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BUSINESS

1. APOLOGIES

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Conflicts of interest (if any) to be reported for minuting.

3. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

3.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Resource Management and Regulation Committee held on Tuesday 22 November 2016

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the District Planning and Regulation Committee

(a) Confirms as a true and correct record, the minutes of a meeting of the District Planning and Regulation Committee held on 22 November 2016.

4. MATTERS ARISING

5. PRESENTATION/DEPUTATION
6. REPORTS


RECOMMENDATION

THAT the District Planning and Regulation Committee:

(a) Receives report 170331031689.

(b) Notes that a comprehensive report on all aspect of the Customer Satisfaction Survey 2016 will be presented to the Council meeting on June 6.

(c) Refers this report to the Community Boards for their information

6.2 District Plan E-Plan Software – Preferred Supplier and Budget - Trevor Ellis (Development Planning Manager) and Jolanda Simon (Information and Technology Services Manager)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the District Planning and Regulation Committee:

(d) Receives report No. 170405033283.

(e) Notes the selection of Isovist as the preferred supplier of the District Plan Review Software Solution, subject to final contract negotiation.

(f) Notes the total budget requirement over 5 years is $347,642 of which $99,570 is available from the Information and Technology Services budget and $34,000 from the Development Planning Unit budget.

(g) Notes that most of the additional cost ($214,072) over 5 years is attributed to external consultant support and contingency, should it be required.

(h) Recommends to Council to confirm additional budget of $214,072 to progress implementation of the E-Plan software solution for District Plan and submissions management purposes and licensing costs.

(i) Notes that additional budget will be sought as part of the 2018/2028 LTP budget to provide for licensing and to support District Plan Review Resource Management Act processes and that this has been previously signalled.
7. PORTFOLIO UPDATES

7.1 District Planning Development – Councillor Neville Atkinson

7.2 Regulation and Civil Defence – Councillor John Meyer

7.3 Business, Promotion and Town Centres – Councillor Dan Gordon

8. QUESTIONS

9. URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS
MINUTES OF THE DISTRICT PLANNING AND REGULATION COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD IN THE WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 215 HIGH STREET,
RANGIORA ON TUESDAY 22 NOVEMBER 2016 AT 1.01PM.

PRESENT

Councillor J Meyer (Chair), Mayor D Ayers (arrived at 1.03pm during item 3.1),
Councillors N Atkinson, P Allen, W Doody and D Gordon.

IN ATTENDANCE

Councillor P Williams and Rangiora-Ashley Community Board member G Miller
Messrs N Harrison (Manager Regulation), S Markham (Manager Strategy and
Engagement), M Johnson (Environmental Services Unit), G Meadows (Policy Manager),
T Ellis (Development Planning Unit), P Waiting (Team Leader – Resource Consents),
N Law (Resource Management Planner), J Tamaiparea (Duty Planner), L Hurley
(Planning Technician) and L Courtney (Governance Secretary).

Councillor Meyer commenced the meeting welcoming the new Committee members.

1 APOLOGIES

There were no apologies.

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

No conflicts of interest were noted.

3 RECEIPT OF MINUTES

3.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Resource Management and Regulation
Committee held on Tuesday 20 September 2016

Councillor Atkinson raised on page 4, paragraph 4, final sentence that ‘kiwis’
should be replaced by ‘people’ as he wanted to include all people not just
New Zealanders. Councillor Atkinson’s comments were noted but as the
minutes were only being received and from a Committee that no longer
existed, no changes could be made to them.

Moved Councillor Allen    seconded Councillor Gordon

THAT the District Planning and Regulation Committee:

(a) Receives for information, the minutes of a meeting of the Resource
Management and Regulation Committee held on 20 September 2016.

CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING

Nil.

5 PRESENTATION/DEPUTATION

5.1 Mrs Davina McNickel (Team Leader Contaminated Sites, ECAN) spoke to
the Committee in relation to the Ministry for the Environment’s Hazardous
Activities and Industries List.
Mrs McNickel spoke to a powerpoint (Trim No. 161125121688) outlining the project. She stated the project arose out of the 2010 Canterbury earthquakes to support rebuild work, so that, if required, land could be remediated before rebuild work commenced. She emphasised that her team investigates and identifies historic use, or at least probable use, of a particular site but does not identify whether that site is or is not contaminated. Possible contamination of a site requires a Detailed Site Investigation at the landowner’s cost.

ECan intend to provide regular updates to the Council and will also hold drop in sessions for local communities. This method has proven to be a more effective way of communicating with the community and providing clarity to those who have queries about their own land. There is a public launch planned for June 2017 but more information will be provided closer to the date.

Councillor Atkinson queried how Council spraying was identified as opposed to private property owner spraying. Mrs McNickel acknowledged that it was an issue. Once historic land use had been identified, then the types of sprays that were probably used could be surmised. However, there were difficulties with organic operators as it was not as simple to identify the kinds of sprays they used but ECan staff were currently developing a guide to assist with this.

Councillor Atkinson asked how identified land use was notified, expressing concern that it could affect property equity. Mrs McNickel replied ECan have a Listed Land Use Register but it was up to each Council to decide how much information to provide. She stated the matter has been tested and there is a lot of case law available.

Councillor Atkinson questioned, once identified as a hazardous or contaminated site, how long the classification stays. Mrs McNickel replied that ECan relies on international classifications regarding the persistence of chemicals in water and soil, and adhere to the Stockholm Convention. Some sites that have had DDT used on the land, persist in the soil decades after it was first used.

Councillor Atkinson queried the difference between air and soil contaminants; one could argue the air contaminants are just as detrimental to people and the environment. Mrs McNickel acknowledged Councillor Atkinson’s query but air contamination was not an issue she could speak to. She explained the project was to assist those who may use land in later years, so they can be aware of what they could possibly be exposed to when conducting work that disturbs the soil.

Councillor Allen asked what property owners were expected do with the information being provided by the project. Mrs McNickel clarified that ECan were only investigating previous land use, not land condition. The effect on landowners would be dependent how the land was worked.

Regarding residential developments on land identified as hazardous: Councillor Williams expressed concern at the possible effect on property values. Mrs McNickel replied the same concerns were raised in Christchurch, commenting that possible historic land contamination combined with other factors, could have a negative effect on property values. The project was carried out in parts of Christchurch and did not have any negative effects on property values. Contamination needed to be investigated and confirmed first.

Mayor Ayers queried the feasibility of investigating historic land use. Mrs McNickel replied the current project would identify this.
Councillor Gordon sought clarification regarding the impetus for the project. Mrs McNickel responded the project was being carried out as requested by Central Government.

6 REPORTS

6.1 Appointment of District Licensing Committee – Malcolm Johnston
(Environmental Services Manager)

Mr Johnston spoke to the report. He referred members to the 2012 changes in the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act and advised the Council formed its own District Licensing Committee (DLC) in December 2013. The request is to re-establish a DLC. He highlighted the Council has the option to appoint an independent commissioner, however, there were advantages to having control of the licensing process within the Council. Mr Johnston commented that staff have recommend a commissioner be co-opted to the DLC from the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board; having a commissioner available gives greater stability and flexibility to the DLC.

Mayor Ayers sought confirmation that the Mayor was still an ex-officio for the DLC. Mr Johnston confirmed that the Mayor was.

Mayor Ayers queried cross accreditation with Hurunui. Mr Johnston replied there were advantages in having the cross accreditation and the staff recommendation was for it to continue.

Councillor Doody queried whether co-opting a commissioner from the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board would relieve pressure on the DLC due to a delay in training for new Committee members. Mr Johnston replied it would but training had been signalled for the earliest possible opportunity.

Moved Councillor Gordon seconded Councillor Allen

THAT the District Planning and Regulation Committee:

(a) Receives report 161104113935.

(b) Recommends to the Council that Councillors Peter Allen, Neville Atkinson, John Meyer and Wendy Doody be appointed to the District Licensing Committee.

