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Councillor John Meyer
Councillor Sandra Stewart
Councillor Paul Williams
The Mayor and Councillors

WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

A meeting of the WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL will be held in the COUNCIL CHAMBER, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA on TUESDAY 5 DECEMBER 2017 at 1.00PM.

Sarah Nichols
GOVERNANCE MANAGER

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

BUSINESS

1. APOLOGIES

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

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

3. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

3.1. Community Service Award

John Rose will be presented with an award recognising his volunteer efforts in the community.

4. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

4.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Tuesday 7 November 2017

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 7 November 2017.

4.2 Minutes of the public excluded portion of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Tuesday 7 November 2017

(see blue Public Excluded Agenda papers)
5. DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

5.1 Andrew Gough, resident of Swannanoa
Mr Gough will share his viewpoint in relation to Item 8.1 Tram Road Speed Limit.

5.2 Bevan Hames, National Manager, Business Development, Apollo Projects Ltd
Mr Hames will comment on the Mandeville business development, particularly in relation to Item 8.1, Tram Road Speed Limit.

6. ADJOURNED BUSINESS
Nil.

7. REGENERATION REPORTS

7.1 Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery Programme – November 2017 Update – Gary Boot (Senior Engineering Advisor), Ken Stevenson (Roading Manager) and Kalley Simpson (3 Waters Manager)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives report No. 171122127014
(b) Notes the recovery works construction programme as presented in Attachment 1 of this report.
(c) Notes that 44 of the 51 projects on the Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery Programme have been completed and two projects are nearing completion and a further three contracts will commence construction in January 2018.
(d) Notes that the current estimate and budget for the capital component of the recovery works is $39,194,800, which represents a $1.4M reduction over the previously approved budget.
(e) Notes that the 2018-28 LTP Budgets are being amended to reflect the budget reduction.
(f) Circulates this report to the Regeneration Steering Group and the Community Boards.
8. REPORTS

8.1 Tram Road Speed Limit, Mandeville North – Bill Rice (Senior Transport Engineer)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 171121126353.
(b) Approves the speed limit change from 100km/h to 80km/h on Tram Road from 500m east of the Bradleys Road / McHugh's Road intersection to 300m west of that intersection.
(c) Notes that the Register of Speed Limits will be updated to include these changed speed limits.
(d) Notes that the Speed Limits Bylaw 2009 allows speed limits to be changed by Council resolution following consultation as required by the Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits.
(e) Notes that the submissions on this proposal have been distributed to the Oxford – Ohoka Community Board for their information.
(f) Circulates this report to all Community Boards.

8.2 Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2017 – Hearing Panel Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2017 (Councillors R Brine – Chair, W Doody and P Williams)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 171123127385.
(b) Approves the following inclusions and amendments in the 2017 Waste Management & Minimisation Plan.

1. Insert Option C as the preferred kerbside collection service in Section 5.4 comprising service choices of: rates-funded recycling bin, collected fortnightly; user-pays WDC rubbish bag OR rates-funded rubbish bin, collected fortnightly; AND/OR rates-funded mixed organics bin, collected weekly.

2. Insert the below targets in Section 2.2

   a. Reduce annual per capita waste to landfill from 294kg per capita in 2015/16 to 236kg per capita by 2029
   b. Increase the annual per capita quantity of materials diverted from 170kg per capita in 2015/16 to 228kg per capita by 2029

(c) Notes that the final draft version of the 2017 Waste Management & Minimisation Plan will be brought to the Council for approval after the 2018-2028 LTP has been approved.

(d) Notes that the Long Term Plan solid waste budgets, Solid Waste Activity Management Plan and solid waste section in the Infrastructure Strategy will be prepared using the kerbside collection methodology as approved in 2(b).
(e) **Includes** a proposal in the Draft LTP to change the rating policy so that motels and other similar businesses only pay for one recycling targeted rate per property. Additional bins, if requested, would be provided and rated at the standard charges.

(f) **Requests** staff to bring further advice to the Council following the LTP consultation regarding the option of the Council or the Contractor owning the bins.

(g) **Requests** staff to bring the proposed engagement method and material for asking property owners which service option they choose to Council for approval prior to release.

(h) **Requests** that staff provide information on proposed fees and charges for properties to change their future service option following their initial choice.

(i) **Requests** staff, prior to the introduction of the new services, to enquire of each eligible household which services they wish to use. If no choice is made the default position will be that the property continues to receive a fortnightly recycling service and has access to the Council’s user pays fortnightly bag collection service.

(j) **Increases** the level of education to the public on the reduction of waste including diversion to green waste.

8.3 **Review of the Local Alcohol Policy and Liquor Ban Bylaw – Lynley Beckingsale (Policy Analyst) and Malcolm Johnston (Environmental Services Manager)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 171108121520

(b) **Supports** the proposal to establish a Project Control Group (PCG) and a Project Manager to oversee the review of both the Local Alcohol Policy 2015 and the Liquor Ban Bylaw 2007.

(c) **Notes** the appointment of the District Licensing Committee Chair, Cr Neville Atkinson, Nick Harrison, Malcolm Johnston, Sharon Stevenson and Lynley Beckingsale as the Project Control Group and Lynley Beckingsale as the Project Manager.

(d) **Notes** these reviews will be undertaken in conjunction with representatives of Community and Public Health and New Zealand Police as partner agencies and key stakeholders.

6.4. **Adoption of Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 Implementation Plan and Establishment of Advisory Group – Veronica Spittal (Senior Policy Analyst) for the Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 Implementation Plan Working Party**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 171116124725.

(b) **Adopts** the attached Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 Implementation Plan for implementation (Trim No. 171122126489).
(c) **Approves** the establishment of the Northern Pegasus Bay Advisory Group.

(d) **Approves** the Terms of Reference for the Northern Pegasus Bay Advisory Group (Trim No. 171122126942).

(e) **Appoints** Councillor ………………… to the Northern Pegasus Bay Advisory Group, as Chairperson.

8.5 **Adoption of Council Standing Orders – Edwina Cordwell (Governance Advisor)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 171115124385.

(b) **Adopts** the Draft Waimakariri District Council, Committee and Sub-Committee and Hearing Panel Standing Orders 2017 (Trim 171121126177), effective from 8 January 2018.

(c) **Notes** that the current WDC Standing Orders (Trim 120313013431) remain active for Community Boards until the Community Boards consider the mattering during their February 2018 meetings, for proposed adoption from 1 March 2018.

(d) **Recommends** that any proposed Standing Orders for Community Boards should be consistent with the Council, Committee, Sub-Committee and Hearing Panel Standing Orders except for those areas which relate specifically to Community Boards.

(e) **Requests** that this report is circulated to Community Boards.
9. MATTER REFERRED FROM COMMITTEES AND COMMUNITY BOARDS

The following Items 9.1 and 9.2 are referred to Council from the Regeneration Steering Group meeting of Monday 6 November 2017. Minutes from that meeting are in Item 11.1 of this agenda.

9.1 District Regeneration – Draft Road Stopping Plans for The Pines Beach – Duncan Roxburgh, Implementation Project Manager District Regeneration

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No.170908097449.

(b) Approves the physical removal and legal road stopping of Hood Avenue and Clarke Avenue in The Pines Beach Regeneration Area.

(c) Approves the physical removal and revoking of the reserve status of Lindsay Lane walkway (off the end of Clarke Avenue), and the divesting of this land of approximately 250 m² area to the Crown at no cost.

(d) Notes that the road stopping and reserve revocation process for Regeneration Areas is proposed to be undertaken through collaboration with Land Information New Zealand (LINZ) utilising the provisions of the Greater Christchurch Regeneration Act 2016 (GCR Act), and the physical removal works are subject to a cost share agreement between the Crown and Council.

(e) Notes that under the terms of the existing Cost Share Agreement with the Crown, the land arising from the legal stopping of redundant roads, with Waimakariri District Council as the registered proprietor, will be divested to the Crown at nil cost to the Crown.

(f) Approves staff working with the Trust to establish a memorandum of understanding for potential future walkway reinstatement over Coastal Park land.

(g) Circulates a copy of this report to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board.


RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 171018112971

(b) Approves Option A, with accessible ramps to the lower deck level, as the preferred design option to progress through to detailed design and procurement of a contractor for construction Options Plans - TRIM No. 171026115714

(c) Approves Poem Option 1 as the preferred poem to be integrated with the terraces design

Item 9.3 is referred to Council from the Audit and Risk Committee meeting of 28 November 2017.
9.3 Review of Rating Policies (other than the Revenue and Financing Policy – Maree Harris (Customer Services Manager))

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Approves the adoption of a policy for the early payment of rates in the current financial year (Trim 171121126330) for consultation in the 2018/28 Draft Long Term Plan to take effect from 1 July 2018.

(b) Approves the adoption of a policy for Remission of Rates in Miscellaneous Circumstances (Trim 171121126338) for consultation in the 2018/28 Draft Long Term Plan to take effect from 1 July 2018.

(c) Resolves to revoke the “Remission of Community Services Charge and Canterbury Museum Levies” policy from 1 July 2018.

(d) Approves the continuation of the current Rates Remission and Rates Postponement policies as outlined in this report, with the minor edits noted, for consultation in the 2018/28 Draft Long Term Plan. (Trim 171121126331 Rates Remissions; 171121126333 Rates Postponements).

(e) Agrees that the Policy for Remission of Rates on Maori Freehold Land is amended to include remission for conservation purposes.

(f) Agrees that the Policy for Remission of Rates on Properties Damaged by the 2010/11 Earthquakes be extended to cover all natural disaster events that renders the property uninhabitable.

(g) Agrees that the Policy for Rates Postponement on land used for Primary Production In Residential and Business Zones be extended to include non-farmland moving from the rural zone to a residential or business zone.

(h) Agrees that a new rates remission policy be introduced for land that meets paragraph (b) of Section 20 of the Local Government Rating Act, and either paragraph (a) or (c).

10. HEALTH AND SAFETY

10.1 Health and Safety Report - November – Jim Palmer (Chief Executive)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 171124127991

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

11.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Regeneration Steering Group held on 6 November 2017

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the information in Item 11.1 be received.

12. COMMUNITY BOARD MINUTES FOR INFORMATION

12.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board held on
9 November 2017

12.2 Minutes of a meeting of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board held on
13 November 2017

RECOMMENDATION
THAT the information in Items 12.1 to 12.2 be received.

13. CORRESPONDENCE

14. MAYOR’S DIARY

14 1 Mayor’s Diary 3 - 27 November - 2017

RECOMMENDATION
THAT the Council:
(a) Receives report no. 171128129050.

15. COUNCIL PORTFOLIO UPDATES

15.1 Iwi Relationships
15.2 Canterbury Water Management Strategy
15.3 International Relationships
15.4 Regeneration (Kaiapoi)

16. QUESTIONS
(under Standing Orders)

17. URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS
(under Standing Orders)

18. 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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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18.1 Minutes of the public excluded portion of Council meeting of 7 November 2017

Confirmation of minutes
Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7
Section 48(1)(a)

18.2 Report of Gavin Lake (Roading Recovery Programme Manager) and Gerard Cleary (Manager Utilities and Reading)

Contract 17/45 Kaiapoi East Access Road Earthquake Recovery Works Tender Evaluation and Contract Award Report
Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7
Section 48(1)(a)

18.3 Report of Kitty Waghorn (Solid Waste Asset Manager)

Extension of Southbrook RRP an Oxford Transfer Station Operations and Maintenance Contracts
Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7
Section 48(1)(a)

18.4 Report of Chris Parton (Sewer Asset Manager) and Daniel Thompson (Special Projects Manager)

Central Rangiora Sewer Stage 2A – Variation to Contract 15/47
Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7
Section 48(1)(a)

18.5 Report of Jim Palmer (Chief Executive)

Appointment of Trustee to Enterprise North Canterbury Board
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>18.1 – 18.5</td>
<td>Protection of privacy of natural persons To carry out commercial activities without prejudice</td>
<td>A2(a) A2(b)ii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CLOSED MEETING
See Public Excluded Agenda (blue papers)

OPEN MEETING

19. NEXT MEETING
The next scheduled meeting of the Council is on Tuesday 30 January 2018 commencing at 9.00am.
MINUTES OF THE MEETING FROM THE WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL HELD
IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA, ON TUESDAY
7 NOVEMBER 2017 AT 1PM

PRESENT:
Mayor D Ayers (Chair), Deputy Mayor K Felstead, Councillors A Blackie, R Brine,
W Doody, D Gordon, S Stewart and P Williams.

IN ATTENDANCE:
J Palmer (Chief Executive), C Sargison (Manager, Community & Recreation), S Markham
(Manager, Strategy & Engagement), K Simpson (3waters Manager), K Stevenson
(Road Manager), J McBride (Development Manager), K Graham (Journey Planner and
Road Safety Coordinator), C Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager), C Parton (Wastewater
Asset Manager), L Beckingsale (Policy Analyst), M Ball (Property Officer), and S Nichols
(Governance Manager).
Meeting adjourned at 3.20pm for refreshments and resumed at 3.30pm

1. APOLOGIES
   Moved: Councillor Felstead  Seconded: Councillor Blackie

   Apologies were received and sustained from Councillors N Atkinson and J Meyer for
   absence.

   CARRIED

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
   Nil.

3. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS
   Mayor Ayers thanked Councillors Atkinson and Felstead for their work in his absence.
   Mayor Ayers commented on two books presented by Mayors of Zonnebeke, Belgium
   and Denmark.

4. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
   4.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Tuesday
      5 September 2017

   Moved: Councillor Williams  Seconded: Councillor Gordon

   THAT the Council:

   Confirms as a true and correct record the circulated minutes of a meeting of the
   Waimakariri District Council held on Tuesday 5 September 2017.

   CARRIED
4.2 Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Tuesday 3 October 2017

Moved: Councillor Doody  Seconded: Councillor Williams

THAT the Council:

Confirms as a true and correct record the circulated minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Tuesday 3 October 2017.

CARRIED

4.3 Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Tuesday 24 October 2017

Moved: Councillor Felstead  Seconded: Councillor Doody

THAT the Council:

Confirms as a true and correct record the circulated minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Tuesday 24 October 2017.

CARRIED

5. DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

Nil.

6. ADJOURNED BUSINESS

Nil.

7. REGENERATION REPORTS

Nil.

8. REPORTS

8.1 Adoption of the Waimakariri Accessibility Strategy 2017-2021 – L Beckingsale (Policy Analyst) and T Sturley (Community Team Manager)

L Beckingsale spoke to the report, reflecting on work undertaken to date.

Councillor Doody reflected on car parks monitored (electronically) for disabled car parks. Staff advised the matter was being investigated and would be reported back to the Council.

Councillor Blackie enquired on the differences in terminology between disability and impairment. L Beckingsale advised the words were interchangeable, with a local group preferring the word impairment. It was considered that a disability is environmental in which they interact with, for example a door that is to heavy and therefore cannot be used by an impaired person.

Councillor Blackie queried the statistical information with staff advising the source was Statistics New Zealand.

Councillor Gordon enquired on the Accessibility Charter. Staff advised the inaugural Charter was signed on 3 November by some Canterbury Councils, and Waimakariri District Council will have an opportunity to sign the Charter in the very near future.
Councillor Doody sought clarity on car parking widths, citing several examples where the length of car park did not allow sufficient room for rear loading vehicles with ramps, or width for manoeuvring a wheelchair as there was path edging impacting on mobility. Staff commented on the NZ Standards and opportunities to arrange for path edges to be cut down, and further consideration for rear loading vehicles to ensure greater accessibility.

Moved: Councillor Doody  Seconded: Councillor Feltstead

THAT the Council:

a) Receives report No: 171026116060.

b) Adopts the Waimakariri Accessibility Strategy.

c) Notes that a Steering Group made up of Tessa Sturley (Manager of the Community Team), Lynley Beckingsale (Policy Analyst) and Jill Waldron (Specialist Advisor and Chairperson of the Waimakariri Access Group) have overseen this review.

d) Notes that public consultation on the draft strategy took place during August/September 2017 and a total of 11 submissions were received in support of the strategy.

e) Notes that feedback received through consultation was considered by the Steering Group and, where appropriate, has been reflected in the final strategy.

f) Notes that an associated Action Plan is being developed which will be discussed with a wider Reference Group for their endorsement as a continuing part of the policy development process.

g) Notes that the final strategy will be circulated to all Community Board members for information, as well as to key external stakeholders and organisations representing people with impairments and the elderly.

CARRIED

Councillor Doody commented positively on the quality of the report.

Councillor Feltstead stated it was a good strategy and implementation was important.

Mayor Ayers was supportive of the strategy. He would sign the Accessibility Charter and encourage other councils to do the same. Mayor Ayers reflected that the strategy assists everyone, including those with temporary mobility issues such as broken limbs. Awareness was important for everyone.

8.2 2018-2021 National Land Transport Programme – support for Cycle Education programme and funding – K Stevenson (Roading Manager) and K Graham (Journey Planner and Road Safety Coordinator)

K Graham spoke to the report, which followed on from an earlier council report that adopted a walking and cycling strategy. The encouragement has come from Transport Agency to encourage cycling and increase cycleways across the country. Safety is a key barrier to people riding cycles, but it is also has health and transport benefits, so there is a balancing, along with on-going education and understanding vehicle drivers.

Councillor Doody queried the cycle park and if there was another way to fund it without NZTA. Staff spoke of examples such as in Oamaru where contractors assisted with sponsorship, community involvement and service groups, which was
an option. It was advised a small cycle park was located in Rangiora suitable for 4-6year olds, and the Kaiapoi Regeneration planning held opportunities for a larger cycle park.

Councillor Blackie queried the criteria for funding from NZTA. Staff advised funding would contribute towards skills education and not infrastructure. Another possibility is a cycle-in-schools fund where cycle area is set aside in the school grounds (ie netball court area) and learn to ride sessions are held at the school.

Councillor Gordon sought clarity on total cost of budget. Staff confirmed gross share is $70,000 with Council contributing 49%. In a supplementary question Councillor Gordon enquired when NZTA funding would be approved. Staff advised approval would be June 2018.

Councillor Stewart enquired about park surfaces and facility requirements. Staff advised the school programme would utilise existing hard surfaces such a netball court. The community Parks such as Westburn Park in Christchurch and Oamaru have a mini road arrangement such as stop/give way signs to provide a mini road environment to help teach children about road safety.

Mayor Ayers noted the urban schools listed, however queried Woodend School missing. Staff advised the list is a Christchurch listing that involves schools closest to urban cycleways, however it was not extensive. Local schools had not yet been approached until a decision was made.

Councillor Doody enquired who would conduct the training, ie teachers or police. Staff explained the Christchurch City cycle safe programme had dedicated trained staff who deliver the programme. NZTA would seek to have consistent training across the country. Potentially the Christchurch team could attend this District or alternatively the local sports trust could potentially undertake training.

Moved: Councillor Gordon Seconded: Councillor Doody

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 170922102542.

(b) **Supports** the cycle skills education programme.

(c) **Notes** that staff will submit $70-80,000 per annum for cycle skills education as part of the roading budget for the draft 2018-2028 LTP for Council consideration.

(d) **Notes** that this funding is subject to NZTA approval and if approved NZTA will fund 51% of the cost.

(e) **Notes** that further work is required on assessing the uptake and delivery of a cycle skills programme within the district. Delivery of cycle skills education would initially be aimed only at children, one of our priority areas within our Walking & Cycling Strategy priorities.

(f) **Notes** that there are many other opportunities to promote cycling in the district such as the construction of a childrens ‘learn to bike’ park, creating tourist cycle trails and supporting the Hurunui Heartland ride, however no funding has been included for these activities at this stage as they are unlikely to meet NZTA criteria for funding.

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

CARRIED
across the district. The matter is still subject to NZTA and be considered as part of LTP however he was supportive of the concept.

Councillor Doody was supportive of training children on road safety and spoke of its many benefits to the community.

Mayor Ayers urged caution for cycle parks, citing accessibility of transporting children across the district to a specific site and potential costs involved for a school.

Councillor Stewart was in favour of the schools programme operating on school grounds, and commented the infrastructure is questionable, concurring with mayoral comments particularly in relation to costs.

Councillor Brine reflected on the cycle programme that in the past had been delivered by the Police.

8.3 **North Canterbury Riding for the Disabled Loan Deferral – C Sargison (Manager Community and Recreation)**

C Sargison spoke to the report and reflected on the organisations conversations relating to funding deadlines. Currently the group were focused on a fundraising event for December, and a funding application for $25,000 was in process.

Councillor Blackie stated he was supportive of the organisation, however enquired on Council lending and ability to repay. Staff reflected on the history with the group, including the purchase of a post earthquake building, which had be paid through fund raising efforts. Staff commented on the groups plans, including utilisation of the land, and their proven capacity and ability to fund raise. The Council at the time of the loan formed a view of the groups integrity.

Councillor Williams enquired if it would be prudent to pay half the loan now and the Council subsidise the interest until a later time. Staff advised it was a possibility that had not been explored with the group. Staff explained the groups current funding operations and various grant applications in progress, and timing implications.

