. a vehicle or person conducting the spraying, rather than stationary signage.

No Spray register

4.6. Currently a ‘No Spray’ register is only maintained by the Roading Team, however is recommended for extension of use to all departments within Council. The spray register is recommended to be owned and maintained by the AIMS Team, on behalf of the Council. This will enable private landowners to specify if they do not desire glyphosate usage in the vicinity (e.g. 5m) of their property, for example due to organic certification requirements, or sensitivity to glyphosate. The size of the buffer area that is not sprayed by Council could be based on a ‘case by case’ basis depending on factors such as what is requested by landowner and whether an anti-drift additive is used, or set at a standard distance.

4.7. Physical markers, such as blue triangles used by Nelson City Council, could be provided to ‘No Spray’ landowners for their installation at the property boundaries. These would demarcate the ‘No Spray’ area visually for contractors.

4.8. Additional cost for maintenance, could potentially be sought by Council from property owners on the ‘No Spray’ register to undertake other options than glyphosate. Any cost recovery policy, however, would need discussion and/or consultation with the community, and is not explored in this report. Properties on the ‘No Spray’ register could be shown as a GIS layer to WDC staff and contractors, on the online herbicide usage map.

Health and Safety – spray audits

4.9. It is recommended for Council staff to ensure that Health and Safety audits specifically for spraying herbicide are carried out by contractors. Currently, generic Health and Safety audits are carried out, however an audit may not be when a contractor is undertaking herbicide spraying work.

Changes to Service Contracts
4.10. Service Contracts are recommended to include conditions for contractors to update the online herbicide usage map (if progressed), use the ‘No Spray’ register, and undertake specific Health and Safety audits for herbicide spraying when new contracts are negotiated. The current roading and rural drainage contract ends in October 2020, and the green space contract in 2021. It is anticipated that this would result in an increase in cost for the contractor, which would be passed to the Council.

Use of alternatives

4.11. It is recommended for staff to maintain on-going awareness of glyphosate alternatives, with a specific review every three years, for any technological advances made, changes in costs, and information on trials of alternative options carried out by others.

Greenspace

4.12. In Greenspace areas, the current practice is to reduce the need to spray by carrying out the following:

4.12.1. Application of mulch on shrub beds to reduce weed growth and therefore reduce the need to spray.

4.12.2. Tree pits created around trees which are covered in mulch reducing the need to spray around the base of the tree where mowers cannot always get to.

4.12.3. Vegetation around all bollards, wire, chain and post and rail fencing is manually controlled which is a specification in the parks contract.

4.12.4. Infill planting is undertaken annually to suppress weed growth and therefore reduce the need to use spray.

4.12.5. Combi guards or equivalent weed matting and plant protection is used when planting new native regeneration areas in natural reserves. The weed matting suppresses weed growth around the plants.

Drainage

4.13. The Council holds a resource consent from Environment Canterbury to spray emergent aquatic macrophytes. However, due to taking a precautionary approach to glyphosate usage, no spraying was undertaken by Council contractors in 2018-19, with a preference for mechanical cleaning methods instead. Historically, approximately 8 - 10% of spring-fed drains have been sprayed every year.

4.14. Glyphosate gel is used to control willow and other woody weeds along open drains and streams. The plant is either ‘drilled and injected’ with the gel, or cut with the stump pasted. These methods ensure no product enters the water.

4.15. Glyphosate is used for managing riparian areas which have been planted with natives. The practice is to target problem weeds that could compete with the natives. A backpack sprayer is used.

Community Water Supply

4.16. At water supply wells for the Garrymere and Poytnzs Road schemes, due to the shallow source of the groundwater, weed control is manual, with mowers or weedeaters used to control any weed / grass growth at these sites.

Wastewater
4.17. The Wastewater team use contractors to apply glyphosate in publically-excluded areas only, such as at Wastewater Treatment Plants. Publicly accessible wastewater assets, such as pump station buildings, have weeds maintained with organic spray options, such as fatty-acid sprays.

**Clean fill and closed landfills**

4.18. Clean fill and closed landfill sits are minimally sprayed with herbicide, i.e. spot spraying for woody weeds and thistles.

**Christchurch City Council experience**

4.19. In 2016, the Christchurch City Council (CCC) stopped using glyphosate products in public places due to concerns that glyphosate might be a carcinogen. Contractors use organic alternatives such as the Kiwicare product 'Weedfree Rapid', which contains fatty acids.

4.20. The use of glyphosate alternatives by Delta, the former CCC Parks contractor, and current WDC contractor, created significant additional costs and contract re-negotiations between contractor and CCC.

4.21. The product, as with some organic sprays, is highly acidic which can cause burns to skin and eyes. Extra protective clothing must be worn by applicators.

4.22. The product is a contact herbicide i.e. the part of the plant must be treated to be effective. Therefore the roots of the plant often remain alive and the plant can re-sprout after treatment. This means more product is required and must be applied more often. This can require an increased Level of Service, (more treatments at the site per year), at an increased cost. Glyphosate is a systemic herbicide, which is transported to the roots.

4.23. The product has a strong odour which received complaints from the public. Especially from dog owners because their dogs like to roll in it. An altered formulation was created in response by Kiwicare, which aimed to reduce smell complaints.

4.24. It is more of a challenge to maintain parks with a tidy appearance which also increases complaints from the public. For example the product appears to be totally ineffective on the common weed mallow.

4.25. Success has been noted with the trial use of foam or steam technology by CCC recently. The technology is new, with the ongoing evaluation. The ability to cost-effectively introduce this alternative will be reviewed by WDC when this information is available.

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

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

5.1.1. Organisations such as the Soil and Health Association and the Green Party are advocating that glyphosate should be reassessed and eventually phased out of use. Former Green MP Steffan Browning produced a critique of the EPA review (2016) of the evidence relating to glyphosate and carcinogenicity.

5.2. **Wider Community**

5.2.1. The community views on this issue are varied. The drainage advisory groups generally are supportive of the use of herbicides, including glyphosate. However
there are opinions over the whole spectrum including people who consider that there should be no use of glyphosate in public areas.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

6.1.1. It is anticipated that there would be a cost in Service Contracts for contractor staff time to upload spray data to the online herbicide usage map, and use of the ‘No Spray’ register. It has not been scoped how much this cost would be.

6.1.2. A significant risk of using glyphosate alternatives is an increase in cost and/or a reduction in level of service provided, due to the limitation of other methods. Contractors have indicated that there is an expected cost increase for alternative methods. While they could not specifically identify a percentage increase in cost, it could be anticipated from information from another Council that a 50% increase could be the minimum expectation.

6.2. **Community Implications**

6.2.1. The community will be more informed about where and when glyphosate is used by Council and its contractors in public areas. This enables greater options and satisfaction for community members.

6.3. **Risk Management**

6.3.1. The Council has chosen to take a precautionary approach to reduce glyphosate usage, due to on-going scientific debate, and conflicting decisions by the World Health Organisation and Environmental Protection Agency on the cancer-causing nature of glyphosate.

6.4. **Health and Safety**

6.4.1. Applicators of glyphosate will be specifically audited to ensure correct PPE is provided and is being used. There will be less unknown exposure of the general public to glyphosate, which allows an individual to take a precautionary approach, to allow for any future research results on glyphosate health effects.

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

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

7.2. **Legislation**

7.2.1. Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act (1996, amended 2015) – Classifies chemicals based on risk, for example as a carcinogen or mutagen, and can restrict their use with New Zealand.

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

7.3.1. There is a safe environment for all

7.3.1.1. Harm to people from natural and man-made hazards is minimised.

7.3.2. There is a healthy and sustainable environment for all
7.3.2.1. Harm to the environment from the impacts of land use, use of water resources and air emissions is minimised.

7.3.2.2. Cultural values relating to water are acknowledged and respected.

7.3.2.3. Harm to the environment from the spread of contaminants into ground water and surface water is minimised.

7.4. **Delegations**

7.4.1. No delegations apply to this matter, as this report is for information only.
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1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to give an update on the Council use of herbicides for weed control operations in the district.

1.2. The use of weed spray is covered in detail for each of the relevant Council functions including costs and the cost of alternative options.

1.3. The advice received to date is that provided glyphosate is used appropriately it can continue to be used.

1.4. If the Council would like to take a precautionary approach there are options presented in this report to limit the use of glyphosate in certain circumstances. Cost estimates for the various options are included so that these can be included in budgets for the draft Long Term Plan (LTP).

Attachments:

i. 160805077062, Interim Update on the use of Herbicides including Glyphosate, for Council Weed control operations, September 2016.

ii. 171012110892, CAREX report on Glyphosate, report to Council October 2017.

ii. 171011110252, Persistence and ecological consequences of glyphosate to control aquatic weeds in Waimakariri lowland waterways, CAREX, September 2017.

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180111001840.

(b) Notes that based on information to date, it is unlikely that the use of glyphosate by the Council would pose a risk to public health and the environment.
3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. Background

3.1.1. Community concerns regarding the use of glyphosate in Council drains have been brought to the Council’s attention. Specifically a resident of Kaiapoi in 2015 blamed the Council’s use of glyphosate for the dieback of submerged weed in the Kaiapoi River.

3.1.2. This report provides a summary of previous reports to Council, activities where the Council’s contractors use glyphosate and suggested options on actions the Council could take to the 2018 Long Term Plan consultation process.

3.2. Kaiapoi River Sediment Testing

3.2.1. The Council had Kaiapoi river sediment sampled and tested for the presence of glyphosate. Water and sediment monitoring undertaken in April 2016 found no detectable concentrations in the water, and concentrations between 0.11 to 0.26 mg/kg in three sediment samples.

3.2.2. Ecan have undertaken monitoring in the Kaiapoi River and noted salt water intrusions up the river when there are spring tides coupled with low flows in the Waimakariri River. This phenomenon is likely to cause dieback of freshwater aquatic plants.

3.3. Advice from Government Ministries and Statutory Authorities

3.3.1. The Council previously sought advice from the Ministry of Health (MOH), Ministry for the Environment (MfE), Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment (PCE) and the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA), on the impact of use of glyphosate and other sprays on public health and on the environment. Their responses are summarised below.

3.3.2. The EPA response referred Council to a recent report it had commissioned, titled "Review of the Evidence Relating to Glyphosate and Carcinogenicity", published in August 2016. This report was prepared by toxicologists Dr Wayne Temple with
contributions from Michael Beasley of the New Zealand National Poisons Centre. The report found that, “based on a weight of evidence approach, taking into account the quality and reliability of the available data – glyphosate is unlikely to be genotoxic or carcinogenic to humans and does not require classification under HSNO as a carcinogen or mutagen”.

3.3.3. The letter from the MOH referred the Council to the EPA as the most appropriate authority in New Zealand on assessing and regulating glyphosate use. Therefore the report prepared by Dr Wayne Temple is considered the most comprehensive and recent resource provided by the Government for New Zealand organisations to assess public health impacts of the use of glyphosate.

3.3.4. The MfE also concurred with the findings of the EPA report. It noted that the EPA has approved the use of glyphosate in New Zealand following consideration of the likely effects of glyphosate on both human health and on the environment. It concluded that “both could be safeguarded by placing appropriate controls on the use of products containing glyphosate”. It went on to state that “the level of glyphosate in Kaiapoi, according to your own testing on 4 April 2016, is not at a level that would cause significant adverse effects for either humans or the environment.”

3.3.5. Apart from a letter received to acknowledge the request for information no further correspondence has been received from the PCE.

3.3.6. The Council was presented these reports at its meeting on the 6th of September 2016, refer TRIM 160929100894 (complete report with attachments; TRIM 160805077062[v2]).

3.3.7. Representatives from the Environmental Protection Authority visited Council in September 2016. They had no issues with the use of glyphosate by Council but cautioned against using more toxic alternatives available in New Zealand.

3.4. Other Herbicides

3.4.1. Included in the report to Council on the 6th of September 2016 was a review of the Council’s use of herbicides across all departments and activities. There are a number of products used for the control of weeds, some of which are specialist herbicides usually employed to control such weeds as gorse and broadleaf weeds and these include active ingredients such as triclopyr, clopyralid, metsulfuron-methyl, haloxyfop-P-methyl ester, sodium hypochlorite, picloram and others. These chemicals are very hazardous and require qualified applicators and none of them are approved to be used over water. As they are specialist herbicides, very little is used by Council contractors. This report does not cover these chemicals in any detail.

3.5. CAREX Partnership

3.5.1. In the summer of 2016 – 2017 The Waimakariri District Council partnered with (CAREX) in a trial to understand the persistence of glyphosate in stream water and sediment and its short-term effects on freshwater invertebrates and fish following spraying of waterways. The results of the trial are summarised as follows:
3.5.1.1. Glyphosate was present in the sediment before spraying had even started.

3.5.1.2. Glyphosate was present in the water column for 1-2 days following spraying, but quickly bound to sediment and broke down.

3.5.1.3. Freshwater invertebrates and fish were not affected by the use of glyphosate to control emergent macrophytes although it was concluded that as these drains are highly modified environments, invertebrates and fish that continue to occupy them may be already tolerant of existing water quality in these systems.

3.5.2. The CAREX trial report was presented to the Council on the 24th of October 2017, refer TRIM 171012110892 (complete report; TRIM 171011110252).

3.6. **Formulations Containing Glyphosate**

3.6.1. Glyphosate formulations are available at the local hardware and farm supply stores. They can be purchased and used with no restrictions. Home gardeners and commercial cropping farmers are using glyphosate. A drive around the district reveals the landowners who are spraying their roadside drains, most likely with glyphosate. It is the most widely used herbicide in the world.

3.6.2. There are many herbicide products on the market containing glyphosate. A common misconception is using the term “Roundup” to describe all formulations, but Roundup is just another formulation produced and marketed by the company Monsanto. The Council’s contractors do not use this particular product.

3.6.3. Each manufacturer adds other ingredients to glyphosate to create herbicide formulations usually to target certain weeds. An example of this is the product Weed Weapon manufactured by Kiwicare for the home gardener market. This also contains saflufenacil, which is effective on broad leaf species. Other added ingredients are surfactants and adjuvants (see below).

3.6.4. The Council’s contractors use two formulations of glyphosate: Greenspace contractors use Glyphosate 360, and Drainage and Roading contractors use Glyphosate 510. The label information for the two formulations are compared in Table 1.

3.6.5. The added ingredients distinguish the main difference between the two formulations; Glyphosate 360 cannot be used in the aquatic environment and is classed as toxic, while Glyphosate 510 is approved to be used in the aquatic environment and not classed as toxic. It is not glyphosate itself that sets the hazard class but the added ingredients. Glyphosate alone does not even rate a class 6 toxic label.

3.6.6. It is also worth noting that the hazard warnings apply to the concentrated product before it is diluted for use. This is for the personal protection of the handlers and care that the concentrated product does not enter the natural environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Comparisons of Glyphosate 360 and Glyphosate 510</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hazard Classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Glyphosate 360</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1D Substances that are acutely toxic - Harmful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4A Substances that are irritating to the eye</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### 9.1B Substances that are ecotoxic in the aquatic environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>Toxicological Information</th>
<th>Ecological Information</th>
<th>Recommended Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glyphosate isopropylammonium 360g/L Tallow amine ethoxylate</td>
<td>ACUTE ORAL: LD50 (rats) &gt;5000 mg/kg. ACUTE DERMAL: LC50 (rabbit) inhalation &gt;5000 mg/Kg. ACUTE INHALATION: LC50 (rats) &gt;10 mg/L for 4 hour aerosol exposure. OTHER TOXICITY INFORMATION: Warning - May cause skin irritation, avoid skin contact. Warning - May cause eye irritation, avoid contact with eyes.</td>
<td>AQUATIC TOXICITY: Toxic to aquatic life. LC50 Fish (Trout) 72hr: 9mg/L SOIL TOXICITY: Not toxic to worms. TERRESTRIAL VERTEBRATES - BIRDS: Not toxic to birds. TERRESTRIAL INVERTEBRATES - BEES: Not toxic to bees.</td>
<td>A non-selective herbicide for the control of most annual and perennial grass and broadleaf weed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glyphosate isopropylammonium 510g/L Alkyl polyoxyethylene phosphate</td>
<td>ACUTE ORAL: LD50 (rats) &gt;10000 mg/kg. ACUTE DERMAL: LC50 (rabbit) inhalation &gt;5000 mg/Kg. ACUTE INHALATION: LC50 (rats) &gt;10 mg/L for 4 hour aerosol exposure. OTHER TOXICITY INFORMATION: Warning - May cause skin irritation, avoid skin contact. Warning - May cause eye irritation, avoid contact with eyes.</td>
<td>AQUATIC TOXICITY: Slightly toxic to fish. SOIL TOXICITY: Not toxic to worms. TERRESTRIAL VERTEBRATES - BIRDS: Not toxic to birds. TERRESTRIAL INVERTEBRATES - BEES: Not toxic to bees.</td>
<td>A non-selective herbicide used before planting for the control of most annual and perennial grass and broadleaf weeds. Will control emerged weeds only, and provides no residual control.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.6.7. What are surfactants?
The term surfactant is a blend of surface active agent. They help to break the barrier between unlike chemicals or surfaces, like the waxy surface of a leaf. Surfactants work because they're able to break the surface tension of the herbicide and leaf surface. This allows the spray to evenly coat leaf surfaces in an even sheen with no beading up or rolling off.

#### 3.6.8. What are adjuvants?
Adjuvants reduce the surface tension, improve the wetting action, and increase the penetration of the herbicide.

#### 3.7. Council’s Use of Herbicide

##### 3.7.1. Greenspace, Roading, Property, Transfer Stations, Closed Landfills, Water, Wastewater & Forestry assets

Glyphosate formulations are used around the Council’s Greenspace, Roading, Property, Wastewater & forestry assets. It is used for:
- Keeping neat tidy edges around gardens and grass areas.
- Keeping footpaths and other traffic areas weed free.
- Keeping the area around marker posts and power poles clear of grass and weeds.
- General control of unwanted problem weeds.

3.7.3. Other sprays and herbicides are used by Council contractors where necessary. These are listed in detail on the table below.

**Table 2. Council Use of Herbicide Products**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Method/ Product</th>
<th>Undiluted Application Rates (if provided/ per annum)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roading</td>
<td>Sicon</td>
<td>Zeal (Metsulfuron – methyl)</td>
<td>6 litres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pulse</td>
<td>22 litres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Glyphosate 510</td>
<td>220 litres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Versatile</td>
<td>20 litres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td>Hide Spraying Ltd</td>
<td>Glyphosate 510</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pulse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grazon (Triclopyr)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Supplies</td>
<td>Graeme Ford</td>
<td>Glyphosate 510</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grazon (Triclopyr)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater</td>
<td>Hide Spraying Ltd</td>
<td>Agpro Green (Glyphosate 510)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grazon (Triclopyr)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pulse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Escort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Properties</td>
<td>National Decorators</td>
<td>Hypostat (sodium hypochlorite)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(roof spraying)</td>
<td>(roof moss &amp; mould)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sicon (ground spraying)</td>
<td>Gallant</td>
<td>0.04 litres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wet &amp; Forget / Surrender</td>
<td>0.3 litres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pulse</td>
<td>0.6 litres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Versatile</td>
<td>1.7 litres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Glyphosate</td>
<td>5.3 litres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>Glyphosate</td>
<td>116 litres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brushkiller</td>
<td>34 litres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maximiser</td>
<td>30 litres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lime Sulphur</td>
<td>46 litres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moss &amp; Mould killer</td>
<td>24 litres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Forestry</td>
<td></td>
<td>Glyphosate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Terbuthylazine (Gardoprim)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grazon (Triclopyr)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pilocram</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aminopyralids (Tordon)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wetting agents (pulse etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Stations</td>
<td>Graeme Ford</td>
<td>Glyphosate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grazon (Triclopyr)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed Landfills</td>
<td>Hide Spraying Ltd</td>
<td>Grazon (Triclopyr)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pulse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanfill Site</td>
<td>Hide Spraying Ltd</td>
<td>Grazon (Triclopyr)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pulse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.7.4. In recent years staff and contractors have been very aware of the concerns around the use of herbicides and in particular glyphosate. The use of glyphosate and other herbicides is limited to essential areas and is one of the range of options, including the use of mechanical weeding.

3.7.5. In Greenspace areas, the current practice is to reduce the need to spray by carrying out the following:

- Application of mulch on shrub beds to reduce weed growth and therefore reduce the need to spray.
- Tree pits created around trees which are covered in mulch reducing the need to spray around the base of the tree where mowers cannot always get to.
- Vegetation around all bollards, wire, chain and post and rail fencing is manually controlled which is a specification in the parks contract.
- Infill planting is undertaken annually to suppress weed growth and therefore reduce the need to use spray.
- Combi guards or equivalent weed matting and plant protection is used when planting new native regeneration areas in natural reserves. The weed matting suppresses weed growth around the plants.

3.7.6. At water supply headworks the use of herbicides has been limited and weed control is undertaken with mowers and weed eaters. The key herbicide used at water headworks sites is glyphosate, however Grazon is also used in specific circumstances. If the Council wanted to minimise the use of chemical sprays at water headworks sites this could be achieved by ceasing use of chemical sprays from water supply well sites, but continuing to use sprays as required at headworks or reservoir sites. Given the limited size and number of the well sites and the sensitivity public have to drinking water quality this is a pragmatic approach that could be managed at a modest cost.

3.7.7. One area that could be of concern to the public is children’s playgrounds. While it would be difficult to manage reserves in general without glyphosate it would be manageable to cease using glyphosate and other herbicides in the immediate area of children’s playgrounds if Council wanted to take a precautionary approach.

3.7.8. Excluding drainage there are no other areas where staff would recommend ceasing the use of glyphosate and herbicides.

3.7.9. Drainage

3.7.10. The initial concerns regarding spraying and the use of glyphosate relates to the maintenance of the drainage network therefore this section will focus on the issues in more detail.

3.7.11. The Council’s contractors spray dry drains to control rank grass. They have strict instructions to spray only the invert of the drain and to leave the banks untouched. Usually one spray per year is enough to keep the drains manageable.

3.7.12. The coastal zone of the Waikarariri district has a network of open drains that have a permanent base flow of spring water. There are a number of introduced aquatic weeds (macrophytes) both emergent (growing above the water) and submersent (growing under the water) that infest these drains. During the summer warm temperatures and longer sunlight hours cause prolific growth of these weeds. The most common emergent macrophytes are:
• Watercress (Nasturtium officinale) native to Europe and Asia.
• Monkey musk (Erythranthe guttata, formerly Mimulus guttatus) native to North America.
• Veronica or water speedwell (Veronica anagallis-aquatica) country of origin unknown.
• Floating sweet grass (Glyceria fluitans) native to Europe.

3.7.13. The prolific growth of these macrophytes cause the following problems:
• Water levels increase along some of the drainage networks causing flooding of surrounding land.
• Decrease of drain capacity which can cause flooding issues during heavy rain.
• During heavy rain events clumps of weed, especially watercress, can become unrooted, float downstream and build up to cause blockages at culverts.
• Macrophytes trap sediment that reduces drain capacity, clog stream beds, reduce habitat for aquatic biota and, like a self-perpetuating system, enable more prolific weed growth.
• Excess weed will hinder the migration of both introduced and native fish populations.
• Detract from the aesthetic appeal of a body of water.

3.7.14. The Council have a resource consent from Environment Canterbury to spray emergent aquatic macrophytes. Historically approximately 8 - 10% of spring fed drains are sprayed every year.

3.7.15. The product authorized for use is Glyphosate 510. The contractor uses a vehicle mounted spray unit and the practice is to spray the middle of the drain only and not spray the banks. Glyphosate is only effective on emergent weeds as sprays are diluted beyond effectiveness when mixed with stream water.

3.7.16. Glyphosate gel is used to control willow and other woody weeds along open drains and streams. The plant is either drilled and injected with the gel or the plant is cut and the stump pasted. These methods ensure no product enters the water.

3.7.17. Glyphosate is used for managing riparian areas which have been planted with natives. The practice is to target problem weeds that could compete with the natives. A backpack sprayer is used.

3.7.18. There are no other herbicides that are approved to be sprayed over water. Most of the organic products on the market contain fatty acids, pine and other oils that are toxic to stream fauna and flora and as such are not appropriate or approved to control in-stream macrophytes.

3.7.19. If the Council wished to take a precautionary approach it could opt to cease spraying glyphosate on emergent aquatic macrophytes in water.

3.8. Alternatives to using Herbicide

3.8.1. Excavation. A digger fitted with a rake attachment is employed to mechanically remove excess weed. A good operator can do this with minimal disturbance to the stream banks and stream base. The major impact is removal of a large proportion of in-stream biomass is removed from the stream. Ideally the removed macrophytes are placed along the side of the stream which will allow fauna to migrate back into the stream. In recent years the development of lifestyle property
has introduced land owners wanting a tidy groomed road frontage and garden, they do not want stream cleanings spoiling their lawns and expect the Council's contractor to immediately remove the cleanings. The impact is that any fauna is totally removed from the stream.

3.8.2. *Shade.* The establishment of native plants to introduce shade along stream banks is proven method to reduce macrophyte growth. In many cases, especially with an east – west aligned stream, the use of glyphosate and excavation is completely eliminated.

3.8.3. *Grass Cutting.* Weed eating dry drains and other areas is an alternative to using herbicide.

3.8.4. Other alternatives were considered in the previous report to Council in September 2016 (refer TRIM 160805077062).

3.9. **Hollistic Management of Waterways**

3.9.1. In 2013 the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment issued a warning that our long finned eel population is in dramatic decline and heading for extinction. Where there is sufficient data; nearly 3 quarters of our freshwater fish species and one third of freshwater invertebrates are classified at risk or threatened with extinction. This report focusses on the use of glyphosate however there are other factors to consider when looking at the health of our lowland waterways. Our freshwater ecosystems are impacted by changes in the water cycle, drainage, pollution and sedimentation, nutrient enrichment, deforestation and invasion by pests. The CAREX report highlights the issue that the health of our lowland waterways is not good. The use of glyphosate can be discontinued by the Council but we cannot expect an improvement in the health of our freshwater systems without looking at the broader picture.

3.9.2. There are opportunities here to look at our waterways holistically and focus on enhancing water quality and water ecology by managing catchments, more riparian planting to introduce shade and habitat.

3.10. **Christchurch City Council experience**

3.10.1. In 2016 the Christchurch City Council stopped using glyphosate products in public places due to concerns that glyphosate might be a carcinogen. Their contractors use “organic” alternatives such as Kiwicare product Weedfree Rapid which contains fatty acids

3.10.2. Discussions with Christchurch City Council staff and the City’s parks contractors Delta and Recreational Services highlights the following issues when using these organic alternatives.

3.10.2.1. The product is highly acidic which can cause burns to skin and eyes. Extra protective clothing must be worn by applicators.

3.10.2.2. As the product is a contact herbicide (glyphosate is a systemic herbicide) every part of the plant must be treated to be effective however the roots
of the plant remain alive and the plant can re-sprout after treatment. This means more product is required and must be applied more often.

3.10.2.3. The product has a strong odour which has increased the number of complaints from the public. Especially from dog owners because their dogs like to roll in it.

3.10.2.4. It is more of a challenge to maintain parks with a tidy appearance which also increases complaints from the public. For example the product appears to be totally ineffective on the common weed mallow.

3.11. Other Views

3.11.1. Organisations such as the Soil & Health Association and the Green Party are advocating that glyphosate should be reassessed and eventually phased out of use. Green MP Steffan Browning produced a critique of the EPA’s review of the evidence relating to glyphosate and carcinogenicity.

3.12. Options

3.12.1. It is recommended that the Council take the glyphosate issue to the 2018 Long Term Plan process for consultation. This would involve discussion of the issue in the Consultation Document. Members of the public will have an opportunity to express their opinions as a submission to the LTP:

- **Option 1:** No change to current practice and use (Staff recommendation). This option has been allowed for in the draft LTP budgets. There is no cost impact if this option is chosen by Council for consultation.

- **Option 2:** Cease use of glyphosate directly into waterways*, water well headworks and in children’s playground areas. Continue current use for all other Council activities. This option would have a cost of approximately $130,000 to $150,000 per annum. If Council wanted to take a precautionary approach staff would support this as it would eliminate the highest risk activities from an environmental and human health perspective. Staff and contractors would be able to manage most of the level of service issues associated with this. *Note refers to ceasing spraying glyphosate on emergent aquatic macrophytes in water.

- **Option 3:** Cease use of glyphosate across all Drainage and public areas (footpaths, parks, playgrounds etc). Continue to use glyphosate for rural roads and forestry areas. This option would cost an additional $1.0 million to $1.5 million above the current budgets in the draft LTP. It would also have a significant impact on levels of service. This option is not recommended by staff.

- **Option 4:** Cease use of glyphosate across all Council activities. Not recommended. This would cost in the order of $1.1 million to $2.0 million above the current budgets in the draft LTP. Staff advise against this option as it would have significant level of service impacts and in particular road safety implications.

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

4. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

4.1. The community views on this issue are varied. The drainage advisory groups generally are supportive of the use of herbicides including glyphosate. However there are opinions over the whole spectrum including people who consider that there should be no use of glyphosate.
4.2. The Kaiapoi Community Board at its meeting on the 20th of June 2016 (TRIM 160620057958) recommended the following:

4.2.1. **Recommends** that Council approves the use of mechanical means, rather than spraying, to control weeds in the Council stormwater and roadside drains, and waterways. Notes that mechanical means, rather than spraying Council drains, is estimated to cost an additional $80,000 per year.

4.2.2. **Recommends** that Council declines support for a return to the use of spraying to control weeds in Council drains.

5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

5.1. The costs that have been built into the draft LTP are based on the Council continuing with its current approach of using glyphosate for weed control where deemed appropriate by Council staff and contractors. If the Council chooses another option for consultation, other than the staff recommendation, the draft budgets will need to be amended to align with this decision.

5.2. The following table compares current weed control costs for each Council activity with a rough order estimated cost range for replacing sprays with mechanical weed control methods. This is not based on a site specific assessment as the exact cost of the most suitable alternative weed control method for each site has not been identified. The cost estimates are instead based on extrapolations based on the actual costs reported by the drainage activity during the recent mechanical weed control trials.

5.3. The results of the trials have been interpolated across all Council activities to provide a starting point for cost comparisons between glyphosate and mechanical weed removal options. To complete a more comprehensive options assessment would require an individual assessment at each site, including, for instance, the most appropriate weed removal option for each drain, reserve margin, garden, road verge etc. This level of in-depth investigation would require significant further resourcing.

5.4. Any Council reduction in its use of glyphosate is unlikely to have a significant impact on the concentrations found in the environment, due to the extent of private usage of the product.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Current Average Annual Cost of Weed Control</th>
<th>Estimated Total Cost of Mechanical Weed Control for all Council weed control (range)</th>
<th>Estimated Additional Cost for Mechanical Weed Control (range)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roading</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$210,000 to $350,000</td>
<td>$175,000 to $315,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td>$630,000 to $1.05 million</td>
<td>$525,000 to $945,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Supplies</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$154,000 to $257,000</td>
<td>$128,300 to $231,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Description</td>
<td>Cost (Incl. Pensioner Housing)</td>
<td>Cost (Parks &amp; Recreation)</td>
<td>Cost (Rural Forestry)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Properties (incl. pensioner housing)</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Recreation (excludes natural reserves &amp; Mainpower Oval)</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$210,000 to $350,000</td>
<td>$175,000 to $315,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Forestry</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$120,000 to $200,000</td>
<td>$100,000 to $180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Stations*</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed Landfills</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanfill Site</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$236,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1.38 million - $2.27 million</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1.14 million - $2.02 million</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Weed control is part of transfer station maintenance and not separately scheduled.

5.5. This report presents a number of options for Council to consider the cost of each option is totalled in the options section of this report. The breakdown of the costs to cease use of glyphosate under Option 2 is approximately $100,000-$120,000 in waterways, $10,000 at water well headworks and $20,000 in children’s playground areas.

5.6. A significant risk of ceasing the use of glyphosate or other herbicides is the reduction in level of service. Despite the increase in cost, due to the limitation of other methods there would be a reduction in the level of service. This reduction in level of service would be activity dependant. Anecdotal evidence from Christchurch gas shown there has been a reduction in the level of service from their approach. We would expect the same for this district.

6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. **Policy**

6.1.1. This matter is not a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance Policy. However if there was a significant change, such as an outright council wide cessation in the use of herbicide, then this would trigger the significance policy in terms of cost and level of service.

6.2. **Legislation**

Resource Management Act 1991

Section 31

(1) Every territorial authority shall have the following functions for the purpose of giving effect to this Act in its district:

(e) the control of any actual or potential effects of activities in relation to the surface of water in rivers and lakes:

Section 35
i. Every local authority shall gather such information, and undertake or commission such research, as is necessary to carry out effectively its functions under this Act or regulations under this Act.

ii. Every local authority shall monitor (a) the state of the whole or any part of the environment in its region or district;

**Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act 1996 (HSNO Act)**

The use of glyphosate in New Zealand is regulated through the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act 1996 (HSNO Act). The Environmental Protection Authority administers the HSNO Act and has the role of assessing and approving the use of hazardous substances for use or continued use in New Zealand. The use of glyphosate is currently approved for use in New Zealand under the provisions of this Act.

6.3. **Community Outcomes**

6.3.1. The air and land is healthy

6.3.2. Core utility services are provided in a timely, sustainable and affordable manner.

6.3.3. There is sufficient clean water to meet the needs of communities and ecosystems
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1. SUMMARY

1.1 The CWMS Fit for Future project developed 2025 and 2030 goals and advice to the Mayoral Forum on implementation.

1.2 With the goals finalised, there is more work to do to engage partners in the development of a Regional Work Programme and to address key strategic matters.

1.3 All Councils in Canterbury have been asked to formally note the decisions of the Canterbury Mayoral Forum.

Attachments:

(i) CWMS Fit for the Future 2025 and 2030 Goals (TRIM No 190730106051)
(ii) CWMS Fit for the Future Graphs (TRIM No 190730106317)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No.190724103611;

(b) Notes the recommendations of Canterbury Mayoral Forum resolved on 24 May 2019 on the CWMS Fit for Future Project, in particular to:

i. note that the Canterbury Mayoral Forum has approved CWMS goals for 2025 and 2030;

ii. note that the Canterbury Mayoral Forum has asked Environment Canterbury to work with territorial authorities, Ngāi Tahu, industry and community partners to develop a Regional Work Programme, with an implementation plan and monitoring framework to deliver the goals;
iii. **note** that implementation to deliver the goals will have resource implications that Councils will need to consider in adopting Annual Plans for 2020/21 and Long Term Plans for 2021–31.

(c) **Circulates** this report to Community Boards for their information.

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 The CWMS Fit for the Future project was started in June 2018. The purpose of the project was;

a) to develop 2025 and 2030 goals for the ten target areas of the CWMS; and

b) provide advice to the Mayoral Forum on what is needed to support delivery of the strategy.

3.2 The CWMS Regional Committee was tasked by the Canterbury Mayoral Forum to lead the development of advice on these matters, supported by a Goals Working Group and six Task Groups representing a range of interests and perspectives.

3.3 Environment Canterbury acted as project manager, providing analytical and logistical support, managing stakeholder engagement, and working with a project steering group of territorial authorities.

3.4 Final advice was taken to the Canterbury Mayoral Forum on 24 May 2019. At that meeting the Mayoral Forum resolved to;

- **note** that the Chief Executives Forum endorses the Regional Committee’s recommendations on proposed CWMS goals for 2025 and 2030;
- **approve** the proposed CWMS goals for 2025 and 2030;
- **agree** that Environment Canterbury work with territorial authorities, Ngāi Tahu, industry and community partners to develop a Regional Work Programme, with an implementation plan and monitoring framework to deliver the goals, and report progress to the Mayoral Forum by February 2020;
- **request** member councils to:
  - note that the Canterbury Mayoral Forum has approved CWMS goals for 2025 and 2030;
  - note that the Canterbury Mayoral Forum has asked Environment Canterbury to work with territorial authorities, Ngāi Tahu, industry and community partners to develop a Regional Work Programme, with an implementation plan and monitoring framework to deliver the goals;
  - note that implementation to deliver the goals will have resource implications that Councils will need to consider in adopting Annual Plans for 2020/21 and Long Term Plans for 2021–31;
  - invite Mayors Damon Odey, Sam Broughton and Winton Dalley to lead public communications about Canterbury Mayoral Forum decisions on the goals following the meeting on 24 May 2019.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1 The CWMS Fit for the Future project has concluded with three major outcomes which include the final set of goals for 2025 and 2030, the beginnings of a Regional Work Programme, and a set of four strategic implementation matters.
4.2 The four strategic implementation matters to be addressed alongside the Regional Work Programme include:

- Effective mechanisms for leadership and accountability;
- Adequate resourcing and funding;
- Regular monitoring, reporting and review of progress;
- A broad base of understanding and support for CWMS.

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1 Groups and Organisations

Two rounds of engagement with Zone Committees, Rūnanga, community groups, sector groups, District Health Boards, Central Government, industry and other stakeholders were completed, as well as engagement with a youth focus group.

5.2 Wider Community

The wider community has not been engaged about the Fit for the Future Project.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1 Financial Implications

There are resource implications in supporting the proposed Regional Work Programme. Following consideration by the land and water Group just established, it will be appropriate for the Council to consider this in the context of its next Long Term Plan. It is relevant to note that $300,000 was added through the recent Annual Plan to support implementation of the Waimakaniri Zone Implementation Programme Addendum.

6.2 Community Implications

Community involvement in CWMS has increased over the last ten years, and the continuing interest in water quality and quantity outcomes is likely to continue.

6.3 Risk Management

There is a risk that future Councils will not support the Regional Work Programme.

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

7. CONTEXT

7.1 Policy

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

7.2 Legislation

The Environment Canterbury (Transitional Governance Arrangements) Act 2016 replaced the Environment Canterbury (Temporary Commissioners and Improved Water Management) Act 2010. Part 3 of the 2016 Act directs Environment Canterbury to have particular regard to the vision and principles of CWMS in addition to the matters relevant under clause 10(1) of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

7.3 Community Outcomes
• The Council makes known its views on significant proposals by others affecting the District’s wellbeing.

7.3. **Delegations**  N/A
## Appendix 2 Proposed CWMS goals for 2025 and 2030

### Target Area: Environmental Limits

#### Theme: Environmental Flows and Catchment Load Limits

Collaborative process is at the heart of the CWMS. It empowers communities to make their own decisions about how best to meet agreed, region wide and local targets. Through the CWMS, the process of setting Environmental Limits (including environmental flows, allocation limits and nutrient loads) provides an opportunity for the community to take local ownership of water management, and to work together through complex information, to reach decisions around priority outcomes and values.

**By 2015:** Set environmental flows for surface streams, rivers and groundwater that are consistent with the fundamental principles of the CWMS and that: • are consistent with ecosystem health and biodiversity targets; • for all braided rivers include flood peaks, flow variability, flood periodicity, and channel forming flows to maintain their braided river character and ecosystems; • afford protection to instream values identified in Ngāi Tahu policies; • are consistent with recreational uses of the water body; • consider all the target areas of this strategy.

Set catchment load limits for nutrients for each water management zone that are consistent with the fundamental principles of the CWMS and that: • are consistent with ecosystem health, drinking water and biodiversity targets; • afford protection to instream values identified in Ngāi Tahu policies; • are consistent with recreational uses of the water body; • consider all the target areas of this strategy.

Established and begun to implement a programme to apply environmental flows to existing consents.

**By 2020:** Review of environmental flows and catchment load limits in response to changing monitoring information, new understanding and technologies, and if requested by regional and zone committees.

**[A106]** Established and begun to implement a programme to review existing consents where such review is necessary in order to achieve catchment load limits.

**By 2025:** All catchments have planning frameworks that include both environmental flows and catchment load limits that are consistent with the fundamental principles of the CWMS and that: • are consistent with ecosystem health and biodiversity targets; • for all braided rivers include flood peaks, flow variability, flood periodicity, and channel forming flows to maintain their braided river character and ecosystems; • afford protection to instream values identified in Ngāi Tahu policies; • are consistent with recreational uses of the water body; • consider all the target areas of this strategy.

All planning processes include consideration of how environmental flows and catchment load limits will be achieved by a mix of regulatory and non-regulatory means that may include consent reviews. Of those consents that do not comply with plan environmental flows and catchment load limits, 20% have been reviewed to apply plan limits.

**By 2030:** Review environmental flows and catchment load limits in response to changing monitoring information, new understanding and technologies, and if requested by regional and zone committees.