(c) Recommends to the Council that Councillor P Allen is appointed as Chairperson of the Waimakariri District Licensing Committee

(d) Recommends to the Council that Councillor N Atkinson is appointed as the deputy chairperson of the Waimakariri District Licensing Committee

(e) Recommends to the Council that Rangiora-Ashley Community Board Chair J Gerard be appointed to the District Licensing Committee as a Commissioner until 31 January 2020.

(f) Notes that Mayor D Ayers is an ex-officio of the District Licensing Committee.

CARRIED

D Gordon commented he was part of original DLC but could not participate now due to work commitments. He believed it was a strong DLC and it was
practical to have Rangiora-Ashley Community Board Chair J Gerard as a commissioner due to his past experience on the Committee.

7 PORTFOLIO UPDATES

7.1 District Planning Development – Councillor Neville Atkinson

Councillor Atkinson met with Council staff to discuss upcoming projects and plan meeting times. He commented on the progress of the District Development Strategy, noting its launch on 2 November 2016.

He commented on the Easterbrook Road development and the issue of commercial facilities in rural areas. A report will be before the Council in the near future and will be considered as part of the District Plan review process.

Regarding the Easterbrook Road development: Councillor Allen asked whether issues could be identified regarding the consent process. Councillor Atkinson responded that the original consent had been for the 11,000m² building. The plan then changed to a factory which required extra conditions under the Resource Management Act, which included a requirement for parking facilities. The next part of the process was to identify whether it should be notified or non-notified and it was deemed the effects were minor, and therefore non-notified. Councillor Atkinson has asked staff to investigate when governance should be notified if a similar situation occurs in the future, so elected members can be aware of issues earlier in the process. The development will progress although neighbouring residents are not happy with the decision. Conditions have been imposed which is hoped will alleviate some of the neighbouring residents’ concerns. He concluded the development is legal and permitted under the Council’s District Plan.

Councillor Allen sought clarification regarding Councillor Atkinson’s comment regarding governance. Councillor Atkinson replied his reference to governance meant the Waimakariri District Council.

Councillor Allen asked whether the conditions would be applied retrospectively. Mr Harrison clarified the consent has not been issued; only a decision made on whether it needed to be notified or non-notified.

Councillor Doody, to Mr Harrison, commended staff for providing the information.

Councillor Gordon asked whether a public meeting had been held regarding the development. Councillor Atkinson replied that a meeting had been requested by the local community and was held by key staff; Councillor Atkinson chaired the meeting but it was not a public meeting.

Mayor Ayers queried what legal recourse was open to those who were not happy with the proposed development. N Harrison replied that a judicial review through the High Court would be the next step. The review would look at the process the Council followed to arrive at its decision, not the decision itself. The High Court could then direct the matter back to the Council for review. Councillor Atkinson added that residents have been offered 2-3 hours of legal advice, at the Council’s cost, to assist with their concerns.

Councillor Doody asked whether construction had started. N Harrison replied that the building has a consent but Council staff have exercised Section 37 (of the Building Act) so the building cannot be used until Resource Consent has been issued; the building, as per the plan submitted for a building consent, can be built without a Resource Consent.
7.2 **Regulation and Civil Defence – Councillor John Meyer**

Councillor Meyer commented on the positives to come out of the Kaikoura earthquakes. He could see early on the effort put in by all, in particular the welfare centres and commended the efficiency of assistance being established. He acknowledged there was some initial confusion but advised if people were uncertain of what to do, to get themselves somewhere safe.

Mayor Ayers commented that he met with residents at the Rangiora Warehouse and New World car parks in the early morning of the 14 November 2016. He welcomed the acting Civil Defence Minister’s comments regarding tsunami warning technology. In relation to civil defence exercises, Mayor Ayers commented that some coastal residents cannot hear the sirens from inside their homes, while others could hear the sirens from Rangiora. He believed there may be a need to extend discussions on tsunami warnings to those neighbouring coastal properties. He noted that not all residents are comfortable in going to welfare centres and there were a number of issues that will require further discussion.

7.3 **Business, Promotion and Town Centres – Councillor Dan Gordon**

Councillor Gordon commented it had been a busy time. He met with the District Development LED group the previous night which is a well-represented group which will feed into the District Plan review. He noted the District Development Strategy launch was well attended and represented.

Councillor Gordon also held portfolio meetings with Council staff and intends to hold regular updates with them. He praised the leadership involved in the town centres. He believed there had been a common sense solution to car parking, noting a lot had gone on behind the scenes. He intends to get around all the town centres and wants to keep connected with those involved in their development. He commented on the goodwill among residents which he saw as been a result of good relationships built by staff involved.

8 **QUESTIONS**

There were no questions.

9 **URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS**

There was no urgent general business.

*Item 5.1 was taken at this time. Note the minutes have been recorded in accordance with the order of the agenda as circulated.*

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 2.12PM.

CONFIRMED

__________________________  ________________________
Chairperson                  Date
**BRIEFING**

At the conclusion of the meeting a briefing covered the following:

1. **Parking update** (M. Johnston, Environmental Services Manager)
2. **District Plan Review – Recap and Next Steps** (T. Ellis, Development Planning Manager)
1. SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to provide the District Planning and Regulation Committee with results of the 2016 Customer Satisfaction Survey with respect to District Development and Regulatory Performance aspects of the survey. The Survey was conducted in November/December 2016. The survey deals largely with the community’s use of, and satisfaction, with the services provided by the Council. The Council’s Policy and Strategy Team, separate to those parts of the organisation delivering services, have managed the survey.

This is the sixth in a series of three yearly surveys conducted by the Council, with the previous surveys having been undertaken in 2001, 2004, 2007, 2010 and 2013. Each of these surveys has used substantially the same questionnaire, which allows the tracing of trends in the community’s satisfaction Council services. 600 households are approached to complete the survey drawn as random sample.

This survey continuity, attention to sample design, tested nature of the questionnaire and the consistently high response rate (81%) mean there is a very high level of confidence in the results as being representative of the whole population. While results are also analysed by ward and for other subsamples in the full report, statistical sampling errors increase with smaller numbers and so results are more indicative rather than representative of opinion at this level.

Attachments:


2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Committee:

(a) **Receives** report 170331031689.

(b) **Notes** that a comprehensive report on all aspect of the Customer Satisfaction Survey 2016 will be presented to the Council meeting on June 6.

(c) **Refers** this report to the Community Boards for their information

3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

3.1. The 2016 Customer Satisfaction Survey conducted in November / December 2016 and involved the circulation of questionnaires to 600 households in the District, with the number of questionnaires allocated to each ward based on the number of people recorded at the 2013 Census. The survey contains 60 questions on all aspects of Council services, The questions focus on the use of and satisfaction with these services.

3.2. The households that participate were randomly selected from the District's valuation roll, using the Excel random number programme. Members of five community groups that assist the Council with delivery and collection of the surveys. These community groups included the Woodend Volunteer Fire Brigade, the Rangiora Croquet Club, Waikuku Boxing Club, Oxford Area School and the North Canterbury Soroptimists. The groups were paid $7.00 per questionnaire returned plus travel costs associated with the distribution of questionnaires. This means that the money associated with the cost of the circulation of questionnaires stays in the community.

3.3. Of the 600 questionnaires circulated 486 were returned, which gives a response rate of 81 percent and a sampling error of +/− 4.4%. This response rate is exceptionally high when compared with the response rates that are presently being achieved by many other organisations sample surveys especially those utilising phone surveying and adopting market research approaches. The fact that the Council was able to achieve this response rate is attributable to the generous cooperation of the people approached to complete a questionnaire, and the work of the members of the community groups that undertook the job of circulating the questionnaires.

3.4. The Council has been using this method of circulating the questionnaires for each of its five most recent Customer Satisfaction Surveys, and for the 1992 survey, and on each occasion the response rate has exceeded 80.0 percent. These very high response rates mean that greater reliance can be placed on the results of the surveys than would otherwise be the case. A high response rate means that any “non-response” bias in the results is minimised.