Moved: Councillor Felstead       Seconded: Councillor Gordon

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 171024114683

(b) **Approves** the loan payments and interest being deferred for North Canterbury Riding for the Disabled for two years with repayments starting in February 2020.

(c) **Notes** that a similar arrangement was agreed to by Council for the Rangiora Croquet Club.

**CARRIED**

Councillor Felstead stated it was a great organisation who provided a great a service. Having been at the opening of their new facility, and meeting the people involved he had faith the group will re-pay the loan when they can.

Councillor Gordon explained about a new leadership team, and spoke of the high integrity of the people involved with this group. He believed they had done an outstanding effort at the facility with community involvement. Councillor Gordon commented on the difference it makes to those that participate in the group, which is primarily a voluntary group.
Councillor Brine concurred with Councillor Gordon, and that this was not the first time a situation had arisen with other groups regarding funding deferment. Councillor Brine reflected on the rugby club at Southbrook, the investment and volunteers and the positive contribution to the community. Councillor Brine reflected on good ideas and due diligence combined with best intention, great people and a fantastic outcome.

Councillor Doody, reflected on the groups professional application to the building purchase process. Councillor Doody was fully supportive of both the group and the motion, stating this proposal would provide the group with breathing space.

8.4 Classification of Reserve 2953 – M Ball (Property Officer)

M Ball spoke briefly to the report advising the reserve had been removed from the forestry asset register.

Moved: Councillor Felstead  Seconded: Councillor Doody

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report 171009108634, with plan 170926103871;
(b) Supports the reclassification of Reserve 2953 to a Utility Reserve under Delegated Authority and subsequent to the advertising and subject to there being no objections to the proposal, the Minister be asked to gazette the classification.

CARRIED

Councillor Felstead remarked that this action made sense and was pleased not to see more trees planted on this particular block.

8.5 Proposed New Road between Lehmans Road and River Road – K Stevenson (Roading Manager) and J McBride (Development Manager)

K Stevenson spoke to the report outlining key matters involved, particularly in relation to land availability. He commented on potential flood mitigation and continuing discussions with Ecan and the Racing Club. It was proposed the road would be built in several years time and funding can be refined through the LTP budgets.

Councillor Williams queried Doncaster Developments and sought clarity on their involvement. G Cleary advised that aspect involved an in-committee report. It was advised more comment could be made in-committee however this aspect for consideration related to an element of shortfall.

Mayor Ayers laid the matter on the table until the end of meeting. (Procedural motion)

At 3.31pm the matter was discussed and resolved.

Moved: Councillor Gordon  Seconded: Councillor Brine

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No 171013111332.
(b) Approves bringing forward $880,000 from the 2020/21 and 2021/22 years to fund the purchase of land for the new road from Doncaster Developments.
(c) **Agrees** to construct the new road only when it can be economically justified based on traffic volumes and cost of maintaining the existing roads. This is likely to be no earlier than the 2021/22 year.

(d) **Approves** staff negotiating with the Canterbury Jockey Club and ECan an option to secure the remaining land for the proposed new road and report back to the Council on these negotiations.

**CARRIED**

Councillor Williams Against

Councillor Gordon stated the matter had been well discussed over the years, as well as today and would like to see matters continue.

8.6 **Request for Funding for Council Share of Petries Road Water Main – C Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager)**

C Roxburgh spoke briefly to the report.

Moved: Councillor Blackie    Seconded: Councillor Doody

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 171027116244.

(b) ** Approves** an additional solely growth funded budget on the Woodend water supply scheme of $28,000 to fund the Council share of the 376m length of 150mm diameter water supply main on Petries Road being installed as part of the Copper Beech development.

(c) **Notes** that this will allow the supply of water to development on the northern side of Petries Road, as well as potentially to the Woodend Beach community in the future, as well as other properties along Woodend Beach Road.

(d) **Notes** that this is calculated as increasing the Woodend water development contribution by $67 per connection, based on preliminary growth numbers that are to feed into the draft 2018-28 Long Term Plan.

(e) **Circulates** this report to the Woodend-Sefton Community Board for their information.

**CARRIED**

8.7 **Tuahiwi Sewerage Extension - C Parton (Wastewater Asset Manager) and S Markham (Manager Strategy and Engagement)**

S Markham introduced the report and provided planning background in relation to Maori Reserve 873. He commented on modification of provisions for part of the reserve area to provide for a form of cluster housing which included reticulation services. S Markham spoke of family groups interested in the cluster housing concept, Runanga input and additional consultation being required to define the take up and plan for size of pump upgrade.

C Parton introduced himself and explained the location of the pump station which currently services 75 houses with a capacity of approximately ten more houses. The LTP budget had provision for scoping in year one, and pump station upgrades in year two.

A new staff recommendation was tabled for consideration.
Councillor Williams sought explanation of connection charges, particularly in comparison to other developments in the district. Staff explained apportionment of cost, associated factors and differences between gravity and step systems. The matter of timing of works, preparation and implementation verse capacity of the scheme was also explained.

Councillor Stewart enquired about applications relating to cluster housing. S Markham spoke of discussions occurring over a number of months, and projections of potential timing, however no formal application had yet been received.

Councillor Stewart queried the rate increase specifically to the Tuahiwi area. J Palmer explained the Eastern Districts scheme, development contributions, capitalising interest and the impacts and risks. He also spoke of benefits to the area and historic grievances in relation to MR873.

Councillor Felstead queried the management of the scheme if more than ten developments occur in quick succession. S Markham commented on discussions, current planning and timing over the next ten years.

Staff responded to a technical question relating to holding capacity and handling water flow.

Mayor Ayers sought clarification on new technology or upgraded systems. Staff outlined the benefits and outlined what was being sought from staff to progress to the next stage of planning.

It was clarified where step systems were in operation through the District. Mandeville had a dedicated step system. Oxford and Rangiopa were predominantly gravity feed systems, however there were some step system units on the urban fringes. The new scheme in Ohoka is an E1 pressure system which is modern step system, as is the last two stages of Pegasus and Beach Grove subdivisions.

Moved: Councillor Felstead    Seconded: Councillor Gordon

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 171020113861.

(b) Agrees to enter into a private agreement with Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga to receive $33,000 towards the cost of implementing a STEP sewer main in Tuahiwi Road from Topito Road to Waikoruru Road at a total cost of $109,470 (incl. GST).

(c) Notes that those connecting to the service would be required to also pay development contributions required for the Eastern Districts Sewerage Scheme Ocean Outfall and the Woodend reticulation system and treatment plant at the sum of $9,471.

(d) Notes that further extensions of the STEP scheme in the vicinity will likely give rise to the need to upgrade the capacity of the Turiwhaia pumping station and further recoveries of these costs will need to be made via an additional development contribution.

(e) Notes that the costs of that upgrade is included in draft LTP budgets for the Council’s consideration in January 2018.

CARRIED

Councillor Felstead remarked that he accepted the need to start the process, but was apprehensive about what happens after the tenth development.

Councillor Gordon held similar reservations and commented on giving effect to the District Plan and the Councils role to facilitate this. It was a complex process
around constraints of development contributions and it would be a fair process going forward.

Councillor Stewart was supportive of the proposal and acknowledged it has challenges in time. The Council has a responsibility to provide appropriate services to MR873, and welcomed early discussions.

8.8 2018 Meetings Schedule – Sarah Nichols (Governance Manager)

S Nichols spoke briefly to the report.

Moved: Councillor Felstead     Seconded: Mayor Ayers

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 171012110890.

(b) Adopts the following meeting schedule for the period from 15 January to 21 December 2018. (as outlined in Trim 171007108447).

Ordinary Council Meeting Dates commencing at 1pm on the first Tuesday of the month:


Council meetings relating to (Draft) Long Term Plan including submissions and hearings:


(c) Adopts the following meeting schedule for the period from 15 January to 21 December 2018 for Standing Committees:

District Planning and Regulation Committee commencing at 1pm on Tuesdays:


Utilities and Roading Committee commencing at 4.00pm on Tuesdays:


Community and Recreation Committee commencing at 1.00pm on Tuesdays:


Audit and Risk Committee commencing at 4.00pm on Tuesdays:


District Licencing Committee commencing at 9am on Fridays:

(d) **Notes** the Community Boards will adopt their timetable at their meetings held during November 2017, as proposed in Trim document 171007108447.

**CARRIED**

9. MATTERS REFERRED FROM COMMITTEES AND COMMUNITY BOARDS

There were no matters referred.

10. HEALTH AND SAFETY

**Health and Safety Report - August – J Palmer (Chief Executive)**

J Palmer took the report as read.

Moved: Councillor Gordon  Seconded: Councillor Blackie

**THAT** the Council **Receives** report No. 171031117605.

**CARRIED**

11. COMMITTEE/WORKING PARTY/Joint Committee Minutes for Information

11.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Audit and Risk Committee held on 19 September 2017

11.2 Minutes of a meeting of the Regeneration Steering Group held on 2 October 2017

Moved: Mayor Ayers  Seconded: Councillor Blackie

**THAT** the information in Items 11.1 – 11.2 be received.

**CARRIED**

12. COMMUNITY BOARD MINUTES FOR INFORMATION

12.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board held on 11 September 2017

12.2 Minutes of a meeting of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board held on 9 October 2017

12.3 Minutes of a meeting of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board held on 18 September 2017

12.4 Minutes of a meeting of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board held on 16 October 2017

12.5 Minutes of a meeting of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board held on 11 October 2017

Moved: Councillor Felstead  Seconded: Councillor Williams

**THAT** the information in Items 12.1 to 12.5 be received.

**CARRIED**

13. CORRESPONDENCE

Nil.
14. MAYOR’S DIARY

Acting Mayors Diary – 22 September to 17 October 2017

Moved: Councillor Doody  Seconded: Councillor Blackie

THAT the Council Receives report no. 171031117365.  

CARRIED

Mayor’s Diary 17 September – 31 October 2017

Mayor Ayers commented on the particularly busy week in Belgium with many New Zealanders present at the various commemorations.

Moved: Councillor Gordon  Seconded: Councillor Felstead

THAT the Council Receives report no. 171107120538. 

CARRIED

15. COUNCIL PORTFOLIO UPDATES

Iwi Relationships

J Palmer advised of a mutual agreement to hold the regular Runanga meetings every second month.

J Palmer advised of the upcoming Hui-a-Iwi from 24 to 26 November. Council representation would be present, as would Enterprise North Canterbury.

Canterbury Water Management Strategy

Councillor Stewart comment on irrigation abstractions from the Waimakariri River and the dry climate being a major factor in the increase of salt in the Kaiapoi River, resulting in increased algae bloom, willow death and sea lettuce growth. Commented on Ecan monitoring being undertaken and it was suggested to invite Ecan staff to discuss matters with the Council.

Councillor Stewart queried the new development in Kaiapoi, wharf area, if marine grade materials were being proposed because of concerns with salt water corrosion levels. Staff advised accordingly.

International Relationships

Councillor Felstead commented on Passchendaele events, which were very solemn and moving and the wonderful hosts in Zonnebeke. Many events were run by the New Zealand Embassy and NZ armed services. Waimakariri representatives met Prince William and Willie Apiata (VC). The Rangiora RSA that attended had enjoyed their experience, with field trips and knowledgeable hospitality.

Councillor Brine commented that he found the Passchendaele experience mind blowing but also depressing at the share waste of life and sacrifice. He acknowledged his gratitude of attending and representing Waimakariri and the fantastic hosts that helped make it such an incredibly memorable week.

Councillor Gordon commented on his experience of Passchendaele and complimented the hosts. He stated it was an honour to represent the Council, and reflected on the Maori aspect and NZ Army involvement at Menin Gate which made it very proud to be Kiwi when overseas.
Mayor Ayers thanked the Council for the opportunity to attend the commemorations. He also commented on other observations during the trip, such as meeting a Danish mayor with a district similar in size to Waimakariri.

Regeneration (Kaiapoi)

Councillor Blackie commented on LINZ making good progress with plans. He provided an update on the previous Regeneration Steering Group meeting. It was advised the food forest was progressing with schools visiting.

16. QUESTIONS

Nil.

17. URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS

Nil.

Meeting adjourned at 3.20pm for refreshments and resumed at 3.30pm

18. MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

Moved: Councillor Felstead Seconded: Councillor Doody

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>18.1</td>
<td>Minutes of the public excluded portion of Council meeting of 5 September 2017</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>18.2</td>
<td>Minutes of the public excluded portion of Council meeting of 3 October 2017</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>Item No</td>
<td>Minutes of the public excluded portion of the Audit and Risk Committee meeting 19 September 2017</td>
<td>To be received for information</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>Minutes of the public excluded portion of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting of 11 September 2017</td>
<td>To be received for information</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>Minutes of the public excluded portion of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting of 18 September 2017</td>
<td>To be received for information</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>Report of Colin Roxburgh (Wastewater Asset Manager) and Gary Stevenson (Utilities Projects Team Leader)</td>
<td>Contract 17/27 Oxford Rural No. 2 Water Supply Upgrade – Pump Stations Tender Evaluation and Contract Award Report</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>Report of Chris Parton (Sewer Asset Manager) and Daniel Thompson (Special Projects Manager)</td>
<td>Central Rangiora Sewer Stage 2A – Variation to Contract 15/47</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>Report of Kitty Waghorn (Solid Waste Asset Manager)</td>
<td>Extension of Recycling and Refuse Kerbside Collection Contract 10/16</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</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Appendix A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 18.1 – 18.8  | Protection of privacy of natural persons  
To carry out commercial activities without prejudice | A2(a)  
A2(b)ii |

CARRIED

The public excluded portion of the meeting occurred from 3.36pm to 4.38pm.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 4.40PM.

CONFIRMED

__________________________
Chairperson

__________________________
Date
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT

FILE NO: IRU-17-01 / 171122127014
MEMO TO: Council
DATE: 5th December 2017
FROM: Gary Boot, Senior Engineering Advisor
      Ken Stevenson, Roading Manager
      Kalley Simpson, 3 Waters Manager
SUBJECT: Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery Programme – November 2017 Update

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to provide an update on progress on delivering the Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery Programme for the roading, water, sewer and drainage works.

1.2. The Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery Steering Group notes that current projects are progressing well, with significant progress since the last update in May 2017.

1.3. The current estimate for the capital component of the recovery works is $39,194,800, which is significantly less than the approved budget of $40,606,000. This is mainly due to a $1.3M reduction in the estimates for roading projects in Kaiapoi South and East, which have now been designed and tendered, so providing better cost certainty.

1.4. The reduction in overall budget is very pleasing, especially given the need to manage significant project risks associated with discovering asbestos containing material within the Courtenay Drive road corridor.

1.5. A total of 44 projects have been completed, which is the same as was reported in May 2017, but two large water and wastewater projects are nearing completion.

1.6. Additionally, three contracts are due to start construction in January 2018, including Kaiapoi East Access Road and Courtenay Downs Road Reconstruction.

1.7. An additional project has been added to the programme to deliver the permanent servicing solutions for remaining houses in the Regeneration Area.

1.8. The budget spent on the projects completed to date is $22.1M. The total spent on the recovery capital programme at the end of October 2017 was $27.4M (projects completed plus projects underway) and this represents 70% of the revised total programme estimate. This is an increase of approximately $4M, signalising the significant progress in the past 6 months.

1.9. At the end of the 2017/18 financial year, all water and wastewater projects and the two key roading projects of the Kaiapoi East Road Link and Courtenay Drive Reconstruction will be essentially complete. At that time, the only uncompleted projects remaining on the Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery Programme will be Kaiapoi East Stormwater and Jones St reconstruction. These two projects are integral to the Kaiapoi East Regeneration Area.
1.10. After the completion of the Kaiapoi East Road Link and the Courtenay Drive Reconstruction at the end of the 2018/18 financial year, it is proposed that the Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery Steering Group will be disbanded and the remaining two projects completed under the direction of the District Regeneration Project Control Group. A final report will be brought to Council at this time.

Attachments:
1) Project Status Table, including Proposed Revised Construction Dates

2. RECOMMENDATION
THAT the Council:
(a) Receives report No. 171122127014
(b) Notes the recovery works construction programme as presented in Attachment 1 of this report.
(c) Notes that 44 of the 51 projects on the Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery Programme have been completed and two projects are nearing completion and a further three contracts will commence construction in January 2018.
(d) Notes that the current estimate and budget for the capital component of the recovery works is $39,194,800, which represents a $1.4M reduction over the previously approved budget.
(e) Notes that the 2018-28 LTP Budgets are being amended to reflect the budget reduction.
(f) Circulates this report to the Regeneration Steering Group and the Community and Advisory Boards.

3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS
Recovery Programme Update
3.2. Since the last update, the focus for the Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery Steering Group has been:
   - Construction for 3-waters replacement on the periphery of the Kaiapoi East Regeneration Area and in the Kaiapoi South Regeneration Area.
   - Design and procurement for roading reconstruction in the Kaiapoi East Regeneration Area and in the Kaiapoi South Regeneration Area.
   - Integrating the infrastructure repair projects with the Residential Red Zone Recovery Plan.
3.3. The group has been working in tandem with the Regeneration Project Control Group that is tasked with implementing the Residential Red Zone Recovery Plan.
3.4. An additional project, Project 57 Servicing Houses in the Regeneration Area, has been added to the infrastructure recovery programme. This subject was discussed in the May Council report (TRIM 170519050782).
3.5. There are currently 51 individual infrastructure recovery projects on the programme and of those:
   - 44 projects have been completed
   - 0 are ahead of programme
   - 4 are on programme
   - 2 are behind programme
• 1 is programmed not to start yet

3.6. There are two projects currently in the construction phase and three contracts are due to start on site shortly, as discussed below.

3.7. Project 7: Courtenay Downs Earthquake Repairs. The sewer works are complete and the two new pump stations are in service. Drainage repair works have been procured and will be completed by the end of January 2018. Tenders for the road repairs closed on 15 November 2017 and are being evaluated. These roadworks should commence on site in January 2018 and be completed in April 2018.

3.8. Project 43: Kaiapoi East Services Re-Routing Earthquake Recovery Works. The water supply recovery works on the periphery of the Regeneration Area are complete. The sewer recovery works are well progressed; the pump station will be commissioning in December 2017 and sewer replacement through private properties will be completed in February 2018.

3.9. Project 45: Kaiapoi East Access Road. Tenders closed on 8 November 2017 and approval to award the contract is being sought under a separate report to Council. The works should commence on site in January 2018 and are due to be completed in May 2018, which is three months sooner than previously expected.

3.10. Project 57 Servicing Houses in the Regeneration Area. Pricing has been obtained for a replacement water main to service remaining houses within the Regeneration Area and to provide for future land use (e.g. sports fields). Subject to Management Team approval, these works should commence in January 2018.

3.11. There is no longer a need to provide servicing for 50 Courtenay Drive as this property has been purchased by the Crown and all structures removed.

3.12. The Steering Group considers that current projects are progressing well, with significant progress having been made in the past six months.

3.13. Table 1 below provides a summary of the programme status since November 2012, as compared with the programme at the time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Status</th>
<th>Number of Projects at Specified Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nov '12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahead of Programme</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Programme</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behind Programme</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Started</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Projects</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Summary of Project Status since November 2012  
* projects on hold

Note: There are 51 projects in the programme but the individual project numbers extend up to 57 as some project numbers have been omitted due to projects being combined as the programme has progressed

3.15. The Steering Group continues to monitor progress in relation to the programme on a monthly basis.

3.16. At the end of the 2017/18 financial year, all water and wastewater projects and the two key roading projects of the Kaiapoi East Road Link and Courtenay Drive Reconstruction will be essentially complete. At that time, the only uncompleted projects remaining on the Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery Programme will be Kaiapoi East Stormwater and Jones St reconstruction. These two projects are integral to the Kaiapoi East Regeneration Area.

3.17. After the completion of the Kaiapoi East Road Link and the Courtenay Drive Reconstruction at the end of the 2018/18 financial year, it is proposed that the Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery Steering Group will be disbanded and the remaining two projects completed under the direction of the District Regeneration Project Control Group. A final report will be brought to Council at this time.

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. The infrastructure recovery programme was presented to the community following its release in May 2012. Drawings showing the programme were published on the Council website and updated periodically, the latest being April 2017. These have now been removed and the information conveyed on the pages about the Regeneration Projects.

4.2. Prior to the works starting on each site, leaflets are delivered to residents to advise them of the works and any significant delays or changes are similarly communicated.

4.3. Extensive community engagement was undertaken by Council through the development of the Draft Residential Red Zone Recovery Plan.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Project Costs and Estimates

5.1. The Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery Budget of $40,606,000 was adopted by Council in May 2017.

5.2. The current estimate for the capital component of the infrastructure recovery works is $39,194,800. This is a significant reduction on the approved budget, mainly due to a $1.3M reduction in the estimates for the Kaiapoi South and East roading projects (Projects 7 and 45). These two projects have a combined budget of $4.5M and were at scheme design stage at the time the budgets were set. Due to the relatively high uncertainties prior to detailed design being completed they had a combined contingency of $1.0M (30%). Risk management and very competitive tenders (Contracts 17/44 and 17/45) has confirmed lower costs for the physical works and a significant reduction in the contingency needed.