All planning processes include consideration of how environmental flows and catchment load limits will be achieved by a mix of regulatory and non-regulatory means that may include consent reviews. Of those consents that do not comply with plan environmental flows and catchment load limits, 50% have been reviewed to apply plan limits.

**By 2040:** Review of environmental flows and catchment load limits in response to changing monitoring information, new understanding and technologies, and if requested by regional and zone committees.

Environmental flow and catchment load limits achieved in all waterbodies.

### Target Area: Ecosystem Health & Biodiversity

#### Theme: Freshwater species and their habitat

Freshwater environments and their inhabitants have considerable ecological and cultural value. Several of our native freshwater species are in decline, or are nationally threatened. Other introduced species are of significant value to recreational fisheries but can pose a threat to native freshwater fish. A regional habitat restoration programme is underway and takes a catchment-based approach to restoring the habitat of freshwater fish species.

**By 2015:** No target set for 2015.

**By 2020:** An upward trend in diversity and abundance of native fish populations.

**By 2025:** Reduction in threatened or at-risk status of indigenous fish species compared to 2020.

**By 2030:** Reduction in threatened or at-risk status of indigenous fish species compared to 2025.

**By 2040:** No Target Set for 2040.
**Target Area: Ecosystem Health & Biodiversity**

**Theme: Drylands**

Drylands are unique ecosystems that provide habitat for rare and threatened species. Presently only around 3% (60,000ha) of dryland ecosystems in Canterbury are protected. Projects for protection and restoration are underway. Priority needs to be given to effective planning and regulatory mechanisms to ensure no further loss of remaining dryland biodiversity.

*By 2015*: No Target set for 2015.
*By 2020*: No Target Set for 2020.

---

*By 2025*: Maintain or improve existing high-quality indigenous dryland ecosystems in intermontane basins and on the plains.
Water use (irrigation and changing hydrology as a result of water use) results in no further loss of indigenous dryland ecosystems.

*By 2030*: Maintain or improve existing high-quality indigenous dryland ecosystems in intermontane basins and on the plains.
Water use (irrigation and changing hydrology as a result of water use) results in no further loss of indigenous dryland ecosystems.

*By 2040*: No Target Set for 2040

---

**Target Area: Ecosystem Health & Biodiversity**

**Theme: Wetlands**

Wetlands, riparian margins and other areas of indigenous vegetation create habitats for indigenous fauna and have important natural character values. In Canterbury, less than 10 percent of the region’s previously-extensive freshwater natural wetlands remain. Drivers of change, particularly wetland loss since European settlement, include drainage, diversion of water, infilling, reclamation, urban development, flooding, fire, vegetation clearance, cultivation, grazing and spread of introduced species. The mapping of the wetlands, and wetland projects helps us paint a picture of where remaining wetlands are, whether they are protected and identification of gaps to be filled. Planning provisions that protect the biodiversity values of natural wetlands are critical and are included in Canterbury’s regional policy statement and plans. The Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan (LWRP) requires the protection and maintenance of wetlands that contribute to cultural and community values, biodiversity, water quality, mahinga kai, water cleansing and flood mitigation.

*By 2015*: Protected all and restored at least two significant wetlands in each zone.
*By 2020*: Protected all existing wetlands.

---

*By 2025*: All existing 2020 wetlands are physically protected through active management.

*By 2030*: All prioritised wetlands are under active management where required and are in the process of being restored to a self-sustaining system.

*By 2040*: Protected all wetlands.
Hāpua, lagoons and estuaries are examples of coastal aquatic environments where the mix of coastal, surface water and groundwater systems produce an often dynamic environment from freshwater through to brackish and saline conditions. These areas provide an important habitat for a diverse array of native plant and animal species including mahinga kai species such as tuangi (cockles), pipi which is endemic to New Zealand, harakeke (flax), and tuna (eel). They also provide important nursery and spawning grounds for marine and freshwater fish species such as īnanga (whitebait), tuna (eel), pātiki (flounder) and margin habitats for the kowaro (Canterbury mudfish). Examples in Canterbury include hāpua river mouth lagoons such as the Rakaia and Ashburton river mouths, Waituna type lagoons or coastal lakes such as Te Waihora/Lake Ellesmere and Wainono Lagoon, tidal estuaries such as the Avon-Heathcote/Ihutai or freshwater river mouths such as the Clarence River.

By 2015: Accelerate the current riparian restoration and management programme for Te Waihora/Lake Ellesmere and tributary streams.

By 2020: A significant protection and restoration programme is in place on the most ecologically significant river mouth or coastal lagoon in each management zone.

By 2025: All coastal lagoons, hāpua and estuaries show improvement in key ecosystem health indicators compared to 2010.

By 2030: All coastal lagoons, hāpua and estuaries show improvement in key ecosystem health indicators compared to 2010.

By 2040: Examples of thriving coastal lagoons, and lowland or spring-fed ecosystems in each water management zone.

Lowland streams and rivers have lower ecosystem health and habitat quality than those in the high country as they are impacted by multiple stressors. These include low flows, habitat degradation and declines in water quality due to diffuse discharges of agricultural and urban contaminants. Land use is of greater intensity in the flatter low country. Contaminants accumulate in groundwater, which re-emerges in lowland streams. Spring-fed streams tend to meander through farms and urban areas, and are susceptible to both localised and diffuse contaminant sources. Actions are underway at numerous sites, catchment-wide, to effect change in land use management that will support all waterways.

By 2015: Protect and enhance the ecological health of the best examples of lowland streams ecosystems in each zone.

Improve ecosystem condition in at least another 10% of lowland streams in each zone.

By 2020: Increased the length of waterway with riparian management appropriate to aquatic ecosystem protection by 50% from 2010 figures.

Improved condition and water quality in at least 60% of lowland streams and 60% of lowland lakes in each zone.

By 2025: Increase in extent of riparian management to protect aquatic ecosystems along prioritised waterways from 2020 figures.

70% of lowland and spring-fed streams with at least good aquatic ecosystem health or showing an upward trend.

By 2030: Increase in extent of riparian management to protect aquatic ecosystems along prioritised waterways from 2020 figures.

80% of lowland and spring-fed streams with at least good aquatic ecosystem health or showing an upward trend.

By 2040: 100% of lowland and spring-fed streams with at least good aquatic ecosystem health or showing an upward trend.
Target Area: Ecosystem Health & Biodiversity

Water quality in the high country is variable among river types, predominantly influenced by sediment inputs and associated contaminants from overland run-off and stock access. Aquatic ecosystem health and water quality is typically higher than in lowland streams, particularly for streams that receive a large volume of flow from higher up in the catchment. Spring-fed streams in the high country are particularly vulnerable to habitat degradation and siltation through stock access, upwelling of groundwater and associated contaminants or runoff from intensive land use. Hill-fed streams may be hampered by inflowing spring-fed tributaries or fluxes of contaminant sources during high flows. Alpine and hill sourced rivers are generally less impacted by contamination sources due to a large volume of flow originating high up in the catchment.

By 2015: Highlighted any high-country spring-fed or foothill streams where ecosystem health is declining, and identified the cause with an action plan in place.

By 2020: All foothill rivers and high-country rivers and/or lakes either in good ecological health or better, or showing upward trend.

By 2025: Maintain or improve aquatic ecosystem health of all foothill and high-country rivers and high-country lakes.

By 2030: Maintain or improve aquatic ecosystem health of all foothill and high-country rivers and high-country lakes.

By 2040: Maintained upland spring-fed streams and lakes in very good aquatic ecosystem health (no decline from 2010). 80% of other rivers/streams and lakes with very good aquatic ecosystem health.

Target Area: Ecosystem Health & Biodiversity

Managing emerging contaminants is fundamental to ensuring safe drinking water. District health boards, Environment Canterbury, territorial authorities and water suppliers are conducting ongoing monitoring and reporting, are implementing and enforcing catchment load limits and are working with communities to improve water quality.

By 2015: Understood any emerging contaminant risks and identified any at-risk areas for targeted management.
Emerging contaminant risks are understood and any at risk areas identified for targeted management, and a remedial programme underway.

By 2020: Understood any emerging contaminant risks and identified any at-risk areas for targeted management and a remedial programme underway.

By 2025: Emerging contaminant risks are understood and limits are set where appropriate; at risk areas are managed with targeted remedial programme in place.
Emerging contaminant risks are identified with targeted remedial programmes in place and evaluated.

By 2030: Emerging contaminant risks are understood and limits are set where appropriate; at risk areas are managed with targeted remedial programme in place.
Emerging contaminant risks are identified with targeted remedial programmes in place and evaluated.

By 2040: Understood any emerging contaminant risks and identified any at-risk areas for targeted management.
Understood any emerging contaminant risks and identified any at-risk areas for targeted management and a remedial programme underway.
### Target Area: Ecosystem Health & Biodiversity

Managing emerging contaminants is fundamental to ensuring safe drinking water. District health boards, Environment Canterbury, territorial authorities and water suppliers are conducting ongoing monitoring and reporting, are implementing and enforcing catchment load limits and are working with communities to improve water quality.

**By 2015:** Achieved nutrient efficiency targets for the zone on all new irrigated land and 50% of other rural properties (and of properties within urban boundaries that apply nutrients over significant areas). Identified where environmental flows are not met or require change to meet ecosystem health and biodiversity outcomes and implemented actions to rectify.

* Identified areas where catchment load limits for nutrients are not met, prioritised areas and implemented actions to ensure there is no further enrichment.
* Demonstrated and included in implementation programmes, how land within the zone will be managed to achieve catchment load limits.

**By 2020:** Achieved nutrient efficiency targets for the zone on all new irrigated land and 80% of other land in major rural uses (pasture, major arable and major horticulture crops) and have 100% of rural properties working towards those targets (and of properties within urban boundaries that apply nutrients over significant areas).

Made progress towards achieving environmental flow and catchment load limits.

**By 2025:** Achieved nutrient efficiency targets for the zone on all new irrigated land and 90% of other land in major rural uses (pasture, major arable and major horticulture crops) and have 100% of rural properties working towards those targets (and of properties within urban boundaries that apply nutrients over significant areas).

Made progress towards achieving environmental flow and catchment load limits.

**By 2030:** Environmental flow regimes and catchment load limits are in place for all catchments and significant rivers affected by abstraction.

**By 2040:** Achieved nutrient efficiency targets for the zone on all new irrigated land and 100% of other rural properties (and of properties within urban boundaries that apply nutrients over significant areas). Achieved all environmental flow and catchment load limits.

### Target Area: Natural Character of Braided Rivers

Braided rivers are iconic features of the Canterbury landscape. The braided river floodplain, or braidplain, comprises both the active channels, less recently disturbed islands and lateral areas with more mature vegetation. The active riverbed includes the network of braided channels, islands and river margins that are inundated during flood events. There are a number of programmes underway to assist with maintenance of the braided rivers.

**By 2015:** Identified where environmental flows do not include flood peaks, flow variability, flood periodicity, and channel forming flows and implemented actions to rectify.

**By 2020:** Made progress towards achieving environmental flows.

**By 2025:** Made progress towards achieving environmental flows that maintain and enhance the dynamic, braided nature and indigenous ecosystems of braided rivers.

Continue to report on Target for 2010.

**By 2030:** Continue to report on Target for 2010.

Continue to report on Target for 2025.

**By 2040:** Canterbury’s braided rivers show the dynamic, braided nature typical of such rivers. Achieved all environmental flows.
**Target Area: Natural Character of Braided Rivers**

Braided rivers are a distinctive feature of New Zealand’s eastern South Island and have considerable biodiversity value. The braided rivers are characterised by ever-changing channels which are home to many species of birds, fish, invertebrates and plants that have adapted to live in this challenging and dynamic environment. Rare native birds such as wrybill, black-billed gull and black-fronted tern depend on braided rivers for their survival, but they are increasingly under threat. The riverbeds, riparian margins, floodplains and associated wetlands and springs support many of the region’s endangered and rare species.

| By 2015: | Protect the indigenous habitats in riparian wetlands, springs and the lagoons associated with braided rivers. Enhance and protect breeding populations of indigenous braided river birds. |
| By 2020: | Protected significant habitat for a full range of indigenous braided river flora and fauna. Protected and enhanced the habitats in riparian wetlands, springs and the lagoons associated with braided rivers. |
| By 2025: | Five priority braided rivers are under active management to increase the area of habitat for a full range of indigenous braided river flora and fauna. Increase area of actively managed habitat for indigenous flora and fauna in riparian wetlands, springs and lagoons associated with braided rivers compared to 2020. Five priority braided rivers are under active management to increase habitat area usable by all species of indigenous braided river birds. |
| By 2030: | Nine priority braided rivers are under active management to increase the area of habitat for a full range of indigenous braided river flora and fauna. Increase area of actively managed habitat for indigenous flora and fauna in riparian wetlands, springs and lagoons associated with braided rivers compared to 2025. Nine priority braided rivers are under active management to increase habitat area usable by all species of indigenous braided river birds. More than 50% of indigenous braided river-dependent species are showing positive trends in abundance and health. |
| By 2040: | All indigenous braided river-dependent species are showing positive trends in abundance and health. Increase habitat area usable by all species of braided river indigenous birds. |

**Target Area: Kaitiakitanga**

Ensuring good quality drinking water at marae is an important Kaitiakitanga target. Looking after visitors/manaakitanga includes ensuring a safe drinking water supply. Previously this target has been measured by compliance with the drinking water standards. This has proved to be a complicated measure as the standards include criteria that are unrelated to the quality of the water and so a rating of ‘non-compliant’ can be misleading. The targets will now be measured using indicators more closely related to the quality/quantity of the water bodies used as the drinking water supply.

| By 2015: | No Target set for 2015. |
| By 2020: | All marae and associated papakāinga have access to high quality drinking water. |
| By 2025: | Maintain or improve, compared to 2020 levels, in the quality or quantity of water bodies used as a drinking water supply to marae and associated papakāinga. |
| By 2030: | All marae and associated papakāinga have access to high quality drinking water that meets Drinking Water Standards. |
| By 2040: | No Target Set for 2040. |
Since signing the Tuia Relationship Agreement between Ngā Papatipu Rūnanga and Environment Canterbury in December 2012, the nature and extent of the relationship continues to grow and develop. Investing in the relationship by bringing capacity and capability to bear, ensures all parties continue to move closer to achieving partnership in the management of the region’s natural, physical and freshwater resources. The cultural values return, from mana whenua engagement and participation in the CWMS collaborative process, will continue to be challenged by the inevitably slow and incremental pace of any real or tangible improvement at the flax roots level in terms of mahinga kai and customary use.

**By 2015:** Protocols for the recognition and exercise of mana, including kaitiakitanga within the Ngāi Tahu rohe, are implemented.  
A report on the health of all Ngāi Tahu nominated water-bodies using the Ngāi Tahu Cultural Health Monitoring Tool.  
Iwi Management Plans in place for all zonal areas.  
Institutional capability within local government to adequately recognise and provide for the principle of kaitiakitanga in water management.  
A formal co-governance arrangement for the active management of Te Waihora (Lake Ellesmere) and its catchment.  
A system for appointing Ngāi Tahu tangata tiakiwai (water guardians) who have formal recognition and support from local government is established.  

**By 2020:** Integrated Ki Uta Ki Tai environmental management philosophies into zonal and regional management planning.  
Further co-governance arrangements (developed in partnership by Ngāi Tahu, the Crown and Canterbury local government) for the active management of nominated waterbodies in North and South Canterbury.  
At least one Ngāi Tahu tangata tiakiwai is appointed in each zone.

**By 2025:** Develop an integrated Te Rūnanga O Ngāi Tahu/papatipu rūnanga reporting mechanism.  
An annual mātauranga informed report is provided for rūnanga on the health of all waterways to inform water management decision-making (by councils and Ngāi Tahu).  
All Iwi Management Plans more than 5 years old are refreshed.  
A review of the level at which Ki Uta Ki Tai environmental management philosophies have been integrated into zone and regional planning is completed.  
Institutional capability within local government to adequately recognise and provide for the principle of kaitiakitanga in water management.  
Succession plans and rangatahi forums are in place to enable the next generation to participate in zone committees and other water management processes.  
Co-governance arrangements developed and being implemented for at least one nominated waterbody in North Canterbury and one in South Canterbury.  
At least one Ngāi Tahu Tangata tiakiwai is appointed in each zone.

**By 2030:** Integrated Te Rūnanga O Ngāi Tahu/papatipu rūnanga reporting mechanism in place.  
Outcomes reporting is being informed by Mātauranga Maori Report.  
All Iwi Management Plans are refreshed in relation to the integrated ki uta ki tai action plan and responded to.  
An integrated ki uta ki tai strategic plan is completed for all catchments that sets out the agreed actions for all participants.  
Institutional capability within local government to adequately recognise and provide for the principle of kaitiakitanga in water management.  
Intergenerational representation is evident and supported, and ongoing development occurs in the CWMS process.  
Co-governance arrangements implemented for at least one nominated waterbody in North Canterbury and one in South Canterbury.  
All zones are sufficiently resourced by Tangata tiakiwai.  
Papatipu Rūnanga are decision makers for allocations of Ngāi Tahu water in each catchment.

**By 2040:** Kaitiakitanga is a normalised and an integrated practice of water management.
Kaitiakitanga is about the active protection, sustainable use and responsibility for freshwater bodies and their related natural and physical resources by tangata whenua. Active participation of Papatipu Rūnanga in CWMS activities and decision-making is pivotal to success. Iwi Management Plans, co-governance of environmental resources and restoration of mahinga kai and wāhi taonga are pioneering examples of shared governance and management responsibilities between Ngāi Tahu and Environment Canterbury.

**By 2015:** Identified customary uses (current and potentially restored) for all waterways.
All degraded wāhi taonga and mahinga kai waterways nominated by Ngāi Tahu have an active restoration programme in place that responds to cultural priorities.
Work and research has commenced on establishing a mahinga kai food gathering standard.
A programme for identifying cultural preferences for river and stream flow agreed in each zone.

**By 2020:** A mahinga kai food gathering standard is confirmed and implemented as a water quality monitoring tool.

**By 2025:** Identified customary uses are mapped for all catchments in Canterbury.
5 sites in each papatipu rūnanga area (including freshwater mātātai and Fenton Reserves) are being restored or protected in recognition of them as wāhi taonga and/or to support and be accessible to papatipu rūnanga for mahinga kai and resource gathering purposes.
At risk freshwater taonga species (e.g. kekewai, kakahi, long finned and short finned tuna) are identified and protection zones are identified and put in place.
Environmental flows provided for through regional planning processes afford protection to instream values identified in Ngāi Tahu policies.
No further loss of intergenerational cultural knowledge and practice.

**By 2030:** 10 sites in each papatipu rūnanga area (including freshwater mātātai and Fenton Reserves) are being restored or protected in recognition of them as wāhi taonga and/or to support and be accessible to papatipu rūnanga for mahinga kai and resource gathering purposes.
Mahinga kai is available that is of high quality.
At risk species are increasing in abundance and the number of at-risk species is declining.
An increase in the number of papatipu runanga whanau who are learning and carrying forward intergenerational cultural knowledge and practice.

**By 2040:** Protection, in accordance with Ngāi Tahu values and practices, of wāhi taonga and mahinga kai waterways.
Target Area: Drinking water

The quality and quantity of drinking-water supplies depends on the management of point sources and non-point sources of contaminants in drinking water supply catchments and aquifers, land-use in the catchment and/or recharge area, and on the treatment provided by the local authority. Actions to protect drinking water differ for groundwater from a secure source and surface water sources. The percentage of the region’s population with access to safe drinking-water is high, but there are numerous smaller water supplies, supplying smaller communities, that are non-compliant.

By 2015:

By 2020: There is an increase in the percentage of the population supplied with water that meets the New Zealand Drinking Water Standards for health-based determinants.

By 2025: Communities that, at 2010, had access to untreated and safe drinking water continue to have access to source water that does not require treatment.

By 2040: Understood any emerging contaminant risks and identified any at risk areas for targeted management and a remedial programme underway.

Communities that, at 2010, were treating drinking water supplies require no new treatment or increased monitoring requirements.

Priority is given to drinking water (including stockwater) over other uses in LWRP.

All community drinking water supplies and self-supplied bores meet the New Zealand Drinking Water Standards for health-based determinants.

Emerging contaminant risks are identified with targeted remedial programmes in place and evaluated.

No new activities in a drinking water catchment/groundwater zone that reduce access to sufficient quantities of drinking water supplies including stockwater.

Drinking water has priority over other uses in the Land and Water Regional Plan and territorial authorities’ district plans.

By 2030: Communities that, at 2010, had access to untreated and safe drinking water continue to have access to source water that does not require treatment.

All drinking water supplies and self-supplied bores meet the New Zealand Drinking Water Standards for health-based determinants.

Drinking water supplies (community use and stockwater) are maintained as a first order priority when reviewing regional policies and planning.
By 2015: Demonstrated, and included in implementation programmes, how land within the zone will be managed to achieve catchment load limits.

Set catchment load limits for nitrate consistent with drinking water quality targets for each zone, identified priority areas where targets are not met and implemented actions to ensure there is no further enrichment.

By 2020: Achieved nutrient efficiency targets for the zone on all new irrigated land and 80% of other land in major rural land uses (pasture, major arable and major horticulture crops), and have 100% of rural properties working towards those targets (and of properties within urban boundaries that apply nutrients over significant areas).

A demonstrable decrease in nitrate concentrations in shallow groundwater in priority areas is achieved.

By 2025: Detailed dynamic groundwater modelling provides data that ensures policy recognises impact of contaminants, land use and climate change.

Implementation programmes in place for each zone to achieve catchment load limits.

Reviewed progress towards achieving catchment load limits in catchments where limits have been in place for at least five years.

Achieved nutrient efficiency targets for the zone on all new irrigated land and 80% of other land in major rural land uses (pasture, major arable and major horticulture crops), and have 100% of rural properties working towards those targets (and of properties within urban boundaries that apply nutrients over significant areas).

Decrease in the number of wells with increasing trends in nitrate level concentrations from 2020.

By 2030: Refine, define and utilise detailed dynamic groundwater modelling to provide data that informs regional and district policies and rules that recognise impact of contaminants, land use and climate change.

Catchment load limits are met (timeframes set in implementation programmes).

Achieved nutrient efficiency targets for all zones as set out in plans.

Decrease in the number of wells with increasing trends in nitrate level concentrations from 2025.

By 2040: Achieved nutrient efficiency targets for the zone on all new irrigated land and 100% of other rural properties (and of properties within urban boundaries that apply nutrients over significant areas).

Average annual nitrate levels in all groundwater wells in Canterbury are below 50% of the maximum allowable value for drinking water.

Nitrate levels in community drinking water wells are below the maximum allowable values of drinking water.
### Target Area: Recreation and Amenity Opportunities

**Theme: Water Based Recreational Opportunities**

Canterbury’s rivers and lakes are highly prized for recreation and used throughout the year by locals and visitors. Recreational and amenity opportunities provide social, cultural, health and economic benefits. CWMS Zone Committees have identified actions and desired outcomes for recreational opportunities and information is being gathered to advance work programmes to support recreation targets.

**By 2015:** A positive trend in the availability and/or quality of recreational opportunities in each zone.

**By 2020:** A positive trend in the availability and/or quality of recreational opportunities in each zone.

**By 2025:** A continuing and measurable positive trend, against baseline information, in the diversity, availability and quality of recreational opportunities in each zone.

- Identify the restoration of priority freshwater recreational opportunities in each zone, developing plans to achieve and show measurable progress.
- Understand threats and act to reduce risk to freshwater recreational opportunities.

**By 2030:** A continuing and measurable positive trend, against baseline information, in the diversity, availability and quality of recreational opportunities in each zone.

- Plans in place that recognise the values and provide protection for recreation and amenity opportunities.
- Priority freshwater recreational opportunities in each zone (identified by 2025) show progress towards restoration and protection.
- Potential threats to freshwater recreational opportunities are understood and plans in place to reduce risk.

**By 2040:** Restored at least one major fresh water recreational opportunity in each zone that was not currently available in 2010.

### Target Area: Recreation and Amenity Opportunities

**Theme: Recreational Water Flows**

Different recreational activities, interests, and users require different water flows at different times. Some require a wilderness experience; others need white-water conditions or safer flows and tranquil places. Most rivers and streams in Canterbury are at, or near, full allocation for reliable ‘run-of-river’ takes.

**By 2015:** Identify where environmental flows are not met or require change to meet recreational outcomes and implemented actions to rectify.

**By 2020:** Made progress toward achieving environmental flows.

**By 2025:** Environmental flows, which support recreational requirements, are set as part of the rule setting process in new plans and included in existing plans when up for review.

**By 2030:** Environmental flows, which support recreational requirements, are set as part of the rule setting process in new plans and included in existing plans when up for review.

- All new and existing consents in review are linked to environmental flows.

**By 2040:** Achieved all environmental flows.
Target Area: Recreation and Amenity Opportunities
Theme: Freshwater Angling

Freshwater angling is a popular recreational activity in Canterbury rivers with brown trout, rainbow trout and Chinook salmon a sought-after catch. The Rakaia River is one of the best salmon fisheries in New Zealand and the upper reaches are set amidst spectacular scenery. Lake Coleridge is a large, exposed high country lake that is heavily fished for its landlocked Chinook salmon. Both the Waiau River and the Hurunui River have some of the most productive reaches of trout fishing in New Zealand and are popular for their seasonal sea run salmon. The Waimakariri River is an excellent trout and salmon fishery in close proximity to Christchurch. Canterbury high country lakes provide fishing in a remote and uniquely scenic environment. Smaller, localised fisheries also exist for other introduced salmonids.

By 2015: A positive trend in the availability and/or quality of freshwater angling opportunities.
By 2020: No Target Set for 2020.
By 2025: Advocate for and support measures to effectively restore and protect fishing opportunities in each water management zone.
By 2030: Freshwater fishing opportunities in each zone are restored and protected.
By 2040: No Target Set for 2040.

Health of lowland streams, rivers and lakes in Canterbury show improving habitat and an increase in fishing opportunities.
20% increase in the number and area of protected salmonid spawning sites from 2009 baseline in identified important areas.

By 2025: Improve on percentage of rivers and lakes being swimmable since 2020 using consistent water quality monitoring and real-time results.
Cyanobacteria risk for priority contact recreation sites in Canterbury rivers and lakes is understood and managed for public health.

By 2030: Achieve the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management target of 92 percent of rivers and 81 percent of lakes in Canterbury being swimmable by 2030.
Progress is made towards achieving identified reduction targets for cyanobacteria.
By 2040: No Target Set for 2040.
In Canterbury, irrigation complements variable rainfall. Careful water application boosts productivity while minimising drainage and water abstracted from aquifers. Minimising drainage helps to minimise nutrient losses as required by regional planning rules across Canterbury. Investment by farmers in modern overhead spray systems has displaced less efficient surface methods. Region wide benchmarks for water use, based on water metering data, are now beginning to inform policy rather than volumes historically allocated or consented. Improvements in application methods and irrigation systems are being driven by Irrigation schemes, Irrigation New Zealand, Industry sector organisations using industry led applied research, practical field programmes and irrigation efficiency testing on-farm.

By 2015: Established and reported against a benchmark of current water use efficiency for irrigation* (from target A184 below). 60% of water used for irrigation is operating according to best practice water use. Established and reported against a benchmark of current water use efficiency for irrigation, community (potable, industrial and commercial) and stockwater.

By 2020: 80% of water used for irrigation and stockwater is operating according to best practice water use. Reduced water used for community water supply by 10% (measured in litres per person for day) compared to that used in 2010.

Increased the benefits gained per unit of water so that the volume of water beneficially used (used in production of crops, electricity, or commercial uses) in each zone as a proportion of the volume of water take is, on average, 5% greater than that achieved in 2010.

By 2025: 90% of water users meeting or exceeding the agreed water use benchmarks. 100% of water used for irrigation and stockwater is operating according to water use Good Management Practices. Continued updating of best practice as industry makes advances.

Drinking water suppliers have demand management programmes in place as part of good infrastructure practices. Policy mechanisms are in place to ensure that efficiency gains are returned to the environment where there is overallocation of the water resource.

By 2030: 100% of water users meeting or exceeding the agreed water use benchmarks. 100% of water used for irrigation and stockwater is operating according to water use Good Management Practices. Drinking water suppliers implementing demand management programmes as part of good infrastructure practices. A percentage of the water saved through water use efficiency is returned back to the environment or is allocated to other uses. Increased the benefits gained per unit of water so that the volume of water beneficially used (used in production of crops, electricity, or commercial uses) in each zone as a proportion of the volume of water take is, on average, 10% greater than that achieved in 2020.

By 2040: Implemented best practice water use on all irrigation, stockwater and industrial/commercial use in Canterbury. Reduced water used for community water supply by 20% (measured in litres per person per day) compared to that used in 2010.

Increased the benefits gained per unit of water so that the volume of water beneficially used (used in production of crops, electricity, or commercial uses) in each zone as a proportion of the volume of water take is, on average, 25% greater than that achieved in 2010.
The CWMS sets an indicative outcome for 2040 of at least 95% reliability of water supply. Increasing irrigated area and reliability requires progress to be made in water management at farm and scheme levels. This includes developing cooperative arrangements between the various water management interests, adopting improved management systems, improving the operation of existing infrastructure and the development and reliability capacity (storage) within these systems. Methods being used include the piping of formerly leaky unlined earth canals and the use of small and medium scale storage as well as improved methods for operating existing large-scale storages. Efficient on farm water use results in water storage being able to supply reliability to larger irrigated areas. More land benefitting from irrigation, both directly and indirectly through mixed irrigation and dryland farming systems, builds resilience into the local economy making it less susceptible to both long-term climate change and short-term dry spells, while widening the range of land use options.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Increased the area of irrigated land and/or reliability of irrigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Improved reliability of supply for at least 50% of irrigated land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>Improved reliability of supply for at least 65% of irrigated land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>Achieved 95% reliability of supply for 75% of irrigated land while also ensuring all target area water uses (including ecosystem health/biodiversity, drinking water and kaitiakitanga targets) are met as per CWMS priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>A substantial increase in the reliability of supply and the area of land irrigated in Canterbury all of which has demonstrated high standards of riparian, nutrient and water use management, and has been shown to be consistent with the principles of the strategy. An indicative target is 850,000 hectares of irrigated land with at least 95% reliability Improved reliability of supply for all irrigated land.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Target Area: Irrigated Land Area

The CWMS identifies infrastructure as a means to contribute to all CWMS target areas, not just the supply of water for irrigation and hydro-electricity. Infrastructure can also address future-proofing issues such as ecosystem support in a changing climate and water quality management through enhanced reliability and distribution efficiency. While the CWMS is a collaborative process involving all councils across Canterbury, infrastructure development is based on cooperation and coordination, while recognising the commercial goals of the parties involved. Infrastructure options are being considered and progressed with a vision for an integrated water infrastructure across Canterbury.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Milestone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>A system of regionally distributed rural water infrastructure for the storage and distribution of water that provides reliable water to all irrigated land has been designed, timetabled, costed and staged. The system has been demonstrated to align with the principles and targets of this strategy. Decided mechanisms for funding infrastructure and the ongoing operation of the strategy. Started on the infrastructure (or reconfiguration of existing consents) that facilitates efficiency improvements and is linked into the regional storage plan. Specified, for each zone, their infrastructure requirements consistent with the regional storage plan, and the principles and targets of the strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Started construction of regional storage and [improved reliability of supply for at least 50% of irrigated land]. Started construction of infrastructure identified in zonal implementation programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>Reviewed regional infrastructure needs (including storage and distribution) based on revised supply and demand factors (including climate change) to meet 2040 goals with a focus on reliability. Establish a “reliability of supply” metric methodology for economic and environmental outcomes of this strategy. Reviewed progress on the funding of infrastructure development and/or the reconfiguration of existing consents that aligns with the principles and targets of this strategy. Reviewed progress on infrastructure development and/or the reconfiguration of existing consents that facilitates reliability improvements and is linked into the regional storage plan. Progress made in construction of integrated infrastructure identified in zone implementation programmes (Integrated - both irrigation and environmental).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>Reviewed regional infrastructure needs (including storage and distribution) based on revised supply and demand factors (including climate change) to meet 2040 goals with a focus on reliability. Establish a “reliability of supply” metric methodology for economic and environmental outcomes of this strategy. Reviewed progress on the funding of infrastructure development and/or the reconfiguration of existing consents that aligns with the principles and targets of this strategy. Reviewed progress on infrastructure development and/or the reconfiguration of existing consents that facilitates reliability improvements and is linked into the regional storage plan. Progress made in construction of integrated infrastructure identified in zone implementation programmes (Integrated - both irrigation and environmental).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>No Target Set for 2040.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Canterbury’s high-country lakes provide a largely natural water storage capacity that can act as an enabler for other renewable generation technologies, such as wind, which rely on the generation from hydro storage being available on demand. Electricity generation is generally, but not always, a non-consumptive use, making it highly complementary to irrigation. Investigating hydro power options, particularly where they have additional benefits or dual use of the water (e.g. in combination with farm irrigation) is encouraged. New infrastructure options must include consideration for hydro-electric power generation and where possible, feature design that utilises the landscape to convey water under pressure. This can minimise the need for pumping and, as a result, can improve energy efficiency.

**Target Area: Energy Security and Efficiency**

By 2015: Started projects to generate electricity from existing irrigation infrastructure.

By 2020: Increased the productivity per unit of electricity – per hectare consumption for irrigation sector and equivalent measures in other sectors.

Generate at least 40-45% of the power used by irrigation in Canterbury from irrigation infrastructure (including multi-use hydro and irrigation systems) within Canterbury and other renewable on-farm sources.

Maintain or increase Canterbury’s contribution to New Zealand’s security of electricity supply.

By 2025: Established measures for the productivity of electricity - per hectare consumption for irrigation sector and equivalent measures in other sectors.

Factored efficient use of electricity in all irrigation infrastructure.

Continue to maintain or increase Canterbury’s contribution to New Zealand’s security of electricity supply.

**Target Area: Indicators of Regional and National Economies**

Indicators for Regional Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and employment growth are readily available, regularly updated and show positive trends. However, direct measures of the ‘value added’ impact of water on the regional economy are not yet readily available.

By 2015: Increase the value and employment added per unit of water.

By 2020: Increased production through the direct application of water to agriculture contributes an additional $0.4 billion per annum value added to the Canterbury economy.

By 2025: Increase the value-add per unit of water uses in consumptive activities.

Productivity of water use grows by 3% per annum.

No decline in rural economic and social vitality from that measured at 2010.

Canterbury household income is maintained or expanded relative to national household income.

By 2030: Increased the value-add per unit of water uses in consumptive activities.

Productivity of water use grows by 3% per annum.

No decline in rural economic and social vitality from that measured at 2010.

Canterbury household income is maintained or expanded relative to national household income.

By 2040: Increased Canterbury’s contribution to national GDP from 15% to 20% of which 2% is attributable to increased production and better water management.

Increased production through the direct application of water to agriculture contributes an additional $1.7 billion per annum value-added to the Canterbury economy.

Recognised and reported on the employment benefits (direct and indirect) that arose from the CWMS.
The opportunity cost is the value of something that is forgone in order to achieve something else. In resource management this is the value that is lost by pursuing one use of a resource at the expense of a possible alternative use. All resources can have an alternative use, which means that every action has an associated opportunity cost.

An externality arises if the activity of one person is affecting another person without compensation. An adverse effect is called a negative externality and a beneficial effect is known as a positive externality. The discharge of nutrients from farmland can end up in water bodies which then contributes to declining water quality. This can have negative impacts on the users of water bodies (e.g. use for drinking water or recreational activities) which is an example of a negative externality.

By 2015: No Target Set for 2015.
By 2020: Measures in place to assess the economic wealth benefits of freshwater biodiversity (and other ecosystem services) and recreational use of water.

By 2025: Develop a way of assessing costs and benefits using a capitals approach that recognises externalities and opportunity costs.
Develop options (including a preferred option) for funding the reinvestment in natural capital, including addressing legacy issues and future opportunity costs.
Measures in place to assess the economic wealth benefits of freshwater biodiversity (and other ecosystem services) and recreational use of water.

By 2030: Develop a way of assessing costs and benefits using a capitals approach that recognises externalities and opportunity costs.
Develop options (including a preferred option) for funding the reinvestment in natural capital, including addressing legacy issues and future opportunity costs.
Measures in place to assess the economic wealth benefits of freshwater biodiversity (and other ecosystem services) and recreational use of water.

By 2040: A demonstrable increase in economic wealth due to biodiversity protection and improvement, and increased recreational use of water resulting from implementation of the CWMS.

The chart shows the short, medium and long term work programme timing as a total for all target areas. This provides an indication of the timing or work to deliver on the 2025 goals.

Short: Programmes that need to start as soon as possible to deliver on the goals (within 1-2 years); prerequisites for other programmes.

Medium: Programmes that should start within the next 2-3 years to effect the goals.

Long: Programmes that span a long duration, have prerequisites or can be started at a later date to deliver on the goals; within 3-4 years.

All sizing in this dashboard report is based upon the count of programmes per target area. Note that not all programmes will be of equal and will vary in cost, scope and duration. Further analysis is required to more accurately assess programme size.

This chart identifies the split of programme activity type, for example, 19% of programmes are Research.
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT FOR DECISION

FILE NO and TRIM NO: GOV-07-01/190515068678

REPORT TO: Council

DATE OF MEETING: 6 August 2019

FROM: Lynley Beckingsale, Policy Analyst

SUBJECT: Policy Manual Review

1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report presents the following policies to the Council for adoption.

1.2 The policies have been updated to ensure a consistent approach making clear the scope, intent and mandate for policies of Council in a recognisable format.

1.3 Management Team Strategy has reviewed these policies, approved the changes and asked that these policies be presented to the Council for adoption.

1.4 A copy of the original policy is attached along with the updated policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCP</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5505</td>
<td>Vandalism Intelligence Reward Policy</td>
<td>Audit and Risk</td>
<td>Jeff Millward/MTO</td>
<td>review complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1040</td>
<td>Council Director/Trustee/Representation/Appointment and Remuneration Policy</td>
<td>Audit and Risk</td>
<td>Jeff Millward/Sarah Nicholls</td>
<td>review complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4460</td>
<td>Political Hoardings on Council owned or administered Land and Buildings Policy</td>
<td>Audit and Risk</td>
<td>Jeff Millward/Mike O'Connell and Shelley Milosavljevic</td>
<td>review complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachments:

i. Policies for adoption
   - Draft Vandalism Intelligence Reward Policy (Trim: 190717100229)
   - Draft Director Appointment and Remuneration Policy (Trim: 190717100234)
   - Draft Political Hoardings on Council land and buildings Policy (Trim: 190122005960)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No 190515068678.

(b) Adopts the reviewed policies:

   S-CP 5505 Vandalism Intelligence Reward Policy
3. BACKGROUND

3.1 The policy manual contains the policies that set the basis for Council decisions and procedures, approved by resolution of Council.

3.2 On 11 April 2019 these policies were reviewed by Management Team Strategy and their comments have been included.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. The majority of policies in the Policy Manual are not subject to mandatory review but Council has undertaken to review all policies every six years (or sooner on request). Those policies with a statutory review cycle are managed as they fall due.

4.2. Council policies need regular review to ensure they are fit for purpose and reflect the current environment. The following table describes the changes made to the policies during the review process:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S-CP</th>
<th>Policy Name</th>
<th>Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5505</td>
<td>Vandalism Intelligence Reward Policy</td>
<td>Updated title to reflect intent of policy. Increase of reward to $250 Excludes elected members and Council staff from claiming reward. Updated Community Outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1040</td>
<td>Council Director/Trustee/Representation/Appointment and Remuneration Policy</td>
<td>Updated title to reflect intent of policy. Remove responsibility of Audit and Risk Committee to appoint Directors because these are reviewed during a newly elected Council and it keeps these appointments consistent. Updated list of organisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4460</td>
<td>Political Hoardings on Council owned or administered Land and Buildings Policy</td>
<td>Updated title to reflect intent of policy. Length of time (9 weeks) adjusted to reflect the changes coming as part of the District Plan review. Review confirmed currency with Acts and Bylaws.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

Not sought

5.2. Wider Community

Not sought
6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

Staff time is the main financial implication of the review of these policies.

6.2. **Community Implications**

Failure to review the policies in the Policy Manual could mean policies are out of date and not a reliable basis for decision-making.