3.5. The household is the unit of analysis for the survey, and respondents are advised that the Council welcomes the involvement of all members of the household in answering the questionnaire. The household was chosen as the unit of analysis in order to maximise the amount of information that could be gathered through each questionnaire.

3.6. Council managers and team leaders have had an initial opportunity to consider the survey results and more detailed tabulations for each activity area are being compiled. Also of value, are the large number of verbatim comments on returned survey forms, which have been electronically captured and sorted. Departments over the coming weeks will be considering the results with a view to where possible improvements can be made within existing resources, and the desirability of new initiatives to continue to improve customer satisfaction.

3.7. Attached at Appendix 1 is the findings report for District Development. Appendix 2 contains the findings report for Regulatory Performance.

3.8. A comprehensive report on all aspects of the Customer Satisfaction Survey will be presented at the Council meeting on June 6.
The key findings of the Customer Satisfaction Survey 2016 with respect to District Development are:

- **Planning for future subdivisions and housing** – 55.9% of households were satisfied with planning for future subdivisions and housing, with 20.8% dissatisfied. 23.3% either had no opinion or provided no response to this question.

- **Planning for the future of rural areas** – 43.7% of households were satisfied with planning for the future of rural areas, with 14.2% dissatisfied. 42.2% either had no opinion or provided no response.

- **Planning for the future of business areas, including town centres** – 66.6% of households were satisfied with planning for the future of business areas, including town centres, with 9.7% dissatisfied. 23.7% either had no opinion or provided no response.

- **Encouraging increased business activity** – 66.1% of households were satisfied with the Council encouraging increased business activity, with 8.4% dissatisfied. 25.5% either had no opinion or provided no response.

- **Promoting the District** – 70.7% of households were satisfied with the Council promoting the District, with 8% dissatisfied. 21.2% either had no opinion or provided no response.

- **Trends in satisfaction with Encouraging Business** – Satisfaction with Council encouraging business activity has increased to 66%, from 47.2% in 2013. This is the highest satisfaction level recorded for encouraging business activity since the question was first asked in 2004. The dissatisfaction level has dropped to 26.7%, however this is not the lowest recorded dissatisfaction level. Dissatisfaction was lowest in 2004, at 14.8%.

- **Trends in satisfaction with Promoting the District** – Satisfaction levels with the Council promoting the District have increased in 2016. While the satisfaction level has typically sat around 60% of households being satisfied, 2016 saw an increase to 70.8% of households being satisfied with Council promoting the District. There was also a significant reduction in dissatisfaction levels from 20.4% in 2013 to 8% in 2016. The no opinion / no response rate has not varied greatly over time.

The key findings of the Customer Satisfaction Survey 2016 with respect to Regulatory Performance are:

- **Noise Control** – 56.4% of households were satisfied with noise control and 7.2% were dissatisfied. 36.4% either had no opinion or provided no response.

- **Animal Control** – 61.9% of households were satisfied with animal control and 10.5% were dissatisfied. 27.6% either had no opinion or provided no response.
• **Liquor Licencing** – 57.6% of households were satisfied with Liquor Licencing and 10.3% were dissatisfied. 32.1% either had no opinion or provided no response.

• **Food Licencing / Food Hygiene** – 64.4% of households were satisfied with Food Licencing / Food Hygiene and 3.9% were dissatisfied. 31.7% either had no opinion or provided no response.

• **Building Consents** – 41.6% of households were satisfied with Building Consents, with 14.4% dissatisfied. 44% either had no opinion or provided no response.

• **Resource Consents** – 38.5% of households were satisfied with Resource Consents, with 13.2% dissatisfied. 48.4% either had no opinion or provided no response.

• **Trends in satisfaction with Regulatory Performance** – There has been no significant change in Satisfaction Levels of households with all aspects of regulatory performance.

4. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

4.1. **Maori**

The views of Maori were not obtained during the development of the questionnaire, but some people with Maori ancestry are likely to have been included in the survey sample.

4.2. **External**

The Council’s Customer Satisfaction Survey is one of the Council’s main opportunities to ascertain the views of members of the community with respects to a wide range of its services and other activities.

4.3. **Internal**

Business Units provided feedback on possible questions and the Management Team reviewed the draft 2016 questionnaire.

5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

5.1. **The cost of the 2016 Customer Satisfaction Survey has been covered from existing budgets. Actions undertaken in response to the findings of this survey will either be covered by existing budgets or included as specific items in future Council budget proposals.**

5.2. **The results of the 2016 survey have a sampling error of +/- 4.4 percent at 95 percent confidence. This means that the whole community’s views are likely to be within 4.4 percent of those recorded in the survey, but there is once chance in 20 that the actual views of the community are outside of that range.**

6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. **Policy**

This matter 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**

There is a safe environment for all
Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable, affordable and sustainable
Businesses in the District are diverse, adaptable, and growing
Core utility services are provided in a timely, sustainable and affordable manner
The community’s cultures, arts and heritage are conserved and celebrated
Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality
People have a wide range of opportunities for learning and being informed
There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision-making by public organisations that affect our District.
Customer Satisfaction Survey 2016

Findings – District Development

April 2017

Prepared by Policy and Strategy Unit
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**KEY FINDINGS**

- **Planning for future subdivisions and housing** – 55.9% of households were satisfied with planning for future subdivisions and housing, with 20.8% dissatisfied. 23.3% either had no opinion or provided no response to this question.

- **Planning for the future of rural areas** – 43.7% of households were satisfied with planning for the future of rural areas, with 14.2% dissatisfied. 42.2% either had no opinion or provided no response.

- **Planning for the future of business areas, including town centres** – 66.6% of households were satisfied with planning for the future of business areas, including town centres, with 9.7% dissatisfied. 23.7% either had no opinion or provided no response.

- **Encouraging increased business activity** – 66.1% of households were satisfied with the Council encouraging increased business activity, with 8.4% dissatisfied. 25.5% either had no opinion or provided no response.

- **Promoting the District** – 70.7% of households were satisfied with the Council promoting the District, with 8% dissatisfied. 21.2% either had no opinion or provided no response.

- **Trends in satisfaction with Encouraging Business** – Satisfaction with Council encouraging business activity has increased to 66%, from 47.2% in 2013. This is the highest satisfaction level recorded for encouraging business activity since the question was first asked in 2004. The dissatisfaction level has dropped to 26.7%, however this in not the lowest recorded dissatisfaction level. Dissatisfaction was lowest in 2004, at 14.8%.

- **Trends in satisfaction with Promoting the District** – Satisfaction levels with the Council promoting the District have increased in 2016. While the satisfaction level has typically sat around 60% of households being satisfied, 2016 saw an increase to 70.8% of households being satisfied with Council promoting the District. There was also a significant reduction in dissatisfaction levels from 20.4% in 2013 to 8% in 2016. The no opinion / no response rate has not varied greatly over time.
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 OBJECTIVES

The Waimakariri District Council’s 2013 Customer Satisfaction Survey was conducted in November / December 2016. It is the sixth in a series of three yearly customer satisfaction surveys to be conducted by the Council.

The main objective of the Waimakariri District Council’s Customer Satisfaction Survey is to obtain a high-level overview of the attitudes of Waimakariri District residents towards the services and facilities provided by the Council. Repeating the survey on a regular basis enables the Council to develop an understanding of the community’s views over the long-term.

The survey does not attempt to explore topics in-depth as the Council conducts more targeted research on topical issues as required.

This report presents the results of this survey and compares these with the results of the 2001, 2004, 2007, 2010 and 2013 surveys where possible.

Information about the key characteristics of the respondent households is also collected in the survey. This data helps with the assessment of the reliability of the survey results. If the key characteristics of the people included in the sample resemble those of the population from which the sample is drawn, greater confidence can be attached to the results than would otherwise be the case.