5.3. The budget spent on the projects completed to date is $22.1M. The total spent on the recovery programme at the end of October 2017 was $27.4M (projects completed plus projects underway) and this represents 70% of the total programme estimate noted above.

5.4. Actual financial expenditure against budget is reported in the quarterly financial reports to the Audit Committee.

Project Risks

5.5. The Infrastructure Recovery Steering Group meets monthly and discusses risks associated with the projects. The group periodically reviews the Risk Register, with the last full review being undertaken in July 2016. There are no remaining risks on the Risk Register that are categorised as “major".
5.6. Other risks still exist, such as availability of contractors and market fluctuations but these are more in line with business as usual and the risk register provides a plan to mitigate them.

6. CONTEXT

6.1. Policy
The Council is authorised to consider matters relating to programming and budgeting of earthquake recovery works.

6.2. Legislation
The Greater Christchurch Regeneration Act, Land Transport Management Act, Local Government Act are all relevant in this matter.

6.3. Community Outcomes
This report relates to the following community outcomes:
- There is a safe environment for all.
- Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable, affordable and sustainable.
- There is sufficient clean water to meet the needs of communities and ecosystems.
- Core utility services are provided in a timely, sustainable, and affordable manner.

Gary Boot
Senior Engineering Advisor
Attachment 1:

Project Status Table, including Proposed Revised Construction Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Expected build start</th>
<th>Expected build finish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: Kaiapoi Town Centre Earthquake Repairs &amp; Bridge Improvements</td>
<td>COMPLETED Mar ’14</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Kaikanui Sewer Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Feb ’14</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Chapman PI Sewer Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Sep ’13</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Otaki St Sewer Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Apr ’14</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: Sneyd St Sewer Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Jun’16</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6: Peraki St Sewage Pumping Main Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Nov ’13</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7: Courtenay Downs Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>In progress. 3m behind. Sewer works completed by ARC Projects on time &amp; commissioning underway. Drainage repairs to be progressed in Dec’17. Road reconstruction tendered &amp; pending award for start on site Jan’18</td>
<td>May’17</td>
<td>Apr’18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10: Kaiapoi Service Centre Sewer Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Nov ’13</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12: Kaiapoi Sewer Earthquake Relining</td>
<td>COMPLETED Oct ’13</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16: Moore St Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Jul ’15</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17: Holland Dr Sewer Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Nov ’13</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18: Sewell St Sewer Earthquake Recovery Works</td>
<td>COMPLETED Jun ‘15</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19: Charles St Sewer Pump Station Earthquake Recovery Works</td>
<td>COMPLETED Aug’16</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20: Pines Beach Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Aug ‘15</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21: Sewer Pump Station Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Jul ’15</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22: Moorcroft Sewer Pump Station Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Feb ’14</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23: Rangiora Sewer Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Jun ’14</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24: Woodend Beach Sewer Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Dec ‘14</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Expected build start</td>
<td>Expected build finish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25: Adderley Tce Water Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Feb ‘13</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26: Cust Water Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Nov ‘15</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27: Gray / Feldwick / Moore St North Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Oct ‘12</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28: Beach Rd West / Reid Memorial Ave East Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Sep ‘12</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29: Dunns Ave North Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Sep ‘12</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30: Adderley Tce / Fuller St Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Jun ‘13</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31: Meadow St Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Mar ‘14</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32: Kaiapoi West Earthquake Infrastructure Rebuild</td>
<td>COMPLETED Dec’15</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33: Various Sewer Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED May’16</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34: Kairaki Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Sept’14</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35: Courtenay Downs Sw Basins Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Apr ‘13</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36: 202 Ferry Rd Stormwater Culvert Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Apr ‘13</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37: Bull Farm Stormwater Pipe Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Dec ‘12</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38: Kaiapoi Cemetery SW Pipe Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Aug ‘13</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39: Feldwick Drain Stormwater Pump Station Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>Not started. Will be progressed with regeneration area drainage catchment management</td>
<td>2018/19 TBC</td>
<td>2018/19 TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40: Cridland St SW Pump Station Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Nov ‘13</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41: Dudley Drain Stormwater Pump Station Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Jun ’14</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42: Bowler St Stormwater Pump Station Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Jun ’14</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43: Kaiapoi East Services Re-Routing Earthquake Recovery Works</td>
<td>In progress: 8w behind. Water works completed on time by OnGrade. Sewer works progressing by Dormer for completion Feb’18. Road repairs to be coordinated with P45</td>
<td>Apr’17</td>
<td>Feb’18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44: Pines Beach Water Source Earthquake Recovery Works</td>
<td>COMPLETED Sep ’15</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Expected build start</td>
<td>Expected build finish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>45:</strong> Kaiapoi East Access Road Earthquake Recovery Works</td>
<td>In progress. On track. Tendered &amp; pending award for start on site Jan’18</td>
<td>Jan’18</td>
<td>May’18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>46:</strong> Old Waimakariri Bridge Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Jul ‘13</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>47:</strong> Kaiapoi Lakes Sewer Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Jun ‘15</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>48:</strong> Red Zone Infrastructure Decommissioning</td>
<td>In progress. On track. Redundant water &amp; sewer assets are being decommissioned where possible. Road decommissioning to be coordinated with Recovery Plan implementation</td>
<td>2018/19 TBC</td>
<td>2019/20 TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>49:</strong> Doubledays Rd Culvert Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED May ‘13</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>50:</strong> Ocean Outfall Trunk Main Valve Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Dec ‘13</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>51:</strong> Fuller St Stormwater Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Sep ‘14</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>52:</strong> Well Redevelopments</td>
<td>COMPLETED Jun ‘15</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>53:</strong> Hugh St Sewer Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Nov ‘13</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>54:</strong> Waikuku Beach Stormwater Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Jul ‘14</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>55:</strong> Stone St Sewer Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED May ‘14</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>56:</strong> Dudley Drain Earthquake Regeneration</td>
<td>In progress; on track. Three packages – (1) minor works by maintenance contractor (Stopforth) completed Jul’16; (2) adjacent railway culvert, works completed by OnGrade Dec’16 (3) works in Regeneration Area being coordinated with Recovery Plan implementation</td>
<td>Feb’18</td>
<td>Apr’18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>57:</strong> Servicing Houses in the Regeneration Area</td>
<td>In progress. On track. Procuring water main through Kaiapoi East Regeneration Area. Consulting with private owners on sewerage options</td>
<td>Jan’18</td>
<td>2019/20 TBC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to seek Council approval to change the speed limits on
     Tram Road within the Mandeville North area.

1.2. A speed limit of 80km/h is proposed on Mandeville Road from 500m east of the Bradley's
     Road / Mchugh's Road intersection with Tram Road to 300m west of the intersection.

1.3. In November 2017 the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board approved consultation being
     carried out on the proposed changes. Consultation was carried out between 10th
     November and 24th November 2017.

1.4. A total of 324 submissions were received on the proposal, as summarised in Table 1.

Table 1 Summary of Submissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Support</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support in full</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional support - Suggest a lower speed limit (50, 60, or 70 km/h)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional support – Suggest a longer length of 80km/h</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional support – Suggest both a lower limit and a longer length</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose – Suggest a lower limit</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose – Suggest a longer length</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose – Suggest both a lower limit and a longer length</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose – Suggest no change to existing</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggest variable speed limits triggered by approaching vehicles</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressed concern about the Mandeville Village Development access but didn’t</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>express an opinion on the speed limit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>101%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.5. The total percentage recorded exceeds 100% due to rounding.
1.6. Concern was expressed about the Mandeville Village Development access by 80 respondents, including the eight who didn’t express an opinion on the speed limit.

1.7. A submission has been received from NZTA. They support the 80km/h speed limit as proposed, and have indicated that they would not approve a 70km/h speed limit. The NZ Automobile Association has responded, and supports an 80km/h speed limit rather than a 70km/h limit.

1.8. At time of writing no responses had been received from the Police, or Road Transport Forum.

1.9. The submissions received on this proposal have been distributed to the Board along with a covering memo for their information.

1.10. Based on this feedback, and on the technical assessment of safe and appropriate speed at this location, it is recommended the speed limit changes from 100km/h to 80km/h as proposed.

Attachments:

i. Plan Showing proposed speed limits (TRIM 170914099898)
ii. Consultation submission summary (TRIM 171116124768)
iii. Memo to Oxford-Ohoka Community Board (TRIM 170913099302[v2])
iv. Speed Count Results on Tram Road (TRIM 171122126397)
v. Aerial photograph showing layout of area (TRIM 171123127484).
vi. Emailed feedback from NZTA (TRIM 171128128959)
vii. Mandeville Residents Association survey submissions (TRIM 171127128611) (circulated separately to members)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 171121126353.

(b) Approves the speed limit change from 100km/h to 80km/h on Tram Road from 500m east of the Bradleys Road / McHughs Road intersection to 300m west of that intersection.

(c) Notes that the Register of Speed Limits will be updated to include these changed speed limits.

(d) Notes that the Speed Limits Bylaw 2009 allows speed limits to be changed by Council resolution following consultation as required by the Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits.

(e) Notes that the submissions on this proposal have been distributed to the Oxford – Ohoka Community Board for their information.

(f) Circulates this report to all Community Boards.
3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

3.1. The Mandeville community has changed significantly from a predominantly large block rural area to an area of rural/residential sections. The reason for reviewing the speed limits within Mandeville community include:

- Increased traffic volumes
- Increased population, resulting in increased pedestrians and cyclists
- Expected changes to traffic patterns due to the proposed business development south west of the Tram Road McHughs Road intersection
- A crash history at the Bradleys, McHughs, Tram Roads intersection
- Feedback from some residents indicating that current speed limits are not appropriate

3.2. In March 2017, engagement with the Mandeville community and road users was carried out to gain some initial feedback on a series of possible speed limit options within the Mandeville community. Based on the initial feedback received a formal speed limit proposal was put out for community consultation.

3.1. The speed limit on Tram Road in the vicinity of the McHughs Road and Bradleys Road intersection was included in the initial discussion. Whilst generally there was support for a lower speed limit the length of the speed limit and the impact of the proposed commercial centre raised a number of questions. It was agreed that at busy times safety is a concern and a lower speed limit would help. However at other times the speed environment is more suited to 100km/h due to the long straight nature of Tram Road and no obvious changes in environment apart from the intersection.

3.2. Some respondents thought a variable intersection speed limit similar to the one at Pineacres would be a good option. However the proximity of Mandeville Road to the McHughs Road, Tram Road intersection is likely to make it difficult to reliably detect vehicles turning from McHughs Road into Tram Road in time to signal a change in speed limit to vehicles on Tram Road. It is also likely to be difficult to detect vehicles turning from the commercial development onto Tram Road in time to signal a change in speed limit. Figure 1 shows the existing layout of the intersection with the site of the Mandeville Village development superimposed. A larger version of this figure is included as Attachment iv.
3.3. In August, Council decided to consider the speed limit on Tram Road at a later date when the detailed design for the commercial area has been confirmed and a safety audit carried out. Council also approved the following speed limit changes on roads within the Mandeville area,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>New Limit</th>
<th>Previous Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wards Road</td>
<td>From Bradleys Road to the boundary of Millfield Subdivision</td>
<td>80km/h</td>
<td>100km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawsons Road</td>
<td>From Wards Road for 800m</td>
<td>80km/h</td>
<td>100km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradleys Road</td>
<td>From Tram Road to 400m north of Modena Place</td>
<td>80km/h</td>
<td>100km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Cul-de-sacs and Access Roads within the Mandeville Community</td>
<td>Full length</td>
<td>50km/h</td>
<td>70km/h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1. A draft of the safety audit on the access to the commercial development at the corner of Tram Road and McHughes Road identified speed at the access as a “Serious” concern. There are four rankings of NZTA Safety Audit concerns, ranging from Minor to Serious. NZTA’s safety audit proforma defines a serious concern as “A major safety concern that must be addressed and requires changes to avoid serious safety consequences.”

3.2. The safety audit makes the following recommendation regarding speed at the access:
“That the designer and / or client raise this concern with the Waimakariri District Council to encourage a review of the posted speed restriction on Tram Road. However, based on the speeds recorded, this may require more than posted speed limit signs.”

3.3. The NZ Speed Management Guide was published in late 2016. The Guide sets out a framework to set safe and appropriate speed limits for different road environments. It also refers to the Infrastructure Risk Assessment tool, which assesses the on road and roadside hazards of a section of road.

3.4. The Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits 2017 came into effect on 21st September 2017, and mandates the use of the Speed Management Guide.

3.5. Tram Road is an Arterial Road with a 100km/h speed limit. The Average Daily Traffic (ADT) on Tram Road is 5,391 vehicles per day (vpd). Tram Road is a key route linking Kaiapoi and Christchurch with the Oxford area. Tram Road is expected to carry increasing traffic volumes following the completion of the commercial development southwest of the Tram Road McHughs Road intersection.

3.6. The Traffic Impact Assessment for the Mandeville commercial development has estimated the Peak hour turning volumes at the Bradleys Road, McHughs Road, Tram Road intersection and the access to the development for 2021. The estimates include projected traffic volumes for all currently consented developments which feed onto Bradleys and McHughs Roads, and are based on a left in, left out only access to the commercial development. The estimated morning and evening peak hour turning volumes are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement Description</th>
<th>Estimated Volume</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Approach: McHughs Road</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Turn into Tram</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight Ahead into Bradleys</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Turn into Tram</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East Approach: Tram Road</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left turn into McHughs</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound on Tram</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right turn into Bradleys</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North Approach: Bradleys Road</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left turn into Tram</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight ahead into McHughs</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right turn into Tram</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West Approach: Tram Road</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left turn into Bradleys</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound on Tram</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right turn into McHughs</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2 Predicted Volumes at Tram / Bradleys / McHughs Intersection Morning peak 2021*
The assessment of Tram Road using the new Speed Management Guide assessed 80-100km/h as the safe and appropriate speed range on Tram Road. The commercial development currently has resource consent subject to a safety audit for a left in left out access onto Tram Road. This will result in a number of vehicles entering and leaving the commercial area while other vehicles are traveling straight past at much higher speeds. The proposed left in – left out access requires a solid concrete centre island to discourage drivers from turning right into or out of the site. These are considered potential hazards for vehicles travelling at 100km/h.

The NZTA Safer Journeys Risk Assessment Tool is a nationwide, automated desktop tool for assessing risk ratings of roads. These risk ratings can then be used to identify safe and appropriate speeds for roads. Using the tool to assess the section of Tram Road around the Bradleys Road intersection resulted in a Medium Infrastructure risk rating. This indicates that 80km/h is considered a safe and appropriate speed for this section of Tram Road. One of the main factors for this is the Death and Serious Injury (DSI) equivalent score.

Using the new Speed Management Guide to assess the area with the new commercial development included, the infrastructure risk rating was assessed as medium.

Collective and personal risk are also used to determine the safe and appropriate speed of a section of road. Assessment of the personal risk, representing the crash risk exposure to each individual traveling along a road corridor, resulted in a “Low-Medium” score. Assessment of the collective risk, that is, the measure of crash density on this section of road, resulted in a “Medium” risk score.

Taking into account the assessments from above (including table 2.2 of the Speed Management Guide) the recommended safe and appropriate speed is therefore 80km/h.

Table 3 Predicted Volumes at Tram / Bradleys / McHughs Intersection Evening Peak 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement Description</th>
<th>Estimated Volume</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Approach : McHughes Road</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Turn into Tram Road</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight Ahead into Bradleys Road</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Turn into Tram Road</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East Approach: Tram Road</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left turn into McHughes</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound on Tram</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right turn into Bradleys</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North Approach: Bradleys Road</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left turn into Tram</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight ahead into McHughes</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right turn into Tram</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West Approach: Tram Road</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left turn into Bradleys</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound on Tram</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right turn into McHughes</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.12. For the reasons above, it is recommended that the speed limit on Tram Road, from 300m west of Bradleys Road to 500m east of Bradleys Road, be changed to 80km/h.

3.13. The existing operating speed on Tram Road was determined using data collected from a special count site, 900m west of Bradleys Road. A mean speed of 97.0km/h and 85th percentile speed of 104.8km/h were recorded.

3.14. The setting of speed limits rule requires that traffic engineering measures are installed so that the measured mean operating speed is within 10% of the proposed speed limit. Table 4 shows the mean operating speeds to be achieved under this requirement for speed limits between 50 and 80km/h.

**Table 4 Speed Limits and Mean Operating Speeds**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speed Limit</th>
<th>Mean Operating Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80km/h</td>
<td>88km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70km/h</td>
<td>77km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60km/h</td>
<td>66km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50km/h</td>
<td>55km/h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.15. The commercial development will introduce a large parking area, significant commercial buildings (including a service station canopy), and prominent signage.

3.16. The following additional engineering measures are therefore proposed on this section of Tram Road, to reinforce the proposed speed limit:

- Threshold treatments at each end of the 80km/h section. These would consist of large speed signs with "Mandeville" beneath the speed limit (see Figure 3)
Figure 3 Threshold Sign

- Narrow lanes (3.0m wide)
- Wide centreline (similar to State Highway 1 south of Woodend – See Figure 4)

Figure 4 Wide Centreline
• Large map type direction signs showing directions to the commercial
development, Mandeville, Ohoka, Oxford, and Kaipoi. A preliminary
sketch of a possible map sign layout is shown in Figure 5 – S6 and S9
refer to the fuel and knife and fork symbols found on road signs.

![Figure 5 Map Sign]

3.17. The presence of these features will result in a more “urban” feel to this section of Tram
Road. It is considered that a reduction in mean operating speed from 97km/h to 88km/h
is likely to be achievable with a combination of these features and the commercial
development.

3.18. However, it is considered that these features, on their own, are unlikely to result in
reduction in mean speed from 97 to 66km/h (as required for a 60km/h speed limit), or
less. Much more severe engineering treatments are likely to be required to achieve that
sort of reduction.

Other Considerations

3.19. The safety audit also identified a concern with the left in left out arrangement. It
considered that vehicles may endeavour to turn right into or out of the site by doing U
turns around the ends of the concrete islands. The commercial development designer is
currently considering options to address this. These options may include designing the
commercial access to accommodate full right turns. The proposed 80km/h speed limit
and engineering measures is considered to be appropriate for that environment.

3.20. The safety audit team will have an opportunity to comment on options to address the
serious issues raised in the audit.

3.21. The lowering of the speed limit for the short section through Mandeville will have
insignificant impacts on motorists travel time between Oxford and Kaipoi. The
difference in travel time between traveling at 100kph (current sign posted speed limit)
and 80 km/h (new proposed speed limit) for the 800m section of road will result in a 7.2
second increase in travel time.

3.22. The Management Team has reviewed this report and supports the recommendations.
4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. The Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits 2017 requires the Council to formally consult with a number of external agencies during the review of a speed limit. The following persons must be consulted in accordance with this requirement and their views will be taken into account:

- The local community that is considered to be affected by the proposed speed limit
- 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

4.2. At their meeting on 9th November, the Oxford Ohoka Community Board passed the following resolution, enabling the proposed speed limit changes on Tram Road to go to consultation:

**THAT** the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) **Receives** Memo No. 171027116188.

(b) **Approves** consultation being carried out on the proposal to change the speed limit on Tram Road to 80km/h, as outlined in the plan (TRIM 170914099898) attached to the main report (TRIM 170913099302).

(c) **Notes** that consultation on this proposal will be carried out between 10 November and 24 November 2017.

(d) **Notes** that the Board will be updated at the end of the consultation process through a memo process.

(e) **Notes** that any submissions on the proposal will be taken into account before the change is presented to the Council on 5 December 2017 for consideration.

4.3. In November, feedback on the proposed new speed limits was sought through advertising in the local newspapers and on the Council’s website. Letters were also sent to NZTA, the Police, the NZ Automobile Association Inc and the Road Transport Forum NZ as required by the rule.

4.4. A submission has been received from NZTA. They support the 80km/h speed limit as proposed, and have indicated that they would not approve a 70km/h speed limit. The NZ Automobile Association has responded, and supports an 80km/h speed limit rather than a 70km/h limit.

4.5. At time of writing no responses had been received from the Police, or Road Transport Forum.

4.6. The consultation was publicised via Council’s website and Facebook page, and with advertisements in the Northern Outlook. In addition, approximately 500 flyers were delivered to homes in the Mandeville area. These flyers included pre-paid postage to return to Council. Submissions were also received via email, and online, using Survey Monkey.
4.7. A total of 324 submissions were received on the proposal. These included 100 posted or emailed submissions and 224 submissions received via Survey Monkey. A summary of the submissions is in Table 5 below and the details are attached (Attachment ii – TRIM 171116124768)

Table 5 Summary of Submissions Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Support</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support in full</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional support - Suggest a lower speed limit (50, 60, or 70 km/h)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional support – Suggest a longer length of 80km/h</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional support – Suggest both a lower limit and a longer length</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose – Suggest a lower limit</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose – Suggest a longer length</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose – Suggest both a lower limit and a longer length</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose – Suggest no change to existing</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggest variable speed limits triggered by approaching vehicles</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressed concern about the Mandeville Village Development access but didn’t express an opinion on the speed limit</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>324</td>
<td>101%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1. The total percentage recorded exceeds 100% due to rounding.