6.3. **Risk Management**

Council has asked that policies, without a statutory review timetable, are reviewed on a six yearly cycle to ensure all policies are fit for purpose. These reviews provide assurance that best practice is incorporated into the policies.

6.4. **Health and Safety**

Not applicable

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

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

7.2. **Legislation**

*Local Government Act 2002, Part 4 s40 (h), (l) and (m).*

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

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

- The Council makes information about its plans and activities readily available.

7.4. **Delegations**
POLICY

Vandalism

DRAFT VANDALISM INTELLIGENCE REWARD

21 Introduction
Vandalism degrades the image, appearance, amenities and environment in our District. It impacts both the residents’ and visitors’ sense of safety, peace of mind and enjoyment of public facilities. It incurs needless remedial costs for the Council and property owners.

32 Policy Context
Vandalism of Council property is an ongoing issue and cost to the ratepayers.

43 Policy Objective
The objective of this policy is to offer a fixed reward of $250 to the person(s) who report vandalism of Council property that results in the successful conviction or resolution of that vandalism.

54 Policy Statement
The Council operates a reward system based upon the successful conviction or resolution of vandalism to Council property with a fixed reward of $250. Council elected members and staff are excluded from claiming a reward under this policy.

Note: The term “conviction” applied to people convicted in the Court system and the term “resolution” applied to people who may be dealt with under other programmes including young people too young to appear in Court.

65 Links to legislation, other policies and community outcomes

Community Outcome:
There is a safe environment for all
- Harm to people from natural and manmade hazards is minimised
- Crime, injury and harm from road accidents, crashes, gambling, alcohol abuse are minimised
  - Our District is well served by emergency services and volunteers are encouraged.
  
  The distinctive character of our takiwa – towns, villages and rural areas is maintained
  - The centres of our towns are safe, convenient and attractive places to visit and do business.
  - Our rural areas retain their amenity and character.

76 Adopted by and date

87 Review
Review every six years or sooner on request.
POLICY

Vandalism

DRAFT VANDALISM INTELLIGENCE REWARD
1 INTRODUCTION
This policy, in accordance with Section 57(1) of the Local Government Act 2002 ("the Act"), sets out an objective and transparent process for identifying, appointing and remunerating appropriately skilled and experienced directors to Council organisations.

These appointments will be made on the basis of merit and Council will follow corporate governance best practice. Directors of Council-controlled trading organisations will be appointed on the basis of the contribution they can make to the organisation, and not on the basis of representation.

2 POLICY CONTEXT
The Council needs to be satisfied that it has appointed directors or trustees to Council Organisations, Council Controlled Organisations and Council Controlled Trading Organisations that have the skills, knowledge and experience to contribute to the governance of the organisation to which they are appointed.

2.1 Schedule of Organisations – see Appendix 1

2.1.1 Definitions

“Council Organisation” means a company or organisation in which local authorities control any proportion of voting rights or rights to appoint directors. Note: “organisation” means any partnership, trust, arrangement for the sharing of profits, union of interest corporation, joint venture or other similar arrangement.

“Director” includes company directors, trustees, managers and office holders of an organisation.

“Council Controlled Organisation” is a company or organisation in which the local authorities control 50% or more of the voting rights or appoint 50% of the directors, trustees or managers.

“Council-controlled trading organisation” is a Council-controlled organisation that operates a trading undertaking for the purpose of making a profit.

3 POLICY OBJECTIVE
The objective of this policy is to ensure the Directors appointed to Council Organisations, Council Controlled Organisations and Council Trading Organisations have the skills, knowledge and experience to contribute to the governance of the organisation they are appointed to.

4 POLICY STATEMENT

4.1 Council: Selection, Appointment and Remuneration of ‘Directors’ to Council Organisations

4.1.1 Where the Council is responsible for appointing ‘directors’, and has not delegated that responsibility to any other body, nominations for candidates to be appointed as ‘director(s)’ of a Council organisation will be received at a public meeting of the Council.

4.1.2 The Council will consider matters including the skills, knowledge, experience and interest of the candidates and decide on the successful candidate.
4.1.3 In specific instances, the Council may elect to adopt a process for the appointment of directors similar to that used by the Audit and Risk Committee for appointment of Council Controlled Organisation (CCO) Directors.

4.1.4 People appointed to such organisations are entitled to the remuneration offered by the entities to which they are appointed.

4.2 Audit Committee: Selection, Appointment and Remuneration of ‘Directors’ to a Council Controlled Organisation (CCO)

4.2.1 The Audit and Risk Committee is responsible for recommending to the Council the will appointment and allocate remuneration of directors to the following CCOs: Council Organisations:

- Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust
- Waimakariri Irrigation Limited

4.2.2 A subcommittee of the Audit and Risk Committee may be established to recommend appointments to the Audit and Risk Committee, to Council.

4.2.3 Where there is a vacancy, the subcommittee shall undertake a selection process that could include:

- Requesting curriculum vitae (e.g. through public advertising and contacting other reputable sources, such as the Institute of Directors)
- Interviewing and assessing candidates
- Reference checking

4.2.4 The subcommittee shall consider candidates’ skills, knowledge and experience when making its recommendations.

4.2.5 Where directors are offering themselves for re-appointment, the Audit and Risk Committee may, at its discretion, make recommendation direct to Council resolve continuation for a further period.

4.3 Consideration of People Required
When considering advertising and selecting a person(s) to fill a vacancy the Appointment Subcommittee will seek and consider a report from management on:

- The skills, knowledge and experience of continuing members of that organisation’s governing body;
- The business issues facing the organisation;
- Any environmental and social issues, including political issues, impacting the organisation.

4.4 Skills, Knowledge and Experience Requirements
The skills, knowledge and experience of the director/trustee may be drawn from the following disciplines:

- Legal
- Engineering/Building
- Regulatory
- Resource Management
- Asset Management
- Accounting/Treasury/Taxation
DRAFT COUNCIL DIRECTOR/TRUSTEE/REPRESENTATION APPOINTMENT AND REMUNERATION

- Strategic Planning
- Policy Development
- Marketing/Communication
- Human Resources

4.5 Attributes
It would be desirable if directors/trustees possessed:

- A knowledge of the District;
- An understanding of Local Government and the Local Government Act 2002;
- A knowledge of company or trustee law;
- A knowledge of the service/industry/sector the organisation provides or is associated with;
- A knowledge of business/governance arrangements and practices.

4.5 People unable to be appointed
The following persons would not be eligible for appointment:

- A person who is under 18 years of age;
- A person who is an undischarged bankrupt;
- A person who is prohibited from being a director or promoter of, or being concerned or taking part in the management of a company, under section 382 or section 383 or section 385 of the Companies Act 1993;
- A person who is subject to a property order made under section 30 or section 31 of the Protection of Personal and Property Rights Act 1988;
- In relation to any particular company, a person who does not comply with any qualifications for directors/trustees contained in the constitution of that organisation;
- A person who holds a substantial shareholding in a material customer of, or material supplier or professional advisor, to the organisation;
- A person who holds a senior managerial position in that organisation.

5 LINKS TO LEGISLATION, OTHER POLICIES AND COMMUNITY OUTCOMES
Companies Act 1993
Protection of Personal and Property Rights Act 1988
Local Government Act 2002

6 ADOPTED BY AND DATE
Adopted by Council on [day/month/year]

7 REVIEW
Review every six years or sooner on request.
## APPENDIX 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Appointment</th>
<th>Remuneration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council Organisations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Pest Management Liaison Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury Civil Defence Emergency Management Group (Joint Committee)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury Regional Landfill Joint Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury Rural Primary Health Organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury Waste Joint Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury Water Management Strategy: Regional Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council of Social Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Communities NZ Assessment Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injury Prevention Waimakariri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville Sports Club Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Canterbury Museum Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Canterbury Sport and Recreation Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ Red Cross Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Promotions Management Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Promotions Action Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Transport Advisory Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rangiora Airfield Advisory Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Land Transport Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sefton/Ashley and Sefton River Rating District Committee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbrook Sports Club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri Access Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri Art Collection Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri Community Arts Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri Community Development Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri Eyre/Cust River Rating Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri Environment Society Inc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri Road Safety Coordinating Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri Safe Communities Governance Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley River Rating Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Rural Water Scheme Management Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury Museum Trust Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Council appointment every 3 years. No remuneration is paid.

Council authorises Woodend-Ashley Community Board to appoint these representatives in conjunction with Hurunui District Council.
## DRAFT COUNCIL DIRECTOR/TRUSTEE/REPRESENTATION APPOINTMENT AND REMUNERATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Appointment</th>
<th>Remuneration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council Controlled Organisations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri District Libraries Trust</td>
<td>The Waimakariri District Libraries Manager is an Advisory Trustee ex-officio on this trust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Council</td>
<td>Council appointment every three years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council Controlled Trading Organisations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transwaste Canterbury Limited</td>
<td>The Council has delegated its authority to appoint directors and to carry out various other tasks as a shareholder to the Canterbury Regional Landfill Committee</td>
<td>Directors are not paid for attending meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council Organisations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury Water Management Strategy</td>
<td>Council appointment every 3 years</td>
<td>Directors’ fees paid except for Councillors and Commissioner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri Zone Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri Irrigation Limited</td>
<td>Council appointment every 3 years</td>
<td>Directors’ fees are paid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council Controlled Organisations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Kōhaka O Tūhaitara Trust</td>
<td>Council appoints 3 of the 6 Trustees of the Trust.</td>
<td>Meeting fees payable to Council appointed Trustees excluding Councillors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise North Canterbury</td>
<td>Appointments made by the Mayors of the Waimakariri and Hurunui District Councils.</td>
<td>Trustees’ can be reimbursed for expenses and receive remuneration except for Mayors and CEO’s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Director Appointment and Remuneration Policy
Adopted Council 5/2/08 Amended Council 2/10/12

GOV-07-01 lb/as
POLITICAL HOARDINGS ON COUNCIL LAND AND BUILDINGS

1 Introduction
Local authorities are responsible for regulating when, where and how signs or signage, including election signs may be displayed.

The election signs are subject to the Electoral Act 1993, Electoral (Advertisements of a Specified Kind) Regulations 2005 which permits election signs up to 3m² to be erected up to 9 weeks two months before polling election day and requires such signs to be removed by midnight the night prior to polling day. All election signage, including any signs on private fences, must be removed by midnight from all locations in the District the night prior to polling day.

These signs are also subject to the Electoral (Advertisements of a Specified Kind) Regulations 2005 which has restrictions on the size and structure of lettering to ensure that an advertisement of a specified kind does not endanger the safety of road users through reflection or dazzle, or that the sign looks like a road sign. The Electoral Act 1993 also specifies that signs shall be no larger than 3m².

The Electoral Act 1993 and Electoral (Advertisements of a Specified Kind) Regulations 2005 provisions overrides Waimakariri District Council (WDC) rules about for the size of signs or the time they may be erected or signs that apply to general election signs.

However, local body/government election signs are not covered by the Electoral (Advertisements of a Specified Kind) Regulations 2005 and Electoral Act 1993 and as such these signs are required to comply with the Waimakariri District Plan signs rules, which are maximum area of 3m², maximum height of 2m, and maximum period of erection of 8 weeks prior to the election date and is taken down within 1 week after that election date. If these requirements cannot be complied with, a resource consent would be required for the sign. However, a resource consent is needed for
- signs larger than 3m²
- signs that are up for longer than 2 months (WDC temporary sign rule permits 9 weeks)
- The Council’s District Plan rules about the number and location of signs on a site still apply.

Signs on state highways need New Zealand Transport Agency approval.

2 Policy Context
The Council receives requests from candidates to erect political signage on road reserves and Council owned land or buildings. Council must be fair and impartial to all candidates and therefore declines all requests for political signage on Council owned or leased buildings or land including the road reserve.
POLITICAL HOARDINGS ON COUNCIL LAND AND BUILDINGS

3 Policy Objective
The objective of this policy is to not have any political signage on Council owned or leased buildings or land including the road reserve.

4 Policy Statement
Requests for the use of Waimakariri District Council land, buildings or road reserve for the erection of political notice boards will be declined.

   This includes any political signage on, or connected to, an immobilised vehicle or parked trailer that is on the road reserve.

5 Links to legislation, other policies and community outcomes
The Electoral Act 1993
Local Electoral Act 2001
Local Electoral Regulations 2001
The Electoral (Advertisements of a Specified Kind) Regulations 2005
NZTA Guidelines for Managing Electioneering Signs on State Highways (SM012 State Highway Control Manual)
NZTA Traffic Control Devices Manual Part 3 January 2011 (Parliamentary electoral advertising)
Waimakariri District Signage Bylaw 2012 (under review)
Waimakariri District Parking Bylaw 2007 (under review)
Waimakariri District Plan (under review) Objectives 12.1.1 and 14.1.1

Adopted by and date

Adopted by Council [date] [month] 2019

6 Review
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1 This report is to provide an overview of the implementation of the solid waste contracts, and to inform the Council about some feedback we have been receiving about the fees for delivery and the process for cancellation of bins.

1.2 Bin deliveries began on 15 April 2019, with an initial schedule of 17,736 bins for 17,696 properties on the delivery list. Waste Management successfully delivered bins to the great majority of these properties by 28 June, with a small number of deliveries delayed owing to some property address discrepancies.

1.3 Council staff continued to record bin orders, cancellations, delivery corrections and requests to swap bins through to 3:30pm on 28 June. During the last week of June Council staff processed these calls into 1,401 service requests, which updated property rates.

1.4 All of these service requests will have been actioned by the end of July, with some bins delivered after the 12 July target. The Audit & Risk Committee approved a rebate of $1/12 of bin-service rates for any property that ordered bins before the end of June and received their bin after the target date, as the residents have not been able to use the service for more than half of the month.

1.5 New bin orders that have come in from 1 July have been invoiced for part-year charges and also a $65 delivery fee. The majority of callers have raised no objection to paying for bin deliveries in addition to the part-charges.

1.6 Bins cancelled from 1 July will be removed from the property, but are not refunded the bin service rates unless there has been an error on the Council’s part. Cancellations made between 1 July and 30 September 2019 will not incur a bin removal fee, and cancellations made from 1 October 2019 will incur a $65 bin removal fee. Some callers have expressed dissatisfaction with this policy.

1.7 Calls for bin swaps have been taken and have now started to be sent through to Waste Management, as they will be able to begin the free bin swaps in early August. This is earlier than anticipated, and the callers will be informed of the earlier delivery time.

1.8 Collections began on 1 July, and Waste Management has provided a good level of service during the first four weeks of the contract, returning to collect in the majority of cases unless
there is clear evidence of contamination, bin-lifts having been made (indicating a ‘packed’ bin), bins/bags not being presented at kerbside for collection or put out in the wrong week.

1.9 The refuse compactor change-over at Southbrook Resource Recovery Park was undertaken on the weekend of 29 & 30 June, with no drop in service for customers. The most important site signage has been updated at both Southbrook and Oxford and we will continue to refresh the signs as required. A new staff member is managing the Oxford transfer station under the new contract.

1.10 The smaller compactor at the kerbside recycling shed has been used to consolidate kerbside recycling into the large hook-load bins since May. The recycling is of better quality now it is not being stored in the pit, and larger items of contamination coming through from bin collections are being removed during the consolidation process. EcoCentral have been satisfied with the product.

1.11 Private bin collection companies have raised a number of issues due to the impact of the Council’s new service on their businesses. They have also asked a number of questions around the operation of the Council’s collection contract and transfer station operations. Staff are currently working to respond to their feedback and questions.

Attachments
i) Kerbside Bins FAQs Waimakariri District Council Website (Trim ref 190730106185)
ii) Kerbside Wheelie Bins Fees and Charges (Trim ref 190730106683)

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190724104090.

(b) Notes that around 10,660 rubbish bins and 8,400 organics bins have been delivered as part of the initial bin roll-out.

(c) Notes that 1,500 bins (8% of the 19,060 bins delivered) were requested between 1 March and 30 June 2019.

(d) Notes that a further 520 bins have been requested for 325 properties between 1 and 23 July, which are subject to a delivery charge of $65 including GST.

(e) Notes that bin cancellations will not incur a removal fee provided they are cancelled by 30 September 2019.

(f) Notes that a bin removal fee will be charged for bins cancelled from 1 October 2019 onwards.

(g) Notes that when the bin service is cancelled the bin collection rate is not refunded for the current year, and the bin collection rate will not be charged from 1 July in the following year.

(h) Notes that the 3 month “free” bin swap timeframe for requests is still in place from 1 July to 30 September 2019, but the contractor will be in a position to begin swapping bins from early August rather than the initially signalled starting date of October 2019.

(i) Approves staff continuing to charge existing approved commercial collection customers the ‘high user’ discount gate fee of $231.90/tonne including GST until 30 June 2020.

(j) Circulates report No. 190724104090 to the Community Boards.
3. BACKGROUND

Delivery of Bins

3.1 Bin deliveries began on 15 April 2019, with an initial schedule of 17,736 bins to be delivered to 17,696 properties (9,900 rubbish bins and 7,776 organics bins) based on the bin orders received by 1 March. Waste Management successfully delivered bins to the great majority of these properties by 28 June, with a small number of deliveries delayed or dropped off at the incorrect address owing to some property address discrepancies.

3.2 Council staff continued to record bin orders, cancellations, delivery corrections and requests to swap bins through to 3:30pm on 28 June. With some automation and a lot of effort from a core group of staff, we were able to process in 1,401 service requests during the last week of June so that these later bin orders, cancellations and swaps could be used to update property rates and the deliveries could be managed through the service request system.

3.3 It has taken Waste Management three weeks to process these service requests and prepare the schedules, and four weeks to undertake deliveries, removals and swaps. At the time the Council considers this report, all bins ordered by 28 June will have been delivered.

3.4 A report was taken to the Audit & Risk Committee (A&R) by Maree Harris, to seek their approval to rebate 1/12 of the bin service rates (one month’s service charges) for those properties that have received their bins after 12 July. This was approved by A&R. There are 362 properties affected by this late delivery.

3.5 Of these 1,401 requests, 986 related to new bin requests. These resulted in 1,502 more bins being delivered, approximately 8% more than were originally scheduled for delivery.

3.6 Waste Management has informed us that the final tidy up of original bin deliveries, swaps and removals will be completed before the end of August. They will begin to re-label recycling bins in the areas where collection days or weeks have changed, as from the week commencing 29 July.

3.7 Waste Management has also informed staff that they will be able to begin actioning the bin swaps that have been requested since 1 July, which is earlier than they had signalled to Council. It is likely that the bin swaps will commence as from 5 August (see 3.14-3.16 for more information).

Bin Service Requests since 1 July

3.8 New Bin requests: Between 1 and 23 July, a total of 325 calls have been made from ratepayers wanting 520 new bins. This is around another 3% more bins than previously ordered. Of these:

a. 50 are new properties requesting recycling bins: 30 of the callers wanted organics bins, 40 wanted rubbish bins, and 9 people wanted only recycling bins.

b. An additional 179 organics bins and 221 rubbish bins were requested for existing properties.

3.9 The property owners requesting new bins as from 1 July been invoiced for part-year charges (as an example bins ordered during July are charged for 11/12 of the service costs) and also a $65 delivery fee.
3.10 The new bin delivery requests are being processed through to Waste Management once the invoices have been paid, and bins are generally being delivered within 1 to 2 weeks of the service request being sent to them. Once the final tidy-up and bin swaps have been completed, new bin deliveries will be made within 5 days.

3.11 **Bin Cancellations:** A number of calls are coming in from people wanting to cancel their bins. Bins cancelled by 30 September 2019 will not be charged for the removal of bins, and bin cancellations made from 1 October 2019 will incur a $65 removal fee. However while we remove the cancelled bins, we cannot refund that portion of the rates.

3.12 One of the sections of the Local Government (Rating) Act that is causing some confusion is that rates must be set using the information in the database at the start of the rating year (1 July) and are not affected by a change in the rateable value or factors during the financial year in which the rates are set.

3.13 As at the time of writing this report 18 service requests have been raised, cancelling 12 organics bins and 16 refuse bins. Note that some people have called but decided not to cancel their bins when they hear that their rates will not be changed until the following year.

3.14 **Bin Swaps:** A total of 111 calls for bin swaps calls have been logged since 1 July. Over 94% are for up-sizes, and almost 6% are for down-sizes. As mentioned in Section 3.7 Waste Management will be in a position to begin these swaps in early August, which is earlier than they had signalled would be the case.

3.15 It is likely that the “free” bin swaps will commence as from 5 August, and we will be contacting those ratepayers who had requested bins swaps to let them know when the swaps will begin, once Waste Management has advised us of the scheduled swap dates.

3.16 The three month timeline for contacting us to arrange for a “free” swap will still apply, with the closing deadline being 30 September, with the swaps being undertaken over the next three months rather than starting in October. An additional pro-rated part-charge will be invoiced for upsizing rubbish and organics bins. Swaps requested as from 1 October 2019 will incur a $65 charge in addition to the pro-rated part-charge.

**Collection Services**

3.17 Collections began on 1 July, and Waste Management has provided a good level of service during the first four weeks of the contract, returning to collect in the majority of cases unless there is clear evidence of contamination, bin-lifts having been made (indicating a ‘packed’ bin), or bins/bags not being presented at kerbside for collection or put out in the wrong week.

3.18 A total of 96 service requests related to uncollected bins or bags were received between 1 and 23 July. Waste Management returned to collect missed bins or bags as recorded in 68 of the requests, and some of these returns were to properties putting rubbish bags and bins out on the wrong week and where the residents requested a return. Another 25 requests did not result in a return to collect for a number of reasons: 10 were out late, 7 were lifted but did not empty out (classed as a packed bin), 6 were out on the wrong week, 1 was an early call and one bin was contaminated. One request has not recorded what the final resolution was.

3.19 Some members of the community have raised questions about the operation of the services including the length of the trucks, their steering and ability to manoeuvre in cul-de-sacs and roundabouts. We are investigating the issues that have been raised, with Waste Management and other Council teams.
Facilities Operations

3.20 The most important site signage has been updated at both Southbrook and Oxford and we will continue to refresh the signs as required, particularly the recycling signage to make it clearer what can go into each bin, skip or container to reduce customer confusion.

3.21 Southbrook RRP: The refuse compactor change-over at Southbrook Resource Recovery Park was undertaken on the weekend of 29 & 30 June. The change took longer than scheduled owing to unanticipated issues, however the level of service provided at the site was not impacted.

3.22 Waste Management have been using the smaller compactor at the kerbside recycling shed to consolidate kerbside recycling into the large hook-load bins, which are back-loaded to EcoCentral, since May. Removing the recycling from the pit has resulted in less cross-contamination of these materials and more space is available in the pit. Larger items of contamination are removed from the kerbside materials during loading so that the quality of recycling being sent to EcoCentral from kerbside bins has improved.

3.23 Oxford transfer Station: the previous transfer station operator retired at the end of July, and one of the staff from Southbrook RRP has been assigned to run the site.

3.24 Rural Recycling Drop-Off Trial: The trial of a rural recycling drop-off facility was included in the Waste Management & Minimisation Plan (WMMP), which was adopted in July 2018.

3.25 We have begun a trial of a rural recycling drop-off facility at Cust, after strong advocacy and support for this facility from the Cust Community Network. The drop-off facility is sited behind the Cust Hotel, and we have obtained the necessary resource consent, a formal agreement with the owners of the Hotel, and a variation to the facilities operations contract for the supply and transportation of bins.

3.26 The bins and signage were in place on 26 July and the CNN organised a celebration on 28 July, which the Mayor and Cr. Brine attended. The members of the CNN have also offered to keep an eye on the facility to ensure it is not being misused, and will help the Council with education of local users.

3.27 The trial will run for a year and we will be able to use the findings from this to determine if this is a cost-neutral way to manage recycling from residents from the greater Cust area, and if it has been successful in increasing diversion while reducing pressure at the other Council facilities.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. Bins ordered before 1 July and delivered after 12 July: A report was taken to the Audit & Risk Committee (A&R) by the Customer Services Manager, to seek their approval to rebate 1/12 of the bin service rates (one month’s service charges) for those properties that have received their bins after 12 July. This was approved by A&R. There are potentially 360 properties affected by late delivery.

4.2. New Bin requests: Some of the 320 callers wanting new bins have expressed dissatisfaction with being charged for bin deliveries, particularly as they consider that the initial bin rollout was ‘free’. The Council approved recovering the costs through a delivery charge in the 19/20 Annual Plan because the rubbish and organics services are opt-in user-pays services.

4.3. We have informed these callers that the initial up-front supply and delivery costs for the number of bins we specified in the contract (which was tendered late last year) was
included for in the contract. Further we were able to update final numbers in early March without incurring any extra costs, and Waste Management is delivering all bins ordered up to end of June under that initial bin roll-out cost, at no extra cost to ratepayers.

4.4. However Waste Management has since had to order in more bins and parts (lids, wheels, etc.) since March to cater for the expected growth and demand, which is higher than Council had forecast. These bins have been transported from the manufacturing plant in Auckland, and Waste Management has to store, assemble and deliver the bins.

4.5. Waste Management is charging us a set rate for bin delivery as from 1 July 2019, so any bins that have been requested since 1 July 2019 are provided at an extra cost to the Council.

4.6. The financial implications of the high demand for bins are discussed in Section 6.1 below.

4.7. Bin Cancellations: Some people have been unhappy with the Council not being able to refund the rates for cancelled bins. Each request for us to provide a refund or adjust and restrike the rates is looked at individually, and where there seems to have been a genuine error we are able to correct that, however where someone has changed their mind the Council is unable to refund them or rebate their rates.

4.8. Bin Swaps: individuals requesting bin swaps between 1 July and 30 September will not incur a ‘bin swap’ charge. Bin swap-ups will have a part-year price differential charged by invoice (the difference between the higher ‘rate’ and the current rate will be pro-rated for the remainder of the year). Swap-down rates will not be refunded.

4.9. Bins swaps requested as from 1 October 2019 will be charged the bin-swap fee and part-charges where these are applicable.

Impacts of New Council Services on Private Collection Companies

4.10. Representatives from several private bin collection companies have raised a number of concerns about the impacts that the Council’s new bin collection service has had on their companies. These companies have all lost a number of customers, they have surplus bins to get rid of, they have had to lay off staff, and the value of their businesses have been lost.

4.11. They have also asked a number of questions around the operation of the Council’s collection contract and transfer station operations. Staff are currently working on a response to these questions, and are following up about the operational matters that have been raised.

Discounted Refuse Fees for High Commercial Users

4.12. The Council offers a discount for high-users of the Southbrook transfer station that do not utilise the resource recovery area. This was calculated on a tonnage basis, with customers disposing of between 1,000 and 2,000 tonnes being eligible for a small discount and those disposing of 2,000 tonnes or more of refuse being eligible for a higher discount.

4.13. The 19/20 Annual Plan budgets included an increase of $6.90/tonne for refuse gate charges to fund the higher landfill disposal and refuse transportation charges that had been signalled by Transwaste. The refuse charge for all weighed vehicles increased to $266.30/tonne, and the high-user discounted refuse rate was increased to $231.90/tonne.

4.14. All account holders were alerted to the proposed changes to gate fees in May and June 2019.
4.15. Staff have taken the approach of maintaining the high-user discount for private operators in the 19/20 financial year, although a number of these companies may not achieve their previous refuse disposal figures because of the impacts of Council’s new collection services on their businesses. The current budgets were prepared under the assumption that the discounted gate fee would still apply to those companies that were receiving the discount prior to 1 July 2019.

4.16. This report seeks approval from the Council to continue charging those companies that were previously receiving the high-user discount, the discounted gate fee of $231.90/tonne including GST until 30 June 2020.

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

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

Groups and organisations have been consulted about the collection services when the Waste Management & Minimisation Plan was reviewed and during the last Long Term Plan, as part of the SCP’s for both of those documents.

5.2. **Wider Community**

The wider community has been consulted about the collection services when the Waste Management & Minimisation Plan was reviewed and during the last Long Term Plan, as part of the SCP’s for both of those documents.

Two letters were sent to all owners of properties within the kerbside collection areas: we asked them to make their bin choices in August 2018, and to confirm or change their choices in February 2019.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

**Delivery Charges.**

As per the contract we are being charged for delivery of each bin. Council has approved that we charge one delivery fee when one or more bins are delivered to a property at the same time. The Council also incurs administrative costs associated with taking and generating new bin, bin swap and bin removal requests.

The delivery costs include assembly and delivery costs. These include travel costs, putting wheels, lids and address label in place, and scanning the RFID tag(s) and registering the bins to a specific property.

The indicative costs and income for bin deliveries to date and forecast to end of year are tabulated on the next page.

Final bin numbers have been estimated by modelling that the demand for bins will halve from current levels in August, will halve again in September and remain at that level for 2 months, halve in November and remain at that level for 2 months and then drop to a steady 50 bin sets delivered per month for the remainder of the financial year. If bin demand does not ease off as modelled the costs will be higher.
The budgets indicated a $388,000 operating surplus in the first year, which was based on a reasonable bin demand and on delivery fees being charged on a user-pays basis. We are still projecting a surplus of $308,600 but if the bin demand continues at a higher level than projected operating costs will be higher than projected and this would reduce the surplus.

### Tonnage and Market Risks

There is still uncertainty around the tonnages that the Council will collect from the bins, and also in the recycling market, both of which could impact on the total costs for the collection account in the current financial year.

If tonnages are higher than estimated, disposal charges will be higher than budgeted for the 19/20 Annual Plan.

If recycling market prices fall further, and if acceptance criteria are tightened further which results in higher processing costs, the Council will be charged more for our recyclable materials to offset these financial impacts on the processor.

### Bag Sales

Bag sales have had a steep decline during July, and it is uncertain if this is just a temporary blip or an indication in the number of households that have moved from bags to bins. Income from sale of bags fund collection and disposal costs, and a drop in bag sales will result in an equivalent decrease in income.

### Financial Risks

The budgeted surplus provides a reasonable level of funding to manage the risks described above.

We will be better able to quantify these costs and refine the Solid Waste budgets in future financial years.

### 6.2. Community Implications

The new kerbside collection services are a significant and important service, which have been implemented after the Council carried out public consultation for the Waste Management & Minimisation Plan and the 2018-28 Long Term Plan.

### 6.3. Risk Management

The contract, which is based on NZS 3917, clearly shares risk between the Council (as Principal) and the Contractor, and the risk share is based on standard industry practice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>To date</th>
<th>To end of year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of properties</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>1,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of bins</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>2,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue from user-pays fees</td>
<td>$18,400</td>
<td>$78,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs</td>
<td>$29,200</td>
<td>$157,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deficit recovered through targeted collection rates</td>
<td>$10,900</td>
<td>$79,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.4. **Health and Safety**

The contractor has an extensive H&S plan, which has been reviewed by staff. Staff will also continue to monitor the contractor’s H&S performance and standards over the term of the contract.

The new vehicles have a range of new features to improve health and safety for the collectors and the public. The rubbish collector still has to exit the truck, which is a low entry vehicle, and lift rubbish bags to about waist height to place them into a ‘tub’. This is attached to a hoist that lifts the bags into the truck hopper so that the driver does not have to throw the bags. However manual handling is still one of the higher H&S risks in the contract.

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

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

7.2. **Legislation**

Local Government Act 2002

S78: Requires local authorities to give due consideration to the views and preferences of persons likely to be affected by, or to have an interest in, the matter.

S79: outlines the responsibility of local authorities to achieve compliance with (S77 and) S78 that is largely in proportion to the significance of the matters affected by the decision.

Waste Minimisation Act 2008

S42: Requires territorial authorities to promote effective and efficient waste management and minimisation within their districts.

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

**k. Core utility services are provided in a timely and sustainable manner**

- Council sewerage and water supply schemes, and drainage and waste collection services are provided to a high standard. 1,4
- Waste recycling and re-use of solid waste is encouraged and residues are managed so that they minimise harm to the environment. 1,3,4

7.4. **Delegations**

The Council has the delegated authority to consider the matters raised in this report.

Kitty Waghorn
Solid Waste Asset Manager
Kerbside Bins FAQs

Questions & Answers

These Q&As help to explain the kerbside collection service.

Making a Choice

Can I change the type or size of my bin? Is there a cost?

We will be able to make changes to bin sizes from early August (2019). If you do want to change the size of your bin let us know during the first three months of the contract (Jul-Sept) and we will arrange to have the bin swapped at no charge to you. After the initial three month “free swap” period there will be a pick-up/ delivery fee when bins are exchanged or surrendered. Refer to the fees and charges list for the cost of bin changes.

Is there a limit of one bin per property?

There will be a limit of one rubbish bin per rateable unit (or dwelling). A second 240L organics bin is available on application to properties that already have one 240L organics bin.

What can I choose if I have a granny flat on my property?

If you have filled out a multi-dwelling declaration form telling us that the second dwelling or granny flat is not let, you will only get the choice of one bin for rubbish and/or one bin for organics for the dwelling you occupy. If the second dwelling is occupied you will be able to choose a bin or bins for that dwelling provided a kerbside collection rate is also paid. (Note: organics bins are not available in Ohoka/Mandeville/Swannanoa.) The base kerbside recycling collection rate includes the costs Council incurs around managing the contracts, administration, etc.

What will happen if I didn’t order any bins?
You won't get any additional bins and you won't be rated for the extra service. If you want to order bins contact Customer Services by email to office@wmk.govt or phone 0800 965 468. You can order online at https://www.waimakariri.govt.nz/services/rubbish-and-recycling/kerbside-collections/order-kerbside-bins. You will be asked to pay a fee to cover the cost of the service for the remaining part of the year and a delivery fee. The bin charges will go on your rates from the following 1 July.

How do I know how big my recycling bin is so that I can compare it with others?

If you lift the lid of your recycling bin, the size may be etched on the top lip of the bin. The 240L organics bin has a serial number starting with WK. The new 80L and 140L bins have the bin size etched on the top lip of the bin.

Delivery

When will the bins get delivered?

Bins will be delivered within two weeks of your invoice being paid. We will let you know when the bins have been scheduled for delivery and the service request number.

Will the bins be left on the street?

The bins will generally be left at the kerbside outside your property and each bin will have an address label indicating the property it belongs to.

What do I do if my bins are not delivered?

If your bin doesn’t get delivered on the day we’ve advised it would be, contact Customer Services by email to office@wmk.govt or phone 0800 965 468 and we will check on progress.

Change of Ownership

If my property changes hands, can the new owner choose something different?

The choice you have made will remain in place for the property. If the property sells during the year and the new owner requires different bin options they will be able to change the bins but rates for the property will not change until the start of the following rating year. If this request is made within 3 months of the change of ownership there is no pick-up or delivery cost for the first change. Any subsequent request to change will incur the pick-up/delivery cost. Any change to a larger volume bin will require payment of the difference between the charges for the bin being surrendered and the new bin.

Can I take the bins with me when I leave?

The bins belong at the property, so you must leave the bins on the property when you move out. If you have an enhanced recycling service and you are moving, talk to Customer Services about what you can do with the enhanced service. The enhanced organics service will be cancelled if you move to another property.
What happens if I move into a property with no bin?

Please check that there is a recycling bin on-site before you buy or move into a property that's within the collection area, and that it is the right size for you. If there isn't a bin on-site you'll need to speak to the seller or landlord to make sure the bin is replaced before you move in, otherwise you'll be charged for the bin replacement. The presence of rubbish or organics bins will depend on the previous owner's choices. If there are rubbish or organics bins at the property the cost for these collections will be included in your rates. You may swap the bins once without a delivery fee for a three month period after the property ownership changes (possession date) but the rates won't change until the start of the following rating year. Any subsequent request to change will incur the pick-up/delivery cost. Any change to a larger volume bin will require payment of the difference between the charges for the bin being surrendered and the new bin.

What happens if I am moving into a newly built house?

Contact Customer Services by email to office@wmk.govt or phone 0800 965 468 to order bins for the property. We charge for a recycling collection service so you will need to order a recycling bin as a minimum. Rubbish and organics bins are optional. You can also order online at https://www.waimakariri.govt.nz/services/rubbish-and-recycling/kerbside-collections/order-kerbside-bins. You will be asked to pay a fee to cover the cost of the service for the remaining part of the year and a delivery fee per set of bins. The bin charges will go on your rates from the following 1 July. (Note: organics bins and rubbish bag collections are not available in Ohoka/Mandeville/Swannanoa.)

Service

What can I put in the organics bin?

Food waste including fruit, veges, meat, bones and fish, bread, pastries, flours, coffee grinds and tea bags, dairy products, garden waste including cut flowers, prunings, cuttings and branches less than 7.5cm in diameter, leaves and grass lawn clippings (as long as they haven't been sprayed with herbicides containing Clopyralid, such as Versatil), human and animal hair, and food-soiled cardboard containers, paper towels and serviettes. The bin lid will have a sticker inside that shows what can and cannot go in the bin, and more information about the new service is available at waimakariri.govt.nz. Kerbside collection reminders and information is available on our new web tool, sign up at https://rethinkrubbish.waimakariri.govt.nz/s/#reminder

How often will rubbish and organics be collected?

Organics will be collected weekly. Recycling and rubbish bags and bins will be collected fortnightly on alternate weeks. Kerbside collection reminders and information is available on our new web tool, sign up at https://rethinkrubbish.waimakariri.govt.nz/s/#reminder

Rubbish gets smelly after a week, why is it only collected fortnightly?

There shouldn't be too much in your rubbish bin that smells if you put all of your food waste into the organics bin (which is collected each week). If you do have meat trays and plastic wrap with blood in them, you can freeze them until your collection day.
Nappies with faeces (poos) should not be put in the bin – scrape or rinse the poos off into the toilet before you put your child’s nappies into the rubbish bin.

Have you changed what you take in recycling?

We’ve been advised by Eco Central that as from 1 July 2019 they won’t accept supermarket carry bags, flimsy plastic packaging like biscuit trays or drink cartons in our kerbside recycling (Eco Central process all our kerbside recycling). We will advertise any further changes in the papers, and at waimakariri.govt.nz

I live in Ohoka/Mandeville/Swannanoa and I have a recycling bin. Will I be able to use rubbish bags? Will I be able to get a rubbish bin, or an organics bin?

You have the option to get a rubbish bin collection service, but not a bag collection. At this stage we’re not planning to provide an organics collection to the properties in your area because we don’t expect there to be much demand for it given the rural nature of this area.

I live in Ohoka/Mandeville/Swannanoa and I (or the previous property owner) opted out of the recycling collection. Will I be able to opt in and get a recycling bin and rubbish bin? Will I be able to just get a rubbish bin?

If your property is inside the collection area boundaries, you can opt into the Council’s collection service for both kerbside (recycling) collection and rubbish bin collection. You can’t just opt into the rubbish service, you will have to pay rates for both recycling and rubbish collections, as the base kerbside recycling collection rate includes the costs Council incurs around managing the contracts, administration, etc.

Why can’t I get a 240L rubbish bin?

Our bag and bin audits showed us that 60% of rubbish can go into the mixed organics bin, and another 9% could go into the recycling bin – that doesn’t leave a lot of rubbish. We’re trying to encourage waste minimization and that’s why we’re offering 3 different sized bins for mixed organics and only the small and medium sized bins for rubbish.

How much am I allowed to put in my bin?

The maximum weight for any bin is 70 kg. The bin most likely to be too heavy is your green bin. Note soil is heavy; knock it off before you put weeds in your bin. Distribute weight by placing heavier items at the top of the bin.

How Much Does it Cost?

If I didn’t make a choice for bins earlier, what will it cost to join up now?

If you order bins now, it is unlikely that these will be delivered in time for the charges to be included on your rates for the new financial year that starts on 1 July 2019. Prior to bin delivery, you will be asked to pay a proportion of the cost of the service for the number of months remaining in the financial year and a delivery charge will apply for orders after 14th June 2019. An invoice will be produced and the bin delivery will be arranged after payment is received. The annual cost (to be confirmed by the Council in June) is included in the list of fees and charges.
**Why do I have to pay a bin delivery/pick up fee?**

The Council is charged a fee for bin deliveries/removals and this is passed on to customers. The alternative would be to increase rates to cover delivery fees. There is one delivery/pick up fee per set of bins delivered to a property at one visit. Refer to the list of fees and charges for the current delivery/pick up fee.

**If I change my mind during the year, do I get my rates refunded?**

No, the laws that allow the Council to collect rates do not permit changes to the rating base during a rating year unless there has been an error. Adjustments in rates take effect from the start of the next rating year. This means that rates may not be taken off or added during the year. If the bin is sent back before October 2019 the pick up charge will be waived. After October 2019 the pick-up charge will be payable.