1.2 THE SURVEY

The Customer Satisfaction Surveys are surveys of residents. The samples do not include non-resident ratepayers, or commercial enterprises based in the District’s Business Zones. It is accepted, however, that there are many home based businesses in the District as well as farms, and that households associated with these were included in the sample. The questions were directed to these households as residents rather than as business owners.

The Council accepts that both non-resident ratepayers and commercial enterprises based in the District’s Business Zones are also customers, but recognises that there are more appropriate ways of communicating with these parties than via a general survey.

The questionnaires are only identified by their area codes and responses could not be traced to any individual or household. The raw data is not available to anyone other than Council staff and is stored securely outside of the document management system. The final report will be published and available through the Council’s document management system or website. Methods such as rounding or consolidation of data into wider categories mean that no household or individual will be able to be identified through the information published in the report.
In 2016, as in 2001, 2004, 2007, 2010 and 2013, the questionnaire was designed to find out the views of the members of respondent households. Respondents were therefore informed that more than one person in the household could be involved with answering the questions. Where there was a question that asked respondents to select only one response from a set of responses, respondents were asked to choose the response that most accurately reflected the opinion of the household. Where space was provided for written comments, respondents were encouraged to include the different experiences of members of the household where relevant.

The first of these surveys was conducted in April 2001, the second in April 2004, the third in April 2007, the fourth in March/April 2010 and the Fifth in March/April 2013. Many of the same questions were used in each survey although a number of changes were made to some of the questions in 2016 in response to feedback from the pre-testing of the questionnaire. Feedback was that it had been very long and time consuming to complete. The 2013 survey contained 75 questions and was 15 pages long. The 2016 survey (refer Attachment 1) contains 61 questions and is 13 pages long. The reduction was achieved through consultation with relevant Council staff. The amendments also reflect the reduction from four wards to three as a result of the 2015 Representation Review.

The response rate of 486 returned and completed surveys for the 2016 survey is comparable to previous surveys with 490 returned in 2013, 516 in 2010, 514 in 2007, 519 in 2004 and 510 in 2001.

2  DISTRICT DEVELOPMENT

2.1  THE QUESTIONS

Respondents were asked to indicate their level of satisfaction with the Council’s performance in:

- Planning for future subdivisions and housing
- Planning for the future of rural areas
- Planning for the future business areas, including town centres
- Encouraging increased business activity
- Promoting the District

Table 1.1 and Figure 1.1 below demonstrate the overall level of satisfaction with these five areas. As can be seen, the overall satisfaction levels are reasonable, with Promoting the District the highest at 70.7% and Planning for the future of rural areas lowest at 43.7%. With regard to levels of dissatisfaction, Planning for future subdivisions and housing was highest at 20.8%, while Promoting the District was lowest at 8%. Those respondents who indicated no opinion or chose not to answer the question varied between 42.2% for Planning for the future of rural areas and 23.3% for Planning for future subdivisions and housing.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Dissatisfaction</th>
<th>No Opinion /No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning for future subdivisions and housing</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning for the future of rural areas</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning for the future business areas, including town centres</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging increased business activity</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting the District</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1.1 - Satisfaction Levels (%) with District Development 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning for Future Subdivision and Housing</th>
<th>Planning for the Future of Rural Areas</th>
<th>Planning for the Future of Business Areas, including Town Centres</th>
<th>Encouraging Increased Business Activity</th>
<th>Promoting the District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion / No response</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage
2.2 TRENDS IN SATISFACTION WITH DISTRICT DEVELOPMENT

The district development questions are relatively new to the Customer Satisfaction Survey. Therefore, comparable historic data does not exist for all district development questions. Questions previously asked include satisfaction with Council encouraging increased business activity and with Council promoting the District. Figure 1.2 and 1.3 below demonstrate the trends in these areas.

As can be seen in Figure 1.2 the satisfaction with encouraging business activity has increased to 66% and this is the highest recorded satisfaction level recorded since 2004. Interestingly, the dissatisfaction level dropped to 26.7%, however this is not the lowest recorded dissatisfaction level. Dissatisfaction was lowest in 2004 at 14.8%. In 2016 this question had a lower non-response rate at 7.3%, than in 2004 with 39.4% of respondents choosing not to answer the question or expressing a ‘no opinion’. This indicates that ‘encouraging business activity’ has become a greater issue for more respondents as more households have an opinion on the matter.

As can be seen in Figure 1.2 satisfactions levels with the Council promoting the District have increased in 2016. While the satisfaction level has typically sat around 60% of respondents satisfied, 2016 saw an increase to 70.8%. There was also a reduction in dissatisfaction levels from 20.4% in 2013 to 8% in
2016. The non-response rate for this question has not varied greatly over time, ranging from 16.2% (2010) to 21.2% (2016).

Figure 1.2 - Trends in Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction (%) with Council Promoting the District 2007 - 2016

2.3 COMMENTS ABOUT DISTRICT DEVELOPMENT

The following comments were made by respondents about aspects of Council’s planning for the long-term future of the Waimakariri District.

Comments about Planning for future subdivisions and housing included concern about:

- Lack of tree planting in existing and new developments
- Too many subdivisions in the District
- New subdivisions causing flooding to existing properties (displacement)
- Roading infrastructure is not coping with current population
- Lack of Public consultation through Resource Consent process
- Subdivision minimum lot sizes

Comments about Planning for the future of rural areas included concern about:
- Changing the minimum lot size in the Rural Zone
- Urban sprawl affecting Rural areas and Farmland
- Commercial / Industrial business in Rural communities

Comments about Planning for the future business areas, including town centres included concern about:
- Lack of car parking in Town Centre
- Too many eateries in Town Centre
- Rangiora Town Centre is not functional

Comments about encouraging increased business activity included concern about:
- Due to Planning regulations it is hard to operate a business in Waimakariri

Comments about Promoting the District included concerns about:
- Lack of promotion of North Canterbury as a place to base business and industry
- Lack of promotion of activities available in Waimakariri District
### ATTACHMENT II – COMMENTS ON DISTRICT DEVELOPMENT

(re Q24 - These are strange questions - how would we know the answers to any of them!, and Q24c - Dissatisfied, No car parking). Q25 - It is not the Council's job to promote the area. It is the Council's job to provide the necessary services, which in its turn will attract business and housing as a result. I don't want to pay rates to promote the area - the area has grown more quickly than the Council can control as it is.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Lack of rural protection has been disastrous after 15 years of haphazard subdivisions in inappropriate areas, resulting in loss of farmland and a degraded environment. 2. Lack of tree protection in dairying conversions. This is an animal welfare issue in some cases, as well as degradation of the landscape. 3. Generally more resources should be put into making the District an attractive place to visit, emphasising beautification by tree planting and protecting historic buildings and landscapes.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 acre plus sections should be allowed to: a) subdivide or/and; b) build larger second homes than currently allowed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A big focus upon Rangiora town centre but not enough for Kaiapoi - push more and get some key businesses involved and out to Kaiapoi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot more parking please</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Ten Pin bowling alley would be nice and/or other sports/activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable housing for the elderly or mental health section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable new housing needed - entry level new housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alleviation of traffic congestion on the northern motorway in morning rush hour. And undermines the residents wishes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are happy that the Council is working to improve all areas in the Waimakariri District.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business development didn’t come from the Council, refreshingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can’t get my head around the spread of low density housing encroaching on good farmland. Large areas that are neither town nor country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care is needed about groundwater allocation and depleting aquifers etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned you have not left enough room in town centre for growth. Council takes too long for building permits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider traffic flow impact of Ravenswood and Pegasus developments for Rangiora as service hub - need to encourage Rangiora CBD use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued community involvement in future planning is very important - maybe offerings online surveys would increase participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council need to promote North Canterbury as a place to base business and industry.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dedicated policies on encouraging zero carbon and more innovative, smaller, efficient homes, including intentional, self reliant community housing schemes (affordable). Urban ad village composting schemes, with serious consideration of localised usage of all public area grass cuttings.