4.2. Concern was expressed about the Mandeville Village Development access by 80 respondents, including the eight who didn’t express an opinion on the speed limit.

4.3. 73% of respondents supported a reduction in the speed limit on this section of Tram Road. Many suggested a lower speed limit than the 80km/h proposed, and/or a longer length of lower speed limit than the 800m proposed.

4.4. The Survey Monkey online survey system is not a secure voting system. This means that it is open to individuals or groups making multiple submissions. A review of IP addresses of Survey Monkey submissions indicated that six individual computers made more than one submission (a total of 40 submissions from the six machines). Many of these submissions may have been individuals living at the same address and using the same computer. However, a maximum of 18 submissions were made from one computer. All of the multiple submissions were in support of lowering the speed limit.

4.5. In addition, an opponent of the proposal was using social media to encourage multiple submissions using different devices (computer, phone, or tablet). The use of different devices by an individual would not have been detected in the IP address review.

4.6. Responses to the suggestions from submitters are outlined below.

**A Lower Speed Limit than 80km/h**

4.7. 35 submissions (11%) suggested a speed limit lower than the 80km/h limit proposed. It is acknowledged that reducing typical vehicle operating speeds to 50, 60, or 70km/h would be likely to result in a safer intersection than 80km/h operating speeds.
Response

4.8. NZTA’s Safer Journeys road safety strategy has a goal to reduce the number of different speed limits applying at higher speeds to 60 km/h, 80 km/h, 100 km/h, and 110 km/h, in order to make the speed limit more self-explanatory to road users. Consequently, the Setting of Speed Limits Rule requires that 70 or 90 km/h speed limits require approval from NZTA (the Agency), and that

The Agency must, in considering a proposed 70 km/h or 90 km/h speed limit, take into account—

(a) the benefit of increasing the distinction between different speed limits across the network by having fewer different speed limits; and

(b) whether the road controlling authority can demonstrate a plan to work towards a speed limit that does not require Agency approval on the road that is the subject of the proposed speed limit. (Section 4.5(2))

4.9. In their feedback the Agency indicted that

The Speed Management Guide is quite clear that 70km/h and 90km/h speed limits are now considered only as interim arrangements until a 60/80/100 rural speed limit regime can be implemented, and Section 4.5(2)(a) of the 2017 Rule now reinforces this approach. Your suggestion of a 70km/h speed limit is not on an interim basis, and no plans to work towards a speed limit that does not require Agency approval have been provided. Therefore on the information available, having regard to Section 4.5(2) of the Rule, I can advise that the Agency would not approve a 70km/h speed limit under Section 4.5(4) of the Rule.

4.10. The next lower speed which could be supported by NZTA is 60km/h

4.11. As noted above, the rule further requires that “…a road controlling authority must aim to achieve a mean operating speed less than 10% above the speed limit.”

4.12. The mean operating speed recorded on Tram Road in a speed survey (attachment iv TRIM 171122126397) was 97.0km/h. The speed limit change, combined with the presence of the Mandeville Village and the proposed engineering changes (threshold treatment, narrow lanes, wide centreline, and right turn bays) is likely to be reasonably effective at reducing the mean operating speed by 10km/h to between 80 and 88 km/h (as required for an 80 km/h speed limit).

4.13. A 60km/h speed limit would require a mean operating speed of 66km/h. This would require a reduction of approximately 30km/h. It is considered that significant engineering works combined with a much more urban environment would be required to achieve a reduction in operating speed of that magnitude.

4.14. It is therefore considered that compliance with these lower speeds in this environment would be likely to be poor.

Increase the Length of Lower Speed Limit

4.15. 16 submissions (5%) suggested increasing the length of lower speed limit beyond the 800m proposed.
Response:

4.16. The reasoning behind the recommended length is to provide a well-defined section of lower speed limit, which is accompanied by an obvious and significant change in roadside environment, and by engineering features, including threshold treatments, wide centrelines, narrow lanes, and map signage. The advantage of this approach is that drivers are likely to identify that the environment is significantly different to the rest of Tram Road, and (often subconsciously) reduce speed.

4.17. It does, however, have some disadvantages, as some submitters have noted. These include:
   - Most drivers approaching a lower speed limit have not reduced speed to the lower limit when they pass the speed limit sign. They also tend to speed up before they get to the sign when leaving.
   - The reduction in vehicle speeds is limited to the confined length of speed limit change.

4.18. The Bradleys Road / McHughs Road intersection and the proposed Mandeville Village access are the two significant conflict points on this section of Tram Road. The ends of the proposed 800m speed limit will be 300m from each of these conflict points. Drivers tend to start to slow down before they reach a speed reduction sign, even though they are travelling at more than the reduced limit as they pass the sign. It is therefore considered that the 300m separation between the conflict point and the signage will result in a reasonable reduction in speed by the time a vehicle reaches either conflict point.

4.19. The Speed Limit Setting Rule recommends a minimum length of 800m for an 80km/h speed limit. The proposed length of 800m for this speed limit on Tram Road was arrived at in an attempt to balance the desire for a short sharp length of reduced speed with a need to ensure that there is enough length to slow down.

4.20. If it is too short there is a risk that vehicles may not slow sufficiently by the time they reach the conflict points with vehicles entering or leaving the Mandeville Village or the Bradleys Road / McHughs Road intersection. If it is too long there is a risk that the road and adjacent environment does not reinforce the message that the speed limit signs convey. Drivers may then adjust their speed (often subconsciously) to suit the road environment as they see it.

4.21. By way of comparison the 70km/h variable speed limit on State Highway 1 at the Pineacres intersection is 600m long.

**Use Variable Speed Limits**

4.22. 3 submissions (1%) suggested using variable speed limits with electronic signs which are triggered by vehicles approaching on the side roads, similar to the ones used on SH1 at Pineacres.

*Response*

4.23. In order to be effective in this situation a variable message speed limit needs to be triggered by a vehicle on say McHughs Road when that vehicle is far enough away from the intersection so that the changed speed limit can be displayed in time for a vehicle on Tram Road to respond to it, slow sufficiently, and arrive at the intersection at more or less the same time as the vehicle on McHughs Road arrives.
4.24. This intersection would require triggers on Bradleys Road, McHughs Road (west of Mandeville Road), and Mandeville Road. The sensors would detect all vehicles approaching on McHughs Road, including those turning down Mandeville Road. Similarly, all vehicles approaching on Mandeville Road would be detected, including those turning left onto McHughs Road. This is likely to result in occasions when the variable speed limit is activated, but there are no vehicles at the intersection.

4.25. Similarly, some detection device would be needed at the exit to the Mandeville Village development. Any device which detects a vehicle approaching the exit from within the carpark is also likely to detect vehicles moving within the carpark, but not approaching the exit. This is also likely to result in false activation of the variable speed limit.

4.26. There is a risk that frequent false activation of the variable signs could result in the system being considered unreliable by regular Tram Road users. This, in turn, could result in poor compliance with the variable speed limits.

**Concerns Regarding the Mandeville Village Access**

4.27. 80 submissions (25%) raised concerns regarding the Mandeville Village Access. These included the following concerns:

- That the speed limit was being reduced to enable access to the village to proceed
- That the currently consented “left in – left out” access could be replaced with an access allowing right turns, and that a consent for that could be granted without notification
- That the possible access allowing full movements is unsafe

**Response**

4.28. A plan change from Rural to Business B4 was granted in 2015 for the Mandeville Village site. One of the conditions of this plan change was a requirement that the Tram Road access be “left in – left out” only.

4.29. A Resource Consent for the development was applied for in 2016. The Consent was granted with a condition that

> The consent holder shall commission an independent Road Safety Audit of the Tram Road accesses, in accordance with NZTA’s “Road Safety Audits for Projects” (2013) and:

> The audit team shall be subject to the Plan Implementation Manager’s approval (with such approval not being unreasonably withheld), and shall include at least one member with experience in the design and operation of high speed rural intersections; and

> Any actions resulting from the Safety Audit shall be agreed with Plan Implementation Manager.

4.30. The safety audit identified concerns about the left in – left out access on Tram Road. Drivers wishing to turn right into site would need to turn at the Bradleys / McHughs roads intersection with Tram Road, and travel down McHughs Road and Mandeville Road to the site access on Mandeville Road. Those turning right out of the site would do the reverse. This is a significant detour, and many drivers would be likely to do dangerous manoeuvres such as U turns at the end of a central island on Tram Road or travelling down the wrong side of the island in order to avoid the detour.
4.31. The safety audit also raised concerns about the speed on Tram Road adjacent to a large business development with the required left in – left out access.

4.32. Council began the review of speed limits in the wider Mandeville area (including Tram Road) in April 2017. In August, Council agreed to consider the speed limit on Tram Road at a later date when the detailed design for the commercial area has been confirmed and a safety audit carried out. Council also approved the speed limit changes on several other roads within the wider Mandeville area.

4.33. The safety auditors, developer’s traffic engineers, and staff agree that a well-designed access which involves full right turns will be safer than a left in- left out access at this location.

4.34. The Mandeville Village developers have indicated that they are in the process of preparing a Resource Consent application for an access which allows full turns. At the time of writing no Resource Consent application had been lodged. However, the developer has shown preliminary sketch plans of a possible access layout to the Mandeville Residents Group, and these plans have been tabled at a briefing of the Oxford Ohoka Community Board.

4.35. The Mandeville Village development is certainly a factor to be considered in the speed limit review on Tram Road. However, it is not the only factor being considered.

4.36. Three crashes have been recorded in NZTA’s crash database at this intersection for the five years between 2012 and 2017. All three crashes involved a vehicle turning out of Tram Road or McHughs Road failing to give way to through traffic on Tram Road. One of the crashes resulted in serious injury, one in minor injury, and the third in no injury. Crashes are only recorded in the database when they are attended by Police. Anecdotal evidence from nearby residents suggests that there have been more crashes at the intersection than the three recorded in the database.

4.37. There has been extensive rural residential development in the Mandeville area over the past 10 years. Traffic volumes on Bradleys Road at Modena Place have increased from 915 vehicles per day in 2010 to 1360 per day in 2017 (48% increase). Numbers on McHughs Road have increased from 825 in 2010 to 1550 in 2013 (89% increase). There are still a number of undeveloped lots to the south of Tram Road. As these develop, volumes on McHughs Road will increase further. This will put further pressure on the intersection, and increase the risk of crashes further.

5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

5.1. The total cost of the new speed limit signage and road marking can be met from existing budgets.

5.2. There are no significant risks associated with changing this speed limit.

6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. **Policy**

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

6.2. **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 requires that permanent speed limits be set by bylaw.

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

6.3. Community Outcomes

6.3.1. There is a safe environment for all:

- Crime, Injury and road accidents are minimised
- Harm to people from natural and manmade hazards is minimised

6.3.2. Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable, affordable and sustainable

- The standard of our District's roads is keeping pace with increasing traffic numbers

Bill Rice
Senior Transport Engineer

Gerard Cleary
Utilities and Roading Manager
### Tram Road Speed Limit Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRIM</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>171114123599</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R DAWE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No Answer to proposal just raised questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171115124058</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M BECKETT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wants Council to look at speed management to lower speeds along Tram Road - Refer to TRIM for full response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171115124301</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>S HERBERT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Questioned Access to Mandeville Business Park No Answer as to speed limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17115124302</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A MEREDITH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I am very excited about the prospect of lowering the speed limit on Tram Road but would love to see it extended past rural properties on Tram Road. We live on Tram Road and on a bend at that. We have narrowly escaped accidents on numerous occasions as people are in such a hurry to get to where they are going they don't tend to look out for indicators indicating turning into properties! Also, a lot of people tend to drive higher than the speed limit as it is on Tram Road. I can be travelling at 100km/h on any given day and will have someone overtake me (and they are definitely not travelling the speed limit). We have lived here for almost 3 years and have never seen a police car or van doing any speed tracking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171116124663</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>J SMITH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171116124666</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>A Louttit &amp; A Marks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>But the distances of the 80km/h should be doubled or even tripped or no-one will bother to slow down. That's the reality!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17116124667</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>A &amp; L RADBURND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171116124682</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>S DALMAN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171116124682</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>A Darmawi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**80km/h SPEED LIMIT ON TRAM ROAD FROM 500M EAST OF BRADLEYS ROAD TO 300M WEST OF BRADLEYS ROAD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Lower Speed Limit / Extended Speed Limit Zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

TRIM: 171116124768
### Proposed Lower Speed Limit / Extended Speed Limit Zone

#### 80km/h Speed Limit on Tram Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRIM</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17116124902</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>B COCKRAN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Any Speed Reduction at this major Tram Road intersection is desirable. 80km/h is an obvious logical choice for the stretch of road indicated on the plan if we were not also dealing with the proximity of the commercial zone under construction. ..... 80km/h will clearly be too high a speed if for example right turning &quot;out&quot; is permitted on to tram road. ..... SEE FULL RESPONSE IN TRIM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17116124897</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>D OHLSON</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171120125237</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>D BAYARD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I completely support this proposal to reduce the speed at this intersection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171120125242</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>D &amp; J Barker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Even lower speed 70k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171120125244</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>M &amp; B Liddicoat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>We both agree to the poroposed change but have the same distance from both ends (500m).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171120125245</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>G H Rivers &amp; D J Wall</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171120125246</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>T KEALS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Looks like a planning cockup again, with a tardy plan to exhonorate the people who approved it in the first place. Last time a centre was planned there we were having an underpass. Keep on guessing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171120125247</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>A WILKINSON</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171120125250</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Y THOMPSON</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This proposal has been presented in a misleading way. It does not give any indication to a new design proposal for a left and right turn to and from the commercial centre (as presented at a recent meeting at the Mandeville Sports Centre) and therefore unaware at such proposals. The council should now no longer allow access from Tram Road for the commercial centre (Mandeville Road access being a much safer option for all commuters and residents).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171120125253</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>ANON</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I cant believe there will be access off Tram Rd into the new shopping centre. That is an accident waiting to happen!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171120125255</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>J STAPLEY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amount of traffic on Tram Rd + Number of crashes/near misses (at this corner) warrant this change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171120125257</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>A &amp; T CROWE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good idea!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171120125261</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>I SHRIMPTON</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prefer 70km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171120125263</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>C THELIN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Needs to happen ASAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171120125265</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>V RUTH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Definitely agree - would be good if it was even slower and a way to get across the road walking at that point. I take me life in my hands every time I cross Tram Road with my dog.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TRIM: 17116124768
### Proposed Lower Speed Limit / Extended Speed Limit Zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRIM</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>171120125267</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>C BREEZE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Should be 70km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171120125271</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>A &amp; H ABRAMS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>But consider the reduced speed limit should be extended to just past Swannanoa School!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171120125274</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>T &amp; C FOWLER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I don’t think that 80ks is low enough should be 70k or 60k. Why would people obey 80ks when they don’t even stop at the STOP sign at that corner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171120125277</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>C &amp; B Scott</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The intersection could almost do with a roundabout at busy times. Definitely need to slow traffic especially with the shops there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171120125278</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>S DUNLOP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171120125280</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>S HUCKETT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171120125282</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>G BENNETT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No required per resource consent process for commercial. This flyer does not portray all the facts. Council should deny right turns into commercial which is the real reason for this proposal. Community safety paramount - Deny any Tram Road access to commercial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171120125285</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>R JACKSON</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>It should be 70lm/h for safety reasons. This is a very busy road and with future subdivisions it is going to get worse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171120125287</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>W DAVIS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Great idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171120125289</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>R COULTER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not many will abide but it may save a life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171120125290</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>M DUCROY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This concept has been long overdue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171120125292</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>ANON</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Absolutely necessary. Have lived on McHughs Road for 25 years and this is long overdue and so important now with development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171120125294</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>M DOUGAN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Suggest you put up signs to advise the change on Tram AND on Bradleys Road. Not just the 80 kph signs, and paint 80 on the roads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171120125295</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>A &amp; M DALE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171120125297</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>L &amp; P SKELLY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Westbound traffic drives through the Bradley/Tram junction at great speed, needs to be slowed down.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171120125299</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>J MURRAY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>…It is suggested that a speed limit of 70km/h be imposed on Tram Road from 500m west of Swannanoa School to 500m east of the Mandeville Village. Also that there be a heavy police presence until motorists get the message… PLEASE SEE TRIM FOR FULL RESPONSE WITH COMMENTS ABOUT THE DEVELOPMENT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TRIM: 171116124768
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRIM</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>171120125354</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>M BROERS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>The intersection needs to be totally changed. Coming off Bradleys Road to go left, right or straight ahead you aren't speeding anyway. Traffic passing Swannanoa School don't slow down and are unlikely to in this suggested area aswell!!!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 171120125367 | 42  | J HAWKER  |         |                     |         | **SEE TRIM FOR FULL RESPONSE** - ... 1. Install a roundabout at the corner. Traffic will have no choice but to slow down and the priorities of who goes when will be more obvious, even with the poor driving skills of many at roundabouts. If there is a small tailback with evening commuters, they may even decide to pay a visit to the village, and NO I don't have any interest in that. 
2. Install electronic 70kmh speed signs such as on the State highway at Burnham, which slow traffic (well most of it) whenever there is a car on the side roads. 
3. Require traffic intending to use the village facilities to use the already existing Mandeville Road entrance and exit. Again a Roundabout on the corner would ensure a better traffic flow. Having driven extensively in Sweden, I know that where there is genuine commitment to road safety, the answers are implemented. I would urge those making decisions on this issue to consider the additional costs to the health system and to families when serious crashes continue through the lack of a desire to do more than save money and placate developers. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRIM</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>171120125368</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>C WINTER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I thought an email was easier than finding the envelope! Yes I support the proposed 80km reduction in speed limit for Tram Road. While all ideas are being considered I wondered if anyone is aware of the huge number of students catching the bus at 7:20am. There are often 15-20 children waiting on a very busy corner. I thought consideration needs to be given to having an area for the bus to pull off the main road and for the children to be sheltered under safely back from the busy road. If you have any say in the bus service along Tram road I know there is an increasing need for this to be reviewed!!! Thanks for your time- please feel free to forward this email to other departments if they need this feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171120125374</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>D &amp; A SCORGIE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SEE TRIM FOR FULL RESPONSE - Talks mainly about access to commercial development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171120125404</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>J WHITTAKER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>See TRIM FOR FULL RESPONSE - Main Points: Supports a 70km/h speed limit around the intersection due to history of crashes and sunstrike. Access from Tram Road should be eliminated for the commercial development as the risk is seen as unacceptable. Points out the current proposed access is flawed and must be reviewed by Council. Points out its a non-notified consent preventing public from submitting on it. If the Council cannot eliminate access to tram road then risk needs to be reduced to an acceptable level. Recomends Council consider a roundabout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171120125424</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>S ROBOTHAM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See Trim for full response - Main points - 1. There be only entrances from Tram Road and the only exit from the Business Park be via Mandeville Road. 2. There be a cycleway from McHughs Road to No.10 Road on the South side of Tram Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Proposed Lower Speed Limit / Extended Speed Limit Zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRIM</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>171121125971</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>G &amp; J BAINBRIDGE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>We would prefer the speed limit be 70km/h due to the increased vehicle numbers and the access off Tram Road to the commercial development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741121125973</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>J COSTELLO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As an engineer I find it disturbing that you allow yourselves to be influenced into approving a very dangerous situation. To reduce the speed so that a developer can increase traffic flow by allowing right turns in and out is totally irresponsible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171121125974</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>E COSTELLO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I am dismayed that you would even consider an entrance/exit from Tram Rd, it is far too dangerous that close to a major crossroad. I hope &quot;Mandeville Village&quot; was not designed to accommodate big trucks and car uses won't need another entrance/exit. The standard of driving in Canterbury is awful and this certainly would not help to improve things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171122126456</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>R &amp; F FLANAGAN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes definitely for greater safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171122126459</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>P MOORE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>This intersection should be down to 50ks. Traffic volumes have increased at this point. There have been many accidents on fatal. P.S the sun strike is very bad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171122126460</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>CD &amp; CL STARKEY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The 80 km/h Speed limit should apply at least 500m west of Bradleys Road and 1km east of Bradleys Road Intersection. The STOP sign at the Bradleys/Tram Road intersection is ignored by at least 80% of motorists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171122126463</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>ANON</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I have a reservation around the proposed length of the speed limit zone - should be a minimum 1km. Also concerned about motorist adherence + policing of the limit when the zone is sited in a section of open road speed limit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171122126465</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>R &amp; D HARLIWICH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We totally agree with this as there has been 3 accidents on this intersection that we know of.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Proposed Lower Speed Limit / Extended Speed Limit Zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRIM</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>171122126469</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>S WHITTAKER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, Let's Talk! You are expecting this community to say whether we agree with an 80km limit, yet you have not been open and transparent about the changes above. This development should not have started until road safety was sorted. A new flier needs to come out telling everyone what the expected road changes are going to be so we can make an informed choice + view. I found out on the 15th Nov yet I am told the safety audit which has declared the median barrier unsafe was decided upon some time ago, yet its been kept very quiet why? Access should not be on/off tram road directly. *You appear to have forgotten to tell this community that the median barrier is not going to be in place as you deem it a safety risk. You need to inform ALL the community that a new resource consent is going to happen with changes to right turns in and out of the commercial centre!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171122126471</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>R FLUIT &amp; J SKELLETT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long past due with the amount of traffic turning or crossing over at this intersection. I DO NOT support direct access onto Tram Rd from new shops as this is too dangerous + will cause traffic accidents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171122126479</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>S GILMORE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SEE TRIM FOR FULL RESPONSE - Suggests that a 70km/h speed limit be put in place along with insisting that a roundabout is the only viable safe option for the intersection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171122126481</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>L EDER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>No discussion needed, reduce the speed, McHughs + Bradleys are already 80 - easy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171122126483</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>C LESTER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70km/h even better. Through traffic wont be happy about this but it is essential for the safety of those using McHughs + Bradleys Road whether crossing or turning, espically at peak hours when the situation will be exacerbated by traffic from the 'shops'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171122126485</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>L &amp; M WHITE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIM</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>SUPPORT</td>
<td>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</td>
<td>AGAINST</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171122126488</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>I &amp; P PAT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Totally agree with this proposal for safety reasons. Another matter worthy of consideration Tram Road travelling east towards Giles &amp; South Eyre Rd's reduced to 80kph. 100kph is too fast for sth eyre road island road intersections. Vehicles exiting from island rd &amp; sth eyre rds onto tram road is very difficult with 100kph speed of vehicles. Many heavy trucks exit on to tram road. If speed limit is reduced to 80kph it would be much safer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171122126490</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>FNH ADMIRAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Many people do not realize that at 100k/hr, 800m takes 29 seconds travel time, 800m@ 80k/hr takes 7 seconds longer and 70k hr is 13 seconds long so 41 seconds for 800m. WHAT ARE WE TALKING ABOUT?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171122126494</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>M &amp; W TAYLOR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Totally support reducing the speed through this zone and intersection. We use it twice daily and with so many cars entering/exitting bradleys/mchugh's it just makes sense to avoid any further crashes. Make it safe - reduce the speed please.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171122126497</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>R &amp; Y EDWARDS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171122126644</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>F VAN DER PLAS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Definitely disagree. Some people insist on driving at 80ks down Tram Road which causes car drivers to be impatient and &quot;overtake&quot; when risky. The proposed exit and entrance to the shopping centre initially shown to us is what, was already agreed upon!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171122126646</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>R VAN DER PLAS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This shouldn’t be allowed. There are already enough issues with slow drivers without changing the rules. The original decision should be adhered to this is typical of a developer getting a doot in the door and changing the rules to suit their needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIM</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>SUPPORT</td>
<td>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</td>
<td>AGAINST</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171122126814</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>R GRIFFITHS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Speed limit must be reduced to 70km/h or even less. You have here a recipe for a disaster. How many times have I told council this? It is clear to me that a total mess is at play here behind the scenes and councils right hand does not know what the left is doing. Please have the courtesy to schedule a public meeting so that some frank and honest discussion can take place, at present the prevailing feeling is that council is obfuscating and being dishonest about the whole process. Please let me have some honesty!! guiding the ENTIRE process safety is paramount!! I have a young family that use the intersection - I will not tolerate your playing with our safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171122126903</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>N BRUINS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Please change the speed limit on Tram Rd, near bradleys rd/McHughs from 100km/h to 80km/hr. Sadly speed is one of the main reasons why we have so many horrific accidents on our roads and country roads are not built for 100 km speed limits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171123127021</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>K STEVENS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I support the proposal to reduce the speed limit to 80km/h through Mandeville</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
80km/h SPEED LIMIT ON TRAM ROAD FROM 500M EAST OF BRADLEYS ROAD TO 300M WEST OF BRADLEYS ROAD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRIM</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 171123127022 | 70  | J Newton & M Peterson | 1       |                     | 1       | Yes, we totally agree with reducing the Tram Rd speed limit near Bradleys/McHughs Rds but the existing proposal does not go far enough. Our comments are: 1. Reduce speed to 70 kmh (not 80 as proposed) 2. Extend the speed limit area for 1 km both east and west along Tram Rd from the Bradleys/McHughs Rds intersection 3. Have a median strip in the middle of the road from the beginning of the Mandeville village business park all the way to the intersection 4. Do not allow right-hand turns into the Mandeville Village from Tram Rd for vehicles heading east (i.e. point 3 - the median strip) 5. Do not allow vehicles to exit from the Mandeville Village onto Tram Rd either turning right to the east or left to the west. All vehicle exits to go onto Mandeville Rd. 6. Construct an overpass over Tram Rd near the Mandeville Village for pedestrians and bicycles (otherwise there will be fatalities as especially children and elderly pedestrians try to get across from the neighbouring northern subdivisions. 7. Consider putting a roundabout at the Tram/Bradleys/McHughs Rds intersection (similar to the one at Pegasus) 8.whatever steps are put in place ensure that there is plenty of policing to make sure the speed limits are obeyed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRIM</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>171123127115</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>G ARMITAGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I have ticked neither. There needs to be more than a 20km/h speed reduction at the intersection. Tram Road is no longer a rural road. I turn right from McHughs into Tram Road every morning at 6:50am. Extremely dangerous also in winter + spring early sun blinding. A roundabout would slow everyone down to a reasonable safe speed. A resident for 20 years new in swannanoa also more light on Tram Road not just at intersections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171123127117</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>K GAMBLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>It will not work, people do not slow down for 800m. If the access to the business park is on Manderville road then this is safe, and I believe this intersection is safe as it is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171123127118</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>S WALKER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Difficult to turn onto tram with 100km limit. West bound exit lane is too short for 100km speed other over take, impatient and dangerous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171123127123</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>S ALTANDISHLIEV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good idea!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171123127126</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>N &amp; L THOMPSON</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lets see the final plans first, the very final plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171123127127</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>V GOUGH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>We would agree with the proposed 80km/h but suggest that a 70km/h speed limit would be more appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171123127130</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>D &amp; J JONES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SEE TRIM FOR FULL EXPLANATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171123127132</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>A &amp; R SHOUD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comments only relating to entrance to Mandeville Business Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171123127146</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>A &amp; G WEBBER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This keeps changing all the time. I cannot make an informed decision about speed until the final plan is shown to us all. Then we can agree or disagree with this survey for speed change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171123127149</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>J &amp; R GARDNER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comments on the access to Tram Road being so close to the Bradleys Road intersection. See full response in TRIM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171123127151</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>S PILE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO - too dangerous, any vehicles turning off/on Tram Rd from/to Mandeville Development. Reducing would not help the safety of commuters especially with 70 kids being dropped off at peak times in morning/night</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171123127153</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>S MAYNARD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70 or 60kms would be even better, same school zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171123127154</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>J COX &amp; P BOESE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50 km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171123127158</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>D K Warren</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This email is in response to your request for feedback on lowering the speed limit around the Bradleys Road – McHughs Road intersection.