**What will the fees be for stolen bins?**

If you call about a stolen or missing recycling bin within 24 hours of it going missing (usually that’s before 5pm on the day after the collection day) you won’t be charged for a replacement. If the call comes after that 24 hour period there is a charge, depending on the size of bin. Refer to fees and charges. The final bin replacement price is set annually by the Council.

**Do I get a refund of the price of any rubbish bags that I no longer need?**

No, the Council will not be buying back unused rubbish bags. You are still able to use these in addition to your bin.

If you have any questions that aren’t answered here please email our Customer Service Team, in the first instance office@wmk.govt.nz or call on 0800 965 468.
## Kerbside Wheelie Bins Fees & Charges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATE OR FEE DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>PROPOSED AMOUNT FOR 2019/20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kerbside collection annual rate (excluding Ohoka, Mandeville, Swannanoa Collection area)</td>
<td>$103.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerbside collection annual rate in the Ohoka, Mandeville, Swannanoa Collection area</td>
<td>$93.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish collection annual rate 80 litre bin</td>
<td>$95.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish collection annual rate 140 litre bin</td>
<td>$125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organics collection annual rate 80 litre bin *</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organics collection annual rate 140 litre bin *</td>
<td>$110.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organics collection annual rate 240 litre bin *</td>
<td>$160.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Joining the service during the year, fee is invoiced pro-rata depending on the number of months left until 30 June*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATE OR FEE DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>PROPOSED AMOUNT FOR 2019/20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish 80 litre bin (fee pro rata during the year)</td>
<td>$95.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish 140 litre bin (fee pro rata during the year)</td>
<td>$125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organics 80 litre bin (fee pro rata during the year)</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organics 140 litre bin (fee pro rata during the year)</td>
<td>$110.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organics 240 litre bin (fee pro rata during the year)</td>
<td>$160.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling service 80L, 140L or 240L bin (fee pro rata during the year)</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bin Replacement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATE OR FEE DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>PROPOSED AMOUNT FOR 2019/20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>240 litre bin</td>
<td>$135.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate or Fee Description</td>
<td>Proposed Amount for 2019/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140 litre bin</td>
<td>$123.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 litre bin</td>
<td>$112.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bin Upsize - Rubbish</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80L to 140L (fee pro rata during the year)</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bin Upsize - Organics</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80L to 140L (fee pro rata during the year)</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140L to 240L (fee pro rata during the year)</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80L to 240L (fee pro rata during the year)</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bin Downsize – Rubbish or Organics</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no refund of rates or fees if a bin is downsized during the year, however, there is no delivery/removal fee charged on the first request to down size a bin.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enhanced Recycling Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional 240L recycling bins by arrangement - annual fee invoiced July-June (where there is already at least one 240L recycling bin allocated to the property), plus delivery fee. This service is not available in Ohoka, Mandeville, Swannanoa.</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enhanced Organics Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One additional 240L organics bin by arrangement – annual fee invoiced July-June (where there is already one 240L organics bin allocated to the property), plus delivery fee. This service is not available in Ohoka, Mandeville, Swannanoa</td>
<td>$160.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RATE OR FEE DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>PROPOSED AMOUNT FOR 2019/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery or Removal Charge</td>
<td>$65.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Per bin or set of bins delivered to or removed from a property during the same visit is added to the fees above.

Please note:

1. The kerbside organics and rubbish bag collection services are not available in the extended Ohoka, Mandeville, Swannanoa Collection Area.
2. The delivery or removal charge is waived where there is a change in the level of bin service within 3 months of possession date in a change of property ownership.
3. The delivery or removal charge is waived where a rubbish or organics bin is being downsized during the year.
4. Pro rata charges mean that a proportion of the charge will be made that is equivalent to the proportion of the financial year remaining (the number of months left).
5. For 3 months after the service introduction on 1 July 2019, no fee will be charged for bin swaps or cancellations.
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT FOR DECISION

FILE NO and TRIM NO: ADM/09 /190725104186

REPORT TO: Council

DATE OF MEETING: 6 August 2019

FROM: Simon Markham, Manager Strategy & Engagement

SUBJECT: Local Government Excellence Programme (LGEP) – Second Assessment

SIGNED BY: Local Government Excellence Programme (LGEP) – Second Assessment

1. SUMMARY

1.1 The Local Governance Excellence Programme CouncilMARK™ is an independent assessment designed to improve the public's knowledge of the work councils are doing in their communities and to support individual councils to further improve the service and value they provide.

1.2 The Waimakariri District Council is a participant in the programme, with its first assessment taking place in March 2017. From that assessment a number of 'recommended areas for improvement' were suggested. This report provides the Council with an update on progress with those improvements.

1.3 The Council has recently been contacted as the second round of CouncilMARK™ assessments are due to take place in 2020 and we have been offered March 2020. The Council needs to decide if it wishes to take up that offer.

Attachments:
   i. CouncilMARK™ Assessment Report March 2017 (181030126654)
   ii. LGEP Recommended Areas for Improvement 2017 – Updated as at 30 June 2019 (190719102017)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190725104186.

(b) Notes the work that has been progressed in relation to the recommended areas for improvement, intended to be substantially completed by March 2020.

(c) Advises LGNZ it is recommending to the incoming Council that it take part in a second assessment in March 2020.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 The CouncilMARK™ programme incorporates an independent assessment system that assesses how councils are performing and the work they're undertaking to grow the value
they deliver. Councils receive an overall performance rating from an Independent Assessment Board and commentary on their performance.

3.2 The CouncilMARK™ programme is best described as a measure of performance assessment and continuous improvement that assists councils to deliver top service and value to their communities.

3.3 The four programme priorities cover:
- Governance, leadership and strategy.
- Financial decision making and transparency
- Service delivery and asset management.
- Communicating and engaging with the public and business.

3.4 The provision and communication of the performance assessment “rating” is not the end-game, rather the focus is on a long-term lift in council and sector outcomes, performance and reputation.

3.5 The CouncilMARK™ programme incorporates a set of performance measurement principles, an over-arching performance framework and a set of underlying performance indicators that will guide the team of independent assessors.

3.6 The four priority areas were derived from public and business feedback from the New Zealand Local Government Survey 2015.

3.7 The CouncilMARK™ local government excellence programme is a system designed to demonstrate and improve the value and services of councils by measuring indicators across four priority areas. Participating councils are assessed by independent experts every three years and given an overall rating from triple AAA to C.
4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1 From the March 2017 assessment we received a AA rating in the Assessment Report received in October 2017 – Strong grades in most priority areas (Attachment i). Our overall performance for each of the four programme priorities were marked as:

- Leading Locally: Stand out
- Investing money well: Performing well
- Delivering what’s important: Better than competent
- Listening and responding: Performing well

4.2 To date 31 Councils have signed up for the programme with one other Council also achieving the AA rating - Greater Wellington Regional Council. All other participants fall into an A rating, B-BBB, and 1 CCC.

4.3 Since receiving the report that included 21 identified areas for improvement, staff have been progressing over the last 18 months a range of improvement initiatives. An update on these is included as Attachment ii. It is intended that all recommended areas for improvement be completed by the time of the second assessment. Many of these remain ongoing and overall this approach is a useful focus for continuous improvement.

4.4 As indicated above LGNZ have sought expression of interest in completing a second three yearly assessment in March 2020. Considerable preparation is required in a planned way for the assessment; that engages with elected members, external stakeholders as well as staff across the organisation.

4.5 As regards timing, Management Team are comfortable with what is proposed insofar as later in the year will be disrupted by the accommodation upgrade project. It would be preferable to have the assessors visit in March while the Draft Annual Plan is out for consultation. The Management Team have reviewed this report and support the recommendations.

5 COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1 Groups and Organisations

The views of external stakeholders on the Council’s performance are part of the assessment.

5.2 Wider Community

It is expected that the first results from the 2019 Customer Satisfaction Survey will be available by mid-March 2020.

6 IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1 Financial Implications

The cost for the second CouncilMARK™ assessment will be $18,500+GST plus assessor disbursements. This is similar to that of the first assessment and can be funded from within existing approved budget.

As part of the ongoing support for continuous improvement, it now includes an onsite debrief workshop with the lead assessor to ensure council has the opportunity to understand and utilise the report in its continuous improvement planning.
6.2 Community Implications

The assessment findings are useful in focusing Council’s improvement efforts with positive community benefits arising. Assessment results that reflect well on performance can assist in community confidence in their Council.

6.3 Risk Management

No specific risk issues have been identified. A downgrading could however, be seen as a reputation risk, but so too could an upgrading have a beneficial outcome in this respect.

6.4 Health and Safety

No specific implications.

7 CONTEXT

7.1 Policy

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

7.2 Legislation

Local Government Act 2002

7.3 Community Outcomes

To varying degrees all of the Council’s strategic objectives (Community Outcomes) are relevant to this exercise.

7.4 Delegations

This is matter for the Council to decide.
Waimakariri District Council

Independent assessment report | October

An independent assessment report issued by the Independent Assessment Board for the CouncilMARK™ local government excellence programme. For more information visit www.councilmark.co.nz

*Period of assessment March 2017
The Waimakariri district is expecting continued rapid growth yet retains its rural/small town character.

The current situation

Waimakariri District Council is a medium-sized, high-growth council emerging from the rebuild that has followed the Canterbury earthquakes. In addition, approximately 10,000 people have moved into the district since the earthquakes, with a further 8,000 forecast to move there over the next seven years. As a result, some substantial issues have emerged.

Competition over resources and priorities for development has built up between Rangiora, Kaiapoi and Woodend. Notwithstanding the significant capital investment which has occurred post-earthquakes, particularly in infrastructure, there continues to be strong demand for further investment in local facilities.

Transport solutions are needed to ensure the district remains a viable commuter suburb, with 42 per cent of the workforce now commuting to Christchurch.

Period of assessment

The assessment was conducted on 13 and 14 March 2017.
Key learnings

The Council needs to be responsive to the pace and timing of change expected by its community relative to its own plans. It will need to complement its good face-to-face service ethic by being more digitally engaged with its community and by providing the technology infrastructure necessary to support increased online communication and services.

> With the on-going volume of work and public expectation, the Council will need to continue to refine and improve its processes for prioritising, managing and reporting projects across the entire organisation.
> The good work undertaken in re-establishing the Council’s infrastructure network can be used in detailed strategic planning to deal with the potentially large impact of increased regulatory requirements as well as community and Māori/Iwi expectations in relation to the environmental issues posed by drinking water, stormwater and wastewater management.
> Having experienced rapid growth, the Council will need to ensure it benefits from the current district development strategy process to deliver a clear vision of the future shape and character of the district.

1. MBIE 2016
2. Stats NZ Census 2013
3. DIA 2013
4. Ministry of Transport 2013/14
Waimakariri District Council has demonstrated leadership and vision for the recovery of its district following the 2010 and 2011 Canterbury earthquakes. This has been achieved through careful financial management and reinvestment in critical infrastructure. The Council recognises it needs to increasingly shift its focus to the future in order to tackle the key issues facing the district.

**Findings**

- **THERE IS STRONG AND COHESIVE LEADERSHIP ACROSS THE ORGANISATION, PARTICULARLY FROM THE MAYOR AND THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE, THAT HAS RESULTED IN THE COUNCIL EMERGING FROM A POST-EARTHQUAKE RECOVERY PERIOD WITH A STRONG AND UNITED ORGANISATIONAL CULTURE.**

- **ASTUTE FINANCIAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT HAS ENSURED SOUND REINVESTMENT IN INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS OVER THE PAST SIX YEARS, AND THE COUNCIL HAS COMPLEMENTED ITS STRONG INTERNAL FOCUS ON OPERATIONAL DELIVERY WITH GENERALLY HIGH STANDARDS OF COMMUNITY SERVICE AND ENGAGEMENT.**

- **THERE IS STAFF CAPABILITY IN THE MAJORITY OF SERVICE AREAS, BUT ROOM FOR IMPROVEMENT IN THE STRATEGY AND EXECUTION OF ITS REGULATORY SERVICES, AND THERE IS RECOGNITION OF THE NEED TO “CATCH UP” IN THE DELIVERY OF ONLINE SERVICES AND COMMUNICATION.**

**Commonly used terms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asset Management Plan</td>
<td>A tactical plan for managing a council’s infrastructure and other assets to deliver an agreed standard of service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Local and regional roads, pathways and cycleways, drinking water, wastewater and stormwater assets, sports and recreation facilities (parks, sportsgrounds, green spaces etc), community and tourism facilities (playgrounds, public toilets, libraries, museums, galleries and public art etc), town centres, and other facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Act 2002</td>
<td>The legislative act that provides a framework and powers for councils to decide which activities they undertake and the manner in which they will undertake them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Plan</td>
<td>The document required under the Local Government Act that sets out a council’s priorities in the medium to long-term.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Council has presented comprehensive and compelling visions, first for recovery and more recently for the district’s future growth.

The Council’s leadership and management have been highly effective in taking the district from a period of earthquake recovery into a new era of growth and development.

The Council’s financial and infrastructure strategies are comprehensive and well integrated, and are focused on medium to long-term issues.

The Council maintains a strong spirit of partnership in all its engagements with Māori/Iwi and the community.

The Mayor and Chief Executive clearly understand and act in their respective roles and understand they are different.

The Council should provide its community with simpler, more understandable financial information.

The Council needs to obtain greater clarity on how the community sees future affordability issues, especially given the prospects for continuing growth.

Greater capability should be developed in the use of business cases and in project governance and reporting.

The Council’s website and wider digital capability require enhancement.
Leading locally
Governance, leadership and strategy

With its district development strategy, the Council is transitioning effectively to a more expansive long-term vision for the future which tackles all the key issues it faces. The vision is supported by well-aligned and cohesive political and executive leadership.

Priority grading

Stand out

Like other Canterbury territorial authorities, the Council has been strongly focused on earthquake recovery for the past six years, and consequently priorities have been more short- to medium-term rather than long-term.

There are some differences of opinion amongst stakeholders whether the long-term vision for the district should have been more substantively refreshed during the recovery period, but steps are now well-underway within Council to set that vision.

Setting the direction for the community

The Council acknowledges it is nearing the end of the post-earthquake recovery, having spent much of the past six years on repairing critical infrastructure. The community had extensive input into the Council’s vision and strategy in 2009, and it is going through a more fundamental review in advance of the 2018-28 Long Term Plan. The leading document for this review is Our District, Our Future – Waimakariri 2048, which sets out the district development strategy.

The Long Term Plan has four key components to its strategic direction, which is focused on earthquake recovery and prudent financial management. While the direction is conservative and fiscally focused, councillors were quick to highlight its underlying community goals. One councillor described the vision as “more of the same” – preserving the “small town” feel and values which have attracted people to the district.

External stakeholders were generally positive about the vision and leadership provided by the Council over the past six years, but they expressed a desire to see more visionary thinking on issues such as developing community facilities and enabling the district to retain its youth. The future vision expressed in Waimakariri 2048 provides this more expansive view: “The Waimakariri district is a great place to live, visit, work and play in – a self-sufficient, culturally diverse and sustainable place with well-connected and attractive urban and rural living environments ... and abundant community facilities and green spaces that excite our people and encourage participation.” It is a comprehensive and well-focused summary of the issues being raised about Waimakariri’s future.

The work priorities within the Long Term Plan and the Annual Plan are strongly linked to the immediate vision of recovery, reinstatement, and careful management of finances to ensure ongoing affordability. The Chief Executive’s performance agreement is well aligned to the direction set by the current Long Term Plan, as are the Māori/Iwi principles which have been developed “to assist in achieving community outcomes and create better understanding for staff and managers across the organisation.”

Creating confident councillors

The Council is particularly thorough in the information it provides to prospective councillors, and it has an extensive induction and training programme for newly elected councillors. In the lead-up to the 2016 local body elections, all candidates were given a comprehensive 64-page guide. Once elected, councillors receive a very full guide to working within the Council, including role descriptions for the Mayor, the Deputy Mayor, the committee chairs and councillors.

The induction process is extensive, balancing formal presentations from staff with tours of the district that give a practical perspective on the Council’s activities. There is a budget for ongoing training, although the Mayor noted “we under-use the training budget a bit.”

There are no formal self-review processes for councillors. The lack of formality reflects the very effective and constructive working relationships that exist, rather than a disinclination to ensure that there is some process for self-reflection.
Effective working relationships

It was evident from observations during the assessment and from comments by external stakeholders that the Mayor and the Chief Executive have an outstanding working relationship which is illustrative of the positive working relationships within the Council more generally. The Mayor and the Chief Executive have similar working styles and both are recognised for their understated manners and their drive to serve their community. The Mayor’s participation in executive management meetings, although unusual, illustrates the trust and confidence that exists within the Council’s working relationships.

The Chief Executive’s performance plans and annual review process are thorough, and it is evident that councillors hold the Chief Executive in high regard. The review process includes an independent facilitator, which adds objectivity and transparency.

Strengthening risk management

The Audit and Risk Committee has existed for 20 years. It has some powers delegated to it, including the powers to review, monitor and recommend to the Council. It has limited decision-making powers on rates issues and the writing-off of bad debts.

The Code of Conduct was last revised in 2010. Its detail on probity issues such as conflicts of interest and sensitive expenditure is limited. It has minimal explanation of non-monetary interests and little recommended action in relation to these. There is no register of interests, which is a gap that should be addressed.

The Audit and Risk Committee does not have an independent member, and a majority of councillors voted against appointing one in February 2017. The minority view was that independence provided transparency, lent objectivity to decision-making, and provided the public with greater confidence. The majority view was that “we’re elected to make decisions and the public don’t want paid people making decisions for us.” The Mayor acknowledged there are strong arguments either way, and considers that the Council should re-address this issue at the start of each new term.

The Council has extensive health and safety processes and information, including a review schedule of policies and documents, a work plan for the year and an annual survey of staff. While there is good statistical reporting to the staff committee on health and safety, the latest (February 2017) report to the Audit and Risk Committee was light on detail, being primarily a commentary on actions to improve health and safety rather than a report on statistical information or trends.

Managing the organisation

An internally developed staff “climate” survey was conducted each year from 2004 to 2008, and has been conducted every two years since then. It surveys staff views on issues such as remuneration, the quality of performance management and communication. There is good tracking of trends, with many of the issues surveyed showing improvement over the years. There is an annual action plan resulting from the survey, although it is relatively brief in detail. The Council recognises the need to increase the focus on organisational development issues and, subsequent to this review, it has confirmed that the survey is to be conducted annually again. Objective input from independent human resources professionals may assist this process.

Strengths

The Council’s strategy is well focused and has led it effectively through the post-earthquake recovery.

The Council has an expansive post-recovery vision that embraces a strong community focus, while continuing to ensure high standards of financial responsibility.

The Council’s internal values are aligned with its vision.

There is an extensive and interactive induction process for councillors.

The Mayor and the Chief Executive have a highly cohesive working relationship. Both clearly understand and act in their respective roles and understand their roles are different.

The organisation’s culture is healthy and strong.

Areas for improvement

The Council would benefit from additional structure provided for councillors’ professional development.

The Council and its committees should undertake annual formal self-reviews.

Risk reporting could provide more analysis of the trends towards improving the health and safety culture.

The Council should revisit the question of having an independent member on the Audit and Risk Committee.

The Code of Conduct should contain a register of members’ interests, and should have greater clarity and detail on managing conflicts of interest.
Investing money well
Financial decision-making and transparency

The Council has excellent financial management and a long-term strategic perspective on expenditure which has enabled rates increases to be well-managed through the post-earthquake recovery. The cost of future regeneration plans will need continued vigilance, particularly to ensure affordability issues are addressed for those on fixed incomes.

Priority grading
Performing well

<Although the long-term vision for the district has not been substantively changed during the earthquake recovery period, the Council has been taking a long-term view of their financial planning throughout this time.>

The earthquake has necessitated an unprecedented level of financial investment in the district, but it has been done with both the immediate and long-term needs of the community in mind.

Planning and evaluating financial goals

The Council has a strong financial strategy, which reflects the care with which it has managed the district’s finances over the past six years. This strategy looks beyond the 10 years of the Long Term Plan, noting that the following 20 years will continue to be influenced by population growth and the demand for additional infrastructure. The links between financial strategy, infrastructure strategy and overall vision are important in the success of the Council’s planning and delivery.

The strategy clearly identifies the most critical factors that will influence spending over the period of the Long Term Plan: the continuation of the rebuild, the impact of continued growth, investment in community facilities, expenditure on stormwater mitigation and planning for natural disasters. This last factor highlights the care taken by the Council in its financial planning. It recognises that there is a moderately high possibility of further damage from earthquakes and, as a result, its ability to borrow may be restricted. Accordingly, it maintains capacity in its budget to address these possible costs. This is a very conservative, but arguably prudent, approach, and reflects the forward thinking that the Council brings to its strategy.

The finance team acknowledges that rates affordability could become an issue, particularly for the district’s older population. The team has done some initial work on superannuitant incomes relative to rates. However, while the Council makes significant use of targeted rates to allocate costs fairly, it is unclear at this stage whether individuals in all sections of the community will be able to easily afford the projected levels of rates increases.

Assessing the financial data

The finance team is experienced and capable, and it produces a very thorough range of financial information. There is full compliance with statutory reporting requirements, and comprehensive information is provided to the Audit and Risk Committee and to the full Council. There is a robust development contributions policy, which ensures that significant growth costs are met by those who create these costs.

The finance team recognises that its next step is to “add value” to the financial reports by better identifying business costs, and providing real-time reports. Although the budgets are not zero based, a balanced budget has consistently been delivered. The Long Term Plan notes that there will not be a balanced budget from 2017 onwards because of the level of funding required for depreciation.

One area of concern is that financial planning documents and budget processes do not express or address cost-efficiency or opportunities for savings. The finance team has acknowledged that there is room for improvement, and that they have been “somewhat intuitive” in how they looked at cost-effectiveness,
and noted that “we could do it more smartly.” It was stated that “the pressure around the council table hasn’t been strongly focused on savings. There’s an envelope of what’s palatable and we spend within it.” While the financial results produced do not suggest poor spending, the budgets would benefit from being zero based or from having cost-efficiencies identified as part of the development and finalisation of budgets.

**Addressing financial risk**

Risks are documented in the risk register provided to the Audit and Risk Committee, and Council reports provide information on risk issues as a matter of course. A Treasury policy outlines the Council’s appetite for risk in relation to its financial activities.

The risk register is relatively thorough, with risks categorised and scored. But the presentation of the risks could be improved. It is not clear what specific control measures have been taken for adjusting the risk scores, and the detail provided on a given risk and its controls are relatively generic. For example, “political” risk has “Code of Conduct” as a mitigation action, but there is no detail on what this achieves or whether it is reviewed for effectiveness.

**Meeting financial targets**

Given the scale of costs incurred from the earthquake, the Council is in a very sound financial position. While debt levels are relatively high, and growing, they are off-set by the district’s growth and its relatively low levels of deprivation. The Council has an AA credit rating and is well within benchmarked limits in terms of servicing its interest costs. Its ratio of debt to total assets, as well as its debt control, is also within benchmarked limits.

The Council’s membership of the Local Government Funding Authority ensures it obtains the most competitive interest rates. It maintains healthy surpluses, which will fund future renewals. Its level of capital expenditure on essential services, which is 176 per cent of its depreciation costs, is significantly above the required benchmark of 100 per cent.

**Being clear and transparent**

The Council is transparent in the sense that it provides all the financial information it is required to provide. But some of that transparency is lost in the way the information is presented. For example, the explanation of the Council’s targeted rating system runs to 14 pages of text and tables that are not likely to be read by many people in the community. While this detail and volume is required for legislative purposes, the essential information could be explained much more succinctly.

The summary version of the Annual Report presents key financial information in a table with no explanation of the terms used. The variances between budget and actual also have a minimal level of detail. Accessibility of the financial information could be improved by following the example set by the councils that provide their communities with brief summaries and make greater use of charts, graphics and non-technical language.

**Strengths**

Despite six years of significant earthquake-recovery costs, the Council is in a strong financial position.

The Council’s financial strategy is comprehensive, well explained, and very long term. It balances community wishes against fiscal responsibility, and is well integrated into the infrastructure strategy.

The Council’s financial management team is very capable.

Financial reporting is comprehensive.

**Areas for improvement**

The Council needs to have a clearer picture of whether rates affordability will become an issue for some groups in the community, for example people on fixed incomes (pensions).

The Council should develop a risk policy, with the risk appetites in relevant areas clearly stated beyond that provided in the Treasury policy.

There needs to be clearer and more specific risk reporting, and a focus on strategic risks being reported to the Audit and Risk Committee, especially without an independent chair.

The Council would benefit from explicitly identified cost-efficiencies in budgets and financial reports.

Financial information should be made more accessible to the community through simpler presentation and explanations.
Delivering what’s important
Service delivery and asset management

The Council is managing its infrastructure assets well, and is unifying its financial management and asset management systems. Its community services are well delivered, with an eye to greater cost-efficiency and community involvement. However, the performance of its regulatory functions is variable.

Priority grading
Better than competent

< The Council performs very well in several aspects of asset management, and has good knowledge of its assets and their condition. The Council is aware its asset knowledge could improve, and data mobility would assist in this. Asset management is integrated with financial management, although maintenance schedules are still spreadsheet based. >

Since the earthquakes, there has been a high rate of infrastructure investment from which the Council is emerging. It is now focusing on managing incremental growth in its networks. However, both its business planning and project management skills need developing. There are very significant uncertainties, particularly in stormwater and wastewater management, which are becoming apparent in the Canterbury region.

The Council stands out in its ability to work with others. It is an active participant in regional forums, and works with neighbouring councils in joint procurement. However, its regulatory performance is mixed and there are conflicting internal and external views on the management of resource and building consents. The Council take an innovative approach to community facilities and their management. The Council has managed the costs of sports fields well by working with the clubs in the district to determine both the level of maintenance undertaken and who does it. For example, line marking and rubbish removal is carried out by clubs themselves, and they advise their members directly on the state of the fields. Astro-turf is used to enable higher levels of use, and provides a more economic option compared to buying additional land.

The Council took the opportunity following the earthquake to rebuild or extend Council community facilities to meet changed and growing needs. Some of the redesign is particularly innovative, including the redesign of the Kaiapoi library to include an arts space, a community space as well as client service desks. Sports facilities are developed in collaboration with other councils acting within the greater Canterbury region.

Assessing capability and capacity

The Council has 16 supplies for drinking water, which service from 40 to 8,000 connections. The larger plants are well managed and maintained. The Council acknowledges the smaller water supplies pose challenges for meeting and maintaining drinking water standards. All supplies comply with the Bacteria Treatment Standard. Nine out of 15 systems comply with the Protozoa Treatment Standard, and the Council is looking for full compliance over the next two years.

The discussions around water have triggered a review that is assessing a change from targeted rates to a district-wide rating. There is relatively little knowledge whether there is significant water loss due to leakage, but water metering is not proposed as a way of managing demand (because there is ample supply). Although the Council does not inspect drinking water reticulation, it has a robust maintenance schedule, keeps records on its burst pipes, and undertakes criticality assessments.

The Council’s stormwater management will be challenged on several fronts, especially given the growing numbers of “life-style
block” landholders. There are issues around the capacity of existing catchments, particularly in Rangiora. Inflows into (and infiltration of) the wastewater network after heavy rain is a significant problem that needs addressing. The Council recognises this, and it is a high priority for capital expenditure. It also recognises that stormwater treatment is a growing issue for the community. It is prioritising capital investment accordingly.

The Council has confidence in its wastewater asset information, with 10 to 15 per cent of the network viewed by CCTV. The most critical or oldest parts of the network are inspected, and around five per cent of the network is reviewed each year. Overflows into areas of water are infrequent (approximately two in five years), and there are approximately 15 overflows onto land each year. The Council is addressing pipe capacity issues to limit future overflows. In one area, it exceeded e-coli levels in a sand bed, which it corrected with further work. It is waiting for a report on another area. The marine outfall has had some asset durability and maintenance issues. The issue of discharging treated wastewater into the sea is likely to remain an issue for the community.

The Council recognises that managing growth well depends significantly on a reliable and resilient transport network and is working constructively with NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) and the Christchurch City Council on options for achieving this. It is adapting well to the NZTA’s One Network Road Classification, and works to maintain its network cost-effectively through a single contract with a private company.

Addressing regulation

The Council has no enforcement strategy for its regulatory responsibilities and has not determined how to balance the two tools it uses for compliance (education, and enforcement through infringement notices or prosecutions). There are only limited (response timeliness) measures for assessing the performance of the regulatory services. This could be improved by performance measures aimed at improving community safety (eg reducing the number of dog attacks).

Resource and building consent issues are managed in an integrated way. However, stakeholders consider the decision-making for consents to be opaque, inconsistent and time consuming.

Planning for land use (“spatial planning”) is being re-examined in a considered and competent way in partnership with other councils in the greater Canterbury region. Two major issues are township development and the balancing of “life-style block” activities against more traditional rural activities.

Meeting capital-investment goals

Infrastructure investment is dominated by a bottom-up engineering oriented perspective. Although some capital projects (eg the indoor courts facility) have undergone feasibility studies, there is no comprehensive and consistent use of formal business case methodologies.

The delivery of capital projects is an area for improvement. Project management disciplines are being increasingly used across the infrastructure team, although they are still to be introduced for the entire organisation. The Council has recognised the need to address this, along with ensuring that all projects are reviewed, audited and reported to the executive and elected members.

**Strengths**

- The Council demonstrates strong and strategic asset management that informs its infrastructure planning.
- The Council’s asset registers are aligned with its financial management system.
- The Council’s financial strategy, asset management strategy and risk planning are integrated.

**Areas for improvement**

- There needs to be improved knowledge of the Council’s infrastructure assets, particularly asset condition.
- Digital devices need to be used more extensively, so that databases can be updated in real time.
- The Council would benefit from establishing an enforcement strategy that creates priorities within its regulatory activities (particularly animal control) and that manages risk better.
- To ensure accountability, there should be public reporting on the outcomes of all major projects, with details on timeliness, cost and scope.
- Capital projects need to be developed and delivered using appropriate levels of expertise in business case planning, and in project management and governance.
Listening and responding
Communicating and engaging with the public and businesses

The Council’s face-to-face engagement and communication is very good, and its relationship with Māori/Iwi is excellent. However, more comprehensive communication and media strategies are needed, particularly in the use of social media and other digital communication.

Priority grading
Performing well

< The Council’s communications and engagement strategy is variable. It excels in direct face-to-face communication. >

However, it does not have a published digital strategy, although it advises that work is underway on consolidating its work in this area. Its website is significantly out of date in terms of both its presentation and the transactions it offers, although it again recognises the need to prioritise further development.

Planning effective engagement
The Council communications staff acknowledged that they were “on the launching pad for improving digital communication” and are now open to improving digital channels, after what was a low priority during earthquake recovery. There has been some initial success with Facebook, and views of its Facebook videos are strong. A development proposal involving the Kaiapoi River received more than 18,000 views. Email and text have been used to alert users about a bridge under repair, but neither medium is used systematically. The website is due for an upgrade. There are other gaps, such as an inability to text residents, and a heavy reliance on the local newspaper for issuing notices. The Council has identified its digital engagement strategy as one of the 13 enablers of the Council’s revised strategy.

Communicating through the media
There is very close engagement between the Council and the local media, and media stories related to the Council appear to be balanced and generally constructive. The Council has a page in the local paper advertising its notices and events. It responds quickly to questions or issues though a range of spokespeople. The Chief Executive and the Mayor both participate in a regular weekly media briefing.

Building relationships with Māori/Iwi
Engagement with Māori/Iwi is outstanding. There is a regular meeting with representatives of the local Iwi, Ngai Tahu Runanga, which includes their resource management advisors. Māori/Iwi feel listened to and have seen positive action by the Council, so there is a high degree of trust.

There are annual planning hui which the full Council attends with the venue alternating between the Council building and the marae.

Building relationships with the community
Through its community services group, the Council is very successful in connecting with more than 300 disadvantaged or vulnerable groups in the community. This includes networks that focus on important local themes such as domestic violence, refugees and alcohol. Initiatives are networked across community groups and with the Police, Women’s Refuge, etc. Youth is a strong focus, and community assets such as the library and the pool are used actively for community connection.

Engaging with the community
There has been strong community engagement, particularly on issues arising from the earthquake. This engagement was led by the Mayor and the Chief Executive, and their strong leadership performance through that difficult period now resonates positively with the community.

The quality of printed communication could improve, particularly in the Council’s statutory documents such as the Annual Plan. Although infographics are used, it is difficult for a household to identify how much it spends and how it compares with other households.
Complaint mechanisms need to be reviewed. There are delays in the Council’s response times, and it is not clear whether systems or process issues are causing these delays.

Communicating when there’s a crisis
In addition to the usual avenues of radio, print and telephone, Facebook is increasingly used as the alert mechanism for an emergency. The Council earned particular praise for its “door-knocking” in the period after the earthquakes as every household was visited. The Council would benefit from using text messages for alerts that are less crucial (eg a “boil water” notice) that would otherwise challenge the Council’s ability to visit every household.

Building relationships with business
Businesses generally have a positive view of the Council but this is dominated by the relationships formed with the Mayor and the Chief Executive, who are regarded as accessible, reasonable, practical and focused on solutions. In some of its regulatory activities, particularly consenting, the Council is viewed as risk-averse, inconsistent and lacking a commercial understanding.

Strengths
The relationship with Māori/Iwi is one of trust, built through active engagement and changes in behaviour.

There is extensive community engagement, with supportive leadership from the Mayor and the Chief Executive.

The Council puts considerable effort into making face-to-face contact, particularly in emergency situations.

Areas for improvement
The Council needs to establish a media and communications strategy.

The Council must develop its digital capability, so that more of its business can be transacted online and more of its communications can be delivered through texts, emails, social media, etc.

The CouncilMARK™ local government excellence programme is a proprietary programme operated by Local Government New Zealand (utilising independent assessors). The rating given to a council is an independent assessment of that council’s performance in certain areas, as at the time the rating was given. LGNZ does not accept any liability to any person whatsoever in relation to any rating, or the council’s participation in the programme. For more information visit www.councilmark.co.nz
## Local Government Excellence Programme (LGEP)
### Recommended Areas for Improvement in 2017 – Management Commentary as at 30 June 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Improvement Recommendation</th>
<th>Update to 30 June 2019</th>
<th>Actions to complete/final comments</th>
<th>Status as at June 2019</th>
<th>Resp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.   | The Council should provide its community with simpler, more understandable financial information. | **Agreed** – the Council can learn from other examples and experiment to improve the accessibility and understanding of financial information.  
**Actions to date** – Recent Annual Plans/Annual Report summaries, and the LTP Consultation Document have been introduced/simplified with this in mind, including clearer indication of where rates are spent.  
Also the online Rating tool indicating a property’s prospective rates and how they are spent has been introduced. Other Councils have shown interest in this tool. It costs $10K per annum to maintain. | **Proposed further actions** – Canterbury Shared Services Group utilising Deloittes to undertake a project to determine good practice in financial information presentation.  
Continue to improve on the disclosures made and the means of communicating their key messages. | On Target | Jeff |
| 2.   | The Council needs to obtain greater clarity on how the community sees future affordability issues, especially given the prospects for continuing growth. | **Agreed** – while we will receive feedback about the affordability of the Annual Plan/LTP through the consultation process, the Council can consider more targeted engagement about affordability of services outside of the LTP process and benefit from undertaking broader analysis of the wealth of our community and the impact rates have on disposable incomes.  
**Actions to date** - An additional measure was added into the LTP benchmarking affordability. The engagement about kerbside collection services prior to the LTP is an example of targeted engagement about a significant service/cost proposition. | Council’s self-imposed policy limits constrain expenditure and the local government prudence reporting regulations assists community awareness of affordability. The Infrastructure and Financial Strategies identify growth projections and funding mechanisms. | On Target | Jeff |
Greater capability should be developed in the use of business cases and in project governance and reporting.

**Agreed** – A Business Case approach has been implemented for roading projects. This can be used across the Council in other areas. Project governance and reporting arrangements have been established for some major projects and these can be implemented organisation wide.

*Actions to date* – Draft Justification Form, and Justification Process developed. Being considered by Capital Works Subgroup of the Asset Mgt. Steering Group. After consideration, it will be incorporated into Quality docs, and used for all future capital works justification.

Senior Policy Planner is assessing completeness of documentation supporting capex in current LTP; will prepare retrospectively for >$250k projects. Major U&R projects in the 18/19 year have a business case; e.g. a business case has been prepared for the AMIS project and the Waste Assessment and Waste Management Plan constitute a business case for the waste services project.