Disappointed in the way Council can ruin the small communities by allowing the building of commercial businesses and not notifying neighbouring properties.

Dissatisfied by not being informed that ground levels of Ryman subdivision were raised without notifying residents of Holly Place.

Dissatisfied with parking for business owners.

Do we really need Ravenswood.

Does not appear to be any cohesive planning of subdivisions or town development. No industrial areas marked for expansion. We have found it easier to operate our business from Rolleston.

Don’t find the Council backs small businesses at all. Taking signs off fences saying they are a distraction and then putting their own signs up in their place. No parking everywhere so workers have nowhere to park and have to walk for miles in the rain.

Don’t follow this.

Don’t know, not informed. More information in local papers would be good, ie The News, Northern Outlook.

Far too many eateries or coffee shops. It would take a month to eat or drink if you went out twice a week to cover all.

Far too many subdivisions have been allowed, particularly in Rangiora. Too many rural areas have been cut up for sprawling subdivisions.

Flooding due to new subdivisions

Go with the flow.

Have no idea what the Council planning is for our area.

Have to be selective where we place subdivisions. Have a structure and plan for long term development.

I am concerned about lifestyle blocks on west side of Lineside Road and loss of rural land on west side of Rangiora boundaries to new subdivisions.

I am concerned regarding the future development of the district, ie the Woodend bypass. The future 10 year programme for the entire district, where is it?
I am concerned that cheap urban development is encroaching upon Rangiora Airport. Its long term strategic position as a satellite airfield (in relation to Christchurch) with fuel and various maintenance facilities must be a priority for the Council to maintain. Rangiora Airfield is the home also for a large and growing sport aircraft and associated training providers. I am concerned that by allowing residential growth nearby the resultant"noise lobby" will emerge and influence Council long term policy and position, to the detriment of the aviator sector.

I am not informed enough. More interested in promoting a clean green image.

I am still learning.

I don't think there is going to be any rural left.

I think all aspects listed above should have a close look, for a small town we need a boost to increase population in all areas.

I think more trees should be planted kerbside, ie along Blackett Street between White and Stephens Streets.

I would like to see less rural residential subdivisions or allow more infill within rural residential so block size could be reduced to 2 acres - only those who are 10 acres or less rather than cut up more rural land. No more subdivision of rural land.

In this District with all the new housing the roading can't take it.

Infrastructure is not adequate or keeping pace with developments.

It is not a core function of the Council to be spending money on advertising/promotion. I know that the argument is that it feeds money to the local economy - this is not a concern of a Council with limited finances. If businesses want it, let them pay.

It is understandable that we are growing rapidly, need for more houses, please consider green belts and more trees.

It is very pleasing to see Milton Reserve being used as well. Maybe in time the horse grazing area could be upgraded to make a better entry into the town via Cones Road. I know that a Col Milton left this land for "grazing" horses in earlier days so it would be good if this area was more welcoming.

It seems flooding issues are very problematic in this district. Utilising the older generation and their knowledge of the district should be encouraged. They have very valuable 'insider' knowledge that is not being listened to.

Keep rural - rural. Restaurants, shops, petrol, not needed. Most work away and shop, then Kaipoi and Rangiora close enough.

Lack of listening or consulting the public with subdivisions.
Limited farm subdivision into 4ha "blocks". We suggest more subdivision of the 4ha blocks around small communities, eg Cust, West Eyreton, to create a village type atmosphere - already halls, schools and other facilities in these "villages" which will be made better use of and most people only want a large section rather than 4ha which they cannot/do not keep and make productive. We are losing good productive agrcultural land to subdivisions everywhere.

Maybe more focus needed to attract businesses to the area.

More development contributions required from large scale subdivisions. Min 4ha for rural subdivision has caused much wastage of land and large scale spread of houses resulting in no community. Should be designated areas down to 1000m², then rest min 20ha. This will improve landuse, roading and create rural communities

More provision for a range of housing options in the right places - higher density in town centres, ie smaller allotments on the rural-urban fringe.

Need green belts around Rangiora and new towns.

New houses are being built with minimal sections.

New subdivisions are soulless/show lack of imagination/too few trees. Not enough green space in the new subdivisions.

No future subdivisions

No information is forthcoming on what is happening in the district.

No more housing in Tuahiwi.

Not familiar with Council planning

Not impressed with how Silverstream had a retrospective problem with flood plan heights

Not sure what the rural plans are.

Okay to have future business areas and activity but you need to cover all the aspects associated with this idea, eg parking, toilet facilities, schools, footpaths, good water supply, etc.

Only to make subdivisions a bit more discrete.

Perhaps sewerage for smaller village.

Planning in all of these areas needs to be more transparent.

Put in new subdivision with no regard to infrastructure. Traffic, roading, etc. Lets dig up roads multiple times because of no forward planning.

Rangiora is not at all well thought out with its shopping area. Needs a huge car park. Pedestrian walkway in High Street would be much better. Don't really go to Rangiora now - much prefer Kaiapoi. Always plenty of parks, and no traffic congestion in main street.

Rangiora is too busy already !!! in the last five years!!!

Rangiora needs a family friendly attraction that will bring families to the area, eg indoor mini golf, ten pin bowling, etc.
Rangiora town centre layout is disorganised and not user friendly.

Recent subdivisions - the building sites are way to small for families, they are a total disaster and in years to come being so crammed in. I feel we are creating slums, and ?? years ago council would have never agreed to such a large amount of dense housing.

Retention of farmland for primary production essential.

Road traffic. Roads are designed to carry so many cars, eg motorway peak times.

Roading has not kept up with residential subdivision development - this can’t continue. Need to do more to attract business so more local jobs available.

Roading infrastructure needs to be in place prior to approving any further subdivisions.

Roading into Rangiora to allow smooth flow in peak times.

Roading/traffic to Christchurch 20 years behind. Water from Woodend given away to Tuahiwi/Ravenswood.

Satisfied mainly for Rangiora and Kaiapoi, not so sure about Oxford. We maybe need a little more help. Our rates are considerably high for such a small town, and I am not sure we get a fare share of the pot compared to Rangiora and Kaiapoi. Example - no pool roof.

Satisfied.

Shoe box housing squeezing properties in.

Specifically promoting Oxford. This is disjointed and many people/businesses have been disenfranchised by the OPAC and their closed minds.

Stop developing Ohoka Village. A glut of sections and houses already available.

Subdivision land sizes are too small - feels like shoebox size with no privacy.

Subdivision such as Silverstream and recently Ravenswood have too small sections. What provision is there for parking and increased pressure on roading, ie traffic levels from Pegasus through Woodend. Infrastructure needs to keep up with housing development.

Subdivision west of us has meant an increased risk of flooding to our property due to the change from paddocks to roads and houses. Solution - widen and upgrade the sides of all creeks and drains that run from NW to SE or create a new drain down western Rangiora that then goes south then west to meet up again with the Northbrook Wetlands.

That more notice be given to traffic flow and parking for business employees and customers.

The number of car park spaces within the Rangiora CBD is not acceptable. There are insufficient car park spaces. A significant car park building is needed.

The rural area is suffering from incremental creep of non-rural activities. 4ha is too small for the motorbikes, bonfires and industrial and commerical uses establishing due to too-permissive rules and poor administration.

The street surface water in Stage 1 Silverstream should never have happened. Its a new subdivision.
There could be more promotion of the attractive features of the area at a national level, eg Waimak and jet boating, fishing, great mountain biking and cycling. Clarity of planning for rural property subdivision, ie 10 acre blocks.

There does not seem to have any plan, or plan is changed to suit 'big players'. The impact on surrounding environs not taken into considerations. Not much foresight.