I do not agree to a reduction in speed.

I cannot see or understand some things based on the information provided and from discussions with others in the area. Maybe you can answer some questions.

1. It seems so unlikely that the project gets the green light and then it turns out changes are needed: in this case to traffic speeds. How can that be? Nothing has changed since inception.

2. Would the project have got the green light in the first place if the traffic situation was as now proposed? I note there was a level of opposition to the project. My real concern is that the project has been given the go ahead using an underhand means, to avoid more public disclosure as part of the consenting process.

3. If the consensus is the speed should not be increased, does that mean the project has to be abandoned or just go back to the original plan with access on Mandeville Road.

4. Is this consultation really likely to lead to change? The Waimakariri Council seems to ask for feedback but I have no sense they are really looking for feedback, just sounding people out over what they have already decided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRIM</th>
<th># NAME</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>171124127692</td>
<td>86 J SKIPPER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>This email is in response to your request for feedback on lowering the speed limit around the Bradleys Road – McHughs Road intersection. I do not agree to a reduction in speed. I cannot see or understand some things based on the information provided and from discussions with others in the area. Maybe you can answer some questions. 1. It seems so unlikely that the project gets the green light and then it turns out changes are needed: in this case to traffic speeds. How can that be? Nothing has changed since inception. 2. Would the project have got the green light in the first place if the traffic situation was as now proposed? I note there was a level of opposition to the project. My real concern is that the project has been given the go ahead using an underhand means, to avoid more public disclosure as part of the consenting process. 3. If the consensus is the speed should not be increased, does that mean the project has to be abandoned or just go back to the original plan with access on Mandeville Road. 4. Is this consultation really likely to lead to change? The Waimakariri Council seems to ask for feedback but I have no sense they are really looking for feedback, just sounding people out over what they have already decided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Proposed Lower Speed Limit / Extended Speed Limit Zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRIM</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 171124127709 | 87  | Hamilton   |         |                     | 1       | 1/ Councilors and Council Staff have maintained in the past that Tram Road is an important arterial feeder road for commuters and that where possible the speed of 100 kph needs to be retained.  
2/ The current intersection is probably as safe as it could be with its new layout. You seldom have to give way to more than 1 or 2 cars when crossing. We use it many times a week from various points traveling to MSC and home (Whites Road).  
3/ The commuter traffic from the west won’t want to be slowing down through here when traveling in and out of town. These restrictions cause bunching of vehicles and causes issues at intersections further along the road. And heading home I’m sure it will be equally frustrating.  
4/ NZTA has just spent tens of millions of dollars on enhancing the motorway to speed up commuter traffic to town and Waimakariri D C seems to be hell bent on slowing everything down before they get to the motorway, Tram Road is a major feeder to these improvements!!  
5/ The want or need to reduce the speed seems to all revolve the new Commercial Village. The commissioner said the developer had to comply with a traffic engineers approved design for a left turn slip lane only. Surely this should have all been approved before works commenced. And why now are more entrances / exits being proposed going against the commissioners ruling. Further to this the “village” was designed and “sold” to the community as a local commercial centre catering for the needs of locals. Now it seems to evolved more into a highway truck stop. Surely if it is for locals then the only entrance to the development needs to be from Mandeville road. By allowing Tram road entrances and exits the WDC would be creating serious road safety issues on this section of the road. |
<p>| 171124127752 | 88  | P MILLAR   |         |                     | 1       | In my last submission I said this area was an accident waiting to happen. This is even more the case now, and I believe a fatality is inevitable the way people drive through this intersection. 80km wont be slow enough. A speed camera should also be installed to force compliance |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRIM</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>171124127753</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>ANON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Should be 70km per hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171124127756</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>I RUST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The speed limit should be reduced further. There has been a number of high speed crashes there this year. Also there should be NO RIGHT TURN onto Tram Road or off Tram Road into complex to close to other intersection. Im a commercial driver and see to many near misses there aready. Even over taken on that intersection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171124127760</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>ANON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Council has approved this development and so must make access safe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171124127763</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>L SMITH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>As the main arterial route to Oxford for commuters into Chch this should remain at open road speed of 100lmh. Subsidiary roads are reduced speeds already</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171124127764</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>J COLLINS &amp; R SKERTEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I believe a round-about like at Pegasus would be more effective. This will 'force' speed reduction not simply rely on drivers to obey a sign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171124127765</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>HARDY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>But disagree Mandeville Village to have direct access out onto Tram Road so close to the intersection Bradley/McHughs and Tram Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171124127766</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>C ROBERTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Actually we think the speed limit should be lower than 80km/h, more like 70km/h as many people usually travel 5-10km over the speed limit. We would also love to see a pedestrian overpass or underpass to allow people to safely cross Tram Road - lots of children in the area who would be able to then get across to Mandeville shops and sports ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIM</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>SUPPORT</td>
<td>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</td>
<td>AGAINST</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171124127821</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>A GOUGH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The suggested Tram Rd speed reduction should not be implemented. The cover letter accompanying the council’s survey was leading and failed to disclose vital information about the developer’s evolving Tram Rd access plans (and are contrary to the Commissioner’s conditions on the Resource Consent). Implementing an 80kph speed limit sets a precedent and effectively gives the green light to the developer to create a complicated and ultimately dangerous intersection metres away from an already busy intersection (Bradleys/McHughs/Tram). The case has not been made that our intersection is the most dangerous traffic hazard along Tram Rd (refer Tram road crash statistics). Swannanoa School and intersections in Clarkville (ie Motorway entrance and exit, Island Rd and South Eyre Rd) are more pressing concerns. The Village has been marketed as a local community amenity – and is not designed to be a commuter rest stop. Customers entering and exiting the village should use the Mandeville Rd entrance/exit which already has the lower and safer speed limit. Customers from Millfield (for example) would then use the existing McHughs/Tram intersection – a council controlled intersection. If local traffic conditions change then there is only one intersection that may require re-design (simpler and more cost effective). It should also be noted that we cannot assume that the Village will actually be a financial success. Preliminary analysis suggests that each household would need to spend $200 per week there (excluding petrol) for it to be viable. If this plan is not successful then the complex may need to be re-purposed until such time as the population has grown large enough to support such a concept. I refer your attention to the new Silverstream retail precinct as a case in point – there are more vacancies there than there are tenants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171124127899</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>NZ Automobile Association</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Canterbury West Coast District of the NZAA supports the proposed speed limit reduction on Tram road with preference to an 80km limit rather than a 70km limit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIM</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>SUPPORT</td>
<td>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</td>
<td>AGAINST</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171127128269</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>GJ Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Proposed Lower Speed Limit</strong> / <strong>Extended Speed Limit Zone</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>80km/h SPEED LIMIT ON TRAM ROAD FROM 500M EAST OF BRADLEYS ROAD TO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>300M WEST OF BRADLEYS ROAD</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TRIM # NAME SUPPORT CONDITIONAL AGAINST COMMENTS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80 is too high. Down to 70km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80km would be ok but not any slower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A crossing please over Tram Road. Lots of kids will use the new Village and school buses stop in the area too.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A great offer for the community overall and reducing access to 80 k/m is a must for everyone's safety accessing and exiting the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A lower speed limit is not the answer to the problems at this intersection....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A very busy corner, essentially a meeting of 5 directions, with a commercial site that will rapidly become popular and a large number of residential pockets close by. Reducing the speed limit to 80km/hr is essential to minimise danger. A well-lit pedestrian underpass would also have a huge positive benefit for safety (and enjoyment).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A very good idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>108</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Absolutely it should be reduced. I also think it should extend as far as No.10 road or even past the school. There are a lot of houses/small businesses &amp; side roads along that stretch. 80km/h won't affect travels time by buggar all across the 2-3km distance!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>109</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Absolutely would be safer if enforced.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Trim for full response. Response Summary: I Support the Council's moves to maintain safety on Tram Road and other roads in the District. Speed Limits at the Mandeville junction on Tram Road should be variable using a similar system to Buchanans/SH73. If the proposal for a 24/7 speed limit goes ahead I believe the speed limit would be largely disrespected when there is no traffic on either side road. This situation would also, by default, have drivers make an assessment as to whether the speed limit was appropriate at that time and whether they should obey it; not a good practice and can lead to other speed limits being disregarded too. As a person who travels on Tram Road reasonable frequently, but not at peak times since 2011, I rarely see any vehicles waiting on Mchughs or Bradleys Road.
80km/h SPEED LIMIT ON TRAM ROAD FROM 500M EAST OF BRADLEY'S ROAD TO 300M WEST OF BRADLEY'S ROAD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRIM</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Actually maybe it should be 70km?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All traffic should turn off at McHughs and then enter the shops via their own entrance. This is the only acceptable safe access to these new shops. Trying to have 3 exits within 800m is madness and makes this intersection considerably more dangerous. Road toll already higher this year. People don't drive well on our roads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Busy intersection and soon to be busier with the new Mandeville development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>But only during busy times. Not late at night or early mornings when nothing is open or you become concerned about breaking the speed limit for its own sake rather than adapting and driving to the conditions. Maybe use timed speed signs like outside Swannanoa school. The onus is on people pulling in and out of the business complex and side roads to do so safely and limiting speed will assist in that. But don't make drivers traveling at 100km slow down for the sake of it if no one else is around.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>But ONLY this area of Tram Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>By allowing an intersection access from the shopping?? Complex into or out of Tram Road you would be making this stretch of road far more dangerous than it currently is, even by reducing the speed limit. Getting onto Tram Road is dangerous enough from the already busy intersection so this adds to the problem. Please revisit your modelling as this will add to the frustration and risk. So no, the speed limit should not be reduced and no there should not be access from the shops onto Tram road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clarkville School Tram /Heywards rd, should be 80km also.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIM</td>
<td># NAME</td>
<td>SUPPORT</td>
<td>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</td>
<td>AGAINST</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Commissioner approved consent for development on grounds main route stayed at 100km. So why does it have to change, oh thats rights because the developers cant get a access safety plan approved at the moment at current speed. So lets pretend the community wants it slower and just maybe the developer will get his safety plan approved. The council must think we are thick if you think we dont know its related to pleasing the developers. Flag the speed change, flag the entry/exit points on Tram Road and oh while you are there flag the service station too. Im sure the residents dont want tankers entering and exiting via Mandeville Road. How about money is put elsewhere than on stupid surveys to save egg on face.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Community and council are being conned by the commercial developer into giving full access off tram Rd. Council should deny access and leave speed limit as existing 100 kmh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DEFINATELY NOT!!!! Lowering the speed limit WILL cause more problems as there are those dumb road users that will carry on driving at 80km/h after they gone through the reduced zone. This is also pandering to the Business park developers. Leave it with the LH turn in and exit via Mandeville Road, McHughes Road and then carry on Left or Right into Tram Road. Those travelling from the West turn into McHughes,Mandeville Road to the shops and exit the same way.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Definitely, even though it is currently 100km, drives generally drive faster than 100km, so I feel that it needs to be reduced.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Do not lower the Tram road limit. If the Tram speed was reduced, then this will cause an increase in traffic on the section of North Eyre road and therefore traffic at Tram/Whites road intersection.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure plenty of signs saying the speed limit rather than just one each end like Mill Rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Proposed Lower Speed Limit / Extended Speed Limit Zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRIM</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Even lower if required. Traffic going in and out of the new development may struggle to get up to 80km so I believe there needs to be a roundabout or something to manage the morning volume of traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Falsely misrepresented by council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I am aware that changes to incorporate right hand turns have been requested by the developers of the Mandeville Village. This was not part of their consent and which was approved months ago and should not even be a consideration. The speed limit change will encourage further obstructions for normal commuters when they do not speed up to the 100km/hr. With this, one then has a stream of traffic behind them and causes frustration for others who then take chances to pass endangering all of the other commuters. There are already enough problems on Tram Road with people coming out of roads without looking - we don't need more of this which will become the case if another turn out into Tram is allowed. The changes will also impact on those of us coming from McHugh's and Bradleys Roads. So please, no do not change the speed limit or the consent given for the initial roading with Mandeville Village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I am saying no, because this was not part of the resource consent given for the Business Park. If the speed limit is lowered, then there will no doubt be environmental creep on the consent and the access will probably altered. This is getting your own way by stealth - the council needs to do better and act responsibly. 11 years ago a similar consent was turned down because Tram Road was too busy. Tram road is considerably busier now than 11 years ago. This is just asking for more accidents. Why was this not discussed at the time of the application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIM</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>SUPPORT</td>
<td>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</td>
<td>AGAINST</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I am surprised that this is going to public consultation. Who within the council has a vested interest in the new Mandeville Business Park? In addition, I note that this is against the conditions as set down by the Commissioner in granting the resource consent to Apollo Projects. This speed reduction appears to allow a future speed reduction to 70km/h to the allow traffic to exit the said Business Park via both a left turn in/out and a right turn in/out on to Tram Rd. That was not part of the plan that was originally submitted. So, the non-notified RC approval process WAS a sham, this cannot be disputed (at rate payer expense) - not only was there an environmental impact (meaning it had to be a publicly notified consent application) but the actual plan it was based on was a fraud. Oh, and guess what - rate payers will be subsidising the road changes - again quite contrary to the Commissioner's conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>I am totally in agreement with this reduction - it would make the major intersection a saver one with the speed reduction plus helps the Mandeville Business Park saver for turning traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I cannot see how close to this intersection the access road will be from the Mandeville Village to Tram Road. I would think it would be prudent that any access into or out of this Mandeville Village is to be as far away from this very busy intersection as possible. I know for sure we've decided that heading down our road Mandeville RD to Whites Road then across to get to Ohoka school is a better idea, avoiding this intersection completely. I feel it's an accident waiting to happen personally and said to my husband we'd best increase our first aid knowledge because we're sure with that added in and out involved with the Mandeville village there will be an increase in near misses or of course a tragic accident.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIM</td>
<td># NAME</td>
<td>SUPPORT</td>
<td>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</td>
<td>AGAINST</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I do think that the speed limit should be lowered in this area. It's already quite hard to turn onto right from, or onto either side road during peak traffic periods so anything we can do to reduce the risk should be done. But as an additional point, I firmly believe that the option to turn right from/into the new Mandeville shopping centre via Tram road should not be allowed - access should be from Mandeville Road solely. Where there is already a side road off a main road with heavy traffic, there is already a risk to turning traffic. Increase other vehicles turning from another exit/entry point in the immediate vicinity and you also increase the risk of dangerous decision making by motorists that are frustrated at not being able to turn in what they consider a timely manner.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I have experienced several near misses turning on to tram road heading to Oxford from impatient drivers turning into tram road to town. Reduced speed would hopefully slow this impatience down.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I have seen a near miss here myself and completely agree this needs to happen especially now it will only get busier.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I have voted yes, but there is a serious caveat with this answer. I believe that Tram Road needs a speed reduction. I believe that speed signs, flashing or otherwise, will not be sufficient to change driver behaviour - particularly within such a limited distance. In fact limiting the speed by signs only could well exacerbate the situation as it will simply add to the current mix of problems, with drivers overtaking those few who are trying to comply with the 80km speed limit. I firmly believe that there needs to be a method of calming the traffic speed - and there needs to be a roundabout at the McHugh's / Tram / Bradley Road intersection. The cost of this is well worth the safety to drivers and pedestrians. My concern is that this proposal is being countered by arguments about the cost - but what price road safety? As soon as the roundabout has saved one life or avoided one injury accident it has more than paid for itself. I am also concerned that some people are against the speed reduction because 'Tram Road has always been 100km". The amount of housing in the area - residents of which feed onto Tram Road - has materially changed the nature of Tram Road and we have to adapt to that. I am also very concerned that a small, but very vocal, number of residents are using the survey about speed reduction to further their churlish campaign against the Mandeville Village development. They are spreading misleading comments about the speed limit and the development and it has begun to have the intended effect of having people vote 'no' to the reduction in speed. So I vote yes to a reduction in speed - with the comment that we need a roundabout to slow the traffic and the question over whether the 80km limit needs to extend further along Tram Road. (A roundabout would have the added advantage of helping pedestrian access across Tram Road by providing a 'refuge' for them, perhaps with safety rails etc).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRIM</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I say this because you haven't given reasons why you feel it needs to change. E.G number of deaths, number of major injuries, number of minor injuries, even the number of accidents. it sounds to me like you are trying to fix something that isn't broken. and also do you really feel that changing the speed limit from 100km to 80km is going to stop accidents?? I feel if you think the flow of traffic is becoming excessive at times at that intersection then I feel 'merging lanes' would be a far better and safer traffic management idea. There is plenty of Road side verge on both side to do this. I think you will find it is not the speed of the Tram Rd drivers that maybe at fault here. It is the very slow speed and lack of perception from the Bradleys Road/McHughs Road turning into Tram Rd. And slowing Tram Rd down will not help fix this If anything it will make it worse because the bad drivers turning will feel like they have more time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>I strongly recommend that you consider reducing the speed limit on Tram Road from the motorway turn off to Swannanoa School to 80km permanently. PLEASE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I support access to the shops from Tram Rd and the reduced speed limit. I am however hopeful that the roading experts will apply their expertise using industry guidelines and standards rather than succumbing to pressure from the individuals who have been very fast and loose with facts in an attempt to sabotage the development from day one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I support this change to reduce speed and increase safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIM</td>
<td># NAME</td>
<td>SUPPORT</td>
<td>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</td>
<td>AGAINST</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>I think it is absolutely stupid to put a small shopping mall on a main artery like Tram Road. What next? Put one on a motorway section of SH1? Putting fast vehicles and a distraction like this is going to cost lives. It should have been at the village heart. Now it will become another bland, characterless mall with little life outside of office hours or a death trap if you add a pub there, as people stumble out in front of cars that won't slow down. Whoever planned this has little clue and clearly wants to make a new town there. Yay. Rural Waimakariri continues to be eroded away. So more importantly, and I don't recall seeing a questionnaire about putting a mall there, which is the more important question, the mall should be removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>I think it should be reduced even further to 50km/hr. As so many people speed through that area as it is. With the village there is going to be increased foot traffic &amp; cars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I think it should go all the way to the school, and I'd love to see a footpath put in the whole way up the left hand side from Mandeville to the school. That would be amazing!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I think the exit from the business park should be out to Mandeville Road only and not on to Tram Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I would prefer that they use the electronic system that imposes a speed restriction when cars approach the intersection so that motorists on Tram road don't have to slow down if there is no traffic. Also would raise drivers awareness preventing further accidents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If anything upgrade the turning bays with islands etc. Keep it at 100km for through traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If this is anything to do with these new shops, no no no. These developers are being bent over backwards to accommodate, they are getting everything handed to them on a plate... No is reducing speed limit and no access to shops off Tram Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIM</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>SUPPORT</td>
<td>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</td>
<td>AGAINST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIM</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>SUPPORT</td>
<td>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</td>
<td>AGAINST</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Its a nonsense to try and artificially impose a change of speed on tram road for a 800m section, in practice the speed change will be minimised by the majority of motorists most of the time. Speed limits work because it is a social contract that makes sense to the driver in the particular context. If it’s busy most drivers will slow to an appropriate speed. The issue is that when it is not busy, drivers have no contextual change and reason to slow down, so you are providing the exiting traffic with a completely false sense of security as they are still expecting traffic to slow down absent of the usual contextual cues. Its plainly stupid to exit the shopping area onto the main road and shameful that the council are not owning the erroneous thinking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>just fix the road. make a turning lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>leave it at 100 but the entrance to the new business should NOT be Tram Rd. It should be off Mandeville Rd. there will be crashes, hold-ups and chaos and to stop that happening and having any come-back on WDC, entrance off Mandeville Rd is the only safe option available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Looks like Ken Stevenson is at it again. Difficult to even believe whatever people say he will do. He is a menace to the general public and the best friend to every ticket writing cop in the District. Loburn was NEVER asked about their catastrophic 80Kms and dumb double yellow lines. It is time to ask Stevenson for his road surveys. I bet he has none, just an agenda to get all limits down to 80kms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Makes perfect sense.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Makes total sense with the amount of development happening along this short stretch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Maybe extend it a little further like 200 metres more each way!!!!!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO ......It will be a commuter nightmare (over what it already is). The speed should stay the 100km that it currently is. The new development should be accessed from mandeville road to reduce risk on tram.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIM</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>SUPPORT</td>
<td>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</td>
<td>AGAINST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Proposed Lower Speed Limit / Extended Speed Limit Zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRIM</th>
<th># NAME</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>people will not slow down to that speed for such a small distance so no point in reducing limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Perhaps 70kmh may force drivers to actually slow as in my experience most look at 80 and read a 100.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Please also consider looking at reducing the speed limits on Tram Road in two further areas...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1) 500 metres west of South Eyre Road/Tram Road all the way east to Main North Road - seen a number of accidents at South Eyre Rd Cnr and Island Road Cnr in the last 6 months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2) From Two Chain Road to No 10 Road in particular in front of Swannanoa School and Preschool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Please be aware of your own processes and requirements ie - Clause 82 of the Local Government Act Significance and Engagement Policy. The online surveying site 'surveymonkey' is insecure - users can lodge multiple submissions using different browsers and their smart phones. The developer knows it too so this survey is worthless. Please postpone a decision on this until the above are addressed and the developer has put in appropriate plans and has resource consent and pays for the changes required up front. Thanks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Please please please, it would be wonderful if you could please reduce the speed limit on this particular section of Tram Road. As well as the new developments my primary and secondary aged children have to cross the road for the school bus. Thank you, Rachel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reducing the speed limit at this intersection will not work and would be very difficult to police. Access to the new shop development should be off Mandeville road and just retain the existing intersection as it is. This intersection is dangerous enough without making even worse with additional exits. My other major concern are pedestrians trying to cross Tram road to get to the shops, especially the school kids.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Refer to the conditions of the resource consent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TRIM: 171116124768
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRIM</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td></td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Safety is of course a concern for drivers however to develop over a main arterial is not sensible in my opinion. Would it be possible to somehow put a merging side access/exit lane in place to prevent these accidents? Most drivers will drive to the conditions in rural communities and enforcing speed reductions will not stop inexperienced/tired drivers pulling out into oncoming traffic with the expectation it will stop or slow regardless of tram road travelling at 80 or 100 km/hr. I do not support the enforced speed reduction. Increased volumes of traffic require increased patience and defensive driving not necessarily speed reduction on a main arterial. If this were not a main arterial my views would perhaps be different. Town planning must have given this consideration when continually increasing lifestyle block subdivisions, but perhaps some Rural planning may be in order here. Perhaps developer contributions could be used for an overpass for subdivision traffic in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Speed limit definitely needs to be reduced. My view is that the limit should be 70 kmph, for safety reasons, considering the volume of traffic, and the very potential for a major catastrophe re vehicle collision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The council has already received various expert reports as part of the consenting process for a number of private plan changes (ie Mandeville Park, Braburn estate) all stated that the increase in traffic would be minor and Tram road intersection was capable of safely handling the increase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Council have been bamboozled. This is a ludicrous proposal designed to allow the commercial developer to gain full left/right access. The result will be death and injury in our community. It doesn’t need so called road experts; it needs common sense decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td></td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The intersection design with turning bays and median are adequate as is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The project received resource consent on the basis this would not be required. All traffic should be required to enter and exit the Business park from Mandeville Road only!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIM</td>
<td># NAME</td>
<td>SUPPORT</td>
<td>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</td>
<td>AGAINST</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The speed limit of 80km/h should be extended back to the motorway and down to Swannanoa School.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>there should be no exit immediately onto tram road it needs to be from the side road. no brainer if you ask me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There should be no reduction in the speed limit and no access to/from the shopping center on to Tram road.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There should be no right turn from the new development onto tram road. This would certainly cause accidents with potential loss of life on an already dangerous intersection.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There would be no need to reduce the speed limit as you will find that traffic will slow regardless as people turn in there. Totally unnecessary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This area has grown so quickly, regardless of the Business Park I feel the speed limit needs to be reduced.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This busy intersection should have a lower speed limit anyway and even more so with this great new development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This consultation has not been widely enough advertised for affected parties to take part. People that commute through the area have not been consulted. You have not addressed your own process and policies ie Clause 82 of the Local Government Act and your very own Significance and Engagement Policy Survey monkey is easy to abuse and put in multi applications/surveys. I am not satisfied that everything has been done in the ratepayers and voters interest re the above.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>This intersection is a danger intersection without the commercial shops going in any way I believe it should be even lower 60 or 50 esp with a day care facility close by</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Proposed Lower Speed Limit / Extended Speed Limit Zone**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRIM</th>
<th># NAME</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This is a bit more than a yes or no answer. Yes the speed should be slower - how to do this effectively is another question. The only way to do this along Tram Road is by physically doing so. It needs to be done right, not just for the now, but for the future; road calming by way of a ROUND-ABOUT. Consideration of design should also be given to pedestrians / cyclists which the new development will undoubtedly attract. Lower speed signs and flashing lights etc are only as good as those willing to comply with them. Given driver behaviour these will have little or no effect on the speed. In fact those complying will find themselves overtaking those who do slow down making it more hazardous. This is evidenced each morning on the Northern Motorway as those travelling at the ‘flashing’ 70km limit are overtaken by all but a few. Therefore a physical impediment to slow traffic down is required and logical – i.e. the Pegasus Round-about (slows traffic down and will cater for future traffic increases). This would also have the effect of allowing traffic to enter and leave Tram Road safely at this intersection, and if properly designed allow for the new village. As stated in the blurb ‘A number of crashes and near misses have been recorded at this intersection’. It is only a matter of time before there is a fatal accident. This intersection has got busier, exponentially so and set to become more so, particularly in light of the new Mandeville Village Shops coming on line, sports grounds and increased housing. Cost an issue?? From the Ministry of Transport Report March 2017, ‘In per-crash terms, the updated average social cost is estimated at $4,729,000 per fatal crash’. The cost of a well-designed round-about will 1) slow the traffic down as required 2) increase safety and prevent further accidents at this very busy intersection. 3) Allow for easier entry and exit from the new village, sports domain and housing 4) Cunning design would also to allow for pedestrians / cyclists to get across the road to...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