**Proposed further actions** –

PDU are developing a ‘Project Risk Analysis’ that considers project complexity, size, risk, and community interest etc., aimed at design and procurement decisions (i.e. once an agreed capital project is being planned). It is proposed to:

- Extend the Project Risk Analysis to cover ‘Funding Requests’, to provide pathways for different levels of project complexity;
- Develop a ‘Business Case’ methodology to be used for funding requests, right-sized for different complexities;
- Ensure that appropriate levels of ‘Project Governance’ and ‘Project Management’ are included in the business case;
- Ensure all proposed 19/20 projects are established under this process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nearly</th>
<th>Gerard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|   | The Council’s website and wider digital capability require enhancement. | Agreed – a review of the overall navigation structure of the website given the way people interact with it and the amount of information it now provides access to is appropriate. In addition within the framework of the Business Improvement Strategy determining the way forward on e-Services from this point and the actions necessary to further enhance the ability for customers to complete Council service transactions online is appropriate.  
**Actions to date** – A digital communications framework is being progressed including a communications survey of the community.  
An e-Services strategy has been developed and the initial implementation project, confirming a corporate approach to the payment gateway is underway.  
An upgrade of the Council’s intranet is also underway. This includes establishing and upskilling ‘Super Users’ across the organisation. | Proposed further actions – In light of these three projects a review of external website navigation and information architecture is appropriate as a key project for 2019/20. | On Target | Simon |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|   | The Council would benefit from additional structure provided for councillors’ professional development. | Agreed – We can prepare a development plan for each Councillor and community board member for the term of each Council.  
**Actions to date** – A programme is being developed that separates the individual development of an Elected Member as opposed to more routine induction. | Proposed further actions – Until the new Council and Boards are elected there is only benefit in identifying a universal induction programme. This is a standard template identifying induction and typical conference and courses e.g. meeting procedures/standing orders; EM webinars from SOLGM and LGNZ; chairing a meeting; Good Decision Making for RMA hearings; Rural Provincial and Zone 5 LGNZ meetings; NZ Traffic Institute (Trafinz); China representation and training; NZ Community Board Conference.  
A discussion and development plan would be established with each elected member post-election and would be dependent on previous experience and/or portfolios to be undertaken. | On Target | Jeff |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The Council and its committees should undertake annual formal self-reviews.</th>
<th>Agreed – It is good practice to periodically review 'how we are going' in a structured way and self-review could be facilitated to enable each elected body to consider its own performance in terms of 'what's working/what's not'.</th>
<th>Proposed further actions – Something further to be developed/considered by the new Council, in terms of the self-review/survey/workshop.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Behind</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Risk reporting could provide more analysis of the trends towards improving the health and safety culture.</th>
<th>Agreed – We need to understand what dimensions of H&amp;S culture can be meaningfully captured and reported.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On Target</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The Council should revisit the question of having an independent member on the Audit and Risk Committee.</th>
<th>Agreed – This is accepted best practice.</th>
<th>Proposed further actions - The Council will next consider this following the 2019 election.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The Code of Conduct should contain a register of members’ interests, and should have greater clarity and detail on managing conflicts of interest.</th>
<th>Agreed – This is accepted best practice.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The Council needs to have a clearer picture of whether rates affordability will become an issue for some groups in the community, for example people on fixed incomes (pensions).</th>
<th>Agreed – Actions to date – We receive feedback about the affordability of the LTP through the consultation process. The Council considers affordability through more targeted engagement about services outside of the LTP process.</th>
<th>Proposed further actions – Undertaking broader analysis of the wealth of our community and the impact rates have on disposable incomes to be completed to be available for consideration in 2020 through the 2020/21 Annual Plan and the preparation of the 2021-31 LTP. Will be informed by findings from the March 2018 Census to be released in late 2019.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Behind</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Financial decision-making and transparency**
<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>11.</strong></td>
<td>The Council should develop a risk policy, with the risk appetites in relevant areas clearly stated beyond that provided in the Treasury policy.</td>
<td>Agreed – <em>Actions to date</em> – The Council adopted in March 2018 a Risk Management Policy (Framework) that outlines Council’s philosophy and appetite for risk.</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12.</strong></td>
<td>There needs to be clearer and more specific risk reporting, and a focus on strategic risks being reported to the Audit and Risk Committee, especially without an independent chair.</td>
<td>Agreed – The Risk Management Framework will focus risk reporting on key risks and mitigation actions. <em>Actions to date</em> – Periodic risk register and health and safety risk reporting to the A&amp;R Cttee. A Tax Risk Governance Framework has been established.</td>
<td>On Target</td>
<td>Jim/Jeff/Liz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13.</strong></td>
<td>The Council would benefit from explicitly identified cost-efficiencies in budgets and financial reports.</td>
<td>Agreed – the options analysis in reports to the Council provides the opportunity to present more information about cost-efficiencies where this is relevant to the matter being considered. <em>Actions to date</em> – Budget reports related to the draft Annual Plan and LTP consider potential cost savings that usually relate to options regarding levels of service. Periodic reports to the Council consider savings e.g. All of Government for Electricity savings.</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Jeff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14.</strong></td>
<td>Financial information should be made more accessible to the community through simpler presentation and explanations.</td>
<td>Agreed – see Item 1. above</td>
<td>Proposed further actions – Enhanced quarterly summary information and a website section that provides summary updates is in preparation.</td>
<td>Behind</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 15. | There needs to be improved knowledge of the Council’s infrastructure assets, particularly asset condition. | Proposed further actions –  
- Roll out the Tech One AMIS system, including capturing mtce. costs, mtce. schedules, and inspections  
- Capture inventory and asset condition info for 3 Waters headworks and facilities  
- Procure and implement ‘Infonet’ CCTV storage system  
- Map out a better process for incorporating vested and built assets  
- Prepare an improved basis for programming CCTV inspections of both S/W and WW  
- Undertake sampling and testing of watermains to improve water reticulation asset condition  
- Continue to improve collection of field data into asset system. | Behind Gerard |

Agreed - The Draft Activity management Plan and Draft Infrastructure Strategy set out a programme for improvement in this area. We use criticality as well. Criticality feeds into how we prioritise the schedule into investigating asset condition. If low criticality then it’s not so important.  
Actions to date -- Roading has a very good understanding of asset condition and this is used to drive the maintenance and renewal programme. For sewer a CCTV programme has been established to survey every pipe every 20 years. Currently pipe burst history has been used as a proxy for assessing water main condition.  
A sampling programme is allowed for in the LTP to allow for sampling and testing of water mains.  
A targeted CCTV programme is being developed for storm water assets.  
Procured an organisation wide AMI System, agreed a data structure.  
Developed and implemented a robust Criticality assessment methodology  
Largely prepared an ‘in-field’ data capture system to be used by water unit  
Completed retrieval of lost CCTV data from suppliers.  
Progressing with AMIS implementation. Have completed config. companion, work order structure, and now completing end-to-end testing. Loading up mtce schedules. Go live date now pushed back until mid Oct.  
AMPs - AMP subgroup is prepping a programme for IS/AMP/LTP, to be considered and incorporated into people’s work load.  
AMP Improvement Plans - AMP subgroup is prepping a single ‘tracking tool’ to monitor progress on tasks across Council.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>16. Digital devices need to be used more extensively, so that databases can be updated in real time.</th>
<th>Agreed – the Business Improvement Strategy identifies Mobility as a key business driver. Actions to date – The mobility strategy is currently being deployed throughout Council Units. The Greenspace, Environmental services and Water Units have made significant progress on the collection of information real time in the field. The AMIS project commencing which will further enhance our real time and reporting services.</th>
<th>Jeff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Council would benefit from establishing an enforcement strategy that creates priorities within its regulatory activities (particularly animal control) and that manages risk better.</td>
<td>Agreed – Staff consider that a more appropriate name is &quot;compliance strategy&quot; with the objective of helping people to comply. The regulatory team already works to legislation, council policy, SOPs and best practice. Actions to date – The compliance strategy would encapsulate these and also provide a vehicle for review, ensure alignment of approach across the teams and enable checks and balances that appropriate decisions are being made at the right time. The team has already begun work on this. It is also apparent that other councils are interested in this project.</td>
<td>Proposed further actions - Canterbury Chief Executives have set up a regional compliance, monitoring and enforcement working group. This is a Canterbury wide working group to develop a compliance strategy with the objective of strengthening links between policy and implementation so that compliance with rules is clearly seen, to ensure there is sufficient staff capacity and staff are appropriately trained, and that processes are made as uniform as possible across the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enforcement Strategy commenced. Prosecution panel in place. Panel included independent Manager or local Snr Police Sargent to help provide objectivity to the decision.</td>
<td>On Target</td>
<td>On Target</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|   | To ensure accountability, there should be public reporting on the outcomes of all major projects, with details on timeliness, cost and scope. | Agreed – this work is being developed through our capital reports template and Contracts database where standard reporting extracts could be provided onto the Council website. *Actions to date* – The Contracts software once deployed will be capable of storing and providing public reporting. For this LTP we compiled information on a CAPEX template that provides this information as a prerequisite that needs a bit of thought how we then transition over to the Contract software, so that it is the Councils central information portal. The LTP will contain this key information and the post reporting done through the Annual Report. Developed a Capital Works reporting template for use at Audit and Risk Ctte level, senior management level, and asset manager level. Includes Council wide and Activity Summary sheets, Council wide and Activity spend profile, Activity overview sheet, details on carry-overs, and programme Capital Works monitoring spreadsheet has more recently been further developed and is being updated monthly by individual asset managers. A quarterly report is being prepared for A&R Committee, and an interim monthly report showing changes submitted to Management Team. The 19/20 programme has been programmed on a monthly basis with a specific monthly capital spend budgeted Still need to progress Contract Completion Reports being on Council website. | Proposed further actions –  
- Refine the Capital Works reporting template to ensure the information presented is clear and provides the info required to assess the delivery of the capital works programme  
- Ensure project budgets for the 2019/20 FY are established with appropriate monthly cash flow projections  
- Provide contract completion reports on Council website |    | Nearly There | Gerard |
|   | Capital projects need to be developed and delivered using appropriate levels of expertise in business case planning, and in project management and governance. | **Agreed** - The Project Delivery Unit has capability and capacity to provide a service to the wider Council. This includes taking responsibility for ensuring appropriate capability and standards for project and contract management organisation wide business case approach is already well established for the roading programme and significant projects. **Actions to date** – This is already being implemented for the 3 Waters capital works programme. A PCG governance structure is currently used for major works. There is an opportunity to improve the governance and reporting for the capital works programme and for more projects within the programme. A project is underway to improve contract and project management across the Council. This involves the use of business process mapping, training and formalised processes. PDU have looked at implementing Aconex as a tool to capture contract information in one place. They will look at using Tech One to do this but can’t foresee this being implemented for at least 2 years. Established an Asset Management Steering Group to assist with the establishment of annual budgets, and review and comment on any reports requesting changes to the project timeframes or budgets. A draft Capital Works Procurement Plan has been developed, and is being circulated for review. A draft timeframe for populating the CWPP has been developed for discussion. Procurement for the important projects on the 2019/20 capital programme will be populated into the form, and it will be used universally in prep for next FY. | **Proposed further actions** –
- Develop an agreed business case process, governance process, and project management process, for funding requests for different levels of project (i.e. minor, med, significant)
- Ensure the agreed process for Business case and project governance is formalised, and implemented for 20/21 FY
- Identify any projects of concern to the Council in 18/19 and in the 19/20 A/P request, and ensure appropriate actions are taken
- Complete review of Aconex and make decision | Nearly | There | Gerard |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Communicating and engaging with the public and businesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 20. | The Council needs to establish a media and communications strategy.  
*Agreed* – we have number of media and communications policies that need review and consolidation into an overall strategy.  
*Actions to date* – A Digital Communications Framework Project in progress. This has been broadened to address wider media and communications. is  
*Proposed further actions* – In light of the framework under development, remaining policies will be rationalised  
|   | On Target  
|   | Simon |
| 21. | The Council must develop its digital capability, so that more of its business can be transacted online and more of its communications can be delivered through texts, emails, social media, etc.  
*Agreed* – See item 1 above.  
*Actions to date* – Have successfully developed and trialled / used the Council Customer Contacts database. Information guidance on ‘Bulk Mail Out’ utilising the database developed.  
|   | On Target  
|   | Simon |
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FILE NO and TRIM NO: EXC-34-20 / 190723102734

REPORT TO: Council

DATE OF MEETING: 6 August 2019

FROM: Jim Palmer, Chief Executive

SUBJECT: Health and Safety Report to Council July 2019

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to update the Council on Health and Safety matters for the month of July.

Attachments:
  i. Discharging Officer Health and Safety Duties
  ii. July 2019 Health and Safety Dashboard Report

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No 190723102734

(b) Notes that there are no significant Health and Safety issues at this time, and that WDC is, so far as is reasonably practicable, compliant with the PCBU duties of the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1. The Health and Safety at Work Act 2015 requires that Officers must exercise due diligence to make sure that the organisation complies with its health and safety duties. Discharging Officer Health and Safety Duties for WDC is outlined in Appendix 1.

2.2. An officer under the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015 is a person who occupies a specified position or who occupies a position that allows them to exercise a significant influence over the management of the business or undertaking. Councillors and Chief Executive are considered to be the Officers of WDC.
3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. There are 11 new work-related incidents in this report, 1 of which requires further investigation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Occurrence</th>
<th>Event description</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17/06/2019</td>
<td>Property or Vehicle</td>
<td>Worker struck a 2 pair house-feed communications cable with their shovel during initial pothole to identify services. Water Unit have discussed with Chorus, who advise that their drawings don’t show cables from their roadside connection box to house. Water Unit have next tried using cable location CAT scanners to pick these fine cables up, with little success. In most cases Chorus route these cables directly from their roadside junction boxes directly into property, however in this case they’ve run it inside an existing open trench that another contractor had open, then routed into the homeowners property.</td>
<td>Water Unit management have talked about taking greater care when exposing services by hand digging, however the size of this 2 pair cable is such that it’s difficult to “feel” with a shovel, let alone see, as they’re of a size that there’s little resistance when pressure is applied. Water Unit is trying to come up with a solution to prevent reoccurrence, however progress is challenging. MONITOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/06/2019</td>
<td>Injury</td>
<td>Worker was in their office and got up from their desk to go and meet with their manager and tripped over their bag handle under the desk with arms full. Worker fell into the door and hit their right jaw.</td>
<td>Worker was preparing to leave the office with tablet and papers in their hands, when their foot got caught in a handbag strap and they tripped and hit jaw into the edge of the door. Contributing factors were being in a rush, having hands full and not placing their bag appropriately away. A recurrence can be prevented by taking better care of placing belongings away properly and being more aware of surroundings when moving around the office and potential hazards. CLOSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/06/2019</td>
<td>Near Miss</td>
<td>Worker was at an event at Loburn Domain and nearly slipped over in the toilets, as the fog came in the louvre windows and the painted floor is like an ice skating rink.</td>
<td>The floor is a painted concrete floor in an older condition. The combination of all factors: older floor surface, moisture from fog or cold weather, dirt from rugby activity make the floor susceptible to being slippery in a variety conditions for a variety of reasons. Greenspace have assessed the floor condition and noted it is fairly aged and dirty. Greenspace will get the floor professionally cleaned (water blasted) and investigate capital interventions (repainting or adding vinyl). CLOSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/06/2019</td>
<td>Lost Time Injury</td>
<td>Sprain to left ankle. Worker had two days off work for ankle to recover.</td>
<td>Cause of accident was his ankle twisting when walking. Worker has advised there was no contributing factors, with the ground being dry and level at time of accident. Worker believes that this type of accident would be hard to prevent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Case Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24/06/2019</td>
<td>Near Miss Regeneration</td>
<td>Backing out laneway outside Ashley building, worker had a near miss with a toddler on a trike. Worker didn’t see him scoot behind my car while backing - only saw him as they got to the road side and his mother ran up to him telling him off saying &quot;I told you to stop!&quot;.</td>
<td>Child was scooting way ahead of mother but was so little was impossible to see. Recurrence can be prevented by not using service lane, or turn car around (back in), and always use reversing cameras. Further advice sought from Roading team regarding use of service lane. H&amp;S to send advice to staff to use cameras and always back in to where they are stopping. OPEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/06/2019</td>
<td>Property or Vehicle Damage Water Unit</td>
<td>The bowl of the Water Unit towable concrete mixer fell off in the live traffic lane while being towed behind the tip truck (787). A truck that was travelling behind stopped and blocked the live lane to allow him to retrieve the bowl (he had put his hazard lights on before exiting the vehicle). Investigator has asked supplier to check the unit to see if there was an assembly issue, as it was a relatively new piece of equipment.</td>
<td>Response from supplier investigation: In order for the bowl to detach from the mixer there are three fasteners that need to loosen/undo. There is a left hand threaded bolt that secures the bowl axle to the machine and two grub screws that are primarily stop the axle spinning but these do assist with securing the bowl. For all three of these to come undone it is fair to say they were probably not secured correctly at assembly. In order to ensure this doesn’t happen again we stripped the drive assembly completely and reassembled using a thread lock compound on all fasteners and tightened them to the correct specification. The machine was filled with water and run for an hour and everything was rechecked. CLOSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/07/2019</td>
<td>Near Miss Water Unit</td>
<td>Member of public was parked in pump station driveway area. Owner was not around but witnessed worker taking a photo of car in driveway. He then came over and told worker that they couldn’t take photos and that there was no non parking signs and that he could park anywhere. Worker explained if there was an emergency with the station and there was a car in the way there was a risk of it being towed. He then became quite aggravated and hot tempered until worker walked away back into station and then he left.</td>
<td>Pending investigation. OPEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/07/2019</td>
<td>Near Miss Libraries</td>
<td>Slipped over on ice in the loading bay at Kaiapoi Library. Worker was walking to pick up newspapers from museum loading bay as that is where they are</td>
<td>It was icy on the ground of the loading bay and worker did not see it. Also possibly moss by the drain of the loading bay at the time. Corrective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.2.

The Health and Safety Team have presented the new Health and Safety Annual Plan (2019/2020) to Management Team and Audit & Risk Committee, for their review. The Annual Plan has four key focus areas for the year:

- **3.2.1.** Review and re-develop the Take-5 hazard assessment mobile form.

- **3.2.2.** Re-develop the Health and Safety presence on the intranet.

- **3.2.3.** Investigate and procure improved Health and Safety risk, hazard and incident management software systems.

- **3.2.4.** Health and Safety participation in Corporate Accommodation working group and/or project team.

### 10/07/2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Type</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lost Time Injury</td>
<td>Aquatics</td>
<td>Worker went into the first aid/cleaning storeroom and slipped on wet floor. Worker did not see that the floor was wet. Degreaser had been spilled and not cleaned up. When worker slipped they jarred lower back.</td>
<td>Floor was wet, another staff member was unaware that they had spilled some degreaser when filling watering cans. Procedure is to use the basin and this may not have been followed. Staff to be notified not to fill watering cans on floor in staff communication diary (complete) &amp; communicated to staff via supervisors (ongoing, Lifeguards). Piece of wet floor mat to be placed in doorway to catch any additional spills. OPEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illness or Medical</td>
<td>Medical Condition</td>
<td>Fast heart rate which settled but then felt faint and required assistance to get to medical Centre. Worker was at their desk working when the incident occurred. Worker told their manager that they had a heart flutter and then 10 minutes later presented as feeling really unwell. After the event manager continued to check on worker for the remainder of their shift.</td>
<td>This was a medical issue. Cause unknown, however has happened previously. There were no contributing factors. Worker felt well when they came to work that day and is not suffering from any stress or anxiety at present. This is an unpredictable incident. Manager is aware of the condition and if it presents again will take the worker to the Medical Centre to be checked out. If it occurs more frequently then worker will be required to take medication. No further action to be taken at this stage. CLOSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injury</td>
<td>Water Unit</td>
<td>Rummaging through the tool box a worker cut their index finger on the pipe cutter blade. The Pipe cutter is normally closed and locked, so unsure why it was open. Worker left cutters in the tool bag without considering the locking mechanism that keeps the blade safety against the dull cutting surface of the opposite blade. Either during travel or by forgetting to close and lock the cutter after last use, the blade has been left exposed and a cut to finger incurred.</td>
<td>The cut was treated by the worker at the scene by applying an adhesive wound dressing. As a result the cutters have been locked together and located in a separate pouch in the tool bag Manager has asked worker to present the incident at the next team brief as a reminder to all. CLOSED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

thrown every morning and there was some black ice on the ground. action: Being extra vigilant about looking for ice. Maybe put something on the surface or have the newspapers dropped off somewhere else (to be investigated further). OPEN
3.3. The Management Team have reviewed this report and support the recommendations.

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. Groups and Organisations
   4.1.1. The above reporting is shared with Management Team and the Health and Safety Committee in particular, for their review and comment.

4.2. Wider Community
   4.2.1. The community has not been consulted with regard to this matter, as this is internal compliance reporting, relating to Health and Safety at Work.

5. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. Financial Implications
   5.1.1. All financial implications for the upcoming year’s health and safety activities have been accounted for within approved project costs (such as Promapp implementation), or via departmental budgets already allocated to health and safety.

5.2. Community Implications
   5.2.1. Community implications have not been included in this report as this is internal compliance reporting, relating to Health and Safety at Work.

5.3. Risk Management
   5.3.1. Risk Management is one of the key performance requirements of a functioning Health and Safety system, therefore an updated version of the Health and Safety Register Action Plan is a key aspect of this monthly report (see Attachment 2).

5.4. Health and Safety
   5.4.1. Continuous improvement, monitoring, and reporting of Health and Safety activities are a key focus of the health and safety management system. Attachment 1 indicates the health and safety monitoring and improvement activities that are in progress at WDC.

6. CONTEXT

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

6.2. Legislation
   6.2.1. The key legislation is the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015.
   6.2.2. The Council has a number of Human Resources policies, including those related to Health and Safety at Work.
   6.2.3. The Council has an obligation under the Local Government Act to be a good employer.

6.3. Community Outcomes
   6.3.1. There is a safe environment for all
   The Health, Safety and Wellbeing of the organisation, its employees and volunteers ensures that Community Outcomes are delivered in a manner which is legislatively compliant and culturally aligned to our organisational principles: ta mātou mauri.
6.4. Delegations

6.4.1. An officer under the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015 is a person who occupies a specified position or who occupies a position that allows them to exercise a significant influence over the management of the business or undertaking. Councillors and Chief Executive are considered to be the Officers of WDC.
### Discharging Officer Health and Safety Duties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OFFICER DUTIES</th>
<th>EXAMPLES OF ACTIVITIES TO SUPPORT DISCHARGE OF DUTIES</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **KNOW**
(To acquire, and keep up to date, knowledge of work health and safety matters) | • Updates on new activities/major contracts  
• Council reports to include Health and Safety advice as relevant  
• Audit Committee to receive minutes of Health and Safety Committee meetings  
• Update on legislation and best practice changes to Audit Committee | Various Committee reports  
Monthly, as required  
Quarterly  
As required |
| **UNDERSTAND**
(To gain an understanding of the nature of the operations of the business or undertaking of the PCBU and generally of the hazards and risks associated with those operations) | • Induction of new Council through tour of District and ongoing site visits.  
• H&S Risk register to Audit Committee  
• Training on H&S legislation and best practices updates  
• CCO activities reported to the Audit Committee | Start of each new term and as required  
Six monthly, or where major change  
At least annually  
At least annually |
| **RESOURCES**
(To ensure that the PCBU has available for use, and uses, appropriate resources and processes to eliminate or minimise risks to health and safety from work carried out as part of the conduct of the business or undertaking) | • LTP or Annual Plan to have a specific report on H&S resources  
• Reports to Committees will outline H&S issues and resourcing, as appropriate | Annually  
As required |
| **MONITOR**
(To ensure that the PCBU has appropriate processes for receiving and considering information regarding incidents, hazards, and risks and for responding in a timely way to that information) | • Report to every Council meeting – standing agenda item to include Dashboard Update and any major developments  
• Risk register review by Audit Committee | Monthly  
Six monthly, or where major change |
| **COMPLY**
(To ensure that the PCBU has, and implements, processes for complying with any duty or obligation of the PCBU under this Act) | • Programme of H&S internal work received by Audit Committee  
• Internal Audit reports to Audit Committee  
• Incident Investigations reported Audit Committee  
• Worksafe review of incidents/accidents reported to Audit Committee | Annually  
As completed  
As required  
As required |
| **VERIFY**
(To verify the provision and use of the resources and processes) | • Receive any external audit results and remedial actions (if any) reported to Audit Committee  
• Worksafe audits, if undertaken  
• Self-assessment against Canterbury Safety Charter and/or SafePlus reported to the Audit Committee | Two yearly  
As completed  
As completed |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Projects</th>
<th>Current Progress</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action 1</strong>: Review and re-develop Take-5 hazard assessment mobile form to account for variations in worker requirements.</td>
<td>On track</td>
<td>Initial workshops have been held with key stakeholders to gather their requirements. The H&amp;S team are now working with the BATS team to make initial proposed changes for testing with users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action 2</strong>: Re-develop Health and Safety presence on WDC intranet to ensure that staff have easy and user-friendly access to Health and Safety systems.</td>
<td>On track</td>
<td>Initial intranet system training has been held with the wider HS&amp;Q unit to ensure that system admin capability exists in the team. The team are currently developing the format of the health and safety intranet presence, as well as ensuring that all assets and links in the current intranet format are transferred into the new intranet format.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action 3</strong>: Investigate and procure improved Health and Safety risk, hazard and incident management software systems to improve corrective action workflows, corporate reporting and staff communication of health and safety risks, hazards and incidents.</td>
<td>On track</td>
<td>A business case is being developed for a Risk Management software package, which will be submitted to both the risk management workgroup and risk management sponsor group, prior to final sign-off by the Business Improvement Steering Group.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Action 4**: Health and Safety participation in Corporate Accommodation working group and/or project team to ensure that the following are considered throughout the project:  
  - Safety in Design  
  - Site security considerations  
  - Risk management  
  - Contractor health and safety management  
  - Site health and safety management  
  - Worker wellbeing | On track | Health, Safety and Quality Manager has been involved in initial project team meetings and risk identification sessions, and has raised health and safety risks within relevant forums. |

**LEGEND**

- On track
- Slightly behind schedule (less than one month)
- Behind schedule (greater than one month)
Incidents/Injuries – July 2019 (*as at 22 July 2019)

July 2018 to Current: Worker/Volunteer Incident Reporting

- Property or Vehicle Damage
- Near Miss
- Injury
- Illness/Medical Incident

Incident Date Reval Hierarchy
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### Lost Time Injuries:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Injuries</th>
<th>Total Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017/18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>340.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>318.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019/20</td>
<td>1 (to date)</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LEAD INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>2019/20</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety Inspections Completed (Workplace Walkarounds)</td>
<td>Q1 2019</td>
<td>12 out of 15 Workplace Walkarounds completed for Q2 2019 (June). Hazards raised for any non-compliances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Delivered</td>
<td>2017/18</td>
<td>People Trained: 454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Delivered</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>People Trained: 467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Delivered</td>
<td>2019/20</td>
<td>People Trained: 73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Contractor Database (drawn from SiteWise Database)

**Contractor Pipeline**

**Contractor Assessment Scores**

**Your Contractors**

- Average Score: 84%

**All Contractors**

- Average Score: 73%
Hazards Reported (last 12 months)

Risk Register Action Plan Tracking July 2019
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Action Owner</th>
<th>Action Lead</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Airfield operations</td>
<td>*Require audits of hangars to ensure that they are in compliance with Building Act and tenancy requirements (including the requirement that hazardous substances are prohibited from hangars).</td>
<td>Grant MacLeod</td>
<td>Chris Brown</td>
<td>31/07/2019 (revised)</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Armed Hold-up/Violent or Abusive Customers (on Council Sites) &amp; Site Security</td>
<td>*Develop and implement action plans based on Site Security Reviews.</td>
<td>Rob Hawthorne</td>
<td>Liz Ashton</td>
<td>Review early 2020 (revised)</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Boat Operations</td>
<td>*Practise rescue plan drills on regular basis *SOPs have been recently reviewed and require re-training.</td>
<td>Richard Cookson</td>
<td>Jeff Millward</td>
<td>31/07/2019 (revised)</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Confined space entry</td>
<td>*Review procedures for any work on Ocean Outfall Pipeline/drop-structure to ensure they are adequate.</td>
<td>Richard Cookson/Kalley Simpson</td>
<td>Gerard Cleary</td>
<td>31/10/2019 (revised)</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Contractor Health and Safety Management</td>
<td>*Contract Management refresher training at least every 2 years (to provide opportunity to review processes to keep up with industry practice).</td>
<td>Charlotte Browne</td>
<td>Gerard Cleary</td>
<td>31/07/2019</td>
<td>COMPLETE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Contractor Health and Safety Management</td>
<td>*PDU to create an internal contract management auditing programme which will include H&amp;S requirements.</td>
<td>Kelly La Valley</td>
<td>Gerard Cleary</td>
<td>30/06/2019</td>
<td>COMPLETE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Corporate Accommodation</td>
<td>*Ensure that comprehensive planning for any large-scale staff relocations has been completed, which includes workstation ergonomic assessments (may need contractor based on volume of assessments).</td>
<td>Rob Hawthorne</td>
<td>Liz Ashton</td>
<td>Review early 2020 (revised)</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Driver Safety</td>
<td>*Encourage staff to find alternatives to driving: e.g. video conferencing, skype etc.</td>
<td>Ashleigh Radford</td>
<td>Jeff Millward/Liz Ashton</td>
<td>Review early 2020</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Electricity &amp; Gas (proximity to overhead/underground lines)</td>
<td>*Ensure that emergency response procedures (i.e. what do to in the event of incident/interaction with underground or overhead power lines) is available, and that all relevant staff are trained.</td>
<td>Richard Cookson</td>
<td>Jeff Millward</td>
<td>30/09/2019 (revised)</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Task Description</td>
<td>Responsible Parties</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity (proximity to overhead/underground lines)</td>
<td><em>Retrain all Water Unit staff in use of cable locators.</em></td>
<td>Richard Cookson</td>
<td>30/06/2019</td>
<td>COMPLETE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity (proximity to overhead/underground lines)</td>
<td><em>Engagement with Mainpower to improve Before-U-Dig response times (create MOU?).</em> <em>Engagement with Pegasus Gas to improve Before-U-Dig processes</em></td>
<td>Richard Cookson, Gerard Cleary</td>
<td>30/09/2019 (revised)</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Management (Workers responding to Civil Emergency events) / Volunteers conducting hazardous activities</td>
<td><em>Ensure that all of the current control measures are captured in Standard Operating Procedures which are clearly communicated to all relevant workers.</em> <em>Undertake a review of operations to ensure that all activity and training is being carried out as per internal H&amp;S processes.</em></td>
<td>Brennan Wiremu, Nick Harrison</td>
<td>Review early 2020</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency response (internal)</td>
<td><em>Earthquake seismic sensors to be installed in key buildings to measure potential damage (decision-making as to whether to evacuate or remain in building in earthquake event).</em></td>
<td>Greig Wilson, Nick Harrison</td>
<td>31/07/2019 (revised)</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency response (internal)</td>
<td><em>Ear Protection needs to be considered in Emergency Procedures i.e. every person should have access to ear plugs or muffs in case of being trapped or required to stay in the building.</em></td>
<td>Health &amp; Safety</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>COMPLETE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavations</td>
<td><em>Develop/review standard operating procedures and retrain staff in new SOP.</em> <em>Create and implement Water Unit competency register to ensure ongoing excavator operator competence.</em></td>
<td>Richard Cookson, Jeff Millward</td>
<td>31/07/2019 (revised)</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Substances - BAU Handling &amp; Storage</td>
<td><em>Ensure non-compliances and improvements from 2019 audit have been completed.</em></td>
<td>Health &amp; Safety, Managers &amp; Team Leaders</td>
<td>31/10/2019</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile plant and machinery</td>
<td><em>Check maintenance records and maintenance schedules are in place to ensure safety of equipment.</em></td>
<td>Health &amp; Safety, Managers &amp; Team Leaders</td>
<td>31/10/2019</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Mobile plant and machinery</td>
<td>*Improve competency records to include a schedule of levels of competency for each staff member/each piece of mobile plant. *Develop/review standard operating procedures and retrain staff in new SOP.</td>
<td>Richard Cookson</td>
<td>Jeff Millward</td>
<td>31/07/2019 (revised)</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence/High Risk</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Review and action of 3-Waters Sites Hazard Review (Dan McNally)</td>
<td>Kalley Simpson</td>
<td>Gerard Cleary</td>
<td>Ongoing (revised)</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence/High Risk</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Review and action of Water Unit Observation Report (Impac)</td>
<td>Richard Cookson</td>
<td>Jeff Millward</td>
<td>Ongoing (revised)</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Site Security WWTP</td>
<td>*Site security review to consider any points of access or vulnerabilities to sabotage (in particular pump stations, treatment plants or pipelines)</td>
<td>Kalley Simpson</td>
<td>Gerard Cleary</td>
<td>30/06/2020</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Traffic management</td>
<td>*Review Traffic Management requirements for Greenspace Team, given that the Greenspaces team will be carrying inspections of street trees/street gardens as well as supervision and checking of the contractor working within the road corridor.</td>
<td>Grant Macleod</td>
<td>Chris Brown</td>
<td>31/07/2019 (revised)</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Violent or Abusive members of public (in the field)</td>
<td>*Consider use of body cameras for enforcement staff</td>
<td>Health &amp; Safety</td>
<td>Nick Harrison</td>
<td>31/08/2019 (revised)</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Violent or Abusive members of public (in the field)</td>
<td>*Enforce mandatory StopViolence training for all staff that interact with public face-to-face (needs analysis by role)</td>
<td>Charlotte Browne</td>
<td>Liz Ashton</td>
<td>30/06/2019</td>
<td>COMPLETE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Violent or Abusive members of public (in the field)</td>
<td>*Develop ‘key client’ staff relationships to ensure that only certain staff deal with identified difficult customers</td>
<td>Managers &amp; Team Leaders</td>
<td>Nick Harrison</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Water Safety (Public) Beaches/Natural Environment</td>
<td>*Review of risk and required control measures (based on what is reasonably practicable)</td>
<td>Grant Macleod</td>
<td>Chris Brown</td>
<td>Review early 2020</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Water Safety (Public)</td>
<td><em>Review of risk and required control measures (based on what is reasonably practicable)</em></td>
<td>Kalley Simpson</td>
<td>Gerard Cleary</td>
<td>Review early 2020</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Water Safety (Public)</td>
<td><em>Require review of security fencing of all Waste Water Treatment Plant sites (internal review – test against other organisations). Review Stormwater site security (internal review – test against other organisations).</em></td>
<td>Kalley Simpson</td>
<td>Gerard Cleary</td>
<td>30/06/2020 (revised)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Working at heights</td>
<td>Water Unit: <em>Review of all structures which require work at heights to determine the adequacy of the fall protection (in particular the harness systems) and any further procedure/training required to ensure safe use of systems.</em></td>
<td>Richard Cookson / Kalley Simpson</td>
<td>Gerard Cleary / Jeff Millward</td>
<td>30/06/2020 (revised)</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All actions are new since the April 2019 Risk Register review.
*All actions with strikethrough have been transferred to department operational risk registers, or completed.
1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report seeks the Committee’s direction for the review of the Gambling Venue Policy and Board Venue Policy which is required every three years by the Gambling Act 2003 and the Racing Act 2003 for each respective policy.

1.2 It is important to note that these policies relate to the availability and location of gambling venues in the District. The proximity to the Christchurch Casino, combined with the growth in internet gambling, both of which are not controlled by Council policies, means the ability to influence the overall incidence of gambling in the community is more a national than a local issue.

1.3 The Board Venue Policy covers premises that are owned or leased by the New Zealand Racing Board (stand-alone venues) and where the main business of the premises is providing racing betting or sports betting services under the Racing Act 2003. There are no stand-alone TAB’s in this District. All TAB’s are within licensed premises or clubs, and so while the Council is required to have a Board Venue Policy, there are no premises to which it applies.

1.4 The number of gaming machines in the Waimakariri District have been trending down since 2006. This trend continued between 2016 and 2019 with the number of machines declining from 165 in 2016 to 163 in 2019. The number of venues that have gaming machines dropped by two, from 14 in 2016 to 12 in 2019.

1.5 If the Committee considers the policies remain fit for purpose a review could be made on the papers. If the Committee considers that elements of the policies should be amended, a Special Consultative Procedure (SCP) will need to be invoked.

1.6 A full review of the Gambling Venue Policy would require a Social Impact Assessment (required under section 101(2) of the Gambling Act 2003), consideration of adding a relocation policy, and consideration of the current cap of one machine per 120 adults.

Attachments:

i. Draft Gambling Venue Policy 2019 (Trim 190606079820)
ii. Draft Board Venue Policy 2019 (Trim 190606079821)
iii. Gambling machine venues and numbers December 2018 (Trim 190606079824)
2. **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the District Planning and Regulation Committee:

(a) **Receives** report No 190606080102.

(b) **Retains** the Gambling Venue Policy unchanged (Trim 190606079820)

(c) **Retains** the Board Venue Policy unchanged (Trim 190606079821), or

(d) **Directs** staff to undertake a full review of the Gambling (Class 4) Venue Policy which may include consideration of a relocation policy (made possible by amendments to the *Gambling Act 2003* which inserted sections 105(5A) and (5B)), consideration of the current cap of one machine per 120 adults, and a Social Impact Assessment (required under section 101(2) of the *Gambling Act 2003*) in the 2020 calendar year.

(e) **Notes** that should the District Planning and Regulation Committee resolve to amend either or both policies, the Special Consultative Procedure will need to be undertaken, which will also be required if a full review of the Gambling Venue Policy is to be undertaken in 2021.

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 The Gambling Venue Policy is a control on gaming machines (Class 4 gambling or pokies), and the Board Venue Policy is a control on Totalisator Agency Board (TAB) venues. These policies have the objectives of controlling the growth of gambling and minimising harm to the community from problem gambling.

3.2 Both policies were implemented in April 2004 through a wide-ranging multi-Council Special Consultative Procedure and managed by a Councillor Working Party. The policies were first reviewed in 2006, again in 2010 following a comprehensive Social Impact Assessment (SIA), and again in 2013. The policies did not change as a result of these reviews. This is the fifth time these two policies have been reviewed.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. The Council’s Gambling Venue Policy regulates the number and location of gaming machines in the District, and the Board Venue Policy sets conditions on the location for any new stand-alone TAB premises. The Gambling Venue Policy is a requirement of the *Gambling Act 2003* and the Board Venue Policy is a requirement of the *Racing Act 2003*. Both Acts specify the matters the Council should consider in the formulation of the policies.

4.2. The Gambling Venue Policy is more relevant in the Waimakariri District than the Board Venue Policy. The Board Venue Policy can apply only to stand-alone TAB outlets. Waimakariri District has no stand-alone TAB outlets, and there is no current intention of the TAB to establish a stand-alone TAB venue in the District. Venues with TAB facilities in the District are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oxford</th>
<th>Rangiora</th>
<th>Kaiapoi</th>
<th>Sefton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Workingmen’s Club</td>
<td>Self Service TAB</td>
<td>Kapiol Workingmen’s Club</td>
<td>Pub TAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plough Hotel</td>
<td>Pub TAB</td>
<td>Kaikanui Hotel</td>
<td>Pub TAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora RSA</td>
<td>JR’s Bar and Grill Self Service TAB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brook Hotel</td>
<td>Self Service TAB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Anglers Arms  Self Service TAB
Woodend
Caspers  Pub TAB
Pine Acres  Self Service TAB

Note: There are no stand-alone TAB venues in Waimakariri. There was one at the Plough Hotel, however this closed some three years ago.

4.3. The objectives of the Gambling Venue Policy are:

- To control the growth of gambling
- To prevent and minimise the harm to the community caused by gambling, including problem gambling
- To control the growth of electronic gaming machine gambling in the District
- To allow those who wish to participate in electronic gambling machine and TAB gambling to do so, safely and responsibly, within the District.

To give effect to these objectives, the Council’s current policy has adequate safe-guards in place in the form of:

- All venues must be located in an on-license or licensed club premise.
- All applications are open to public submission and will be heard by a hearing panel. This enables the Council to keep abreast of trends in the industry, and is a forum for the expression of community views. This is relatively unique, as the Act enables delegations to staff without a hearing, however this is not preferred.
- There is a current cap of one gaming machine per every 120 adults, 18 years of age and over. This cap was instituted in 2004 when the Act came into force and matched the number of machines to the population at that time.

4.4. With the current cap of 1:120 for adults 18 years of age and over, as long as any new application fits within the criteria of the Gambling Act 2003 and the WDC Policy, there is capacity to increase gaming machines numbers across the District. The estimated adult population of 18 years or older at June 2018 is 46,560. Based on this figure, an adult population of 46,560 divided by the current cap of 120 equals 388 gaming machines. The number of gaming machines at 31 March 2018 in the Waimakariri District is 163, which is well under the current policy threshold, so theoretically another 225 gaming machines could be established in the District.

4.5. If the adult population of 46,560 is divided by the current number of gaming machines of 163 then this would signal a new cap ration of 1:285, that is, one gaming machine for every 285 adults (18 years of age or older) in the District. There is little demand for new machines (the last was Five Stags) which was the first application in four years, so the necessity to change the policy is not overriding.
4.6. Table 1 Machine and Venue Numbers – Local Trends:

Since December 2006, machine numbers and venues have declined. There appears to be a natural attrition in the reduction of gaming machines in the District, which is likely a result of the Department of Internal Affairs’ (DIA) compliance costs declining rental returns.

4.7. If the Committee considers that the policies need amending, both the Gambling Act 2003 and the Racing Act 2003 require that the SCP of the Local Government Act 2002 be invoked. If the SCP is to be used, it is likely a full social impact assessment would be required. A social impact assessment in itself requires considerable consultation with the community and agencies working in areas that observe the effects of problem gambling, as well as the organisations that benefit from gaming proceeds. A social impact assessment would take some 6 – 8 months to complete and would need resources to be allocated to fulfil it. If the Committee does resolve to review the Gambling Venue Policy it would be preferred to timetable a review over the next two years so that appropriate resourcing could be arranged. It should also be noted that if the Committee resolves that the policies remain unchanged, then the SCP does not need to be invoked.

4.8. Both Acts require a review of each policy every three years, so the next review date would be April-June 2021.

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

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

Not sought.

5.2. Wider Community

Given the declining numbers of gaming machines, and that this has been trending consistently downwards since 2006, community views have not been sought.
6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

If the policies are to be amended, the costs of a Special Consultative Procedure would be in the order of $10,000. The cost of a Social Impact Assessment would be approximately $25,000 whether or not it is undertaken in-house or out-sourced.

6.2. **Community Implications**

Class 4 gambling is a legal activity and those premises established prior to October 2001 are allowed up to 18 gaming machines, and after October 2001, a maximum of nine gaming machines. It is through the gambling policy that the Council has a means of balancing the tension between allowing a lawful activity and still providing for community and individual well-being.

6.3. **Risk Management**

6.4. The policy has safeguards in the form of where venues may be located and all applications are heard by a hearing panel and open for public submission.

6.5. **Health and Safety**

N/A

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

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

7.2. **Legislation**

The *Gambling Act 2003*

102 (5) A territorial authority must complete a review of a policy within 3 years after the policy is adopted and then within 3 years after that review and each subsequent review is completed.

The *Racing Act 2003*

65E(5) A territorial authority must complete a review of a policy within 3 years after the policy is adopted and then within 3 years after that review and each subsequent review is completed.

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

*There is a safe environment for all*

7.4. **Delegations**

The Committee has responsibility for Gambling Venues under Delegation S-DM 1026. It also has the “authority to initiate a Special Consultative Procedure, or otherwise consult the community on matters related to the committee’s activities and where the proposed consultation is not contrary to an established Council position”.
1 Introduction

Gambling in New Zealand is regulated by the Gambling Act 2003.


The Act regulates six classes of gambling. This Policy is concerned with Class 4 gambling, which is gambling that involves the operation of gaming machines (pokies), outside of casinos.

While Council recognises that gambling is a legitimate form of entertainment, there is concern about the social impact that gambling, and in particular problem gambling, can have in the community. This policy seeks to minimise harm from problem gambling.