There is a large need for smaller section sizes in Rangiora, eg 300-400m2

There is too much subdivision of rural land into poorly utilised 4ha blocks. This is totally against the principle of sustainable development. More township development needed to preserve the rural lands for production and landscape values. Large scale dairy should be discouraged, irrigation used more for cropping/horticulture. (less environmentally damaging as well).

There isn't a lot of advertising and promoting of the district.

There seems to be little flow with development of the thoroughfares through Rangiora. There is improvement but opportunity to get it right and keep traffic moving.

Too many coffee shops, not much variety in shops going up. Council should be planning roading into the city before planning future subdivisions as traffic puts people off living out of Christchurch.

Too many empty shops and commercial buildings.

Too many rural blocks are being turned into subdivisions, putting strain on existing roads and facilities. Leave rural no smaller than 20 acres. Don't spread out too far all at once, it means a new area now that will all get old at same time.

Too many rural subdivisions popping up like mini small towns - don't need anymore. Don't need new shopping centres in these areas. Doesn't seem to be any public say on these new areas.

Too many small non productive blocks. Destroying rural environment.

Too many subdivisions.

Too much red tape preventing business in the regions to thrive. Too many greenies and women in charge that stop or slow down progress.

Too much residential growth. Too many subdivisions too quickly, makes these investments less sound.

Too much rural subdivision. Too many industrial style enterprises creeping into the countryside. More effort should be put into keeping industrial activity contained. Look to the UK for the best example.

Too much semi-rural is morphing into pseudo-rural.

Town centre needs more shops (various) and less cafes.

Tram Road shops need to go through consultation process properly.

Water use (irrigation and clean waterways)
We do not agree to people buying lifestyle blocks and building 'manufacturing' businesses on the land. We are a rural area and should remain so, if people are doing the above, then we can say goodbye to quiet rural living. Also, why didn't these people purchase a property in a commercial area, not even 2km from us. Because the land was CHEAPER.

We have a disjointed town shopping centre with poor traffic flow and poor parking.

We live in Okuku - half way between Rangiora and Oxford for all purposes. We don't see any planning happening. We are still as disadvantaged as when the area was very rural and now the population is still significant but no rubbish collection, no talk of it, no plans to let us subdivide, etc.

When planning for future subdivisions thought needs to be put iin to road width. We find new subdivisions have too tighter roading.

Where is our pub at Mandeville

Where is the detail for promotion of recreational/sporting activities in the area?

Would love to see planning for the future of rural areas in order to comment. Need to get info to households.

You are developing so fast we don't have the correct infrastructure in place to cope with the increase in people/housing and cars.

You keep allowing subdivision and development in Rural areas, eg Mandeville, with no thought to infrastructure, ie roading - nightmare to get to work, and to be able to pay my Council fees if I don't work.
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KEY FINDINGS

- **Noise Control** – 56.4% of households were satisfied with noise control and 7.2% were dissatisfied. 36.4% either had no opinion or provided no response.

- **Animal Control** – 61.9% of households were satisfied with animal control and 10.5% were dissatisfied. 27.6% either had no opinion or provided no response.

- **Liquor Licencing** – 57.6% of households were satisfied with Liquor Licencing and 10.3% were dissatisfied. 32.1% either had no opinion or provided no response.

- **Food Licencing / Food Hygiene** – 64.4% of households were satisfied with Food Licencing / Food Hygiene and 3.9% were dissatisfied. 31.7% either had no opinion or provided no response.

- **Building Consents** – 41.6% of households were satisfied with Building Consents, with 14.4% dissatisfied. 44% either had no opinion or provided no response.

- **Resource Consents** – 38.5% of households were satisfied with Resource Consents, with 13.2% dissatisfied. 48.4% either had no opinion or provided no response.

- **Trends in satisfaction with Regulatory Performance** – There has been no significant change in Satisfaction Levels of households with all aspects of regulatory performance.
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 OBJECTIVES

The Waimakariri District Council’s 2013 Customer Satisfaction Survey was conducted in November / December 2016. It is the sixth in a series of three yearly customer satisfaction surveys to be conducted by the Council.

The main objective of the Waimakariri District Council’s Customer Satisfaction Survey is to obtain a high-level overview of the attitudes of Waimakariri District residents towards the services and facilities provided by the Council. Repeating the survey on a regular basis enables the Council to develop an understanding of the community’s views over the long-term.

The survey does not attempt to explore topics in-depth as the Council conducts more targeted research on topical issues as required.

This report presents the results of this survey and compares these with the results of the 2001, 2004, 2007, 2010 and 2013 surveys where possible.

Information about the key characteristics of the respondent households is also collected in the survey. This data helps with the assessment of the reliability of the survey results. If the key characteristics of the people included in the sample resemble those of the population from which the sample is drawn, greater confidence can be attached to the results than would otherwise be the case.

1.2 THE SURVEY

The Customer Satisfaction Surveys are surveys of residents. The samples do not include non-resident ratepayers, or commercial enterprises based in the District’s Business Zones. It is accepted, however, that there are many home based businesses in the District as well as farms, and that households associated with these were included in the sample. The questions were directed to these households as residents rather than as business owners.

The Council accepts that both non-resident ratepayers and commercial enterprises based in the District’s Business Zones are also customers, but recognises that there are more appropriate ways of communicating with these parties than via a general survey.

The questionnaires are only identified by their area codes and responses could not be traced to any individual or household. The raw data is not available to anyone other than Council staff and is stored securely outside of the document management system. The final report will be published and available through the Council’s document management system or website. Methods such as rounding or consolidation of data into wider categories mean that no household or individual will be able to be identified through the information published in the report.

In 2016, as in 2001, 2004, 2007, 2010 and 2013, the questionnaire was designed to find out the views of the members of respondent households. Respondents were therefore informed that more than one person in the household could be involved with answering the questions. Where there was a question that asked respondents to select only one response from a set of responses, respondents were asked to choose the response that most accurately reflected the opinion of the household. Where space was provided for written comments, respondents were encouraged to include the different experiences of members of the household where relevant.
The first of these surveys was conducted in April 2001, the second in April 2004, the third in April 2007, the fourth in March/April 2010 and the Fifth in March/April 2013. Many of the same questions were used in each survey although a number of changes were made to some of the questions in 2016 in response to feedback from the pre-testing of the questionnaire. Feedback was that it had been very long and time consuming to complete. The 2013 survey contained 75 questions and was 15 pages long. The 2016 survey (refer Attachment i) contains 61 questions and is 13 pages long. The reduction was achieved through consultation with relevant Council staff. The amendments also reflect the reduction from four wards to three as a result of the 2015 Representation Review.

The response rate of 486 returned and completed surveys for the 2016 survey is comparable to previous surveys with 490 returned in 2013, 516 in 2010, 514 in 2007, 519 in 2004 and 510 in 2001.

## 2 REGULATORY PERFORMANCE

### 2.1 THE QUESTIONS

Respondents were asked to indicate their level of satisfaction with the Council’s performance in:

- Noise Control
- Animal Control
- Liquor Licencing
- Food Licencing / Food Hygiene
- Building Consents
- Resource Consents

Table 1.1 and Figure 1.1 below demonstrate the overall level of satisfaction with these six areas. As can be seen, the overall satisfaction levels vary, with Food Licencing / Food Hygiene the highest at 64.4% and Building Consents the lowest at 41.6%. With regard to levels of dissatisfaction, Building Consents was highest at 14.4%, while Food Licencing / Food Hygiene was lowest at 3.9%. Those respondents who indicated no opinion or chose not to answer the question varied between 44% for Building Consents and 27% for Animal Control. The high no opinion / no response rates do influence the satisfaction rates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Dissatisfaction</th>
<th>No Opinion /No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noise Control</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Control</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor Licencing</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Licencing / Food Hygiene</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Consents</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Consents</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Figure 1.1 - Satisfaction (%) with Regulatory Performance 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>No Opinion / No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noise Control</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Control</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor Licencing</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Licencing / Food Hygiene</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Consents</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Consents</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Levels (%)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2 TRENDS IN SATISFACTION WITH REGULATORY PERFORMANCE

Figure 1.2 compares the household satisfaction levels with aspects of regulatory performance of 2013 and 2016. As can be seen, the satisfaction levels have not significantly changed.