189 Online Submission 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRIM</th>
<th># NAME</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This is a complicated junction and lowering the speed limit would help, however NO NEW access onto Tram Road should be allowed from the properties in the area highlighted including the Mandeville Business Park and these would be too close to the existing junction and would raise the potential for further accidents. Access to the Business Park should be just from Mandeville Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This is a dangerous intersection especially with the acute angle of Mchugh's road. The Mandeville development will increase traffic in this area and people on Tram Road need to slow down. Mchugh's road should be 80kph as a number of kids bike around the area and cars are going too fast.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This is a development that should never have happened in the first instance and now I understand the council will be picking up the tab for some of the road works that will be required to support this so called development. The only people to profit from this will be the developer at a cost to the council and rate payers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This is a joke, this development has breached a number of existing rules and has bent the council around to allow them to breach the rule, and then chase consent later. The development has contributed to the lack of safety at the intersection by allowing vehicles to merge and turn into the path of other vehicles travelling on Tram Rd. There is absolutely no need to exit onto Tram Rd, they have a perfect access onto Mandeville Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This is a main arterial road from oxford and needs to be fast flowing for the development of oxford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This is a MAJOR commuting route - I'm not in favour of access to the business park off Tram Rd and I am not in favour of a reduced limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIM</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>SUPPORT</td>
<td>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</td>
<td>AGAINST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>196</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>197</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>198</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Proposed Lower Speed Limit / Extended Speed Limit Zone**

80km/h SPEED LIMIT ON TRAM ROAD FROM 500M EAST OF BRADLEYS ROAD TO 300M WEST OF BRADLEYS ROAD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRIM</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>199</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>This lowering of speed is solely for the purpose of a few individuals and one particular company to push though against locals wishes the allowance of entry into and out of the Mandeville shop and unmanned fuel station, from Tram Road. THIS is against the commissioners recommendation that this is solely from Mandeville Road and was not suppose to be from Tram Road, DUE to the speed and main route would be affected. It is nothing to do with reducing crashes at all, in fact the whole Mandeville shop and layout is badly thought out, and should never have been given un-notified consent. Majority of locals in this area and surrounds DO NOT want it and never have, but it was approved and now the business involved facing issues with entry and exit points, this is a round about way of letting this business and few individuals have their way, without local approval. Stupid to lower the speed in this area, how about improving the intersection layout first, including the Mandeville road entry to McHughs Road, this is the area cars do not stop at, and cut corner and zip though onto McHughs and fail to stop in time on Tram stop. The speed is already lower for school area and rightly so. We do not need to slow traffic anymore in this road, it needs to flow at this speed so traffic does not back up to the next intersection around Ohoka, in peak times. If the Mandeville Shop developers is failing to get the fuel company to come to the party as the entry and exit currently is off Mandeville Road, and not Tram, is is their issue and not to be satisfied by under handed dealings like this to get speed lowered. It always was a stupid place to out this development anyways and should never have been consented by council in first place. A much safer place for fuel station would be further up Tram, away from residential to service long hauler traffic from CHCH to Oxford. If people really want to fuel up they can go around and entry and exit off Mandeville Road as per the consent plans.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TRIM: 171116124768
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRIM</th>
<th># NAME</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This measure is the very least that should be considered and is clearly insufficient given other proposed changes on that intersection. As a user of the intersection both privately and as a bus driver(school bus) I have used the intersection four plus times each day at all times of the day. I would not care to comment on how many times there have been near misses in front of my nose while stopped at the stop sign on Bradleys Road. Any one of these could have resulted in the inclusion of vehicles stopped and waiting on side roads. Even at 80kmh two vehicles involved in a head on crash would still have a combined speed of 160kmh and this is without introducing additional complications such as traffic entering and exiting the village currently under construction. I also note that this survey is grossly inadequate in scope as the choices given are limited, hence a more detailed submission is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This will assist everyone maneuvering through this area and most of all foster safety!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This will make life safer for all residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This would effect the traffic the whole way down Tram road making it even more congested at the Tram Road, South Erye Road intersection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Times are changing, the new Government is keen to adopt Vision Zero policies, so many parts of Tram Road should by rights be 80km/h or less. The Mandeville area should be no more than 60km/h. As it is children cross there to catch school buses, so please check out Vision Zero and let the Waimakariri be one of the first to abide by it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Totally agree as this section of road needs a slower speed at the intersections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tram Road is a 100km road. Putting the village shop in that location was always going to be a problem but the council elected not to hear residents concerns and the commissioner said traffic and speed would not be an issue. In all the years I have lived here there has only been one accident of note and that was caused by someone failing to stop at the stop sign.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TRIM: 171116124768
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRIM</th>
<th># NAME</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tram road is a major arterial route for commuters into Christchurch. NZTA has just spend hundreds of millions of dollars to improve the northern corridor into the city and now this council is reducing the speeds on important routes into the city. This appears to be totally counter productive to the roading improvements. A few years back at meetings with the council when discussing the tram road and bradleys/ mchughs intersection, the council were adamant about the importance of tram road as a feeder road and that they would not be reducing the speed. Just look at the battles Swannanoa and Clarkville schools have had trying to get any speed reduction. So it seems ironic that now speed reductions are being proposed to appease a commercial development. So do you then reduce the speed around every intersection on Tram rd because they all have a crash history ? This all seems to be around the new development wanting access to Tram rd. This development was for locals so surely access from Mandeville rd is all that is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tram road needs to flow, why create confusion for traffic by adding an entrance prior to McHughs intersection. At this stage when cars are slowing for the intersection you know exactly where they will be existing, add in an entrance off tram into the village and you immediately create doubt add in sun strike and watch the casualties grow, nobody wants that. Mandeville road at 50km/hr is the only safe option. You need to focus on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unless other engineering measures are taken no one will observe a lower speed over this short length of Tram Road. Engineering and enforcement options could be: - retrospectively negotiate closure of the left in/left out from the Mandeville Village, with all access off Mandeville Rd, therefore removing that safety risk. - install a large diameter roundabout on Tram Rd. - enforce STOP control on side road as this is commonly ignored by those entering from side roads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIM</td>
<td># NAME</td>
<td>SUPPORT</td>
<td>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</td>
<td>AGAINST</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unsafe to do so as this will allow developer to push council for right turns into and out of the shops. Community is being misled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very few cars will slow to 80km/h for just 500m of road.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 212  | Online Submission | 1       |                     |         | We do not have the final plans for the new development. Why not? How can we make this decision without it? The development has been allowed to start without a proper decision on the use of Tram Road. There is already access to the development from Mandeville Road allowing extra entrances from Tram Road to the development will affect the flow of Tram Road a main commuter route to Christchurch. During the Plan Change 33 (PC 33) process the Council proposed a single left hand turn INTO the development (no left out). 2. At the Commissioner hearing for PC33 so-called expert evidence was heard from the developers traffic engineer who persuaded the Commissioner to agree to the principle of a left in AND left out on the basis that this could be safely achieved at the existing 100km/hr posted speed limit. 3. At the Resource consent hearing December last year, a so-called traffic expert from the developer convinced the Commissioner that two left in’s and one left out from Tram could be safely achieved at the existing posted speed limit. The additional left in came as a result of the developer requiring a service entry lane behind building 1 for truck deliveries. Commissioner Collins agreed to this despite he being the same Commissioner who some years earlier, when the larger plot at 474 Mandeville Rd (of which the commercial land forms part of) was subdivided, imposed a consent condition requiring that no access from Tram Rd be allowed to this land. On the grounds of safety! (this consent notice was imposed on the title for the land). 4. Scenario 3. above is what is known in the public domain as there is public access freely available to the relevant documents. 5. What has changed since the ‘experts’ advice given at points 2 and 3. The answer is nothing, except that the developers experts appear not now to be able to design a satisfactory access/egress at the posted 100km/h speed limit (as they had led us all to believe earlier) nor would it appear con
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRIM</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td></td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We hear the entry/exits on Tram Rd will be Left &amp; Right turns now ... Considering the extra amount of traffic coming and going from the development with some crossing the Tram Rd flow, with the inevitable increase in risk, will there be painted 'flush median' areas to provide limited 'safe havens' for turning vehicles on Tram Rd.? Turning vehicles will also have to judge their manoeuvres based on observation of approaching traffic, and it appears from the diagram the 80km zone starts only about 150 - 200 metres from the first entry point. With the lowest common denominator in mind, I do not believe this is enough to ensure stable 80km/hr for some on-coming traffic heading west. For westbound traffic, will there be a sealed entry lane off the main Tram Rd. lane, or will following traffic be forced to slow right down behind vehicles turning left into the new complex?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td></td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>When the planning for the new development was done, it was clearly agreed that the speed limit would not need to change and that left turns onto and off Tram road would be the only access. If the access model is planned to change, then this should be highlighted for review, and not just the consequence of an unconsulted change in plan (e.g a speed reduction). I note that other high volume intersections onto/off Tram Rd (Island Road, Clarkeville, South Eyre Rd) are all 100km, so I can only conclude that the Bradleys Rd intersection is not the real reason for this proposed change. Thanks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIM</td>
<td># NAME</td>
<td>SUPPORT</td>
<td>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</td>
<td>AGAINST</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80km/h SPEED LIMIT ON TRAM ROAD FROM 500M EAST OF BRADLEYS ROAD TO 300M WEST OF BRADLEYS ROAD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>215 Online Submission                                                                                                      Why? It aint broken why fix it. Perhaps look at the South eyre road intersection. Why slow down a main arterial route? Who sticks to the speed limit anyway? We think its a bit dodgy that it just happens to be the bit of road that the development needs access to on tram road? 100 down to 80 then push for 70 then remove the island, create ins and outs from tram road, left and right hand turns, and you got yourself more carnage than what's happening now. Awesome, who will be responsible for those deaths then? Crazy decision, council wake up, you are being fleeced or perhaps taking the back hand approach to avoid embarrassment in the eyes of the community for agreeing to change land to encompass such a development. Sincerely hope it all goes belly up. Save the council further embarrassment time and money. Concentrate on better matters.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>216 Online Submission                                                                 Yes, may as well as this will at least slow traffic down around this area. There should be a slip road into the new shopping complex but exit should have to be via Mandeville Rd only. Then traffic will have to safely exit onto tram Rd via the usual intersection which will be much safer and lead to minimal traffic hold up.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>217 Online Submission                                                                 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>You council people need to stop pretending that the survey is in the interests of community safety and admit its because the Hames can't get their road people to supply a road plan that the is considered safe in and out of their development and then chuck in a right hand turn too, and the council will pay for modification of the road! Thank goodness there are intelligent people in our community who can dig up the facts present to the peoples and give them informed information rather than this glorified crap that gets printed on nice paper by the council. The whole process has been a total bulls up, this is another example of trying to fix something that isn't working. Pathetic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIM</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>SUPPORT</td>
<td>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</td>
<td>AGAINST</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171127128310</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>M JACOBS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This should have been thought about before the construction of the shopping centre commenced. It should continue to be 100km as per the rest of Tram Road. The Engineers should have got this right to start with before permits were submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171127128311</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>R ILOTT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Even 70km/h would be better as they have reduced it to this in other parts of the country i.e. Buchannans Road and West Coast Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171127128312</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>CLARKE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171127128313</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>D O'BORN &amp; N ROWE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171127128314</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>M LAWS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Should go to 70 km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171127128317</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>P OSBORNE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171127128319</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>W DUFF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speed Limits are nothing but codders to grow the Police …Unreadable…. - after all if they worked then why is the road toll growing? Place meaningful warning sighs where they should be as an alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171127128320</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>M ALLAN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>My belief is that it should be unreadable to 70kph. May be progressively 100-80-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171127128464</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>K DEER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See Trim for full response - summary: In summary, I DO NOT agree that the speed limit be reduced from 100km/h to 80km/h as this will apparently remove any barriers to the commercial development going ahead which is the real reason for the proposed change; the fact that the Council has allowed this development to proceed to the point it has without addressing and resolving these issues is both naive and potentially fatal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171128128835</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>J WATSON</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I believe it should be 80kms per hour down all Tram Road until past Swannanoa. As there are many driveways with people exiting and entering Tram Road, with 2 schools to pass in this area also making a speed reduction a safety factor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Proposed Lower Speed Limit / Extended Speed Limit Zone