2 Policy Context

Section 101 of the Gambling Act 2003 requires a territorial authority to adopt a class 4 venue policy.

The Policy allows Council to directly control the growth of Class 4 gambling via gaming machines by creating rules around numbers of venues and gaming machines, and their location within the District. It also allows the community to input to decision-making through Council’s public notification and submission process, should there be any new requests for venues or an increase in gaming machines numbers at an existing venue.

3 Policy Objective

1. To control the growth of gambling
2. To prevent and minimise the harm to the community caused by gambling, including problem gambling.
3. To control the growth of electronic gambling machine gambling in the district.
4. To allow those who wish to participate in electronic gambling machine gambling to do so, safely and responsibly, within the District.

4 Policy Statement

Societies requiring Council consent

Any society requires Council consent in respect of a class 4 venue to:

- Increase the number of gambling machines that may be operated at the venue.
Gambling Venues

GAMBLING VENUE POLICY

- Start operating gambling machines at such a venue that was not on any society’s licence within the previous 6 months.
- Start operating gambling machines at such a venue for which a licence was not held on 17 October 2001.
- Continue to operate gambling machines at a venue for which a licence was not held on 17 October 2001, but which was added to a society’s licence on a date after 17 October 2001 and before 19 September 2003.

Matters that the Council will consider when making a decision on any application are:

1. That the application is associated with premises that have an on licence, club licence or is a chartered club in terms of the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012, or is a TAB venue.
2. That gambling machines are not the primary part of the venue’s operation or income.
3. That the venues are not in a Residential Zone as defined by the Operative District Plan.
4. That the venue is not on a site that the Council considers will unnecessarily display class 4 gambling activity to places and institutions primarily frequented by people under the age of 18 years old.
5. Class 4 gambling venues should not be located in premises that are incompatible with other predominant uses of the premises or of other premises in close proximity.
6. Class 4 gambling machines will not be located within a venue where the primary activity is associated with family or children’s activities.
7. That a district wide cap of 1 gambling machine per 120 people 18 years old or older be used as a guideline to limit any increase in machine numbers.
8. That external signs at venues be restricted to one per site, of an appropriate size and attached directly to the building, and that describes that gambling machines are on the premises. Advertising of prize money of any description shall not be visible from the exterior of the premises.
9. Gambling machines must not be visible from the road.
10. That the gambling area of a venue does not have a separate entrance to a street, separate name or otherwise appears as a separate activity from the primary venue.
11. Venues are to have a host responsibility and gambling harm minimisation policy and staff training programme.

Applications and fees

1. All applications will be publicly notified and open for submissions for a period of 10 working days. The Hearings Committee will hear and decide all applications.
2. All fees and charges must be paid before any consent is granted. A deposit of $1000 is required with hearing costs and disbursements charged monthly.
3. Councillor and staff time is charged at the rates specified in the Fees and Charges Schedule.
GAMBLING VENUE POLICY

5 Links to legislation, other policies and community outcomes

Community Outcome – there is a safe community for all

6 Adopted by and date

The Gambling Venue Policy 2016 was approved by the Resource Management and Regulation Committee at its meeting on 19 July 2016.

The Resource Management and Regulation Committee has the delegation to be responsible for gambling venues.

7 Review

Council must complete a review every three years. The next review is due in April-June 2019.
POLICY

Gambling Venues

BOARD VENUE POLICY

1 Introduction

A Board Venue is a Totalisator Agency Board (TAB) operated on premises owned or leased by the New Zealand Racing Board and where the main business carried on at the premises is providing racing betting or sports betting services under the Racing Act 2003.

The Racing Act 2003 requires the New Zealand Racing Board (the Board) to gain consent from Territorial Authorities if it proposes to establish a new Board venue (TAB).

The policy is limited to New Zealand Racing Board owned TAB outlets. It does not cover TAB terminals in privately owned premises such as hotels, taverns or clubs as these may be established without Territorial Authority Consent.

2 Policy Context

Under Section 65D of the Racing Act 2003, territorial authorities must adopt a Board Venue policy for stand-alone TABs operated by the Board.

If all TAB’s within a District are inside a licensed premises or club, the Territorial Authority is still required to have a Board Venue Policy, even though there are no premises to which it applies.

3 Policy Objective

To ensure the Council and the community has influence over the provision of gambling in the District.

Section 65D of the Racing Act 2003 specifies:

1. A territorial authority must, within 6 months after the commencement of this section, adopt a policy on Board venues.
2. In adopting a policy, the territorial authority must have regard to the social impact of gambling within the territorial authority district.
3. The policy must specify whether or not new Board venues may be established in the territorial authority district and, if so, where they may be located.
4. In determining its policy on whether Board venues may be established in the territorial district and where any Board venues may be located, the territorial authority may have regard to any relevant matters, including—
   a) the characteristics of the district and parts of the district:
   b) the location of kindergartens, early childhood centres, schools, places of worship, and other community facilities:
   c) the cumulative effects of additional opportunities for gambling in the district.
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BOARD VENUE POLICY

4 Policy Statement

Matters the Council will consider when making a decision on any application are:

1. That the venues are not in a Residential Zone as defined by the Operative District Plan.

2. That the venue is not on a site that the Council considers will unnecessarily display gambling activity to places and institutions primarily frequented by people under the age of 18 years old.

Applications & fees:

1. All applications will be publicly notified and open for submissions for a period of 10 working days. The Hearings Committee will hear and decide all applications.

2. All fees and charges must be paid before any consent is granted. A deposit of $1000 is required with hearing costs and disbursements charged monthly.

3. Councillor and staff time is charged at the rates specified in the Fees and Charges Schedule.

5 Links to legislation, other policies and community outcomes

Community Outcome – there is a safe community for all

6 Adopted by and date

The Board Venue Policy 2016 was approved by the Resource Management and Regulation Committee at its meeting on 19 July 2016.

The Resource Management and Regulation Committee has the delegation to be responsible for gambling venues.

7 Review

Council must complete a review every three years. The next review is due in April-June 2019.
## Venue and numbers by Territorial Authority as at 31 December 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trust/Licensed Club</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THE SOUTHERN TRUST</td>
<td>Brook Bar</td>
<td>16 Southbrook Road, Rangiora, Canterbury</td>
<td>Waimakariri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUST AORAKI LIMITED</td>
<td>Five Stage</td>
<td>329 Huntingdon Drive, Rangiora, Canterbury</td>
<td>Waimakariri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAIAPOI WORKINGMENS CLUB &amp; MSA INC</td>
<td>Kaiapoi Wmc And Msa</td>
<td>513 Raven Street, Kaiapoi, Canterbury</td>
<td>Waimakariri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERT Your Local Gaming Trust Limited</td>
<td>Kaikanui Tavern</td>
<td>67 Williams Street, Kaiapoi, Canterbury</td>
<td>Waimakariri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUB CHARITY LIMITED</td>
<td>Mainstreet Sports Bar</td>
<td>27 High Street, Rangiora, Canterbury</td>
<td>Waimakariri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUB CHARITY LIMITED</td>
<td>Maudville Tavern</td>
<td>29 Raven Quay, Kaiapoi, Canterbury</td>
<td>Waimakariri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OXFORD WORKINGMENS CLUB &amp; MSA</td>
<td>Oxford Workingmens Club &amp; Msa</td>
<td>166 High Street, Oxford, Canterbury</td>
<td>Waimakariri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUST AORAKI LIMITED</td>
<td>Pineacres Tavern</td>
<td>140 Main North Road, Kaiapoi, Canterbury</td>
<td>Waimakariri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE SOUTHERN TRUST</td>
<td>Plough Hotel</td>
<td>358 High Street, Rangiora, Canterbury</td>
<td>Waimakariri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RANGIORA RETURNED SERVICES ASSOCIATION CLUB INC</td>
<td>Rangiora RSA Club</td>
<td>82 Victoria Street, Rangiora, Canterbury</td>
<td>Waimakariri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERT Your Local Gaming Trust Limited</td>
<td>Woodend Tavern</td>
<td>51 Main North Road, Woodend, Canterbury</td>
<td>Waimakariri</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Venue and numbers by Territorial Authority as at 31 December 2018.**
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT FOR INFORMATION

FILE NO and TRIM NO: EXC-17 / 190531077619

REPORT TO: Audit & Risk Committee

DATE OF MEETING: 16 July 2019

FROM: Simon Markham, Manager, Strategy & Engagement


1. SUMMARY

1.1. The Audit and Risk Committee received, for comment, the draft Enterprise North Canterbury Statement of Intent at its 26 March 2019 meeting.

1.2. At its Board meeting on 29 May 2019, and with no comments being presented against the Draft Statement of Intent, the Enterprise North Canterbury Board approved its Statement of Intent beginning 1 July 2019 for the 2019/20 year.

1.3. At the same Board meeting they also approved the Enterprise North Canterbury Business Plan 2019/20 and the Promotion of Waimakariri District Business Plan for 2019/20. These reports are attached for your information.

1.4. The purpose of this report is for the Audit and Risk Committee to recommend to Council that they receive the approved Statement of Intent from Enterprise North Canterbury for 2019/20 and the approved Enterprise North Canterbury’s Business Plan.

1.5. The Audit and Risk Committee are asked to approve the Promotion of Waimakariri District Business Plan for 2019/20.

Attachments:

i. Enterprise North Canterbury’s Approved Statement of Intent 2019/20 (190531077496)
ii. Enterprise North Canterbury’s Approved Business Plan 2019/20 (190531077492)
iii. Promotion of Waimakariri District Business Plan 2019/20 (190531077495)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Audit and Risk committee:

(a) Receives report No 190531077619.
(b) Receives the Approved Statement of Intent beginning 1 July 2019 and the Approved Enterprise North Canterbury’s Business Plan.
(c) Approves the Promotion of Waimakariri District Business Plan for 2019/20.
(d) Recommends to Council that it receives, for information, the Approved Statement of Intent beginning 1 July 2019, Approved Enterprise North Canterbury’s Business Plan and Promotion of Waimakariri District Business Plan for 2019/20.
(e) Notes that we shall be working with ENC to update the Visitor Strategy.
3. BACKGROUND

3.1. Enterprise North Canterbury is a Council Controlled Organisation (CCO), where the Trustees are appointed by the Waimakariri and Hurunui District Councils.

3.2. The Trust was registered in August 2002 to provide promotional and economic development services on behalf of the Waimakariri and Hurunui District Councils and promote the region as a visitor destination.

3.3. The Trust is a not-for-profit organisation. A significant amount of funding comes from grants and sponsorship to fund the activities undertaken.

3.4. As an economic development agency, ENC seeks to improve the region’s investment and business-enabling environment so enhancing the region’s competitiveness, retaining and increasing jobs, improving incomes, enhancing economic well-being thus improving the quality of life of residents.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

Promotion of Waimakariri District Business Plan 2019/20

4.1. To achieve the Promotion Objectives, the 2019/20 Promotion Plan has four key goals, one of which is focussed on the business sector, and three of which are specific to the visitor industry sector.

**BUSINESS PROMOTION**
- Market the district so that more businesses want to set up here

**ENHANCE THE VISITOR EXPERIENCE**
- Collectively market the district to visitors
- Provide quality information services

**CONNECT WITH RESIDENTS**
- Increase local pride, awareness of events and endorse their own district to friends and family

**DESTINATION DEVELOPMENT**
- Grow the districts offering by assisting and promoting new and existing visitor attractions

Business Plan 2019/20

4.2. The ENC Strategic Plan vision is:

‘To inspire, attract and retain individuals, businesses and social enterprises to invest in our region’

4.3. This Annual Business Plan generally takes the Objectives from the Statement of Intent, then prescribes the initiatives ENC will take, and the means and resources required, to progress the Strategic Objectives in 2019/20.

4.4. The Management team have reviewed these reports and supports the recommendations.
Visitor Strategy
4.5. We shall be working with ENC in the coming year to update the Visitor Strategy.

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS
5.1. Groups and Organisations
Ongoing dialogue that ENC has with the local business sector and visitor industry assisted with the preparation of the Statement of Intent and the District Promotions Business Plan that has been reported on.

5.2. Wider Community
Each year ENC’s Annual Report is audited by Audit New Zealand.
As part of the District Development 2016 Survey, satisfaction with encouraging business activity has increased to 66% and this is the highest recorded satisfaction level since 2004. This indicates that ‘encouraging business activity’ has become a greater issue for more respondents as more households have an opinion on the matter.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS
6.1. Financial Implications
Under section 65 of the Local Government Act, the Council must regularly undertake performance monitoring of council organisations to evaluate their contributions to the:
- council’s objectives for the organisation;
- desired results set out in the organisation’s statement of intent; and
- overall aims and outcomes of the local authority.

Delegation S-DM 1022 provides that the Audit & Risk Committee has the jurisdiction to “Monitor performance of the Council-Controlled organisations on a six monthly basis”.

6.2. Community Implications
Among other advantages, supporting and enabling the growth in the local economy; visitor industry partnering and promotions; and, attracting new business to the district through ENC programmes have benefits in increased local business sector strength, more local jobs, retained retail expenditure and increased town centre vitality.

6.3. Risk Management
The ENC Board meets regularly to oversee implementation of agreed plans and programmes in accordance with the accountability requirements of ENC being a CCO. ENC formally reports to the Council at six monthly intervals, and meets regularly with WDC staff to monitor progress and address any issues that arise.

6.4. Health and Safety
ENC operates at arm’s length from the WDC and manages its own health and safety programme.

7. CONTEXT
7.1. Policy
This matter is not a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.
7.2. Legislation

Local Government Act S.10 Purpose of Local Government and Part 5 Council-controlled organisations and council organisations

7.3. Community Outcomes

**Businesses in the District are diverse, adaptable and growing**
- There are growing numbers of businesses and employment opportunities in our District.
- There are sufficient and appropriate places where businesses are able to set up in our District.

**The distinctive character of our takiwā - towns, villages and rural areas is maintained**
- The centres of our towns are safe, convenient and attractive places to visit and do business.
- Our rural areas retain their amenity and character.

7.4. Delegations

Delegation S-DM 1022 provides for delegated authority to the Audit and Risk Committee to monitor the performance of Council Controlled organisations and to review and provide comments on draft Statements of Intent.
STATEMENT OF INTENT
For the Financial Year Beginning 1 July 2019

INTRODUCTION

North Canterbury Economic Development Trust trading as Enterprise North Canterbury (ENC) is a Council Controlled Organisation (CCO) established by the Waimakariri District & Hurunui District Councils. This Statement of Intent sets out the overall intentions and objectives for the period of 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2022.

NATURE AND SCOPE OF ACTIVITIES

ENC is an Economic Development Agency with a vision:

‘To inspire, attract and retain individuals, businesses and social enterprises to invest in our region’

THE OBJECTIVES OF THE TRUST

The objects of the Trust as set out in clause 3.1 of the Deed of Trust are to:

a) “Cultivate economic initiatives and foster growth for the benefit of the North Canterbury Community
b) Promote the economic, environmental, cultural and social well being of the North Canterbury Community
c) Foster, develop and assist in the management of best practices and effective use of the resources of North Canterbury
d) Promote and nurture community-based, sustainable economic growth through projects to benefit the people of North Canterbury Community”

In pursuing these objects ENC will:

- Operate with the utmost integrity
- Be innovative, proactive and professional
- Work collaboratively in all activities it facilitates
- Respect the democratic processes of the sponsoring Councils.

ENC’s modus operandi is to “stimulate/facilitate/liberate” new projects, as initiatives will only lead the regional economy to a higher level if a project is self-sustaining in the hands of the private sector. ENC does not see itself as “owning” projects in the long term. Accordingly when assessing new initiatives ENC will:

- Promote the sustainability of business
- Have an awareness of the needs of the community within which business operates
- Be a leader and facilitator but not an investor in development projects

THE PERFORMANCE MEASURES

In pursuit of its vision ENC has adopted three strategic objectives against which its performance will be monitored.
ENC Strategic Objectives
Performance Measures 2019/20

Vision: ‘To inspire, attract and retain individuals, businesses and social enterprises to invest in our region’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Objective 1: Supporting existing businesses to grow and prosper</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 1.1</strong> Support existing businesses by the provision of training, coaching, and mentoring services and networking opportunities</td>
<td>Deliver the Regional Business Partner Programme for NZTE</td>
<td>A minimum of 60% net promoter score of services provided by ENC through NZTE’s annual customer survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Undertake 48 Capability Assessments and issue a minimum of $80,000 NZTE Vouchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A minimum of 24 businesses referred to Business Mentors NZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Refer at least 2 businesses undertaking research and development work to Callaghan Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide training of local business owners and managers</td>
<td>Run 20 half day business training workshops with 80 business people attending, with attendees expressing a minimum of 80% satisfaction rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide networking opportunities to market, share knowledge, exchange information three times a year</td>
<td>Run 3 networking functions with a minimum of 60 attending and each event is fully sponsored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support local businesses by referring them to the appropriate support agency</td>
<td>A minimum of 60 businesses referred to external agencies (excluding BMNZ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retain ENC’s Business Partner Programme to provide increased services to local businesses</td>
<td>Retain a minimum financial commitment of $10k from business partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 1.1</td>
<td>Communicate with businesses so they are well informed about services and support available to them. Maintain and grow ENC’s website and social media.</td>
<td>A minimum of 10 electronic newsletters distributed. Enhance northcanterbury.co.nz website and Facebook and increase number of visitations. Grow social media channels and website visitors by 10%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Objective 1.2 | **Celebrate and Recognise Business Leaders in the region**
Launch the 2020 Business Awards | Full sponsorship of seven categories is achieved. Successful launch event held. An increase of 10% business entries. |
| Objective 1.3 | **Undertake analysis of regional employment opportunities and trends**
Have a high level of understanding of local labour market conditions and economic confidence in North Canterbury. | Complete 2 business confidence surveys with a minimum of 50 businesses participating with results picked up by newspapers. |
| Objective 1.4 | **Assist Hurunui Town Development**
ENC and the Council’s fully understand the needs of small businesses in rural townships. | Survey completed and discussed with participants and Council. Business initiatives are created following engagement. ENC to assist in implementing two activities as a result of their engagement. |
| Objective 1.5 | **Manage the ENC Business Centre**
Maintain engagement with Corporate Sponsor MainPower, two Silver sponsors and eight bronze sponsors. Generate bookings and catering for room hire. Success in repeat business for room hire and new business as a result of marketing the business centre through various channels. Run free events to encourage businesses to engage with the Centre. | Achieve sponsorship to the value of $64,000. Achieve at least $17,200 room hire and $7,600 for catering for the Business Centre. Quarterly “Talk with the Experts” are held and well supported. |
### Strategic Objective 2: Attract and inspire businesses, Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu and Government to Invest in our region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.1 Develop a North Canterbury Cycle Trail</strong></td>
<td>Involve strategic partners who will provide leadership and advocacy. Prepare a feasibility study for the development of a North Canterbury Cycle Trail from Christchurch to Waipara. Steering Group to lead initiative. Commence feasibility study and market development strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.2 Develop a strategic partner group to influence and attract a significant business to the region</strong></td>
<td>Set up a Food Sector focus group with an appropriately skilled team who will strategically develop relationships with key innovative investors and organisations who would move to the region. Group set up and objectives agreed. Several significant business opportunities identified. Council actively involved and working in partnership with the group.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strategic Objective 3: Promote the Waimakariri District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promote the Waimakariri District to businesses and visitors</strong></td>
<td>Overall satisfaction by WDC. Favourable response from annual report to WDC and renewal of service delivery contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.1 Business Promotion</strong>&lt;br&gt;Promote the Waimakariri District to attract new businesses and support expanding businesses:</td>
<td>Act as the first point of contact for all new business enquiries. At least 40 new and expanding businesses are supported with investigating setting up a business in the district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with existing developers and Council to enable them to achieve tenants for their developments</td>
<td>Number of connections to developers tracked At least 5 new businesses set up in the District as a direct result of ENC’s intervention ENC will be an active member with Council in the Mixed Use Business regeneration land discussions and plan development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote the district as a diverse and dynamic business community</td>
<td>Track and grow online visitations to the Invest Section of ENC website 15 case studies have been written and promoted widely At least 20 new businesses to the District are profiled on ENC’s Facebook District promotional video is produced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Enhance the Visitor Experience</td>
<td>Develop the Waimakariri Story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lead the development of a Waimakariri District Visitor Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leverage the Waimakariri District profile to visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distribute marketing publications both hard copy and online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manage web and online channels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinate joint advertising opportunities with operators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operate the Kaiapoi i-SITE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **3.3 Connect with Residents** | Promote and support quality events which reinforce the strengths and brand of the District and are embraced by the community  
Administer the contestible event funding | Number of events currently promoted increased by 5%  
Waimakariri Events Calendar distribution and the database continues to increase  
The contestable event fund is fully subscribed  
Event Organisers receive templates, advice and networking opportunities  
ENC will monitor for Council:  
- the proportion of innovation ie new events vs existing  
- the reject rate (is the fund big enough?) |
| **3.4 Develop new Products** | Develop cycle trails and connections in the Waimakariri  
Identify and support new rural tourism experiences  
Celebrate culture and diversity in the district | District wide walking/cycling map developed and printed and online  
Facilitate the agreement of parties and development of an eastern loop cycle trail  
Assist new rural tourism product to commence  
Progress opportunities to promote culture of local iwi  
Assist TKTT in promoting their places and stories |
THE BOARD’S APPROACH TO GOVERNANCE

The Board of Trustees is responsible for the overall corporate governance of ENC. The Trust Deed sets out the governance responsibilities of the Trustees. The Board guides and monitors management of the business and affairs of the Trust on behalf of the Councils to whom they are accountable. The Mayors of each of the Councils are Trustees, and the two CEO’s are Advisory Trustees. The Board meets two monthly.

THE ACCOUNTING POLICIES

The Trust is a not-for-profit organisation. The Trust has adopted accounting policies that are consistent with the Financial Reporting Act 1993 and Financial Reporting Standards issued by the Institute of Chartered Accountants of New Zealand. The Trust has elected to apply the PBE SFR-A (PS) Public Benefit Entity Simple Format Reporting – Accrual (Public Sector) on the basis that the Trust does not have public accountability and has total annual expenses of less than $2m.

THE RATIO OF CONSOLIDATED SHAREHOLDERS FUNDS TO TOTAL ASSETS

As at 30th June 2018 the Trust’s Equity comprised 61% of total assets and 100% of net assets. Equity is defined as the sum of the amount of retained earnings and accumulated losses. Total assets are defined as the sum of the net book values of current assets and non-current assets as disclosed in the Trust’s annual report.

DISTRIBUTIONS TO SHAREHOLDERS

The Trust’s Equity is not distributed, but is held in reserve to fund the Trust's future economic development activities and Waimakariri District promotion activities as appropriate.

INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED TO SHAREHOLDERS

Annually the Trust reports to the Councils, with the following matters being covered:

- Trust Directory
- Review of the Year’s Activities
- Report against the Year’s Performance Measures
- Statement of Financial Position
- Statement of Cashflows
- Statement of Financial Performance
- Statement of Movements in Equity
- Notes to the Accounts
- Auditor’s Opinion

Half yearly reports are provided to Councils including a statement of income and expenditure for the period, and a report of achievements against the Trust’s objectives.

Quarterly reports are required by WDC.

The two Mayors and CEO attend Board meetings and receive bi-monthly management and financial reports. The Trust’s Strategic Plan and the Annual Business Plan and Budget are made available to the two Councils following its approval by the ENC Board.
PROCEDURES FOR MEMBERS TO ACQUIRE SHARES

There is no means for Trustees to acquire shares.

COMPENSATION FROM LOCAL AUTHORITIES

The Trust receives seed capital from the two District Councils to enable it to initiate its economic development activities. In addition ENC has a service contact with Waimakariri District for the provision of District Promotion services. The following table sets out the current level of funding and that projected for the next three years (excl. GST).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authority</th>
<th>2019/20</th>
<th>2020/21</th>
<th>2021/22</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri</td>
<td>$TBA</td>
<td>$TBA</td>
<td>$TBA</td>
<td>Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri</td>
<td>$TBA</td>
<td>$TBA</td>
<td>$TBA</td>
<td>District Promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurunui</td>
<td>$TBA</td>
<td>$TBA</td>
<td>$TBA</td>
<td>Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To be advised as Councils determine funding through their Annual Plan processes

If any other contracts are entered into between the Trust and any territorial or regional authority, payment of the contract price will be required from such contracting authority.

COMMERCIAL VALUE OF THE SHAREHOLDERS’ INVESTMENT

The commercial value of the shareholders’ investment is the Trust’s equity is $488,467 at 30 June 2018 as stated in the annual report.

The Trust Deed requires that “the capital and income of the Trust fund shall be applied only within New Zealand to meet the Objects of the Trust”. On winding up all surplus assets are to be applied by the Councils to similar purposes as the Objects of the Trust. No reassessment of the Trust’s commercial value is therefore proposed.

OTHER MATTERS

The Trust has a contract with Waimakariri District Council for the provision of promotion services until 30 June 2021. The contract has a right for the trust to call for renewal of the contract for a further three years. The contract has a minimum annual level of funding specified ($200,000) but provides for the Council to confirm a final level of funding each year as it approves the annual Promotion Business Plan, prior to the commencement of each year.
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Enterprise North Canterbury

2019/20 Business Plan

‘To inspire, attract and retain individuals, businesses and social enterprises to invest in our region’
1.0 INTRODUCTION

The ENC Strategic Plan vision is:

‘To inspire, attract and retain individuals, businesses and social enterprises to invest in our region’

This Annual Business Plan generally takes the Objectives from the Statement of Intent, then prescribes the initiatives ENC will take, and the means and resources required, to progress the Strategic Objectives in 2019/20.

2.0 FINANCIAL RESOURCES

Annually the Waimakariri (WDC) and Hurunui District Councils (HDC) provide seed funding for ENC. This year we will receive $208k from WDC and $51k from HDC as capacity funding for economic development activities.

This base level of funding is used to undertake specific projects and is also used as a catalyst with Government departments and agencies, and the business sector, to leverage additional funds. The contracts ENC has with Government agencies are for the regional delivery of national economic development programmes. These Government contracts are negotiated for the delivery of specified services, with payments being made against agreed milestones. For 2019/20 contracted funding is $56k ($60k last year) from NZTE for the Regional Partner Programme. We have also included capacity funding from the Provincial Growth Fund (up to $100k).

Our corporate sponsor MainPower continues to provide $30k as capacity funding (same as last year). Other private sector funding for specific projects is budgeted at $196k ($297k last year, this is down because no business awards income) plus VIC sales of $140k ($111k last year).

ENC has a service contract with WDC through to June 2021 for the delivery of promotion activities specific to that District, with confirmed funding of $438k ($429k last year) which includes Event Funding in the amount of $48k. WDC and the ENC Board jointly approve the annual Promotion Business Plan setting out the services to be provided and appropriate performance measures.

ENC operates a project-based accounting system. To the greatest extent possible, staff and related overhead costs are charged to individual projects, so such costs are funded by the project sponsors, and the budget is prepared with this objective in mind. Where individual projects span more than one financial year any pre-payments received are recorded as “Income in Advance”– some $130k ($127k last year) have therefore been carried forward into 2019/20.

The financial position for ENC remains healthy. An operating surplus of $28k is budgeted this year.

To the greatest extent possible we secure funding before incurring Project expenses (thus minimising financial risk) and anticipate earning $16k in interest as a result. The 2019/20 budget is attached as an Appendix. It sets out the funding to be attached to each of the programmes.

Approved ENC Business Plan 2019/20
3.0 STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES

It is the District’s capacity that drives economies – the twenty-first century infrastructure; the business culture; the regional leadership; the connected, active networks of innovation and the spirit of collaboration. Waimakariri and Hurunui District Council’s investment through ENC enables and facilitates:

- Acceleration of high growth companies through the Business Accelerator Programme
- Entrepreneurship events through their networking functions and business breakfasts
- Joining the dots between sources of capital and the creation of new businesses
- Start-up advice, resources and training
- Research and development funding;
- Celebration of businesses through the North Canterbury Business Awards

The draft Statement of Intent that was submitted to Councils in February 2019. No changes were made. As a result, the 2019/20 Statement of Intent sets out THREE Objectives for the year and relevant Performance Measures but is necessarily high-level.

To more fully describe the wide range of activities to be undertaken by ENC some additional detail on objectives and performance measures and targets are included ensuring the business environment supports successful and sustainable enterprises.

OBJECTIVE ONE: Supporting existing businesses to grow and prosper

Objective 1.1 Support existing businesses by the provision of training coaching, mentoring services and networking opportunities.

There is considerable scope for the enhancement of business capability through training, coaching and mentoring of the SME sector. A particular focus is on the needs of individual businesses experiencing growth.

Performance Measures – ENC will:

- Work one on one with businesses to deliver the Regional Business Partner (RBP) Programme for NZTE and issue vouchers where appropriate
- Provide training of local business owners and managers
- Provide networking opportunities
- Support local businesses by referring them to the appropriate support agency this includes providing research and development support and funding to innovate
- Retain ENC’s Business Service Partner Programme
- Communicate with businesses and maintain and grow ENC’s website and social media
 Targets:
- Undertake at least 52 Capability Assessments for NZTE and issue $80,000 NZTE Vouchers while achieving a minimum of 60% net promoter score through NZTE annual customer survey
- Refer a minimum of 24 businesses to Business Mentors NZ
- Refer a minimum of 60 businesses to external agencies for funding and support (excluding BMNZ)
- Refer at least 2 businesses to Callaghan Innovation
- Run at least 20 half day workshop/seminars with 80 business people attending each session with a minimum of 80% of participants finding the overall standard to be very good or excellent
- Run 3 networking functions with a minimum of 60 people attending each networking event and have each event fully sponsored
- A minimum of 60 businesses ‘outside of the RBP’ met with and referred to appropriate agency (excluding BMNZ)
- Retain financial commitments from business service partners with a minimum of 10 partners at any given time and income generation of $10,000
- Produce at least 10 electronic newsletters and increase website visitors and Facebook connections increase by 10% (currently 1,555 Facebook followers)

Funded by:
NZTE $56,283; Businesses & NZTE vouchers $94k; Sponsors $7,500; Council Capacity Grants $58k

Objective 1.2 Celebrate and recognise business leaders in the region

The recognition and celebration of business achievements within the region is an important stimulus for entrepreneurs and will be leveraged to increase the involvement and overall reputation of North Canterbury businesses.

Performance Measure – ENC will:
- Secure at least seven category sponsors and MainPower as major sponsor
- Launch the 2020 North Canterbury Business Awards
- Secure enough entries to run the awards

Targets:
- Full sponsorship of seven categories achieved
- Successful launch event held
- At least 60 businesses apply to enter

Funded by Council Capacity Grants $9k
Objective 1.3  Undertake analyses of regional business opportunities and trends

ENC and Council seek to have a high level of understanding of local business conditions and economic confidence in North Canterbury.

Performance Measure – ENC will:
- Complete 2 business confidence surveys

Targets:
- Achieve a minimum of 50 participating businesses in the survey and ensure that the results are reported to board and newspapers
- Infometric reports are included in board reports and widely distributed.

Funded by Council Capacity Grants

Objective 1.4  Assist Hurunui Town Development

ENC can provide support services to clusters of North Canterbury small businesses in rural townships, to further assist their development. Waimakariri District’s requirements are accommodated in the Promotion Contract.

Performance Measures – ENC will:
- Complete a town survey if requested to determine the opportunities for development by consulting with businesses and Council
- Assist potential investments that may be suitable for the Hurunui Region

Targets:
- Survey completed and shared with businesses and Councils
- Business initiatives are created following engagement
- ENC assists in implementing activities as a result of engagement

Funded by Hurunui Council Capacity Grant of $8k

Objective 1.5  Manage the ENC Business Centre

The Business Centre is an excellent way of partnering with the private sector to offer meeting and training room facilities for use. It also allows businesses to access the many services that ENC offers to North Canterbury based businesses including free business assessments, funding to assist with business training and coaching, an extensive calendar of business relevant events and free ‘Talk with the Experts’ sessions.

There are also drop-in workspaces where businesses can use the ultrafast Wi-Fi and work productively whilst on the move, and photocopying and printing facilities.

Performance Measures – ENC will:
- Maintain engagement with Corporate Sponsor MainPower, two Silver sponsors and eight bronze sponsors
- Generate bookings and catering for room hire
- Secure repeat business for room hire and new business as a result of marketing the Business Centre through various channels
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Run free events to encourage businesses to engage with the Centre for example “Talk with the Experts” and topical sessions by specialist consultants

Targets:
- Achieve sponsorship to the value of $67,500
- Achieve at least $25k for Business Centre hire and catering
- Bookings increase through greater awareness of centre
- Quarterly free “Talk with the Experts” sessions held with good uptake

Funded by Sponsors $67,500 and $25k from meeting room bookings and catering and photocopying/equipment hire

OBJECTIVE TWO: Attract and Inspire Businesses, Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu and Government to Invest in our region

ENC has and can continue to play a role in attracting businesses and government investment in new product development and be part of an influencer group tasked with identifying potential significant organisations to set up in North Canterbury.

Objective 2.1 Develop a North Canterbury Cycle Trail

Some sectors of the regional economy will benefit from a collaborative approach to achieve better results than is possible by each business acting independently.

Performance Measures – ENC will:
- Involve strategic partners who will provide leadership and advocacy
- Produce a feasibility study for the development of a North Canterbury Cycle Trail from Christchurch to Waipara

Targets:
- Steering Group to lead initiative
- Feasibility study completed

Funded by Capability Funding from Council Grants and MBIE

Objective 2.2 Develop a strategic partner group to influence and attract a significant business to the region

It is the District’s capacity that drives economies – the twenty-first century infrastructure; the business culture; the regional leadership; the connected, active networks of innovation and the spirit of collaboration. ENC will:

Performance Measures – ENC will:
- Food Sector focus group set up to strategically develop relationships with key innovative investors and organisations who would move to the region

Targets:
- Group set up and objectives agreed
- Several significant business opportunities identified
- Council actively involved and working in partnership with the group

Funded by Councils Capacity Grant
OBJECTIVE THREE: Promote the Waimakariri District

ENC will promote Waimakariri District in accordance with the Promotion Business Plan. There are four key objectives in the plan: one is focussed on the business sector, and three are specific to the visitor industry sector. The specifics are set out in the 2019/20 Promotion Business Plan approved annually by WDC/ENC.

Objective 3.1 Business Promotion (Business Sector)

Promote the Waimakariri District to attract new businesses and support expanding businesses:

Performance Measures - ENC will
- Act as the first point of contact for all new business enquiries
- Work with existing developers and Council to enable them to achieve tenants for their developments
- Support major or targeted investment in the region
- Promote the district as a diverse and dynamic business community

Targets:
- At least 40 new and expanding businesses are supported with investigating setting up or expanding their business in the district
- Track and grow registrations to the online business startup course
- Number of connections to developers tracked
- At least 5 new businesses set up in the District as a direct result of ENC’s intervention
- At least 1 new major tourist investigated and supported by ENC
- ENC will be an active member with Council in the Mixed-Use Business regeneration land discussions and plan development
- Track and grow online visitations to the Invest Section of ENC website
- 15 case studies written and promoted widely
- At least 20 new businesses to the District will be profiled on ENC’s Facebook
- District promotional video is produced

Objective 3.2 Enhance the Visitor Experience (Visitor Industry)

Promote the District so visitors are attracted to visit and spend time in the District by the special experiences and attractions offered and provided with quality information services

Performance Measures – ENC will:
- Continue developing the Waimakariri Story
- Lead the development of a Waimakariri District Visitor Strategy
- Leverage the Waimakariri District profile to visitors
- Distribute marketing publications both hard copy and online
- Manage web and online channels
- Coordinate joint advertising opportunities with operators
- Operate the Kaiapoi i-SITE
Targets:
- Waimakariri Story created and promoted in alignment with the Canterbury and NZ Story
- A new visitor strategy is developed and signed off by key stakeholders
- New image and video library is continually updated
- Official Visitor/Walking and Cycling Guide and Street Maps distributed
- Achieve growth in online presence through website page visits and Facebook likes and reach, Instagram and newsletter uptake
- Coordinate the Waimakariri District’s inclusion in the 2020 Walking Festival
- Deliver an effective and coordinated business partner programme
- Achieve more awareness of the district with other tourism agencies which results in more inbound bookings
- Achieve growth in guest nights and visitor arrivals to the district measured by Stats NZ (Commercial Accommodation Monitor)
- Achieve growth in visitor spend measured by MBIE (Regional Tourism Estimate Spend)
- Meet i-SITE NZ membership accreditation and achieve income from business partners and commissions

Objective 3.3  Connect with Residents (Visitor Industry)

Promote and support quality events which reinforce the strengths and brand of the District and are embraced by the community to the local and domestic markets. Events raise the profile of the District.

Performance Measures – ENC will:
- Promote and support quality events which reinforce the strengths and brand of the District and are embraced by the community
- Administer the contestable event funding

Targets:
- Number of events currently promoted increases by 5%
- Waimakariri Events Calendar distribution and the database continues to increase
- The contestable event fund is fully subscribed
- Event Organisers receive templates, advice and networking opportunities
- ENC will monitor for Council:
  - the proportion of innovation ie new events vs existing
  - the reject rate (is the fund big enough)

Objective 3.4  Destination Development

Developing the Waimakariri District as a tourism destination includes improving and supporting existing operators, iwi, and working with private sector investors to plan and develop new visitor attractors that leverage the Waimakariri offering.

Performance Measures – ENC will:
- Facilitating the connection of existing cycleways agencies to create a promotable product (working title, The Eastern Loop Track), alongside of raising the profile of individual tracks and their destinations
Clustering activities with relevant businesses to provide compelling experiences, quality tourism businesses and remarkable service to entice first time and repeat visitation

Researching the cultural, environmental and historical aspects of the district to create compelling and attractive stories of our places for promotion to local residents and visitors Celebrate culture and diversity in the district

Targets:

- Development of the Eastern Loop Cycle trail has been progressed due to ENC’s facilitation and agreement of all parties
- Cycle Trails, individual and looped (when ready), in the district well profiled and promoted to locals and visitors, particularly Christchurch residents
- Strong relationships with Ngāi Tūāhuriri, ECan, TKOT and WDC for cycleways and stories going forward
- Itineraries and suggestions for residents and visitors are developed and promoted showcasing our places
- Stories; cultural, environment, historical of our places are developed, promoted and integrated into itineraries and on cycle/walk way promotion

Funded by Waimakariri District Council $438k ($429k last year) plus $130k income in advance from WDC operators and sponsors $22k ($24k last year) plus VIC sales of $140k ($111k last year)

4.0 THE SUCCESS MEASURES

ENC will monitor trends in the region’s economic activity

Measuring economic activity within the region with any accuracy is limited by the quality of available data. Most economic data is collected at a national level then interpolated to the regions. There is only a limited linkage between ENC’s strategic objectives and the available data, and furthermore, ENC does not operate in isolation in the pursuit of economic development with North Canterbury.

The following statistics will be monitored to assess absolute and relative changes in economic activity in the region:

- Changes in the region’s real value-added (GDP) growth relative to that of Canterbury and New Zealand (Source: BERL or Infometrics)
  - In 2018 (most recent publicly available data from MBIE) Waimakariri GDP grew by 3.1% and Hurunui grew by 2.0%. This is compared to a growth of 2.3% for Canterbury and 2.7% for New Zealand
  - In 2018 the Waimakariri GDP was $1,856 and the Hurunui GDP was $687m

- Changes in the number of businesses in the region by size category and the number of their employees (Source: Statistics NZ & NZ Business Frame)
  - In Hurunui (as of 2018) there are 2,532 businesses with 5,200 employees. This is a drop in business numbers of 2.5% and an increase in employees of 2.0%
In Waimakariri (as of 2018) there are 6,429 businesses with 15,000 employees. This is a drop in business numbers of 0.9% and an increase in employees of 2.0%

- The percentage growth rate in the number of businesses and their employees in North Canterbury relative to that of Canterbury and New Zealand (Source: Statistics NZ & NZ Business Frame)
  - As above for Waimakariri and Hurunui.
  - For Canterbury a drop in business numbers of 0.4% an increase in employees of 3.0%
  - For New Zealand an increase in business numbers of 0.7% an increase in employees of 3.2%

- Changes in the number of full-time equivalent jobs in North Canterbury relative to the region’s population growth rate (Source: Statistics NZ)
  - ENC were unable to find any up-to-date information showing how many people are FTE in individual TLAs. The most recent data I could find was from the last census in 2013.
  - Hurunui population increased an estimated 50 from 12,800 to 12,850 – an increase of 0.4%
  - Waimakariri population increased an estimated 1,400 from 59,300 to 60,700 – an increase of 2.4%

- Changes in residents’ income levels relative to that of Canterbury and New Zealand
  - Waimakariri mean household income level has INCREASED 6.4% to $104,200
  - Hurunui mean household income level has INCREASED 6.4% to $89,300
  - Canterbury mean household income level has INCREASED 6.4% to $100,900
  - New Zealand mean household income level has increased 7.4% to $104,400
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PROMOTION OF WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT

2019/20 BUSINESS PLAN

Incorporating

Business Promotion
Visit Waimakariri and Events
Kaiapoi i-SITE
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Enterprise North Canterbury (ENC) has been contracted since 2005 by Waimakariri District Council to promote the Waimakariri District as an innovative and progressive place to stay and play and since 2012 ENC has been working closely with local developers and Council to promote the Waimakariri District as a destination for business relocation, expansion and start-ups.