![Figure 1.2 - Trends in Satisfaction Levels of Households with Aspects of Regulatory Performance 2013 - 2016](image)

2.3 COMMENTS ABOUT DISTRICT DEVELOPMENT

The following comments were made by respondents about aspects of Council’s regulatory performance.

Comments regarding noise control
- Bird scarer’s are noisy and need to be banned.
- Council should enforce noise rules more effectively, as not enforcing them creates antisocial behaviour between neighbours (eg – loud machinery and commercial operations adjacent to residential homes; impacts on rural amenity)
- Noise control is ineffective and they do not respond to complaints.

Comments regarding animal control
- Need more action when roaming dogs on parks, beaches and roads are reported
- Need more action regarding barking dogs, particularly at night
- After hours staff are unfriendly

Comments regarding liquor licensing
- There are enough liquor outlets. We do not need any more.
- Waikuku liquor licence should have been granted.
- Should not allow liquor to be sold so close to Woodend School.
Comments regarding building/resource consenting

- Building and/or resource consents cost too much and take too long
- Hard to get clear answers regarding building / resource consents from Council

Comments regarding Food Licencing

A small number of respondents also discussed food licencing and mentioned they are expensive and too hard to obtain. They also commented on the perceived vindictive behaviour of staff.
ATTACHMENT II – COMMENTS ON REGULATORY PERFORMANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$700 to get a consent for a carport that was only worth $2,000!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A firewood merchant operating next door.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After going for resource consent find Council staff uncontactable and didn’t return calls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always make even the simplest thing difficult.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal control - pickup hours - unfriendly staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal control - poor. Would not do anything about bulls on property from unknown farm. Building Inspectors insensitive, do not know the relevant legislation and only give their point of view not what is legal or required. Resource consents take too long. No local knowledge applied or common sense.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Control needs to be more active in Waikuku. Noise Control needs to be easier to access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are liquor bans in parks being enforced?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the time (now dated) excessive inspections for a simple building project and inconsistent standards demonstrated by staff. No recent experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boy Racers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building consents - making sure builders construct as per the approved plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building consents - some aspects too rigid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building consents slow but same all around country. Subdivisions popping up without public consultation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building consents still take an age to get returned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Called in (Council) about a vicious looking stray dog wandering, was told to capture it. Far too slow, too expensive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial activity in rural areas should be subject to approval by neighbours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consents take an extremely long time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consents take too long with people waiting in limbo for them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consents too slow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of consents - ridiculous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of consents is prohibitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could do better. More cost effective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council made it extremely hard to obtain licence for rural kitchen. Were not interested in previous food safety plans utilised in Christchurch. Building Consent requirements were extreme. Even Inspector couldn’t believe what we had to do for foundations etc on small portacom unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council should help provide answers to building consent issues but instead just say &quot;does not comply&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog control - roaming dogs, not being able to be caught.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog control useless in Kaiapoi area as nothing is done about noisy dogs when submitting a complaint.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t believe there should be as many and certainly no more liquor stores.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far too many liquor outlets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fireworks being let off year around, the big bangs after 11pm and before 2am.

Food licensing is expensive and cumbersome, especially for small/medium vendors. Building consents are very expensive for something the Council is not liable for.

Freeway noise is a problem.

Have always had a good response from Council

Have not experienced any contact for any of these.

I know liquor licences have been declined at Waikuku. Should be encouraging local drinking if anything, rather than drinking and driving. We are isolated. If people drink elsewhere they may drink and drive (or more likely to).

I thought it a bit tough to be told "dog control" would not come unless I restrained the dog. I wondered how my parents at 87 and 91 would have managed to restrain a large male American Pitbull.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>More control as to the type of dogs allowed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii)</td>
<td>Cats are a predator. They destroy bird life. If owners of pet cats cannot keep them on their own property they should not complain if they disappear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii)</td>
<td>I believe guidelines for building placement and size etc, should be Council responsibility, however building compliance may be controlled by insurance companies. As having had a house built in the last four years, it was interesting to witness stories of building inspectors being sidestepped and outwitted, especially by national building companies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv)</td>
<td>I do not believe it is the Council's or Government role to be involved in injury prevention on private property in areas such as swimming pools and height safety. It should be connected to the insurance industry. The Councils and Government have enough to do looking after their own backyard with roads and waterways.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Initially, after the Christchurch earthquakes we built at Pegasus. The building consent was a tedious, overlong procedure, putting months on our progress. Admittedly, it was just post-earthquake, but Christchurch red-zoned people were very vulnerable and the slow process, and at one point threatened extra costs - $1000 - $5000 (additional engineer's reports on the land we were told) was decidedly u

Liquor licensing - we have enough

Liquor licensing and food hygiene officers behave in a deplorable way - very vindictive.

Liquor licensing is okay re where it’s sold, but unhappy about the hours restrictions.

Living on the main road is not what it was due to the increase in heavy trucks, milk tankers, logging trucks, etc. Very noisy.

Need for consents seem too extreme and cost too much.

Need to reduce the number of liquor outlets.

No concerns.

No more liquor licencing please

Noise control - bird scarer noises. My house is 150m from a cannon going off every five minutes from January to end of April. Really, really awful. Please ban bird scarers.

Noise control bylaws don’t allow for effective control of ongoing sustained noise issues. I had a neighbour operating commercial vehicles, diggers, on his property for three years until he moved recently. Council are reluctant to enforce. This is antisocial activity in residential areas.

Noise control called by us three times in one night - nothing done regarding noisy party.

Noise control have been very helpful when we have had issues with neighbours. A lot of loose dogs in our area (Waikuku Beach).

Noise control is ineffective on our street.

Noise control needs sorting out and improvements made.
Noise control re rural amenity appears toothless. Building consent team leader conduct regarding Cure Boating Club lift requirement was unnecessary and infuriating for Club, and created extra time delay and cost for a community group.

Noise control seems inconsistent and drawn out in regards to happy resolution. Hasn't affected me personally but it has affected a family related household in the district.

Not at all. But for others a created nightmare.

Not sure of the need for so many Off Licences

Our noise control is needing attention, too many burnouts on roads and loud exhausts on cars don't get pulled up. Too much liquor in Kaiapoi for size.

Permit charge for replacing woodburner to comply with current regulations is excessive for elderly residents who are trying to comply with clean air laws.

Permit prices are too expensive for what they are.

Phoned the council regarding an aggressive dog that was out. An hour later the dog was still out and in the same place. No-one came to get the dog.

Refer to Q25. A building of 20% of land cover can be built without notifying neighbours is not acceptable.

Regarding liquor licensing and lack of public consultation, Council listening to the public, for example, liquor store in Woodend being so close to the school.

Resource consent seems futile at times - more revenue gathering than necessary.

Resource consents are often far too expensive for the project to be undertaken.

Response times seem excessive.

Some building and resource consents in Pegasus should never have been allowed.

Stop chopping up rural land. Ohoka did not need to have its plan changed for one small group of greedy developers.

Ten years ago building consent was slow and expensive.

The Animal Control people don’t seem to have any interest in enforcing bylaws regarding dogs disturbing their neighbours. We have given up calling and logging times and frequency and even recording our neighbours dog howling excessively. Nothing was done except a chat with the offending dogs owners.

These are background issues for this household. 'No opinion' probably our best option.

Too long and expensive to sort building /resource consents

Too many dogs let off their leashes to run freely and poo around Glenvale walkway. Owners not picking up their mess. Needs to be patrolled randomly.

Too many dogs roaming free.