### 80km/h SPEED LIMIT ON TRAM ROAD FROM 500M EAST OF BRADLEYS ROAD TO 300M WEST OF BRADLEYS ROAD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRIM</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>171128128959</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>NZTA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>See Trim for full response</strong> - Summary: Using the Safer Journeys Risk Assessment Tool 80km/h is safe and appropriate. Tram Road in the vicinity of Bradleys Road/McHughs Road intersection is in the top 5% high benefit opportunities for the network, confirming a speed management change should be progressed with some urgency. The new Setting of Speed Limits Rule 2017 and Speed Management Guide are quite clear that 70km/h and 90km/h speed limits are now considered only as interim arrangements until a 60/80/100 rural speed limit regime can be implemented, and Section 4.5(2)(a) of the 2017 Rule now reinforces this approach. You suggestion of a 70km/h speed limit is not on an interim basis, and no plans to work towards a speed limit that does not require Agency approval have been provided. Therefore on the information available, having regard to Section 4.5(2) of the Rule, I can advise that the Agency would not approve a 70km/h speed limit under Section 4.5(4) of the Rule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171129129463</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>I EPPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>See Trim for full response</strong> - Summary: 1. An 80km over the larger area say 500meters, then a internal 70km closer to the intersections operating at peak times. 2. It was totally agreed by all present that 80km was too fast for the new traffic arrangement. 3. The speed limits like 70km like near Rolleston. 4. Similar to the Pine Acres corner. 5. The speed limit indicator like they move around the district indicating your actual speed on peak time basis only. 6. Incorporate a fenced off lane barrier similar to BP on Johns Road opposite Reward Fresh which prevents all right turns onto Tram Road, this was met with major support at the meeting. 7. The plastic pop up barrier posts similar to Pine Acres and the Tram Road entry onto the motorway prevent right turning. 8. The Community felt access on to Mandeville Road McHughs Road Tram Road as it gave clear safe access to all uses. 9. Chevron marking between lanes considerably improves site access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171102118666</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Mandeville Residents Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>See Trim for full response</strong> - Summary: 1. An 80km over the larger area say 500meters, then a internal 70km closer to the intersections operating at peak times. 2. It was totally agreed by all present that 80km was too fast for the new traffic arrangement. 3. The speed limits like 70km like near Rolleston. 4. Similar to the Pine Acres corner. 5. The speed limit indicator like they move around the district indicating your actual speed on peak time basis only. 6. Incorporate a fenced off lane barrier similar to BP on Johns Road opposite Reward Fresh which prevents all right turns onto Tram Road, this was met with major support at the meeting. 7. The plastic pop up barrier posts similar to Pine Acres and the Tram Road entry onto the motorway prevent right turning. 8. The Community felt access on to Mandeville Road McHughs Road Tram Road as it gave clear safe access to all uses. 9. Chevron marking between lanes considerably improves site access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td></td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIM</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>SUPPORT</td>
<td>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</td>
<td>AGAINST</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

80km/h SPEED LIMIT ON TRAM ROAD FROM 500M EAST OF BRADLEYS ROAD TO 300M WEST OF BRADLEYS ROAD

Proposed Lower Speed Limit / Extended Speed Limit Zone

TRIM: 171116124768
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT

FILE NO and TRIM NO: RDG-31-15/ 170913099302

REPORT TO: Oxford-Ohoka Community Board

DATE OF MEETING: 5 October 2017

FROM: Bill Rice, Senior Transport Engineer
Chris Sexton, Intern Engineer

SUBJECT: Tram Road Speed Limit Review

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Board’s support to consult on a proposal to change the speed limit on Tram Road, within the Mandeville Community area.

1.2. A speed limit of 80km/h is proposed on Tram Road, from 500m east of Bradleys Road to 300m west of the Bradleys Road.

1.3. The Mandeville Community has changed significantly, from a predominantly large block rural area, to an area of smaller block rural/residential sections.

1.4. In August, the Council approved the following speed limit changes on roads within the Mandeville area,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>New Limit</th>
<th>Previous Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wards Road</td>
<td>From Bradleys Road to the boundary of Millfield Subdivision</td>
<td>80km/h</td>
<td>100km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawsons Road</td>
<td>From Wards Road for 800m</td>
<td>80km/h</td>
<td>100km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradleys Road</td>
<td>From Tram Road to 400m north of Modena Place</td>
<td>80km/h</td>
<td>100km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Cul-de-sacs and Access Roads within the Mandeville Community</td>
<td>Full length</td>
<td>50km/h</td>
<td>70km/h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.5. It was noted at the time that the speed limit on Tram Road would be considered at a later date once the detailed design for the commercial area was confirmed and a safety audit carried out.
1.6. A draft of the safety audit on the frontage to the commercial development south of the intersection of Tram Road and McHughs Road has raised serious concerns about the speed on Tram Road at the access point, and recommended that a speed limit review be carried out on Tram Road over this section.

1.7. The proposed process and timeline for the speed limit change is as follows;

- Oxford-Ohoka Community Board support to consult and recommend to Council – 5 October 2017 (this report)
- Consultation – 6 October 2017 – 20 October 2017
- Council approval of the speed limit change – 7 November 2017
- Notify NZTA and Police of the change – 10 November 2017
- Implement the change (14 day period required following notification to NZTA and the Police of the change) – 24 November 2017

Attachments:
- Plan showing proposed speed limits (TRIM 170914099898)
- Speed Count Results on Tram Road (TRIM 170413036842)
- Report to Council on Changes to Mandeville Speed Limits (TRIM 170713072773)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 170913099302.

(b) Approves consultation being carried out on the proposal to change speed limit on Tram Road to 80km/h, as outlined in the attached plan (TRIM 170914099898).

(c) Notes that consultation on this proposal will be carried out between 6 October to 20 October 2017

(d) Notes that the Board will be updated at the end of the consultation process.

(e) Notes that any submissions on the proposal will be taken into account before the change is presented to the Council on 7 November 2017 for consideration.

3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. The Mandeville community has changed significantly from a predominantly large block rural area to an area of rural/residential sections. The reason for reviewing the speed limits within Mandeville community include:

- Increased traffic volumes
- Increased population, resulting in increased pedestrians and cyclists
- Expected changes to traffic patterns due to the proposed business development south west of the Tram Road McHughs Road intersection
- A crash history at the Bradleys, McHughs, Tram Roads intersection
- Feedback from some residents indicating that current speed limits are not appropriate

3.2. In March 2017, engagement with the Mandeville community and road users was carried out to gain some initial feedback on a series of possible speed limit options within the Mandeville community. Based on the initial feedback received a formal speed limit proposal was put out for community consultation.

3.1. The speed limit on Tram Road in the vicinity of the McHughs Road and Bradleys Road intersection was included in the initial discussion. Whilst generally there was support for a
lower speed limit the length of the speed limit and the impact of the proposed commercial centre raised a number of questions. It was agreed that at busy times safety is a concern and a lower speed limit would help. However at other times the speed environment is more suited to 100km/h due to the long straight nature of Tram Road and no obvious changes in environment apart from the intersection.

3.2. Some respondents thought a variable intersection speed limit similar to the one at Pineacres would be a good option. However the proximity of the McHugh's Road, Mandeville Road intersection to the Bradleys Road, McHugh's Road, Tram Road intersection are likely to make it difficult to reliably detect vehicles turning from McHugh's Road into Tram Road in time to signal a change in speed limit to vehicles on Tram Road. It is also likely to be difficult to detect vehicles turning from the commercial development onto Tram Road in time to signal a change in speed limit.

3.3. In August, Council therefore agreed to consider the speed limit on Tram Road at a later date when the detailed design for the commercial area has been confirmed and a safety audit carried out. Council also approved the following speed limit changes on roads within the Mandeville area,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>New Limit</th>
<th>Previous Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wards Road</td>
<td>From Bradleys Road to the boundary of Millfield Subdivision</td>
<td>80km/h</td>
<td>100km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawsons Road</td>
<td>From Wards Road for 800m</td>
<td>80km/h</td>
<td>100km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradleys Road</td>
<td>From Tram Road to 400m north of Modena Place</td>
<td>80km/h</td>
<td>100km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Cul-de-sacs and Access Roads within the Mandeville Community</td>
<td>Full length</td>
<td>50km/h</td>
<td>70km/h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1. A draft of the safety audit on the access to the commercial development at the corner of Tram Road and McHugh's Road identified speed at the access as a “Serious” concern. There are four rankings of NZTA Safety Audit concerns, ranging from Minor to Serious. NZTA’s safety audit proforma defines a serious concern as “A major safety concern that must be addressed and requires changes to avoid serious safety consequences.”

3.2. The safety audit makes the following recommendation regarding speed at the access:

“That the designer and / or client raise this concern with the Waimakariri District Council to encourage a review of the posted speed restriction on Tram Road. However, based on the speeds recorded, this may require more than posted speed limit signs.”

3.3. NZTA has recently reviewed the way speed limits are managed nationally and late last year the new NZ Speed Management Guide was published. The NZ Speed Management Guide sets out a framework to set safe and appropriate speed limits for different road.

3.4. Tram Road is an Arterial Road with a 100km/h speed limit. The Average Daily Traffic (ADT) on Tram Road is 5,391 vehicles per day (vpd). Tram Road is a key route linking Kalapoi and Christchurch with the Oxford area. Tram Road is expected to carry increasing traffic volumes following the completion of the commercial development southwest of the Tram Road McHughs Road intersection.

3.5. The Traffic Impact Assessment for the Mandeville commercial development has estimated the Peak hour turning volumes at the Bradleys Road, McHughs Road, Tram Road intersection and the access to the development for 2021. The estimates include projected traffic volumes for all currently consented developments which feed onto Bradleys and McHughs Roads, and are based on a left in, left out only access to the commercial development. The estimated morning and evening peak hour turning volumes are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement Description</th>
<th>Estimated Volume</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Approach : McHughs Road</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Turn into Tram</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight Ahead into Bradleys</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Turn into Tram</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East Approach: Tram Road</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left turn into McHughs</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound on Tram</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right turn into Bradleys</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North Approach: Bradleys Road</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left turn into Tram</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight ahead into McHughs</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right turn into Tram</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West Approach: Tram Road</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left turn into Bradleys</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound on Tram</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right turn into McHughs</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1 Predicted Volumes at Tram / Bradleys / McHughs Intersection Morning peak 2021*
### Table 2 Predicted Volumes at Tram / Bradleys / McHughs Intersection Evening Peak 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement Description</th>
<th>Estimated Volume</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Approach : McHughes Road</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Turn into Tram Road</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight Ahead into Bradleys Road</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Turn into Tram Road</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East Approach: Tram Road</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left turn into McHughes</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound on Tram</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right turn into Bradleys</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North Approach: Bradleys Road</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left turn into Tram</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight ahead into McHughes</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right turn into Tram</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West Approach: Tram Road</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left turn into Bradleys</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound on Tram</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right turn into McHughes</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6. The Previous assessment of Tram Road using the new Speed Management Guide assessed 80-100km/h as the safe and appropriate speed range on Tram Road. The commercial development currently has resource consent subject to a safety audit for a left in left out access onto Tram Road. This will result in a number of vehicles entering and leaving the commercial area while other vehicles are traveling straight past at much higher speeds. The proposed left in – left out access requires a solid concrete centre island to discourage drivers from turning right into or out of the site. These are considered potential hazards for vehicles travelling at 100km/h.

3.7. The NZTA Safer Journeys Risk Assessment Tool is a nationwide, automated desktop tool for assessing risk ratings of roads. These risk ratings can then be used to identify safe and appropriate speeds for roads. Using the tool to assess the section of Tram Road around the Bradleys Road intersection resulted in a Medium Infrastructure risk rating. This indicates that 80km/h is considered a safe and appropriate speed for this section of Tram Road. One of the main factors for this is the Death and Serious Injury (DSi) equivalent score.

3.8. Using the new Speed Management Guide to assess the area with the new commercial development included, the infrastructure risk rating was assessed as medium.

3.9. The road safety metrics that also feed into determining the safe and appropriate speed are the collective and personal risk metrics. Assessment of the personal risk, representing the crash risk exposure to each individual vehicle traveling along a road corridor, resulted in a “Low-Medium” score. Assessment of the collective risk, the measure of crash density at a network level, resulted in a “Medium” risk score.
3.10. Taking into account the assessments from above (including table 2.2 of the Speed Management Guide) the recommended safe and appropriate speed is therefore 80km/h.

3.11. For the reasons above, it is recommended that the speed limit on Tram Road, from 300m west of Bradleys Road to 500m east of Bradleys Road, be changed to 80km/h.

3.12. The existing operating speed on Tram Road was determined using data collected from a special count site, 900m west of Bradleys Road. A mean speed of 97.0km/h and 85th percentile speed of 104.8km/h were recorded.

3.13. The speed management guide recommends that traffic engineering measures are installed so that the measured mean operating speed is within 5km/h of the proposed speed limit.

3.14. The commercial development will introduce a large parking area, significant commercial buildings (including a service station canopy), and prominent signage. The presence of these features will result in a more “urban” feel to this section of Tram Road. This is likely to result in some reduction in operating speed in the area. However, it is considered that these features, on their own, are unlikely to result in reduction in mean speed exceeding 10km/h.

![Figure 1 Tram Road / Bradleys Road intersection with commercial development in background](image)

3.15. The following additional engineering measures are therefore proposed on this section of Tram Road, to reinforce the proposed speed limit:
- Threshold treatments at each end of the 80km/h section. These would consist of large speed signs with “Mandeville” beneath the speed limit (see Figure 2)
Figure 2 Threshold Sign

- Narrow lanes (3.0m wide)
- Wide centreline (similar to State Highway 1 south of Woodend – See Figure 3)

Figure 3 Wide Centreline

- Large map type direction signs showing directions to the commercial development, Mandeville, Ohoka, Oxford, and Kaipoi. A preliminary
Other Considerations

3.16. The safety audit also identified a concern with the left in left out arrangement. It considered that vehicles may endeavour to turn right into or out of the site by doing U turns around the ends of the concrete islands. The commercial development designer is currently considering options to address this. These options may include designing the commercial access to accommodate full right turns. The proposed 80km/h speed limit and engineering measures is considered to be appropriate for that environment.

3.17. The safety audit team will have an opportunity to comment on options to address the serious issues raised in the audit.

3.18. The lowering of the speed limit for the short section through Mandeville will have insignificant impacts on motorists travel time between Oxford and Kāiapoi. The difference in travel time between traveling at 100kph (current sign posted speed limit) and 80 km/h (new proposed speed limit) for the 800m section of road will result in a 7.2 second increase in travel time.

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

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. The Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits 2003 [54001] as amended requires the Council to formally consult with a number of external agencies during the review of a speed limit. The following persons will be consulted in accordance with this requirement and their views will be taken into account:

- The local community that is considered to be affected by the proposed speed limit
- 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
4.2. It is proposed to seek community views through the Council’s website, social media, notice in the local newspapers and letters to all property owners adjoining the roads being changed.

5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

5.1. The developer of the commercial development will meet costs associated with the access to the development, including all signage and road marking required for the access. The developer will also meet the costs associated with installing 2 of the speed limit threshold signs at the eastern end of Tram Road.

5.2. Council will be responsible for the following costs associated with changing the speed limit:

- Centreline removal at $0.65 per m²
- Centreline repainting at $0.35 per m of broken white line
- Centreline repainting at $0.65 per m of solid white line
- 2 speed limit threshold signs at a rate of approx. $3000 per sign

The total length of road marking associated with the development access has not been confirmed yet. Therefore, the length Council is responsible for is also unknown.

The total cost to Council is therefore unknown, but is expected to be small, and can be met from existing budgets.

5.3. There are no significant risks associated with changing this speed limit.

6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. **Policy**

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

6.2. **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 (54001/1) requires that permanent speed limits be set by bylaw.