This is being achieved by developing a strong, positive profile promoting Waimakariri to local, national and international audiences. This aims to attract visitors and new business through marketing and events, profiling why it is worth visiting/investing in/doing business in/relocating to.

WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT PROMOTION OBJECTIVES

GOALS

To achieve the Promotion Objectives, the 2019/20 Promotion Plan has four key goals, one of which is focussed on the business sector, and three of which are specific to the visitor industry sector.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUSINESS PROMOTION</th>
<th>ENHANCE THE VISITOR EXPERIENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Market the district so that more businesses want to set up here</td>
<td>• Collectively market the district to visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide quality information services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE WAIMAKARIRI STORY

CONNECT WITH RESIDENTS

• Increase local pride, awareness of events and endorse their own district to friends and family

DESTINATION DEVELOPMENT

• Grow the districts offering by assisting and promoting new and existing visitor attractions

GOAL ONE: BUSINESS PROMOTION (Business sector)

The role of ENC is to market the desirable features of setting up in the Waimakariri District, encouraging more businesses to establish will create more jobs and greater benefits to the local economy. This role is not an isolated one, so to be effective ENC must, and does, work closely with multiple parties including private (local and prospective) business interests, developers, and WDC staff.

This role involves supporting potential investors and developers in identifying opportunities, assisting with assessing feasibility, and finding funding or investors to
assist when needed. This means that a project may take years from the first contact until the project becomes public knowledge if it turns out to be viable.

ENC conducts marketing activities by promoting the Waimakariri District as a destination for business to setup, expand or relocate to. ENC will:

- Give business planning and modelling support to new and expanding businesses
- Work alongside developers to promote their developments and making connections and making direct referrals to the appropriate opportunities
- Understand and promote the opportunities for businesses to set up in the district
- Provide resources to assist prospective businesses to plan successfully
- Provide data and data analysis to prospective investors
- Connect potential developers to funding or assistance when relevant
- Identify opportunities that will support and enhance existing businesses.

The Waimakariri District Council will:

- Actively lead and implement Council’s ‘Business friendly’ resources and processes aimed at helping new and expanding businesses to successfully navigate all regulatory and legislative requirements
- Develop and implement key plans and strategies aimed at creating an appropriate environment and framework for businesses to operate within (being town centre plans, district development strategies and district plan)
- Case management and support through Council’s regulatory processes

1.1 Acting as the first point of contact for all new business enquiries
ENC’s role is one of developing close working relationships with business and developers which can involve having important and impartial conversations with businesses that Council cannot (due to its role as the regulatory authority). ENC will:

- Provide start up support by providing valuable statistics, business planning, training and modelling assistance
- Make introductions and connections with local community, businesses and developers
- Assist in identifying appropriate locations suitable to the new business

1.2 Working with existing developers and Council to enable them to achieve tenants for their developments
The key values seen by business, developers, investors, banks and real estate agents is ENC’s ability to be independent, apolitical and to offer sound impartial advice. It is a partnership-focused relationship building on good collaboration with business owners and developers. ENC will:

- Work with local developers and building/land owners to assist them to catalyse their developments
- Provide information on general business performance and what business types are doing well in the Waimakariri
- Work with Council to assist with finding suitable developers and tenants for the Mixed Use Business Area in Kaiapoi
1.3 Supporting major or targeted investment in the region
ENC will actively seek and support:

- investment opportunities for Waimakariri that align with the objectives of the district plan
- the feasibility assessment of a major tourism attraction in Waimakariri
- new investors and developers of new tourism infrastructure (such as hotels)
- options to establish a tourism attraction in Oxford

1.4 Promoting the district as a diverse and dynamic business community
To raise the awareness of the District as a business destination by profiling the benefits and opportunities of the region, ENC will:

- Host a significant section on ENC’s website on business investment in the Waimakariri District including lifestyle, job opportunities and education with a link to Visit Waimakariri’s website showcasing the “play” element
- Provide case studies as part of the marketing profile
- Improve social media business promotion channels
- Work with the WDC Communications team and their online editors to link content on business promotion and Council support
- Produce a District promotional video

Targets:
- At least 40 new and expanding businesses are supported with investigating setting up or expanding their business in the district
- Track and grow registrations to the online business startup course
- Number of connections to developers tracked
- At least 5 new businesses set up in the District as a direct result of ENC’s intervention
- At least 1 new major tourist investigated and supported by ENC
- ENC will be an active member with Council in the Mixed-Use Business regeneration land discussions and plan development
- Track and grow online visitations to the Invest Section of ENC website
- 15 case studies written and promoted widely
- At least 20 new businesses to the District will be profiled on ENC’s Facebook
- District promotional video is produced

GOAL TWO: ENHANCE THE VISITOR EXPERIENCE (Visitor Industry)

Determining the promotional message and positioning for the Waimakariri as a visitor destination has been undertaken. This year will see the alignment of the destination branding ‘Waimakariri Story’ with Canterbury and NZ Story. It will incorporate the districts attractions, visitor activities, natural features, community cultures and aspirations with an aim to position the district in the minds of locals, domestic and international tourists as a desirable destination.

To achieve this Visit Waimakariri will deliver the following objectives:
2.1 MARKETING THE DISTRICT

Promote the district as a visitor destination to; Christchurch and Canterbury residents, North Islanders and selected International markets.

2.1.1 Marketing Promotion

a. Continue developing the Waimakariri Story by creating an online resource with licence-free content available to be downloaded for the purpose of promoting the Waimakariri District as a place to live, work and visit:

- Creating an online platform for hosting story content
- Sourcing and creating content; written and imagery

b. Visit Waimakariri will continue to leverage the Waimakariri District profile by:

- Attending relevant trade and consumer shows
- Providing relevant and updated district information, including events via Website and social media
- Developing an annual targeted promotion plan of the district events and ‘what there is to do’ to local, Christchurch and Canterbury residents
- Consulting with industry organisations
- Monitoring visitor numbers and spend

2.1.2 Marketing publications

Depending on supplies of the Official Visitor Guide (OVG) incorporating the Walking and Cycling Guide, Visit Waimakariri may need to re-design and print a new OVG. We will continue to distribute the current district marketing collateral including:

- The Official Visitor Guide and Walking & Cycling Guide
- Town Centre street maps

2.1.3 Web and online channels

Manage the following online marketing channels:

- [www.visitwaimakariri.co.nz](http://www.visitwaimakariri.co.nz) which includes business partners, i-SITE and town profiles. Grow the content of this site to include non-business partners at a lower listing level.
- Visit Waimakariri social media channels – Facebook and Instagram
- Introduce more blogs to increase social and website traffic as well as Google rankings
- Continual increase of the profile of the Waimakariri District on the Tourism New Zealand and ChristchurchNZ web portals

Targets:

- Waimakariri Story is promoted through all marketing channels
- New image and video resources continually created
- Official Visitor/Walking and Cycling Guide and Street Maps distributed
- Attend TRENZ in Christchurch in 2020
- Track success of promotion activities for the year specifically to Christchurch residents
• **Achieve greater awareness and linkages of the district with other tourism agencies which results in increased visitations**
• **Achieve growth in guest nights and visitor arrivals to the district measured by Stats NZ (Commercial Accommodation Monitor)**
• **Achieve growth in visitor spend measured by MBIE (Regional Tourism Estimate Spend)**
• **Achieve growth in online presence through website page visits and Facebook likes and reach, Instagram and newsletter uptake**

### 2.2 COORDINATION

Much of the tourism sector depends on effective relationships, partnerships and connections as it does on promotion. Visit Waimakariri has a small staff with a limited marketing budget. Therefore, we rely on our ability to entice tourism operators and sponsors to take part in everything we initiate. This includes district publications, website listings and events.

#### 2.2.1 Visit Waimakariri Visitor Industry Partnership

Visit Waimakariri will retain and attract Business Partners as a means of ensuring collective strength and consistent messaging in the sector and to ensure partners are well informed of industry developments.

Visit Waimakariri will:
• Continue to promote and sign up business partners
• Review and update business partner benefits
• Communicate with partners by a quarterly newsletter containing relevant industry information as well as on an as needed basis with time-specific information
• Coordinate two networking functions or topical workshops for business partners
• Commercial Accommodation Monitors and Visitor Spend is monitored and communicated to all relevant parties
• Support Waimakariri tourism operators in relevant industry initiatives
• Promote trade ready operators and work with those who wish to become trade ready for promotion to international markets.
• Support and host familiarisation visits by ChristchurchNZ and Tourism New Zealand

#### 2.2.2 Town Centre Promotion and Support

ENC’s role is to ensure that individual town organisation promotion programmes are well coordinated and understood and complement one another to achieve a stronger district wide profile.

This will be achieved by:
• Supporting and cooperating with Council, Community Boards and the Town Centre Association’s.
• Supporting joint promotional opportunities

#### 2.2.3 Other Stakeholders

When undertaking marketing projects, ENC will liaise with other stakeholders where appropriate:
• Local promotion associations
• Waimakariri District Council and Community Boards
- ECan
- Te Kohaka o Tuhaitara Trust (TKTT)
- Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu
- Department of Conservation
- Canterbury Regional and District Tourism Organisations
- Tourism New Zealand
- New Zealand Motor Caravan Association
- NZTA

Targets:
- Deliver the Business Partner Programme
- Two business partner functions held
- Four newsletters sent to business partners
- Achieve growth in business partners to fund website
- Attend quarterly town promotions meetings in conjunction with WDC

2.3.1 OPERATING AND GROWING THE KAIAPOI i-SITE

The Kaiapoi i-SITE is the official Visitor Centre for Waimakariri District and has national i-SITE accreditation. It provides coordinated, consistent and professional District-wide information to residents and visitors, as set out in i-SITE standards and requirements.

- The i-SITE focus will continue to be the high standard delivery of information services. There will be continued emphasis on staff training, attend i-SITE Conference for increased knowledge and product presentations
- Strengthen customer relationships by developing a programme of regular contact and familiarisation of the District tourism businesses
- External revenues will be maximised contained by:
  - Raising the awareness of local residents and operators of the services available through the Kaiapoi i-SITE to achieve increased sales, bookings and commissions
  - Developing packages for residents and groups utilizing the i-SITE knowledge and the relationships cultivated within the tourism industry
  - Acting as a ticketing agent for Dash, i-Ticket and NC Music Society
- Distribute the District’s marketing material including the Official Waimakariri Visitor Guide/Walking and Cycle brochure, Rangiora and Kaiapoi street maps, Waimakariri Events Calendar and the new residents’ pamphlet.

Targets:
- Meet i-SITE NZ membership accreditation
- Achieve income from business partners and commissions

GOAL THREE: CONNECT WITH RESIDENTS (Visitor Industry, event specific)

Visit Waimakariri will promote and support the district’s quality events, which reinforce the strengths and brand of the Waimakariri District to the local and domestic markets. Events raise the profile of the District.
3.1 Event Promotion

Visit Waimakariri will raise the awareness of what Waimakariri has to offer including the many attractions our residents support such as local markets and events. This includes leveraging their personal networks (social media and word-of-mouth).

Develop and manage an Events Marketing and Communications Plan for the promotion of events in the Waimakariri District to residents and visitors, including:

- Produce a monthly Waimakariri Event Guide showcasing key visitor events, including the distribution of the guide and growth of the listings and distribution channels
- Produce an annual events calendar
- Produce an email newsletter showcasing events, walks and business partner promotions – currently monthly.
- Manage event poster and electronic display throughout the District.
- Investigate advertising collective events around a common time including school holiday promotional programmes, seasonal and outdoor events.

3.2 Contestable Event Funding

Provide a contestable events fund for the promotion of events and/or to fund event coordination.

Maintain and adhere to the funding conditions (e.g. allocations, criteria and application forms) of the event fund with the Events Funding Panel, and implement any enhancements to ensure criteria are relevant, realistic and achievable.

The Events Funding Panel¹ will meet twice a year to review applications for visitor and community events applying to the Waimakariri Event Fund Contestable Fund.

3.3 Assistance to Event organisers

Add value to the events sector by:

- Promoting the online Waimakariri Event Toolkit
- Host two networking functions annually for event organisers to networking for future collaboration purposes

Targets:

- Number of events currently promoted increases by 5%
- Waimakariri Events Calendar distribution and the database continues to increase
- The contestable event fund is fully subscribed
- Event Organisers receive templates, advice and networking opportunities
- ENC will monitor for Council:
  - the proportion of innovation ie new events vs existing
  - the reject rate (is the fund big enough

GOAL FOUR: DESTINATION DEVELOPMENT

Developing the Waimakariri District as a tourism destination includes improving and supporting existing operators and working with private sector investors to plan and

1 This Event Funding Panel comprises: Robin Brown, Christine Watton and Claire Gifford

Approved 2019/20 Business Plan
develop new visitor attractors that leverage the Waimakariri offering. This will be achieved by:

4.1 Facilitating the connection of existing cycleways and agencies to create a promitable product (working title, The Eastern Loop Track), alongside of raising the profile of individual tracks and their destinations:

- Work with WDC, ECan, TKTT towards the creation of safe, easily accessible and well-marked on-road cycleways between the existing tracks in the eastern side of district
- Work with above agencies on development of cohesive signage for the Eastern Loop Track to make it easy for cyclists to find, follow and understand
- Work with agencies to develop a compelling story for cycling in Waimakariri District and promote to local and Christchurch residents
- Keep informed and engaged with the development of:
  o the new shared cycleway coming into the district from Northern Arterial Motorway
  o the new Silverstream loop track being created by ECan
  o the waterways cycle project led by a subcommittee of Waimakariri Zone Committee
- Continue to update, information pertaining to cycle trails on our website and online walking and cycling guide

4.2 Clustering activities with relevant businesses to provide compelling experiences, quality tourism businesses and remarkable service to entice first time and repeat visitation:

- Identify all tourism businesses, experiences/attractions by locality ‘place based’ to promote
- Create suggestions for visitors to participate in local activities in specific places to be available on website, social media, and printed at i-SITE as needed.

4.3 Researching the cultural, environmental and historical aspects of the district to create compelling and attractive stories of our places for promotion to local residents and visitors:

- Work with Ngai Tūāhuriri to gather, share, collaborate on historical and present stories pertaining to Maori
- Work with TKTT and ECAN to gain a greater understanding of facts and projects pertaining to the environment
- Connect with locals in our places, the way it was, the way it is to give a ‘feel’ to the stories
- Visit district museums and curators to understand and convey historical stories that would be of interest to a visitor or spike their interest to learn more
- Connect with Art Galleries of the district to understand the influences and reasons for the art in our district.

**Targets:**

- Development of the Eastern Loop Cycle trail has been progressed due to ENC’s facilitation and agreement of all parties
- Cycle Trails, individual and looped (when ready), in the district well profiled and promoted to locals and visitors, particularly Christchurch residents
- Strong relationships with Ngāi Tūāhuriri, ECan, TKOT and WDC for cycleways and stories going forward
- Itineraries and suggestions for residents and visitors are developed and promoted showcasing our places
- Stories; cultural, environment, historical of our places are developed, promoted and integrated into itineraries and on cycle/walk way promotion
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE UTILITIES AND ROADING COMMITTEE HELD IN
THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA ON TUESDAY 18 JUNE
2019 COMMENCING AT 4.00PM

PRESENT

Councillor P Williams (Chairperson), Mayor D Ayers, Deputy Mayor K Felstead, Councillors
R Brine, J Meyer and S Stewart.

IN ATTENDANCE

Councillors D Gordon, N Atkinson (until 5.20pm), W Doody (until 4.45pm), K Barnett (to
6.35pm)
J Palmer, (Chief Executive), G Cleary (Manager Utilities and Roading), K Simpson (3
Waters Manager), B Rice (Senior Transport Engineer), J McBride (Roading and Transport
Manager), G Hutchison (Wastewater Asset Manager), S Collin (Infrastructure Strategy
Manager), O Davies (Drainage Asset Manager), K Graham (Road Safety
Coordinator/Journey Planner), D Roxborough (Project Mgr District Regeneration), F Scales
(Senior Project Engineer), S Allen (Water Environment Advisor, L Hurley (Technical
Administrator) and A Smith (Governance Coordinator)

1 APOLOGIES

There were no apologies.

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

There were no conflicts of interest.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

3.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Utilities and Roading Committee held on
Tuesday 16 April 2019

Moved Councillor Meyer Seconded Councillor Felstead

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee:

(a) Confirms, as a true and correct record, the minutes of a meeting of the
Utilities and Roading Committee held on Tuesday 16 April 2019.

CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING

There were no matters arising

5 DEPUTATION

There were no deputations.
6 REPORTS

6.1 Request for Approval to Undertake a Speed Limit Review in the Tuahiwi Area – Joanne McBride (Roading and Traffic Manager) and Bill Rice (Senior Transportation Engineer)

J McBride and B Rice presented this report requesting approval of the committee to undertake a speed limit review in the wider Tuahiwi Area. This is a result of a number of concerns raised at a meeting held in May at the Marae. There have also been several service requests received requesting a review of or changes to the speed limits in the area.

Councillor Felstead sought confirmation that this is the highest priority for speed concerns in the district. J McBride said this area and the State Highways are the two highest areas of concern.

Councillor Barnett asked if this could be done in conjunction with NZTA as a matter of efficiency. J McBride said this was being followed up.

Moved Mayor Ayers Seconded Councillor Meyer

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 190606079692;
(b) Approves staff undertaking a review of speed limits in the wider Tuahiwi area generally within the boundary of (but excluding) Lineside Road / Main North Road / Rangiora Woodend Road and Boys Road;
(c) Notes that a further report will be brought to the Rangiora-Ashley, Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi and Woodend-Sefton Community Boards on the proposed changes and requesting approval from Council to consult prior to going out to the community;
(d) Notes that speed limits will be assessed using NZTA’s Speed Management Guide (2016);
(e) Circulates this report to the Rangiora-Ashley, Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi and Woodend-Sefton Community Boards for information.

CARRIED

Mayor Ayers supports approval of this request, noting that some of the roads in this area are not suitable to be travelled at 100kph.

Councillor Meyer also in support, believes it is appropriate for this review to be undertaken and this will have support from the community.

Mayor Ayers in reply noted that this review will touch on three of the Community Board areas, most significantly Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi.
6.2 Belfast to Kaiapoi Cycleway Consultation – Bill Rice (Senior Transportation Engineer) and Hari Pillay (Roading Design Engineer)

B Rice and J McBride presented this report, which seeks approval to commence consultation on a new cycleway from Tram Road to the existing Passchendaele cycleway, via Kaiapoi. B Rice spoke on the assessments that have been done on the options considered, noting the preferred route consisting of two sections. The first section from Tram Road to Vickery Street, would run along the west side of the Main North Road, which would be a shared path separated from the road. The second part would be from Vickery Street to the Passchendaele Path. B Rice noted that this is the best solution that is available.

Councillor Stewart asked what will be the favoured style of cycleway. B Rice noted that there could be a combination of options shown in the report, depending on the level of traffic in different areas.

Councillor Williams asked has there been any survey undertaken on whether this path would be used by commuter cyclists or recreation cyclists. B Rice said this information would be gathered during the consultation process.

Moved Councillor Meyer Seconded Mayor Ayers

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee

(a) Receives report No. 190412055544;
(b) Approves public consultation on the cycleway route(s) as shown on the attached drawing (Attachment ii);
(c) Approves consultation with the adjacent property owners and residents;
(d) Notes that Project Control Group aims to have the cycleway completed by October 2020 to coincide with the opening of the CNC cycleway;
(e) Notes that a speed limit review is proposed on Main North Road and Tram Road, in conjunction with this project;
(f) Notes that safety audits will be carried out by an independent audit team at concept design, detailed design and post construction stages;
(g) Notes that the total estimated cost of the cycleway is $1.5m ($810,000 for section between Tram Road and the edge of the Kaiapoi urban area, and $610,000 for the section within the Kaiapoi urban area)
(h) Notes that $1.022m has been allocated in the Long Term Plan for construction of the Tram Road to Kaiapoi urban area section of cycleway in years 2018/19 and 2019/20, and that $500,000 per annum has been allocated for the construction of urban cycleways in Rangiora and Kaiapoi for each of the years from 2018/19 to 2020/21.
(i) Notes that minor improvements on Main North Road (near Hellers and Clemence Drilling properties) are proposed to be designed and built in conjunction with this project, with funding to come from the Minor Improvements budget;
(j) Notes that this report has been presented to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board at their June meeting;
Councillor Meyer noted that it is becoming commonplace here in New Zealand and overseas to have cycleways. Councillor Meyer spoke on comments from a current cyclists and also noted the numbers of cyclists using the Passchendaele Memorial Path. There is a lot of interest in this proposal and it will get a lot of use.

Councillor Atkinson does not support putting the cycleway beside a main road, and believes that the Council needs to be forming cycleways away from the main roads. Council needs to be looking at alternatives properly. There is no mention of lighting the cycleway. Council needs to be looking at making sure the people are safe and needs to be more careful than we are.

Councillor Gordon supports this matter going out for public consultation. Councillor Gordon suggested that the Council also needs to work with Environment Canterbury in promoting the recreational opportunities along Doubledays Road and around the Waimakariri River. Staff were thanked for the opportunity to view the area proposed in the site visit last week.

Mayor Ayers supports this going out for consultation. There are two things to be looked at for the cycleway – safety and convenience. A motorway/pathway would be the way to get cyclists from this side of the Waimakariri River into Christchurch. Mayor Ayers does support the most direct route and supports what is proposed to go out to consultation. The Council also needs to think about the cycleways and businesses.

Councillor Meyer noted the finished cycleway will have some parts laid out away from the roads and this will also make it safer for the driving public.

6.3 Stockwater Race Bylaw Review 2019-2021 – Libica Hurley (Technical Administrator) and Kalley Simpson (3 Waters Manager)

L Hurley (Technical Administrator) and K Simpson (3 Waters Manager) presented this report. This report provided an update to the committee on the proposed scope of the Stockwater Race Bylaw review, which will involve seven sub-projects, to be completed by June 2020. The Bylaw will then go out for public consultation in the second half of 2020, with the revised bylaw being updated by June 2021.

There were no questions.

Moved Councillor Brine Seconded Councillor Felstead

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 190528075199.

(b) Notes the proposed scope of the Stockwater Race Bylaw 2019 review including the following sub-projects:

- Works in Private Property
- Road Reserve Race Maintenance
- Managed Aquifer Recharge
- Environmental Benefits
- Firefighting Benefit
- Ponds
- Fencing of Water Races
• Biosecurity and Contamination Risks

(c) **Notes** that staff have commenced the Stockwater Race Bylaw 2019 as requested by Council and this review is expected to take 2 years.

(d) **Circulates** this report to the Water Race Advisory Group (WRAG), Waimakariri Water Zone Committee (WWZC) and Community Boards for their information.

**CARRIED**

6.4 **Central Rangiora Gravity Capacity Sewer Upgrade – Stage 4 Increase in Scope – Gavin Hutchison (Wastewater Asset Manager)**

G Hutchison and K Simpson presented this report. G Hutchison spoke seeking the approval of the committee to increase the scope for Stage 4 of the Central Rangiora Gravity Capacity Sewer Upgrade to include a portion of Stage 5. G Cleary noted that this increase makes sense to package the difficult parts of this project together in this stage. The scope of Stage 4 has been reviewed and determined that it would be a better outcome and less disruptive for the stage to continue north of Johns Road, rather than stopping in the middle of the Johns Road/King Street roundabout.

Moved Councillor Brine Seconded Councillor Williams

**THAT** the Utilities and Roading Committee

(a) **Receives** report No. 190531077797.

(b) **Approves** the increase in the Stage 4 scope for the 2019/20 financial year to include the Johns Road to George Street section of pipework on King Street.

(c) **Notes** that there is sufficient budget of $1,095,000 in the 2019/20 financial year to complete the proposed increase in Stage 4 scope.

(d) **Notes** that an expression of interest will be issued for Stage 4 in June 2019 and tendered in July 2019.

(e) **Circulates** to the Rangiora Ashley Community Board for their information.

**CARRIED**

Councillor Williams noted that this will be a more economical way for this project to progress.

6.5 **Sea Foam Testing – Update on Summer 2018 Results – Simon Collin (Infrastructure Strategy Manager) and Sophie Allen (Water Environment Advisor)**

S Collin and S Allen presented this report, providing an update from sea foam samples taken in the last summer season. These samples taken in December 2018 and the results showed higher levels of both E. coli and Enterococci than that taken previously in January 2018. To date there has been $55,000 on the testing.
Councillor Atkinson expressed concern as to why it is proving so difficult for Council staff to get the samples of sea foam. The sources of information on the reports of sea foam can come from beach walkers, and Councillor Atkinson has concerns that he is receiving monthly notification of the foam on the beach but this information is not getting to the Staff, so testing can be undertaken.

Mayor Ayers suggested that the “Snap Send Solve” service request could be used for this. G Cleary noted that it can be challenging to get the sample to the laboratories, with the samples needing to be collected when the laboratories are open, and kept chilled.

S Allen noted that there is a weekly sample test undertaken by Water Unit staff for the Ocean Outfall to meet the consent requirements. The sampling and testing is to determine that the e.coli are within the limits of the consent of the Ocean Outfall.

It was noted that there are Environment Canterbury Rangers, TKTT Rangers and the weekly attendance by Water Unit staff who would all be able to report any sea foam sightings.

Councillor Meyer noted a product that is seen on the beach, which is almost tar-like, that sits in the last pond of the treatment plant, and goes from there out to sea. K Simpson believes this is the sludge build up, but does not believe there is any testing done on this and this does not go out to the sea.

Councillor Stewart suggested that there could be a network set up when there is a phone call from a member of the public and this information can be passed on as well.

Moved Councillor Brine Seconded Councillor Felstead

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 190605078713.

(b) Approves an additional expenditure of $41,000 over and above the original $75,000, to allow ongoing sampling and testing of sea foam to be carried out.

(c) Approves funding coming from the beach monitoring budget of the Eastern Districts Sewer Scheme, which has $32,870 available.

(d) Notes that the faecal source tracking test will only be carried out if the E.coli and Enterococci counts are sufficiently high for the detection level of this test.

(e) Notes that it is not certain that the proposed sampling and testing programme will provide a definitive result of whether there is a source of contamination from the ocean outfall in the sea foam.

(f) Notes that the Eastern Districts Sewage Scheme ocean outfall continues to meet its consent conditions, with respect to water quality at point of discharge.

(g) Circulates a copy of this report to the Kaiapoi –Tuahiwi and Woodend-Sefton Community Boards

(h) Circulates a copy of this report to the Rūnanga Liaison Committee

CARRIED
Councillor Brine believes this is money well spent and it is unfortunate that when people are seeing this foam that Council staff are not being advised of it.

Councillor Atkinson has concerns that there has been reports from the public on the presence of sea foam made previously and these have not been responded to. The Council needs to deal to these concerns and to have better systems in place for acting on these reports and collecting the samples and getting these tested. To only have three samples collected over a two to three year period is not good enough.

Councillor Stewart suggests there needs to be extensive publicity about the sea foam notifications, and that there are attempts to capture this information. Councillor Stewart agrees with the frustration shown by other Councillors and suggested that there be a specific contact phone number available that members of the public can call with sightings of the sea foam, so the Council can get samples that are able to be analysed and can draw some conclusions.

Councillor Barnett noted this is a difficult situation for the Council, with the reduced level of service that the Council provide over the weekends. Any raising of the levels of service will come at a cost. Suggested that the Council afterhours number needs to be directed to the right people. Council Barnett also noted that the sites tested have not shown any concerns and impacted on the health of ratepayers.

6.6 Cust Rural Drainage Advisory Group – Owen Davies (Drainage Asset Manager)

In the absence of O Davies, K Simpson presented this report, which seeks approval of the committee to formally disestablish the Cust Rural Drainage Advisory Group. The committee had not met since March 2014. Meetings ceased because some longstanding members of the group did not wish to stand for re-election which reduced the number of active members. At the last three yearly election of group members in 2017, only one nomination was received. Council Drainage staff have been managing the Cust Rural Drainage Scheme since 2014, with the scheme functioning satisfactorily and no complaints received from ratepayers.

Moved Councillor Felstead Seconded Councillor Williams

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee
(a) Receives report No. 190513067176.
(b) Approves the dis-establishment of the Cust Rural Drainage Advisory Group.
(c) Notes that Council Drainage Staff will continue to seek input and advice relating to the on-going maintenance of the Cust Rural Drainage Scheme, directly from schemes ratepayers as required rather than via an advisory group.
(d) Notes that only one ratepayer of the Cust Rural Drainage Scheme responded and indicated interest in being a member of the Cust Rural Drainage Advisory Group.
(e) Notes Staff will write to all ratepayers to advise them that the group no longer formally exists.
(f) Circulates this report to the Oxford Ohoka Community Board for their information.
CARRIED

Councillor Stewart noted that this group is a remnant of a group that was more active at amalgamation, over 30 years ago, and suggested all these groups need to be reviewed. Councillor Stewart referred to the matter raised at all the meetings of these rural drainage advisory groups, for the introduction of a district wide drainage rate.

6.7 Risk Assessment of arsenic in groundwater for the wider Kaiapoi area – Sophie Allen (Water Environment Advisor)

S Allen and K Simpson presented this report recommending that the Council undertake a risk assessment of arsenic in groundwater, for private wells in the wider Kaiapoi area. Arsenic levels above the MAV (Maximum Accepted Value) have been found in a small number of private wells in the north-west Kaiapoi area. It was confirmed it is proposed to undertake testing in 30 private wells. The budget requested is to cover the funding for the gathering of the results and secondly a consultant to analyse these results.

Councillor Williams asked what is the power of the Council if an unsuitable sample in a private well is detected in this process. K Simpson said the Community and Public Health would be advised of this. The scope may need to be extended to look at what is the role of the Council, or the owners treating their own supply. J Palmer noted this issue could be part of the Government’s 3 water review, which could require Councils to take on more responsibility in areas like this. This will be challenging for our Council with such a large number of private water supplies in the district.

Moved Councillor Williams Seconded Councillor Stewart

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee recommends:

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190527075121.

(b) Notes the scope of the risk assessment, which aims to define an area(s) where any elevated risk of arsenic in groundwater exists, which includes testing for arsenic in 30 private wells and geochemical data interpretation for the wider Kaiapoi area.

(c) Approves an additional budget of $37,000 from the general rate to be allocated under the Environmental Health account, against the Environmental Surveys GL (10.571.829.2465), for a risk assessment of arsenic in groundwater for the wider Kaiapoi area.

(d) Notes that approximately $12,000 of the allocated budget will be for Water Unit sampling and laboratory analysis of 30 private wells. Approximately $15-20,000 of the allocated budget is for a consultant to undertake data analysis, existing geochemical data review, report writing and recommendations. The remaining $5,000 is for project contingency.

(e) Notes that specific communication will be undertaken by WDC staff with individual landowners and general communication with the wider community following obtaining test results and the risk assessment.

(f) Notes that a sole source supplier will be approached for the data analysis role, due to the limited market of suppliers for the service,
Councillor Williams believes it is a responsibility of the Council to make sure that all ratepayers are safe.

Councillor Stewart commented on the contaminants being released into the water supply. It is the individual home owners responsibility to test water in their own supplies, but believes that the Council has a responsibility and is happy to support this recommendation.

6.8 Horrellville/Carleton Effluent Spill – Update and Next Steps – Sophie Allen – (Water Environment Advisor)

S Allen and K Simpson presented this report summarising the response by Council and Waimakariri Irrigation Ltd to a dairy effluent spill on 16 May to the east of Oxford. A malfunction of a centre pivot irrigator led to discharge of dairy effluent at one site continuously for a number of hours. A boil water notice was issued on 17 May as there could have been contamination of the groundwater water quality.

It was noted that two weeks after this incident, there was the significant rain event in Queens Birthday weekend, which impacted on the elevated levels of e.coli in testing undertaken following this.

Councillor Stewart referred to item 1.9.c in the report, on identifying locations and reviewing consent conditions for existing holding ponds and soak pits, both Council-owned and privately-owned. There would be a focus on non-lined holding ponds and soak pits which could affect water quality for domestic use. K Simpson advised that some holding ponds have consents via a farm environmental plan, but not all of them require consents. K Simpson noted that this would be included in the review of the Bylaw and advice is provided to landowners for any holding ponds that are installed.

Councillor Felstead asked is it clear who is responsible for the $7,000 costs. S Allen noted that the landowners have acknowledged responsibility to ECan and may be seeking to recover costs from the business for the failure of the irrigation central pivot.

Moved Councillor Felstead Seconded Councillor Stewart

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee

(a) Receives report No. 190529076343.

(b) Notes that WDC staff will work with Waimakariri Irrigation Ltd. and other parties to capture the response to the incident response, any lessons learnt, recommendations, and improvements to procedures.

(c) Notes that costs of approximately $7,000 have been paid by Council for water quality sampling and analysis in relation to the effluent spill.

(d) Notes that WDC staff will investigate whether costs incurred by the Council can be recovered.

(e) Notes that an incident report from Environment Canterbury is being prepared for release.
(f) **Acknowledges** the work by Waimakariri Irrigation Ltd to manage the effluent spill response.

Councillor Stewart noted that the Farm Environmental Plan (FEP) is the standard of good farming practice and this is part of the Waimakariri Irrigation Ltd consent. FEPs are audited by private consultants. With this happening on the farm of a WIL shareholder, this shows that the public cannot have confidence in these FEPs. Councillor Stewart suggests that this is a “flag” to this district, here is one instance of something that could be happening across the district and we can have no ability to have confidence of the testing being undertaken by Waimakariri Irrigation. There is contamination of the shallow aquifers after a heavy rain.

6.9 **20 February 2018 Storm Event - Summary of Service Requests – Kalley Simpson (3 Waters Manager)**

K Simpson presented this report providing a summary of the drainage service requests received during and following the 20 February 2018 storm event. It was noted that the website has been updated on the basis of this report.

Councillor Williams commented on the stagnant water that is lying in the reserve at Waikuku Beach and sought an update on this. K Simpson said there is work at Taranaki Stream, and a flood gate is being replaced, which includes a modern fish pass. This is due to happen before September 2019. Within the reserve itself, the greenspace team are working on the area between the flying fox and the beach carpark.

G Cleary noted that with the earthquakes there has been a lowering of the level of land, and there has also been an exceptional high rainfall levels on several occasions over recent years. Waikuku is also dealing with sea level rise. There has been a series of improvements to the efficiencies on drainage at Waikuku Beach.

Moved Councillor Stewart Seconded Councillor Meyer

**THAT** the Utilities and Roading Committee

(a) **Receives** report No. 190606079750.

(b) **Notes** that of the 21 drainage assessments identified from the 208 service requests, 19 have been completed and the remaining 2 in The Pines Beach and Waikuku Beach areas are still ongoing.

(c) **Notes** that of the 11 upgrade projects related to the 208 service requests, 3 has been completed, a further 2 will be completed this financial year, 2 have been carried over to next financial year and 4 will be completed in future years.

(d) **Notes** that the webpage has been setup on the Council’s website to provide updates on the status of drainage works underway in The Pines Beach and Waikuku Beach.

(e) **Circulates** this report to the Council for information.

**CARRIED**

Councillor Stewart noted there are still two outstanding issues from the February 2018 storm event, but it does signal to all here of the challenges ahead of dealing with the regular events. Councillor Stewart extended
congratulations to the 3 Waters team of getting through 360 service requests over the past 16 months.

6.10 Road Safety Action Plan 2019/20 – Kathy Graham (Road Safety Coordinator/Journey Planner)

K Graham (Road Safety Coordinator/Journey Planner) presented this report seeking endorsement of the Waimakariri Road Safety Action Plan for 2019-2020. Noted the inclusion of FENZ, for their attendance at crashes and involvement with road safety.

There are target areas within this Action Plan, relating to this district. The actions listed aren’t exclusive and don’t select specific locations. This Action Plan is prepared in collaboration with other stakeholders.

Councillor Barnett suggested that this Action plan does not address the issues that need to be addressed in this district to make the roads safer to drive on.

Moved Councillor Meyer Seconded Mayor Ayers

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee

(a) Receives report No. 190529076363

(b) Endorses the 2019 - 2020 Road Safety Action Plan (Doc 190529076366)

(c) Circulates this report to the Community and Advisory Boards

CARRIED

Councillor Meyer said the issues with the two worst intersections in the district both come up for discussion regularly at meetings of the Waimakariri Road Safety Committee on how there can be safety improvements implemented. The members of this committee are doing their best to make this district a safer place and the Police representatives on the committee respond well to the questions and comments.

Councillor Barnett noted the full consultation on the recent speed limit change to the Rangiora-Woodend Road. It was suggested by Councillor Barnett that there is no action being taken on the two worst intersections in the district and the Council should be lobbying to the people responsible for this. Statistics show that there is still a high number of accidents and this road safety action plan should include some actions. This Council needs to stand up and take action on this matter.

Councillor Williams noted concern with the Pineacres corner and believes that in the view of the public, nothing has been done to deal with the safety concerns for this corner. Councillor Williams suggested that NZTA need to be more proactive in making this intersection safer.

Councillor Gordon asked for information on more detailed data to be available on the number of crashes on various intersections. K Graham responded that analysing crash data is a very specialised subject. It is also noted that there are a number of crashes in the district that are not being reported to the Police, and some are bordering on serious.

Mayor Ayers noted that crashes sometimes have multiple causes. 60% of deaths in road crashes in New Zealand are caused by vehicles crossing the centre line. Mayor Ayers noted that there has been work done at Pineacres corner, including the hazard signal lights. The five cross-roads corner on
Rangiora-Woodend Road is now safer also, with the reduction in the speed limit along Rangiora-Woodend Road to 80kph.

Mayor Ayers suggested that there are two other dangerous intersections in our district, being Johns Road/Plasketts Roads, and Tram/South Eyre/Giles Roads.

Councillor Meyer is disappointed with lack of understanding of the work of the Road Safety Committee. Spoke on the Safer Roads project which has a budget, and it is hoped that some of this will be made available for Woodend.

7 MATTERS REFERRED FROM COMMUNITY BOARDS

There were no matters referred from Community Boards

8 PORTFOLIO UPDATES

8.1 Roading – Councillor John Meyer
Nothing to report.

8.2 Drainage and Stockwater – Councillor Sandra Stewart
Nothing to report

8.3 Utilities (Water Supplies and Sewer) – Cr Paul Williams
Nothing to report.

8.4 Solid Waste– Cr Robbie Brine
Councillor Brine advised there is to be a Joint Landfill Committee meeting in August.

9 QUESTIONS

There were no questions.

10 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS

There was no general business.

11 MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

Moved Councillor Meyer Seconded Councillor Brine

THAT the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting.

The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter and the specific grounds under section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution, are as follows:
11.1 Report of Fraser Scales (Senior Project Engineer), Kalley Simpson (3 Waters Manager), Duncan Roxborough (Project Mgr District Regeneration) and Joanne McBride (Roading and Transport Manager)

Kaiapoi East Enabling Works and Beswick SMA Project Update

Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7

Section 48(1)(a)

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Reason for protection of interests</th>
<th>Ref NZS 9202:2003 Appendix A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>Protection of privacy of natural persons To carry out commercial activities without prejudice</td>
<td>A2(a) A2(b)ii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CARRIED

Closed meeting

Resolution to resume in Open Meeting

Moved Councillor Meyer seconded Councillor Williams

THAT open meeting resumes and the business discussed with the public excluded remains public excluded.

CARRIED

Open Meeting

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 6.55pm.