Too many liquor outlets allowed in the District. Retail, why allow retail in Silverstream, not 5 minutes from Kaiapoi shopping. What a joke. Lets just have retail on every corner, every subdivision. No thought in overall planning of district. A bit like 10 acre blocks, and justifying them by making them so called economic (olives, flowers, etc). Just another Council f*** up. Really good utilisation of land use !!!

Too many liquor outlets. Many of the takeaway outlets are quite dirty, especially fish and chip shops.

Too much red tape and paper work and the audit process adding more costs.

Too much red tape and regulations
Too much red tape in regards to consents. Council see to think its their job to decide when we should be in bed in regards to liquor licensing .. bloody idiots ... we are adults.

Too much red tape, needs to be streamlined.

Unnecessary delays in issuing building consents have a real and negative effect on people's livelihoods.

Very impressed with the speed five sheep were removed from Rahme Crescent after I rang the Council.

Was hard to get a clear answer re building/resource consents from Council.

We are in dispute with a local farmer regarding the "disappearance" of water from the mature creek running through our property. WDC and ECan appear to be powerless to do anything about it.

We called animal control after we were approached by a menacing dog in Rangiora - but the lady on the phone seemed disinterested. (Dog with no collar growled and bared its teeth at toddler, baby and mum, and followed us up the street until distracted by another dog behind a fence.)

We do not agree to people buying lifestyle blocks and building 'manufacturing' businesses on the land. We are a rural area and should remain so, if people are doing the above, then we can say goodbye to quiet rural living. Also, why didn’t these people purchase a property in a commercial area, not even 2km from us. Because the land was CHEAPER.

We have a problem dog in the street and animal control have failed to deal with the problem. They don’t follow up on complaints adequately.

We have been made to jump through hoops regarding a current build. The Council don’t want to help but have been more interested in creating hurdles. Difficult to deal with.

We have no knowledge - send info to households - communication for us new kids on the block.

We have our own septic tank which is cleaned out approximately every four years. Only two in household.

We never see animal control go past.

We note many mobile food vendors have a lack of refrigeration and proper facilities to look after food. Chilly bins are NOT ACCEPTABLE.

What is our local number for Noise Control. I am unaware of Animal Control. We do not need any more liquor licensing.

Where I have needed noise or animal control I have had no assistance.

Why are consents so bloody costly! Also dealing with the Council is like working with the Mafia! Don’t complain or risk getting put to the bottom of the pile! Not a lot of helpful advice given, just loots of what you should do. Extremely stressful! Geez, how much red tape do you own.

Wrights Road dam needs to be squashed as it is dangerous, under engineered and mismanaged.

You allow housing to be built without complying to consents and no added roading to copy with the traffic into Christchurch.

You ignore increased water use (above allowed levels) and animal's near rivers, and worse idiots driving along Ashley River bed during breeding season.
1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is twofold:
   a. To note confirmation of a recommended E-Plan supplier following a Request for Proposal (RFP) process; and
   b. To recommend to Council that it approves additional budget for inclusion in the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan for E-Plan implementation and licensing.

1.2. This report reconciles the preferred E-Plan solution against existing budgets. There is existing budget within both the Information Technology Services and the Development Planning Unit budgets. However, full implementation and licensing costs, including contingency, are unbudgeted specifically beyond this financial year. Additional budget will be required for the 2018-2019 year onwards.

1.3. The E-Plan project is an important project for the District Plan and by extension other submission processes, and the product will help achieve broader customer service objectives.

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the District Planning and Regulation Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 170405033283.

(b) Notes the selection of Isovist as the preferred supplier of the District Plan Review Software Solution, subject to final contract negotiation.

(c) Notes the total budget requirement over 5 years is $347,642 of which $99,570 is available from the Information and Technology Services budget and $34,000 from the Development Planning Unit budget.

(d) Notes that most of the additional cost ($214,072) over 5 years is attributed to external consultant support and contingency, should it be required.
Recommends to Council to confirm additional budget of $214,072 to progress implementation of the E-Plan software solution for District Plan and submissions management purposes and licensing costs.

Notes that additional budget will be sought as part of the 2018/2028 LTP budget to provide for licensing and to support District Plan Review Resource Management Act processes and that this has been previously signalled.

3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. A Request for Proposal (RFP) process was undertaken to identify a preferred supplier for Waimakariri District Council’s (WDC) District Plan Review Software Solution (E-Plan). As a result of the subsequent evaluation process, Isovist Ltd have been selected to provide the software. Overall, Isovist provide an E-Plan package that has an end customer focus and from a staff point of view strikes the right balance in regard to its Resource Management Act and Local Government Act planning functions and IT/GIS integration. Isovist currently supply Environment Canterbury, Hurunui and Selwyn Districts with a similar product.

3.2. The following tables provide a summary of costs and existing budget:

### E-Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Year 1 (2017/18)</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Grand total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Licensing costs</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor implementation costs</td>
<td>$27,100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$27,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Consultant cost (PM) for ePlan implementation</td>
<td>$49,320</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$49,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDC Risk Reserve (10%) Support - DP Review process</td>
<td>$10,042</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$10,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Yearly Costs</td>
<td>$130,262</td>
<td>$39,840</td>
<td>$86,620</td>
<td>$52,960</td>
<td>$37,960</td>
<td>$347,642</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Grand total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Licensing (in IT Budget)</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$37,150</td>
<td>$7,290</td>
<td>$7,470</td>
<td>$7,660</td>
<td>$99,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ePlan implementation costs (DPU budget)</td>
<td>$34,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget - shortfall</td>
<td>$56,262</td>
<td>$2,690</td>
<td>$79,330</td>
<td>$45,490</td>
<td>$30,300</td>
<td>$214,072</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3. Total costs for year 1 are estimated at $130,262, with an approved budget of $74,000 for licensing and implementation. The extra cost can be attributed to contingencies, being external project management and potential additional costs related to ongoing assistance from the vendor. On-going costs over the following years relate to licensing, plus anticipated time from external support and Isovist (especially in regard to District Plan notification, submissions and hearing management). Most of these additional costs are dependent on the software selection and negotiation with the vendor.

3.4. The Development Planning Unit E-Plan budget for 2016/2017 is $34,000 relating to operative plan migration. The Information Technology Services budget for 2016/17 sits at $40,000 for licensing; this assumed an on-premise solution for the operative plan. Timing is such that most of this budget will be recommended to be carried forward to 2017/18. $30,000 was budgeted for 17/18 for setting up the District Plan Review
component, and $7150 was budgeted for yearly licensing costs (to be carried forward to 2018/19).

3.5. The selected software solution is SaaS (Software as a Service (cloud option)), meaning a cheaper license for the first year ($24,000), but subsequent years it will also be $24,000 each year not the approximately $7,000 per year budgeted for. Being an SaaS client will mean the latest version of the software is always available (there are no in house costs for hosting) and it also paves the way towards shared services with other Councils given the extent of use of the product with adjacent councils.

3.6. The Plan implementation and later Resource Management Act (RMA) costs are unbudgeted specifically beyond this financial year, but can be sourced from the District Plan Review funding. The need for potential additional budget for the RMA process through the Long Term Plan process has also been previously signalled to Council.

3.7. The E-Plan project is part of the Business Improvement Strategy for 2016/17 to 2020/21.

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. No community views have been sought. This project provides an important tool in regard to engagement with the community and stakeholders, linking to organisational objectives and objectives relating to the District Plan Review and other regulatory processes.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. Financial implications are set out above. In addition, report 160505040697 notes that the costs of the hearings stage of the District Plan review are to be determined through the 2018/2028 Long Term Plan and a portion of the contingency, if required, will fall within this budget assessment.

6. CONTEXT

6.1. Policy

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

6.2. Legislation

Resource Management Act 1991
Local Government Act 2002

6.3. Community Outcomes

Local, regional and national organisations make information about their plans and activities readily available.

Local, regional and national organisations make every effort to take account of the views of people who participate in community engagement.