CONFIRMED
PRESENT:
Sam Redman (WDC), Caitlin Tipping, Ellie Tizzard, David Ayers (WDC Mayor), Dan Gordon (WDC Councillor), Jacob Harford, Kirstyn Barnett (WDC Councillor), Arabella Jarman, Bailey Dodd, Jaden Williams, Sasha Crawford, Damon Galbraith, Ben Spark, Eris Le Compte (Minute Secretary).

GUESTS:
David Hill (North Canterbury News), Claire Fletcher (E Can), Sarah Nichols (WDC Governance Manager), Alex Tindall (Wai Youth Representative), Simon Markham (WDC Strategy and Engagement Manager).

APOLOGIES: Hope McCormack, Katie Lange, Luca Hodgson, Benya Ickenroth

1. WELCOME:
Arabella welcomed committee members and guests.

2. UPDATE ON CLIMATE CHANGE IMPACTS – SIMON MARKHAM
Simon circulated a print out of climate change updates and policy developments in the Waimakariri area. Important issues to be considered are:

- Changes to ground water and sea levels world wide
- Expect warmer temperatures
- Extreme weather events
- The challenges ahead

In answer to questions, Dan Gordon informed the group that WDC Council is discussing options and costings for future planning. The charging stations for cars for instance, is being looked out now. It is important to have input from the younger generation as it will be them who will eventually be effected by changes.
Arabella thanked Simon for providing explanations and updates.

3. **ECAN REPORT ON BUS TRANSPORT UPDATES – CLAIRE FLETCHER**

Claire returned showing PowerPoint results of the consultations which were held May/June with the three high schools in the district. The main calls were for more bus coverage and more frequent services. There could be changes to the Blue Line service by bringing in two link services.

There were 700+ submissions to the proposed changes, with 100+ being young people under 18 years of age. Across the school visits approx. 600 students were consulted with. These are really good numbers and exceed even the submissions received for the Regional Transport Plan.

Kaiapoi High School feedback concerns were that there will be no bus service to Waikuku as well as no regular bus service between Pegasus and Christchurch.

Rangiora High School would like a more regular bus service between Rangiora and Christchurch between 9am and 5pm. And again, concerns about the lack of service to Waikuku.

Rangiora New Life again mentioned the Waikuku lack of service and would like a direct connection between Pegasus and Rangiora.

The high school consultations showed that there is a high percentage of under 18 year olds use the bus service every day. The second round of consultations presenting alternative proposals will take place 15 July to 4 August.

4. **LOCAL ELECTIONS/COMMUNITY BOARDS – SARAH NICHOLS**

Sarah is both WDC Deputy Electoral Officer and Governance Manager. She gave an outline of how the upcoming local body elections on 12 October work and how they will affect younger people. Anyone aged 18 and over on 12 October 2019 can enrol for voting (enrolment forms can be downloaded, filled out and signed and returned to a local Post Centre). To be eligible to vote, it is necessary to be a NZ citizen or Permanent Resident. A full list of candidates standing for election will be published on 16 August.

Voting papers are to be sent out on 20 September, including a booklet on the profiles of candidates and have to be posted back by 8 October or, dropped into any Council Service Centre before 12 noon on 12 October.
Sarah pointed out that younger people if interested should consider putting their names forward as a representative for community boards (or other elected positions) in the interests of the community. If elected, it is a three year commitment, attending meetings etc. A remuneration is paid; between $7,200 and $11,200 per annum (for Community Board Members). Prior to the elections, some local organisations will be holding candidate information evenings (yet to be notified) and there will also be an information evening held at Council Chambers on 9 July.

5. **PRESENTATION TO ALL BOARDS – SAM REDMAN**

Sam recently attended a Community Board meeting presenting the Dudley Park plan, and also indicated that Youth Council were interested in being better connected with the Community Boards in the future. Community Boards are also keen to have more connection with the Youth Council in future.

6. **REPORTS FOR DISCUSSION:**

   **David Ayers:**
   David Ayres reported that discussions have taken place between Hurunui, Selwyn and Waimakariri councils about higher density housing in these regions.
   David will be attending a Migrant Suitcase Exhibition at the Oxford Library running until 20 July.
   Kaiapoi Promotions organisation is rebranding.
   WDC Council is to start looking into a building expansion to council offices in Rangiora.
   The new organic bins and red rubbish bins are now underway in Rangiora.

   **Dan Gordon:**
   The quiz evening organised by the Rangiora Leos (Young Lions) recently raised $2,600 for Big Brothers, Big Sisters. Dan acknowledged the work put in by Kirstyn and the team.
   At today’s council meeting it was agreed to send a submission to central government explaining that all rules relating to climate change need to be consistent, regardless of any changes in governments.
   Dan has spoken with the developer working in Lineside Road re the removal of trees, it is hoped they will be saved. Notable trees can be registered and protected but they must be trees of particular significance.
   A Youth Connect Forum on climate change is being held in Christchurch on 11 July at 7.30pm. As Kirstyn will be attending this, she will have room in her car
to take interested persons. Sam will do a check to see if anyone interested in going.

Sam Redman:
Sam has been consulting with the Greenspace Team from WDC re the Dudley Park development and another meeting will be held soon.
Sam would like to have a sub group meeting before the next Youth Council meeting on 30 July. Date for sub group meeting would have to be either 16 or 23 July. Sam will make contact with members. Sam to catch up with Grant.

7. **YOUTH SPACES STAKEHOLDERS FORUM – SAM REDMAN**
This is being held on 4 July – 4 – 6pm at the Woodend Community Centre. At this time, 55 have signed to attend.

8. **GENERAL BUSINESS:**

**WaiYouth**
Sam congratulated Alex on becoming chair of WaiYouth. Alex is keen to come along to Youth Council meetings in future as a representative and will be most welcome.
Tickets are now on sale for the All Night Party being held 9-10 August – 7pm to 9am. Early bird prices are $50 per ticket. Discounts are available for those who volunteer to help.

**Student Volunteer Army**
Caitlin has attended a meeting of the Student Volunteer Army and Sasha has also volunteered for the group.
Caitlin advised that she is stepping down as the Youth Council representative for the Age Friendly Group. However, in the future, it is possible that input may be required from Youth Council.

**WaiYouth Winter Festival**
Kirstyn advised this is being held on 21 July. Sam will email out information.
9. ACTIONS:

- **ACTION** – Claire Fletcher advised that the second round of consultations presenting alternative proposals will take place between 15 July and 4 August.
- **ACTION** – An information evening for those considering standing for local body community board elections will be held at Council chambers on the evening Tuesday 9 July.
- **ACTION** – Climate Change Youth Connect evening is being held in Christchurch on 11 July at 7.30pm. Sam to check with members if interested in going as Kirstyn will have space in her car.
- **ACTION** – Sam to set up a sub group re the Dudley Park development. Sam to contact members re the sub group meeting before the next Youth Council meeting on 30 July.
- **ACTION** – Winter Festival on 21 July. Sam to send out information.

Meeting closed at 9.02pm.

Next meeting is on **Tuesday 30 July 2019** at 7pm, at the Rangiora Service Centre.

**PLEASE NOTE RETURN TO LAST TUESDAY OF THE MONTH**
MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF THE OXFORD-OHOKA COMMUNITY BOARD HELD IN THE OXFORD TOWN HALL, 30 MAIN STREET, OXFORD ON THURSDAY 4 JULY 2019 AT 7PM.

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

IN ATTENDANCE
D Ayers (Mayor), S Markham (Manager Strategy & Engagement), N Harris (Manager Regulation), J McBride (Roading and Transport Manager), M Kwant (Community Projects Officer), Councillor D Gordon, T Kunkel (Governance Team Leader) and K Rabe (Governance Adviser).

The meeting adjourned for a workshop from 7.11pm to 7.32pm.

1 APOLOGIES
There were no apologies.

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
There were no conflicts of interest.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board – 6 June 2019
Moved J Ensor seconded K Felstead
(a) THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:
   Confirms the circulated Minutes of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting, held on 6 June 2019, as a true and accurate record subject to the amendment to clause 7.1 ‘Road Naming’, that the spelling of the name ‘Beale’ as stated in the agenda should be spelt ‘Beal’.
   CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
J Ensor confirmed that the August 2019 meeting would be held at the Mandeville Sports Club and not in Oxford as stated in the Agenda.

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 – Joanne McBride (Roading and Transport Manager)

J McBride spoke to her report.

D Nicholl expressed a concern that there was not much work scheduled in the Board’s area. J McBride explained that a further rating exercise would be done mid-way through 2020 to reassess the schedule and to make changes if required.

S Farrell enquired about the work being done on street lighting in Oxford as it has been found that the lighting levels in some streets were low. It was noted that the Council has further work to do to confirm LED lighting requirements before they proceed with further replacement. Some other districts have experienced similar issues about lighting levels.

J Ensor noted that the white LED lighting did not seem to be as effective as orange LED lighting. J McBride reported that an investigation was still being done on the best lighting options for various areas i.e. urban vs rural.

M Brown inquired about the costing for the planned cattle underpasses and was informed that the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) subsidised underpasses, and the Council was therefore only responsible for approximately 4% to 5% of costs.

K Felstead noted that the sealing of the Oxford Carpark was on the schedule and suggested that the entrance to the carpark which caused low slung cars to bottom out when entering or exiting the carpark, should be fixed at the same time.

Moved M Brown seconded J Lynn

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190620087398.

(b) Notes that feedback can be provided back to the Roading Manager through to 26 July 2019.

CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 7.11pm and resumed at 7.32pm.

15 MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

Moved K Felstead seconded M Brown

THAT the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting.

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

CARRIED

CLOSE MEETING

See Public Excluded Agenda (blue papers)

OPEN MEETING

The meeting resumed at 7.38pm.

7.2 Elected Members Code of Conduct Refresh – Sarah Nichols (Governance Manager)

S Markhan spoke to the report.

S Farrell asked why this review was being done prior to the 2019 election instead of waiting for the new Board to review the Code of Conduct.

K Felstead explained that various issues have arisen recently that brought to light that the some areas of the Code of Conduct needed to be modified. The Council therefore deemed it necessary to review the Code to mitigate these issues.

D Nicholl commented that he thought it was a good idea to have a robust Code of Conduct in place for new Community Boards as this would make the transition easier.

S Farrell asked if the new Boards would be able to review the Code of Conduct and make it relevant to them. It was explained that it was best practice for the Council and Community Boards to have the same Code of Conduct. However, there was no legal reason why a Community Board could not make amendments to suit the Board’s individual needs if required.
Moved T Robson seconded M Brown

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190620087363.

(b) Adopts the 2019 Elected Member Code of Conduct, effective from 31 July 2019. (Trim Ref: 190625089193).

CARRIED

S Farrell abstained

7.3 Oxford-Ohoka Community Board Grant Fund 2019/20 and General Landscaping Fund 2019/20 – Kay Rabe (Governance Adviser)

K Rabe spoke to the report and explained that currently outstanding invoices were being paid, the General Landscaping Fund’s balance would therefore only be finalised by the August 2019 meeting.

In response to question, K Rabe confirmed that the Council’s Greenspace team would be meeting with the Board in August 2019 to discuss various project options for the new financial year.

Moved M Brown seconded J Ensor

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(c) Receives report No. 190621087488.

(d) Notes that the Board’s General Landscaping Budget allocated by the Council for 2019/20 is $12,430 with a carry forward for 2018/19 still to be determined due to outstanding invoices.

(e) Notes that the Board’s Discretionary Grant Funding allocated by the Council for 2019/20 is $6,670 and that there is no carry forward from 2018/19 budget.

(f) Approves the Board’s 2019/20 Discretionary Grant Fund Application Criteria and Application Form (Trim No. 190621087485).

(g) Approves the Board’s 2019/20 Discretionary Grant Accountability Form (Trim No: 190621087553).

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

CARRIED

7.4 Application to the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board’s Discretionary Grant Fund 2019/2020 – Thea Kunkel (Governance Team Leader)

T Kunkel spoke to the report.

D Nicholl noted that he phoned the Christchurch Western Riding Association and suggested they consider a different material for the rails to ensure a longer lifespan.

J Lynn commented that the suggested changes may throw the costing/budget out.

Moved T Robson seconded J Lynn

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190611082065.

(b) Approves a grant of $500 to the Christchurch Western Riding Association towards the cost of replacing the rails of its sand arena.

CARRIED
8 CORRESPONDENCE
Correspondence was tabled from W Doody thanking the Board for its kind wishes, support and sympathy at her brother's passing.

9 CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT
9.1 Chairperson’s Report for June 2019
Moved W Doody seconded D Nicholl

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:
(a) Receives report No 190523072432.

CARRIED

10 MATTERS FOR INFORMATION
10.1 Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting minutes – 13 May 2019
(Trim No 190509066000).

10.2 Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting minutes – 20 May 2019
(Trim No 190514067740)

Moved J Ensor seconded M Brown

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board receives the information in items 10.1-10.2

CARRIED

11 MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE

The purpose of this exchange was to provide a short update to other members in relation to activities/meetings that have been attended or to provide general Board related information.

J Ensor
- Commended Council on its prompt work with various safety improvements.

J Lynn
- Attended All Boards – Concerned at lack of progress regarding safety improvements at Woodend.

S Farrell
- Attended All Boards – Concern at NZTA’s seemingly lack of progress on safety improvements in general;
- Attended Museum meeting – drainage concerns;
- Attended Keep Oxford Beautiful meeting – tree plantings;
- Attended Suitcase Exhibition; and
- Query regarding status of Art in Public Places Committee

T Robson
- Attended Opac meeting;
- Attended successful Oxford Light Festival;
- Attended All Boards – concern over NZTA’s lack of progress;
- Attended the Suitcase Exhibition; and
- Attended Pearson Park Advisory Group meeting.
M Brown
- Attended Oxford Rural Advisory Group meeting;
- Attended the Oxford Rural Drainage Advisory Group meeting; and
- Attended the Oxford Light Festival.

K Felstead
- Update on Council matters with particular attention to the Blessing of the Artwork in the Council Chamber, Regional Public Transport Plan and the Canterbury Museum contribution.

W Doody
- Attended Suitcase Exhibition – strongly recommended; and
- Oxford Neighbourhood Support drive.

12 CONSULTATION PROJECTS

S Markham confirmed that all the Community Board members received an invitation to attend the Council’s sessions with the community on Natural Hazards.

12.1 Board Discretionary Grant
Balance as at 25 June 2019: $0 (note $500 commitment to Waimakariri Arts Trust).

12.2 General Landscaping Fund
Balance as at 25 June 2019: $1,060.

13 MEDIA ITEMS

14 QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

15 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

NEXT MEETING
The next meeting of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board is scheduled for Wednesday 7 August 2019 commencing at 7.00pm, at the Mandeville Sports Club.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 8.55pm.
CONFIRMED

________________          __________________
Chairperson                  Date
Workshop

- Nuisance Bylaw - Nick Harrison (Manager Regulation)
- Members Forum – Ohoka Domain
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE WOODEND-SEFTON COMMUNITY BOARD
HELD IN THE WOODEND COMMUNITY CENTRE, SCHOOL ROAD, WOODEND ON
MONDAY 8 JULY 2019 AT 7.00PM.

PRESENT
S Powell (Chairperson), J Archer, A Blackie, R Mather and J Meyer.

IN ATTENDANCE
S Nichols (Governance Manager), J McBride (Roading and Transport Manager), D Gordon
(Councillor), N Harrison (Manager Regulation), K Rabe (Governance Advisor) and
E Stubbs (Governance Support Officer).

1 APOLOGIES
Moved J Archer seconded R Mather
Apologies were received and sustained from A Thompson and A Allen for absence.
CARRIED

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
Item 7.3 – R Mather as a member of the Pegasus Residents Group.

3 CONFIRMATION MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board – 10 June 2019
Moved J Archer seconded R Mather
THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:
(a) Confirms the circulated Minutes of the Woodend-Sefton Community
Board meeting, held 10 June 2019, as a true and accurate record.
CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
There were no matters arising.

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS FROM THE COMMUNITY
There were no deputations.

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS
There was no adjourned business.
7 REPORTS


J McBride noted the report was annually submitted to Community Boards to invite feedback on the proposed Roading Capital Works Programme. She advised that the budget was a general allocation for renewal projects and was based on a condition rating process. These ratings were then presented to the Community Boards. The program also provided for minor improvements from service requests and the deficiency database. The new Footpath Programme had been through a prioritisation process.

J Archer enquired if the gap in the footpath between the old Woodend Hotel site to Judson’s Road in Woodend was included in the programme. J McBride advised that the work on this section of the footpath would be included with the work being done by the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) at the southern end of Woodend. This would form part of a wider pedestrian and cycle link. It would however also depend on the intersection configuration. J McBride confirmed that there was a separate budget for this project.

S Powell noted the scope of work still to be completed by NZTA in Woodend. This would cause significant delays in the work on the footpath. She asked if an interim solution could be found to form a solid surface to make it easier for users. J McBride agreed to investigate the matter further.

R Mather enquired if the inclusion of the intersection improvements in Pegasus were as a result of issues with visibility. J McBride advised that there was an ‘avenue effect’ at some intersections which drew the human eye through the intersection. There were however options, such as signage, to improve safety at intersections as well as to increase visibility and awareness.

R Mather asked about work on the rumble strips in Pegasus. J McBride advised the work would begin in the next six to eight weeks.

S Powell requested an update on the ‘Five Crossroads’ intersection. In response, J McBride advised that right turn bays would be installed as an interim option to create a safe space for waiting cars. The road widening required undergrounding of power lines. A more permanent solution would take more time and consultation, however the power lines would be moved far enough away to allow for any future intersection improvements. The interim improvements would be undertaken during the 2019/20 financial year. There was $500 - $750,000 in the budget which would cover the initial improvements and progress the next more permanent steps.

A Blackie referred to a letter, written to the Northern Outlook, regarding complaints about the quality of roading work at Ravenswood. The response from the Council was that the contractor would not be paid until the issues were remedied. J McBride noted the challenges with the project and that the Development Team were managing the project. It had been a challenging process with opportunities to do better in future projects.

Moved A Blackie seconded R Mather

THAT the Woodend-Sefton 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
7.2 Woodend-Sefton Community Board’s Discretionary Grant Fund 2019/2020 and General Landscaping Fund 2019/2020 – K Rabe (Governance Advisor)

K Rabe spoke briefly to the report. She advised that Recommendation (c) should not include the amount being carried forward from the previous financial year, as the amount was not confirmed.

With regard to the General Landscaping Fund, K Rabe reported that the final budget would be confirmed at the upcoming General Landscaping Fund workshop.

In response to questions, K Rabe noted the Discretionary Grant/Accountability forms could be revamped if requested.

Moved S Powell seconded J Archer

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190612082628.
(b) Notes that the Board’s General Landscaping Budget allocated by the Council for 2019/20 is $12,430 with a carry forward from 2018/19 still to be determined.
(c) Notes that the Board’s Discretionary Grant Funding allocated by the Council for 2019/20 is $4,090 with a carry forward from 2018/19 still to be determined.
(d) Approves the Board’s 2019/20 Discretionary Grant Fund Application Criteria and Application Form (Trim No. 190621087519).
(e) Approves the Board’s 2019/20 Discretionary Grant Accountability Form (Trim No. 190621087554).
(f) Approves that Discretionary Grant Fund applications be considered at each meeting for the 2019/20 financial year (July 2019 to June 2020).

CARRIED

S Powell was happy with the current format of the forms.

Having expressed a conflict of interest R Mather left the room at 7:23 pm prior to the consideration of Item 7.3.

7.3 Application to the Woodend-Sefton Community Board’s 2019/20 Discretionary Grant Fund – K Rabe (Governance Advisor)

K Rabe spoke to the report noting that the application was to send three (3) Resident Group Committee members to attend a training workshop on ‘working with the community’. The Pegasus Residents’ Group did not request the entire cost of the workshop as the three (3) members would be paying a portion of the workshop fees themselves.

K Rabe confirmed that accountability forms for previous funding were returned promptly.

A Blackie referred to the accomplishments of the group and asked whether they need further training.

Moved J Meyer seconded S Powell

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190620086973.
(b) Approves a grant of $450 to Pegasus Residents’ Group Incorporated towards the cost of a training course for members.

CARRIED
J Meyer suggested the Pegasus Residents’ Group could be used as a model in the future.

S Powell commented that the Group made a good contribution and the skills learnt could enhance the group further.

R Mather returned to the table at 7:29pm following the consideration of Item 7.3.

7.4 **Elected Member Code of Conduct Refresh – S Nichols (Governance Manager)**

S Nichols spoke to the report commenting that it was similar to the report taken to the Council in May 2019. At the beginning of every term a Code of Conduct was in place. In November 2016 the Community Boards and the Council opted to keep the 2013 version but had requested a review later in the term. A review was therefor completed in April 2019 and the Council had adopted the proposed version in the Agenda in May 2019.

S Nichols noted paragraph 4.5 outlined the objectives of the Code which were based on Local Government New Zealand (LGNZ) Guidelines. Paragraph 4.4 advised of ‘tweaks’ in the code for law changes.

S Nichols apologised for some sections in the guidelines still referring to ‘Councillors’ which should have been amended to ‘elected members’. This was so that the Council and Community Boards would adopt the same Code of Conduct for consistency.

S Nichols commented it was comforting that the Code had not been enacted since 2002. In the first instance, if a complaint was made, the matter would be addressed through a low-level resolution discussion. If this method was however unsuccessful, the Code outlined the steps to be taken to attain resolution.

S Nichols noted that the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board had adopted the 2019 Elected Member Code of Conduct the previous week.

S Powell referred to Section 5.2, Relationships with Staff, and queried the use of the word ‘familiar’. She suggested removal of the word as it was open to interpretation. S Nichols advised the word ‘sexual’ was to be removed from the next paragraph so that it would read ‘avoid any form of bullying or harassment’.

Moved S Powell seconded A Blackie

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190625089232.

(b) **Adopts** the 2019 Elected Member Code of Conduct, effective from 31 July 2019. (Trim 190625089193) subject to ‘Councillors’ being amended to ‘Elected Members’.

CARRIED

8 **CORRESPONDENCE**

The response from A Petrie (Roading Compliance Engineer) to a query from R Mather regarding road closures for events in Pegasus (Trim 190702093291) was tabled. This response was previously circulated to Board members via email.

R Mather commented that they were in a ‘wait and see’ phase for the upcoming season of events. She noted the response had not covered how the previous year’s incidents had occurred.
S Powell commented that Pegasus was different to other townships. Closing roads for three events in a fortnight had an adverse impact on the community.

J Meyer asked where the breakdown in communication occurred. R Mather stated that it was unclear, but hoped that Council staff were now more aware of the issues.

S Nichols advised that Traffic Management Plans were reviewed and approved by Council staff. The breakdown in communication could also occur from event organisers to their marshals.

9 CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT
9.1 Chairpersons Report for June 2019

Moved A Blackie seconded J Meyer

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190701092428.

CARRIED

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

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

10.3 Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting minutes 12 June 2019 (Trim No. 190606079618)

Moved J Meyer seconded R Mather

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board receives the information in Items 10.1-10.03.

CARRIED

Note: Matters for Information were circulated to members separately.

11 MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE

June Diary for J Archer, R Mather, A Thompson, A Allen (Trim No. 190626089778)

11.1 J Meyer

- Referred to the new Gladstone Pathway and asked for feedback on its use. R Mather noted the lampposts in the middle of the path that required some form of highlighting for safety reasons. A Blackie urged for consistency as the proposed location of another path had been required to be moved due to lampposts being in the middle of the path.
- Noted the District Plan process was going well.

11.2 A Blackie

- Advised dredging at the Kaiapoi River Marine Precinct had been scheduled to start that day. It was required to be finished by the end of August 2019.
- Waikuku Beach Camp – progress was being made on decision making.
- Noted opening of magnificent mural in the Council Chambers.
11.3 **R Mather**
- Update on Pegasus Community Centre - at this stage the process had come to a halt, however, there is a meeting scheduled with Council staff on 11 July.
- Invited members to a presentation from Sam Huo of the Pegasus Golf Club to the Pegasus Residents Group.

11.4 **J Archer**
- Pricing a stage for the Woodend Community Centre. The Community Association would raise the funds. He was looking at a compact set that would assist with storage.

12 **CONSULTATION PROJECTS**

S Powell noted the two public consultations underway – the Dog Control Bylaw and Policy Review, (consultation closes Friday 26 July 2019) and Natural Hazards, (consultation closes Friday 26 July 2019).

It was noted that the Dog Control Bylaw was currently topical. Issues with dog control around Pegasus were raised and would be followed-up by N Harrison (Manager Regulation). The Greenspace team would update the Schedule shortly to include parks and reserves in the Pegasus area which should mitigate problems. There was a brief general discussion on the effectiveness of enforcement of bylaws in general. It was noted that there had already been an indication from two residents that they wished to speak at the hearing on the Dog Control Bylaw review.

S Powell noted the dissatisfaction from Waikuku Beach residents about a local venue not being included in public consultation calendar for the Natural Hazard Review.

S Powell noted the ECan Bus Service ‘review of review’. She noted that ECan had taken the feedback from the Community Boards and the Youth Council on board and were amending the previously proposed routes. They would provide information on commuter numbers to the Boards as some of the new routes would be on the basis of ‘use it or lose it’.

There was general agreement that the Board wished to submit on both the Dog Control Bylaw and Bus Service Review. K Rabe was requested to coordinate a meeting.

13 **FOSTERING COMMUNITIES**

14 **BOARD FUNDING UPDATE**

14.1 **Board Discretionary Grant**
Balance as at 2 July 2019: $4,090.

14.2 **General Landscaping Fund**
Balance as at 2 July 2019: $12,430.

15 **MEDIA ITEMS**

There were no media items.

16 **QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**

There were no questions.
17 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

There were no urgent general business.

NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board is scheduled for 7pm, Monday 12 August 2019 at the Pegasus Community Centre.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 7.51pm.
CONFIRMED

________________
Chairperson

________________
Date

Workshop

- Nuisance Bylaw – Nick Harrison (Manager Regulation)
- Members Forum – Bus Review
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 refer 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 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
D Gordon believed the report had been well covered.

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.
CARRIED

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)
MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF THE KAIAPOI-TUAHIWI COMMUNITY BOARD WHICH WAS HELD IN MEETING ROOM 1 (UPSTAIRS), RUATANIWHA KAIAPOI CIVIC CENTRE, 176 WILLIAMS STREET, KAIAPOI ON MONDAY 15 JULY 2019 AT 4PM.

PRESENT

J Watson (Chairperson), C Greengrass (Deputy Chairperson), R Blair, J Meyer, M Pinkham, P Redmond and S Stewart.

IN ATTENDANCE

D Ayres (Mayor), J Palmer (Chief Executive), J McBride (Roading and Transport Manager), N Harrison (Manager Regulation), Councilor D Gordon and K Rabe (Governance Adviser)

1 APOLOGIES

There were no apologies.

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

There were no conflicts of interest declared.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

3.1 Minutes of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board – 17 June 2019

Moved J Watson seconded P Redmond

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Confirms the circulated Minutes of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting, held on 17 June 2019, as a true and accurate record.

CARRIED

3.2 Minutes of the Public Excluded portions of meetings of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board held on Monday 17 June 2019

(See Blue Public Excluded Agenda papers)

4 MATTERS ARISING

There were no matters arising.

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

A Senior Scientist – Groundwater from Science for Communities, L Burbery, was in attendance and reported on a project focusing on the reduction of nitrate levels in underground aquifers, and he reported on the trial at Silverstream Reserve. As part of his presentation, L Burbery advised that they had developed a filter barrier that is trench about 25x5 metres that is ‘sheet piled’ to stop the trench collapsing, and using filter material that is a combination of wood chip and gravel/sand mix to reduce nitrates in aquifers. Although successful, this method was expensive and was therefore not a cost effective method when using it in practical applications.
L Burbery advised that his team would now experiment with alternative methods such as drilling into the aquifer and depositing gravel piles to use as filters or pumping methane gas into the aquifer to activate chemical reactions to reduce the nitrates.

In response to questions, L Burbery confirmed that these investigations would be carried out at the same site in the Silverstream Reserve. An information panel was currently being prepared for erection at the drilling site to inform the public of the purpose of the testing and the anticipated outcomes.

The Chairperson thanked L Burbery for his informative presentation.

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS

There was no adjourned business.

7 REPORTS


J McBride spoke to the report and confirmed that a further condition rating would be carried out in the first half of 2020.

R Blair advised that the Board had previously requested the upgrading of the kerb and channel along Williams Street north of Cass Street in Kaiapoi and enquired if this work would form part of the proposed Roading Capital Works Programme for 2019/2020.

In response, J McBride advised that Otaki Street in Kaiapoi and the surrounding area would be the primary focus for this financial year. She however undertook to investigate the area highlighted by the Board.

Moved J Watson seconded M Pinkham

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190709096683;

(b) Notes that feedback can be provided to the Roading and Transport Manager at the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting.

CARRIED

7.2 Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board’s Discretionary Grant Fund 2019/2020 and General Landscaping Fund 2019/2020 – Kay Rabe (Governance Advisor)

K Rabe spoke to the report highlighting the balances for Board funding for the 2019/20 financial year. She confirmed that the amount shown on page 31 of the Agenda (paragraph 4.3) should read $6,242.

S Stewart noted that the final amount of the General Landscape Fund 2019/2020 was yet to be determined and enquired as to when this figure would available.

K Rabe advised that amount to be carried forward from the 2018/19 financial year was in the process of being finalised. However, the Greenspace Team would be holding a workshop in August 2019 to assist the Board in identifying possible projects for 2019/20. It was anticipated that the General Landscape Fund 2019/2020 budget would be confirmed at the workshop.
Moved R Blair seconded C Greengrass

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190612082575.

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

(c) Notes that the Board’s Discretionary Grant Funding allocated by the Council for 2019/20 is $6,130 and the carry forward from 2018/19 is $1,400 giving a budget of $7,530 for the 2019/20 financial year.

(d) Approves the Board’s 2019/20 Discretionary Grant Fund Application Criteria and Application Form (Trim No.190621087512).

(e) Approves the Board’s 2019/20 Discretionary Grant Accountability Form (Trim No. 190621087555).

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

CARRIED

7.3 Application to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board’s Discretionary Grant Fund 2019/2020 – K Rabe (Governance Advisor)

K Rabe spoke to the report outlining the need for mobile jumps to enable the Club to hold events at the Silverstream Reserve without damaging the reserve by installing static jumps.

Moved P Redmond seconded C Greengrass

THAT the Kaiapoi - Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190704094408.

(b) Approves a grant of $500 to the Kaiapoi Branch - North Canterbury Pony Club towards the cost of purchasing mobile jumps for pony club events.

CARRIED

7.4 Elected Member Code of Conduct Refresh – S Nichols (Governance Manager)

K Rabe spoke to the report drawing attention to the refreshed Code of Conduct which took into account changes to legislation, and which also aimed to enhance the effectiveness of the local authority by developing a culture of mutual trust, respect and tolerance.

J Watson enquired about the process that would be followed once a complaint was made. J Palmer stated that the complaint should firstly be raised with the Chairperson of the Board who, after consultation with the Chief Executive, would define an appropriate process.

Various members contemplated the merits of the Community Boards establishing a Code of Conduct Committee, either for individual Boards or a combined Committee comprising of the Chairs of the four Boards to oversee any complaints.

J Palmer suggested that the Board could use the Code of Conduct Committee already established to oversee the Council’s complaints if it so chooses.
P Redmond commented that, in his opinion, this may be the best option as the Council’s Code of Conduct Committee should be unbiased. However, he proposed that the Board should recommend that the new Community Boards review the matter of Code of Conduct Committees when adopting their Codes of Conduct.

Moved P Redmond seconded R Blair

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:
(a) Receives report No. 190625089259.
(b) Adopts the 2019 Elected Member Code of Conduct, effective from 31 July 2019. (Trim 190625089193).
(c) Notes that the Code of Conduct be refined in particular as regards the establishment (or not) of a Code of Conduct Committee for Community Boards.

CARRIED

8 CORRESPONDENCE
There was no correspondence.

9 CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT

9.1 Chair’s Diary for June 2019

Moved J Watson seconded R Blair

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:
(a) Receives report No 190709096486.

CARRIED

10 MATTERS REFERRED FOR INFORMATION

10.1 Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting minutes – 4 July 2019 (Trim No. 190705094928)
10.2 Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting minutes – 17 June 2019 (Trim No. 190703093846)
10.3 Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting minutes 12 June 2019 (Trim No. 190606079618)

Moved J Watson seconded C Greengrass

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board receives the information in items 10.1-10.03.

CARRIED

11 MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE

S Stewart
- Attended Kaiapoi Art Expo and Blackwells Fire and Ice Night Market;
- Update on Plan Change 7;
- First meeting of the Land and Water Group later in the week;
- Water Zone Committee refresh; and
- Crown Public Health investigation of arsenic in public wells
P Redmond

- 18 June 2019 - Attended ECan Briefing regarding proposed bus routes at Kaiapoi;
- 21 June 2019 – Attended RPA ‘Big Splash” at RSA Rangiora;
- 24 June 2019 – Attended All Boards Briefing;
- 26 June 2019 – Attended KPA ‘Brand’ workshop at the Riverside Church – low attendance but good ideas raised;
- 26 June 2019 – Attended Kaiapoi Marine Precinct workshop;
- 2 July 2019 – Attended WDC Council meeting and unveiling and blessing of Artwork;
- 7 July 2019 – Attended RSA Maritime Service at St Bartholomew;
- 9 July 2019 – Attended Candidate evening at Rangiora;
- 12 July 2019 – Attended Kaiapoi Art Expo opening night;
- 13 July 2019 – Attended Hazards drop-ins at Rangiora and Kaiapoi; and
- 15 July 2019 – Attended the Sustainability workshop regarding E-cars.

M Pinkham

- 17 June 2019 – Attended AGM of Kaiapoi Promotions Association
- 18 June 2019 – Attended Ecan Bus review workshop;
- 19 June 2019 – Attended Pink Ribbon breakfast CT;
- 24 June 2019 – Attended CWNCT Board meeting;
- 26 June 2019 – Attended KPA Business breakfast with Brydon Heller as guest speaker;
- 27 June 2019 – Attended Town Association meeting – considerable concern regarding the Belfast to Kaiapoi cycle route;
- 8 July 2019 – Attended Canterbury Housing and Transport Group – frustration at lack of progress on development of Regional Passenger Transport Plan;
- 10 July 2019 – Attended KPA Committee meeting;
- 12 July 2019 – Kaiapoi Art Expo; and
- 13 July 2019 – Attended WDC Natural Hazards Workshop
  - Frustration at WDC position on Regional Policy Statement (RPS)
  - Reluctance to prepare plans not based on logical boundaries but on the arbitrary RPS boundaries

J Meyer

- New roundabout in Jones Street; and
- Work on District Plan continues

A Blackie

- Attended most of the events covered by other members i.e. Kaiapoi Art Expo, Bus review etc;
- Food Forest report back;
- Dredging project; and
- Silverstream planting – disappointing turnout

C Greengrass

- Attended most of the events covered by other members;
- Attended Access meeting and Museum Meeting;
- Attended Landmarks and Heritage meeting; and
- Attended Garden meeting
R Blair
- Attended All Boards Briefing; and
- ECan Bus Review

12 CONSULTATION PROJECTS

About The Dog Control Bylaw and Policy Review
Consultation would be closing Friday 26 July 2019.

Natural Hazards
Consultation would be closing Friday 26 July 2019.

Road Sealing
Consultation would be closing Friday 2 August 2019.
https://www.waimakariri.govt.nz/have-a-say/lets-talk/consultations/lets-talk-road-sealing

Board members were requested to identify and confirm which consultations they would wish to submit on in the near future.

13 REGENERATION PROJECTS

13.1 Town Centre, Kaiapoi
Updates on the Kaiapoi Town Centre projects were emailed regularly to Board members. These updates could be accessed via the link below:

13.2 Kaiapoi Regeneration Steering Group
The next meeting of the Kaiapoi Regeneration Steering Group would be held in Meeting Room 1, Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre, at 4pm on Monday 5 August 2019. This meeting will be open to the public.

14 BOARD FUNDING UPDATE

14.1 Board Discretionary Grant

14.2 General Landscaping Budget
Balance as at 9 July 2019: $24,860. (Excluding carry forward)
15 MEDIA ITEMS

16 MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

Moved J Watson seconded M Pinkham

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 was excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to this 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 the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting of 17 June 2019</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 was 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 were 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>

CARRIED

CLOSE MEETING

See Public Excluded Agenda (blue papers)

OPEN MEETING

Open meeting resumed at 5.25pm
17 QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS
There was no questions.

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

NEXT MEETING
The next meeting of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board was scheduled for 4pm, on Monday 19 August 2019 at the Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 5.25PM.

_______________________
Chairperson

______________________
Date

Workshop
- Nuisance Bylaw Nick Harrison (Manager Regulation)

Briefing
(Please note - Briefings were public excluded)
- Proposed Kaiapoi Development – Simon Markham (Manager Strategy and Engagement)
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT FOR INFORMATION

FILE NO: GOV-18 / 190619086528
REPORT TO: Council
DATE OF MEETING: 6 August 2019
FROM: David Ayers, Mayor
SUBJECT: Mayor’s Diary 25 June – 30 July 2019

1. SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 25 June</td>
<td>Compass FM Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 26 June</td>
<td>KPA Brand Breakfast, Kaiapoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rangiora Promotions Last Wednesday Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 27 June</td>
<td>Historic Document Presentation from WIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 28 June</td>
<td>Department of Conservation Breakfast, Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting with Rachel Hyde, DPMC to discuss Emergency Management System Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christchurch’s first Electric Buses Launch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 1 July</td>
<td>Interview with David Hill - North Canterbury News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 2 July</td>
<td>Compass FM Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rangiora Salvation Army Just Brass Concert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 3 July</td>
<td>Mayors Professional Development Advisory Group Conference Call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enshi Sister City Advisory Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Launch of the Suitcase Exhibition, Oxford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 4 July</td>
<td>Rangiora Borough School Visit to Understand Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 5 July</td>
<td>Interview with David Hill - North Canterbury News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 7 July</td>
<td>Cr Dan Gordon represented me at Seafarers’ Service, Kaiapoi – other councillors also attended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 7 July to Tuesday 9 July</td>
<td>LGNZ National Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 9 July</td>
<td>Compass FM Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 10 July</td>
<td>Congratulated Neroli Lancaster from Percival Street Bakery on selection for NZ trades team going to Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natural Hazards Workshops – Ohoka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 11 July</td>
<td>ECAn Briefing on Plan Change 7, Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury Regional Road Safety Working Group, Christchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pegasus Conference Hotel Project Discussion with Sam Hu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natural Hazards Workshops – Oxford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 12 July</td>
<td>Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spoke at unveiling of plaque for Matariki Planting, Silverstream Reserve, Clarkville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with David Hill - North Canterbury News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opened Kaiapoi Art Expo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 13 July</td>
<td>Visited Kaiapoi winter festival events - twice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff Social Club Mid-Winter Function, Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 14 July</td>
<td>Alan Fraser Memorial Girls Tournament - Waimakariri United Football Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 15 July</td>
<td>Kemps Purchase Discussion with Rangiora High School student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 16 July</td>
<td>Compass FM Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 17 July</td>
<td>Animal Control Meeting with Larissa Corboy and John and Gina Mudgway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visit to Imam at Al Noor Mosque - Condolence Register Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 18 July</td>
<td>Exhibition Opening - Art on the Quay, Kaiapoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 19 July</td>
<td>Meeting re Changing Places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 20 July</td>
<td>SOFIA Tour, Christchurch Airport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 21 July</td>
<td>Attended Rangiora winter festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 22 July</td>
<td>Interview with David Hill - North Canterbury News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 23 July</td>
<td>Compass FM Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting regarding tiny houses consenting issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 24 July</td>
<td>Prosperity Framework presentation &amp; discussion - Jim Palmer and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Ayers meeting with Joanna Norris &amp; Anna Elphick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ChristchurchNZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 25 July</td>
<td>Buffet lunch for Jennifer Storer farewell from Canterbury Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 26 July</td>
<td>Canterbury Registered Masters Builders 2019 House of the Year,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wigram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 27 July</td>
<td>Visited CDEM Exercise, Oxford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 28 July</td>
<td>Cust Recycling Facility Opening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 29 July</td>
<td>Canterbury Museum Trust Board meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THAT the Council:

a) Receives report No. 190619086528.

David Ayers
MAYOR