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

6.3. **Community Outcomes**

(a) There is a safe environment for all:

- Crime, Injury and road accidents are minimised
- Harm to people from natural and manmade hazards is minimised

(b) Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable, affordable and sustainable

- The standard of our District’s roads is keeping pace with increasing traffic numbers

Bill Rice
Senior Transport Engineer
Waimakariri District Council Metrocount Report
Speed Statistics by Hour

Datasets:
Site: [0656DSP] TRAM RD 900m west of Bradleys Road <100> @ 10.812
Attribute: [-43.376328 +172.523612]
Direction: 7 - North bound A>B, South bound B>A, Lane: 1
Survey Duration: 14:17 Friday, 5 August 2016 => 11:49 Tuesday, 16 August 2016,
Zone:
File: 0656DSP 0 2016-08-16 1149.EC1 (Plus B)
Identifier: ES10ASNY MC56-L5 [MC55] (c)Microcom 19Oct04
Algorithm: Factory default axle (v4.08)
Data type: Axle sensors - Paired (Class/Speed/Count)

Profile:
Filter time: 14:18 Friday, 5 August 2016 => 11:49 Tuesday, 16 August 2016 (10.8972)
Included classes: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13
Speed range: 10 - 160 km/h.
Direction: North, East, South, West (bound), P = North, Lane = 0-16
Separation: Headway > 0 sec, Span 0 - 100 metre
Name: Default Profile
Scheme: Vehicle classification (NZTA2011)
Units: Metric (metre, kilometre, m/s, km/h, kg, tonne)
In profile: Vehicles = 39803 / 39879 (99.81%)
**Speed Statistics by Hour**

**Site:** 0656DSP 1.2NS

**Description:** TRAM RD 900m west of Bradleys Road <100> @ 10.812

**Filter time:** 14:18 Friday, 5 August 2016 => 11:49 Tuesday, 16 August 2016

**Scheme:** Vehicle classification (NZTA2011)

**Filter:** Cls(1-13) Dir(NESW) Sp(10,160) Headway(>0) Span(0 - 100) Lane(0-16)

Vehicles = 39803

Posted speed limit = 100 km/h, Exceeding = 15172 (38.12%), Mean Exceeding = 105.32 km/h

Maximum = 159.7 km/h, Minimum = 97.0 km/h

85% Speed = 104.83 km/h, 95% Speed = 110.12 km/h, Median = 97.74 km/h

20 km/h Pace = 88 - 108, Number in Pace = 31315 (78.67%)

Variance = 82.15, Standard Deviation = 9.60 km/h

### Hour Bins (Partial days)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Bin</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>85%</th>
<th>95%</th>
<th>&gt;PSL 100 km/h</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0000</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>142.1</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>95.9</td>
<td>105.8</td>
<td>115.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0100</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>145.0</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>97.9</td>
<td>107.7</td>
<td>117.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0200</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>144.5</td>
<td>95.4</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>106.9</td>
<td>116.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0300</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>125.9</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>108.8</td>
<td>115.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0400</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>140.7</td>
<td>98.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>107.6</td>
<td>112.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0500</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>133.4</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>100.6</td>
<td>109.6</td>
<td>116.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0600</td>
<td>2123</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>146.4</td>
<td>101.0</td>
<td>101.5</td>
<td>108.4</td>
<td>113.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0700</td>
<td>2531</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>130.8</td>
<td>98.1</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>105.2</td>
<td>110.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0800</td>
<td>3169</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>156.5</td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td>104.0</td>
<td>108.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0900</td>
<td>2608</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>131.4</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>98.2</td>
<td>105.4</td>
<td>110.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>145.3</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>105.3</td>
<td>110.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100</td>
<td>2253</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>143.5</td>
<td>96.4</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>104.9</td>
<td>110.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td>2143</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>159.6</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>104.7</td>
<td>110.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300</td>
<td>2230</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>133.1</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td>103.7</td>
<td>109.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400</td>
<td>2932</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>146.3</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td>104.0</td>
<td>109.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>3256</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>130.3</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>103.9</td>
<td>108.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td>3419</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>148.3</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>104.0</td>
<td>109.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>3484</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>145.2</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>104.1</td>
<td>108.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>2421</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>131.8</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>103.8</td>
<td>108.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1280</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>146.4</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>98.2</td>
<td>104.9</td>
<td>110.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>137.1</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>104.9</td>
<td>111.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2100</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>159.7</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td>106.3</td>
<td>113.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2200</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>137.9</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>105.5</td>
<td>111.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>125.9</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>98.7</td>
<td>107.0</td>
<td>113.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39803</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>159.7</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>104.8</td>
<td>110.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hi Chris – this has just come across my desk this morning, so apologies for the delay in response. For your records, all speed limit requests for the Agency now come to me, and we then arrange the Agency response.

The Safer Journeys Risk Assessment Tool provides a map of Safe and Appropriate Speeds, a map showing mean travel speeds derived from TomTom data, and the high benefit opportunities for speed management on the network. For Tram Road in the vicinity of the Bradleys Road/McHughs Road intersection, the maps show the safe and appropriate travel speeds at 80km/h, and that the mean travel speeds are in the order of 80km/h, both indicating that 80km/h proposed is the most appropriate speed limit. The maps also show that the entire length of Tram Road is in the top 5% (east of the intersection) and 10% (west of the intersection) high benefit opportunities for the network, confirming a speed management change should be progressed with some urgency.

I note the maps also show 80km/h as the safe and appropriate travel speeds for both Bradleys Road and McHughs Road in the vicinity of the intersection with Tram Road. Assuming the information we have for this area is correct, the maps show that McHughs, and adjoining Mandeville Road, are posted at 80km/h now, and I’m wondering if retaining Bradleys Road at 100km/h in the vicinity of the intersection will be self-explanatory to road users (noting also that the western half of Bradleys Road is posted at 70km/h).

From your letter dated 13 November, I understand you are formally consulting on an 80km/h speed limit for Tram Road, while seeking Agency comment on 70km/h as an option. Since the Setting of Speed Limits Rule 2017 came into force on 21 September, Section 4.5(3) of the Rule requires Council to notify the Agency if you are proposing to formally consult on 70km/h speed limits, on the basis that 70km/h speed limits now require Agency approval/gazetting, and we don’t want you consulting on speed limits that won’t ultimately be approved. So the current situation is that Council hasn’t notified the Agency that it proposes to consult on a 70km/h speed limit, and is not now formally consulting on 70km/h speed limit.

Notwithstanding, in considering a request for a 70km/h speed limit, the Agency has to have regard to section 4.5(2) of the Rule:
4.5(2) The Agency must, in considering a proposed 70 km/h or 90 km/h speed limit, take into account—
(a) the benefit of increasing the distinction between different speed limits across the network by having fewer different speed limits; and
(b) whether the road controlling authority can demonstrate a plan to work towards a speed limit that does not require Agency approval on the road that is the subject of the proposed speed limit.

The Speed Management Guide is quite clear that 70km/h and 90km/h speed limits are now considered only as interim arrangements until a 60/80/100 rural speed limit regime can be implemented, and Section 4.5(2)(a) of the 2017 Rule now reinforces this approach. You suggestion of a 70km/h speed limit is not on an interim basis, and no plans to work towards a speed limit that does not require Agency approval have been provided. Therefore on the information available, having regard to Section 4.5(2) of the Rule, I can advise that the Agency would not approve a 70km/h speed limit under Section 4.5(4) of the Rule.
Please feel free to contact me if you need to discuss this further.

Cheers, Glenn

Glenn Bunting / Manager Network Safety
Safety and Environment
DDI +64 4 894 5025 / M +64 21 962 829
E glenn.bunting@nzta.govt.nz / w nzta.govt.nz

Chews Lane / Victoria Arcade, 50 Victoria Street,
Private Bag 6995, Wellington 6141, New Zealand
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1. The purpose of this report is to seek Council's approval of the recommendations of the hearing panel, following public consultation on the draft Waste Management & Minimisation Plan 2017.

1.2. On 6th June 2017, Council received report No 170501042046, and approved the proposed draft Waste Management & Minimisation Plan 2017 (TRIM 170516049172) and its companion document the Waste Assessment (TRIM 170516049162) for release for public consultation, and agreed to initiate a Special Consultative Procedure for the Waste Management & Minimisation Plan.

1.3. The central issue within the draft Waste Management & Minimisation Plan 2017, was consideration of a number of options for additional kerbside collection services, which would provide households with a choice of services that would best serve their needs.

1.4. An extensive advertising campaign was carried out to publicise the kerbside collection options that were being considered, and submissions were sought. A significant number of submissions were received, with 35 submitters wishing to be heard.

1.5. At the conclusion of the this consultation process and hearings, the panel resolved to recommend to Council that it insert Option C into the draft Waste Management & Minimisation Plan 2017 as the preferred suite of kerbside collection services to be offered to those households currently receiving the Council’s recycling and refuse bag collection service.

1.6. This option also has the most significant likely impact on improved waste diversion from landfill.
Attachments:

i. Amended Draft Waste Management & Minimisation Plan 2017– recommended amendments have been included. (171123127465).

ii. Council report approving consultation for the Draft Waste Management & Minimisation Plan 2017 (170501042046[v1]).


iv. Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2017 consultation report to Hearings Panel (170807083752[v01]).

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 171123127385.

(b) Approves the following inclusions and amendments in the 2017 Waste Management & Minimisation Plan

1. Insert Option C as the preferred kerbside collection service in Section 5.4 comprising service choices of: rates-funded recycling bin, collected fortnightly; user-pays WDC rubbish bag OR rates-funded rubbish bin, collected fortnightly; AND/OR rates-funded mixed organics bin, collected weekly.

2. Insert the below targets in Section 2.2

a. Reduce annual per capita waste to landfill from 294kg per capita in 2015/16 to 236kg per capita by 2029

b. Increase the annual per capita quantity of materials diverted from 170kg per capita in 2015/16 to 228kg per capita by 2029

(c) Notes that the final draft version of the 2017 Waste Management & Minimisation Plan will be brought to the Council for approval after the 2018-2028 LTP has been approved

(d) Notes that the Long Term Plan solid waste budgets, Solid Waste Activity Management Plan and solid waste section in the Infrastructure Strategy will be prepared using the kerbside collection methodology as approved in 2(b).

(e) Includes a proposal in the Draft LTP to change the rating policy so that motels and other similar businesses only pay for one recycling targeted rate per property. Additional bins, if requested, would be provided and rated at the standard charges

(f) Requests staff to bring further advice to the Council following the LTP consultation regarding the option of the Council or the Contractor owning the bins.

(g) Requests staff to bring the proposed engagement method and material for asking property owners which service option they choose to Council for approval prior to release.
(h) **Requests** that staff provide information on proposed fees and charges for properties to change their future service option following their initial choice.

(i) **Requests** staff, prior to the introduction of the new services, to enquire of each eligible household which services they wish to use. If no choice is made the default position will be that the property continues to receive a fortnightly recycling service and has access to the Council’s user pays fortnightly bag collection service.

(j) **Increases** the level of education to the public on the reduction of waste including diversion to green waste.

3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**


3.2. An extensive publicity campaign was carried out to engage the public on the central issue of additional kerbside collection services. Significant public response was received, (3,148 submissions) and this is summarised in the staff report to the Hearings Panel (170807083752).

3.3. Two hearings meetings were held, on the 28th and 31st August 2017, and three subsequent deliberations meeting were held. The minutes of all five meetings are recorded in document 170828092879.

3.4. The panel concluded that it would recommend to Council that kerbside collection Option C be the preferred kerbside collection service, which provides the greatest choice to householders as to the services they may wish to use.

3.5. This option permits householders to keep using refuse bags, if they wish to, but also offers a full suite of wheelie bin collections for refuse, recycling and organics for those that prefer a higher level of service.

3.6. This option also has the most significant likely impact on improved waste diversion from landfill, which would be reflected in higher waste reduction targets in the draft Waste Management & Minimisation Plan 2017, if Council adopts the recommendations of the hearings panel.

3.7. In anticipation of the Council adopting the recommendations of the hearings panel, draft Long Term Plan solid waste budgets, Solid Waste Activity Management Plan and the solid waste section in the Infrastructure Strategy are all currently being prepared on the basis of the Option C kerbside collections.

4. **PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE PANEL RECOMMENDATIONS**

4.1. To accommodate any changes that might arise from the final LTP outcome, recommendation (c) from the panel has been changed from:

   *Notes that the final draft version of the 2017 Waste Management & Minimisation Plan will be brought to the Council for approval in December 2017, to*

   to

   *Notes that the final draft version of the 2017 Waste Management & Minimisation Plan will be brought to the Council for approval after the 2018-2028 LTP has been approved*

4.2. To better align with LTP process recommendation (e) from the panel has also been amended from:
Changes the rating policy so that motels and other similar businesses only pay for one recycling targeted rate per property. Additional bins would be provided and rated, on request, to

Includes a proposal in the Draft LTP to change the rating policy so that motels and other similar businesses only pay for one recycling targeted rate per property. Additional bins, if requested, would be provided and rated at the standard charges

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

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. The views of the community have been sought through public consultation in accordance with Section 83 of the Local Government Act 2002, using the Special Consultative Procedure. The public were notified of this proposal through articles and public notices in the Northern Outlook, North Canterbury News, the Kaiapoi Advocate, the Oxford Bulletin, Oxford Observer and via information on the Council’s website including an online calculator tool. A display was set up in the Rangiora Service Centre, information appeared on the Districts digital screens and on Facebook and Twitter. Drop in sessions were run in Pegasus, Mandeville, Rangiora and Kaiapoi. Information was also mailed out to all households within the current kerbside collection area and a Questions and Answers Booklet was available at all Service Centres and Libraries.

5.2. Information was provided in person to two separate meetings of Greypower, Greypower subsequently sent a list of questions to Council which were answered in writing.

5.3. A breakdown of the submissions and the preferences expressed for the three different options is as follows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Number of Submissions</th>
<th>Percentage of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option A</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option B</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option C</td>
<td>1,606</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Option selected</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,604</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4. Copies of the draft Waste Management & Minimisation Plan and statement of proposal were made available at service centres and libraries. All of the submitters to this draft Waste Management & Minimisation Plan were acknowledged in writing and each was provided the opportunity to speak to the hearing panel in person.

5.5. If the Council adopts the recommendations of the hearings panel, the draft Waste Management & Minimisation Plan 2017 will be updated to incorporate the changes. However, since the consultation process for the 2018-2028 LTP provides a further opportunity for the public to provide feedback on the kerbside collection proposals, the Waste Plan cannot be finalised until after the 2018-2028 LTP has been adopted.

6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. There are no direct financial implications arising from the Council adopting the recommendations of this report. However should the result of the LTP consultation process and decision making be that the Option C kerbside services are made available to the public in 2019, there will be an impact on the rates for those households that choose to use the offered bin service(s).
6.2. Those effects are detailed in section 5 of the 6th June report (170501042046[v1])

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

This matter is a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance Policy. In addition, it is a requirement of the Waste Minimisation Act that the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan is consulted upon via a special consultative procedure if there are significant changes made during the review.

7.2. **Legislation**


7.3. **Community Outcomes**

This report relates to the following community outcomes:

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

Simon Collin  
Infrastructure Strategy Manager

Kitty Waghorn  
Solid Waste Asset Manager

On behalf of  
Cr. R. Brine  
Chair: Waste Management & Minimisation Plan Hearing Panel
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Part A

Foreword

[Council to arrange foreword]
1 Introduction

Waimakariri District Council (the Council) has a statutory responsibility under section 42 of the Waste Minimisation Act 2008 (the Act) to “promote effective and efficient waste minimisation” within the Waimakariri District. In order to do this, the Council is required to adopt a Waste Management and Minimisation Plan (WMMP) under section 43 of the Act.

This WMMP is a guiding document which identifies Waimakariri’s vision, goals, objectives, targets and methods for achieving efficient and effective waste management and minimisation. It also provides information on how Council intends to fund the activities of the WMMP over the next six years.

In addition to the legislative framework in which this WMMP has been developed, it has also been developed in the context of the New Zealand Waste Strategy 2010 (NZWS) and its two goals of:

- Goal 1: reducing the harmful effects of waste
- Goal 2: improving the efficiency of resource use

This WMMP should also be read in association with Council’s Waste Assessment (WA). With the exception of the vision, goals, objectives and targets, those matters covered in detail in the WA are not repeated in full in this WMMP, but are summarised where appropriate. A copy of the WA is attached as Appendix A to this WMMP.

This WMMP covers solid waste generated in the Waimakariri District including biosolids generated from wastewater treatment. In developing the Plan to address solid waste in the District the Council has considered the waste minimisation hierarchy of reduce, reuse, recycle, recover, treatment and disposal.
2 Vision, goals, objectives, policies and targets

Working together, Council and the community can achieve more effective and efficient waste management and minimisation in the District. Council is proposing the following vision, goals, objectives and targets. Taken together these form the strategy for Council’s WMMP.

2.1 Vision for the future

Our vision for the future is:

“To value resources and eliminate waste and its harm to the environment”

2.2 Goals, objectives, policies and targets

Goals

The goals that we will use are those from the New Zealand Waste Strategy:

- Improving the efficiency of resource use
- Reducing harmful effects of waste

Our objectives and policies

Our objectives and policies to meet our goals are:

Table 1 Objectives and Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Objectives:</th>
<th>Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1: Improving the Efficiency of Resource Use</td>
<td>1. Our community has opportunities for avoiding or reducing waste at source.</td>
<td>- Provide practical information and advice to all parts of the community (residential, businesses, industry) on how to minimise waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. The Council works with other councils, central government, industry and other parties to improve product stewardship (i.e. aiming to reduce the environmental impact of the life cycle of products).</td>
<td>- Collaborate with other councils to collectively promote producer responsibilities and product stewardship in the District and Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Our community has opportunity to maximise the diversion of material for reuse, recycling or recovery.</td>
<td>- Promote and support product stewardship programmes operating in-district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. The range of diverted material will be improved and the quality of these materials enhanced.</td>
<td>- Ensure that there is adequate infrastructure provided to manage diverted material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Use bylaws where appropriate to facilitate waste minimisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Set a baseline of the current quantity of materials diverted and monitor and measure the diverted materials to determine if there is an increase in diversion as a result of changes in the range and quality of diverted materials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 2: Reducing Harmful Effects of Waste</th>
<th>Objectives:</th>
<th>Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Our community has access to services for effective and efficient management of waste that comply with current environmental and health practices.</td>
<td>Continue providing timely convenient and cost effective kerbside waste collection services to serviced areas and extend areas where needed. Ensure that cost-effective convenient facilities such as drop-off points, resource recovery park, transfer station facilities and hazardous and clean fill waste are available for residents to dispose of waste. Continue providing timely, convenient and cost effective management of litter in public spaces. Work with commercial service providers to ensure that adequate alternative services are available for disposal of waste when the council is not providing the service.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The disposal of sewage treatment residuals complies with current environmental and health practices.</td>
<td>Ensure the management of sewage treatment residuals is consistent with best practice.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Our community is informed and educated regarding issues regarding hazardous waste and residual waste.</td>
<td>Provide practical information and advice to the community on how to minimise and dispose of hazardous and residual waste. Gather and report on information about waste streams in the District to ensure effective waste management.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Our targets

Following consultation and the Council’s decision to adopt the hearing panel’s recommendation that Option C (the advanced option) be put forward into the draft 2018-2028 LTP for further consultation, the waste reduction targets are:

- Reduce annual per capita waste to landfill from 294kg per capita in 2015/16 to **236kg per capita** 2029.
- Increase the annual per capita quantity of materials diverted from 170kg per capita in 2015/16 to **228kg per capita** by 2029.
3 The waste situation

3.1 Overview of existing waste management and minimisation infrastructure and services

A summary of the current services provided by Council and non-Council providers is outlined below. For a detailed description of Council and non-Council solid waste services, refer to Part 1 and Appendix 1 of the attached Waste Assessment.

Services provided by Council

The main services and facilities include:

- Kerbside waste collection (user pays bags)
- Kerbside recycling collection (bins funded by a targeted rate)
- Drop off facilities at Kairaki Beach, Waikuku and Woodend Beach
- Oxford Transfer Station
- Southbrook Resource Recovery Park (RRP)
- Sutherlands Pit clean fill disposal site
- Hazardous waste drop off facilities
- Waste minimisation education
- Management of five closed landfills

Council does not operate its own landfill with residual waste being sent to the regional Kate Valley landfill facility in the Hurunui District.

Governance arrangements for regional waste minimisation lie with the Canterbury Waste Joint Committee where nine councils are represented, including Waimakariri.

All recyclable materials from kerbside collections are sent to the Eco Central Limited Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) in Christchurch.

Non-council provided services and facilities

Private companies meet the waste collection requirements of business and households beyond those supplied by Council and have approximately a two-thirds share of the domestic collection services market. These services are provided at an additional cost and include:

- Kerbside refuse collection (residential and business)
- Collection of divertible material – recyclables and green waste
- Collection of agricultural recycling and agrichemical containers
- Hazardous waste collection and disposal
3.2 Public health protection

The range of public and private waste services in the Waimakariri District and Canterbury region ensures public health will be adequately protected in the future. Waimakariri has access to a landfill that meets national legislative requirements for at least 20 years. The community has adequate access to council or privately-owned drop-off and collection services for refuse, hazardous waste and litter, but further waste minimisation is achievable as outlined in this Plan. This Plan proposes services for better waste minimisation.

Canterbury District Health Board were sent a copy of the draft Waste Management and Minimisation in May 2017, and a number of reminders, but no feedback was provided. Therefore this plan has not taken into consideration the views of the CDHB. (insert summary comment from feedback if any arrives before plan is finalised).

3.3 Summary of the volume and composition of waste and diverted materials

The Council is currently sending 16,580 tonnes of refuse to the Kate Valley Landfill. Around 2,450 tonnes is from the Council kerbside collection, 300 tonnes from litter bins, removal of fly-tipping, and other Council contracts, and the remainder includes private waste collections from commercial and residential properties (8,880 tonnes) and waste self-delivered by residential and commercial customers (4,950 tonnes). More detailed information about the Districts waste and its composition is provided in the Waste Assessment (Appendix A).

Due to commercial sensitivity, limited data is available on the type and volume of waste collected by private waste providers although it is recognised that some waste will be transported in (or out) of the district for reuse, recycling or disposal. At this stage, it is not possible to track waste that has been transported from outside the District to Councils facilities for disposal.

A summary of the per capita waste in the Waimakariri District; composition of Council domestic kerbside refuse bags and composition of general waste received at the Southbrook RRP is shown in Figure 1 and Figure 2 below.

Figure 2 shows that the total amount of waste going to landfill per capita per year has remained relatively static since 2011/2012 with only a minor increase noticeable in the 2013/2014 year. The quantity of recycled material overall has also remained relatively static since 2011/12 and the total amount of other diverted material also remained static over the same period.
Figure 1 Source and Destination of Waste and Diverted Materials managed by the Council

Figure 2 Composition of total waste per capita per year
Figure 3 Composition of Council domestic kerbside refuse bags (SWAP 2017)

Figure 3 shows that the highest proportion of waste material in kerbside refuse bags was organic making up over half of the waste collected at 58.9%. Other potentially divertible material includes plastics, paper, glass, metals, timber and textiles, totalling a further 28.3%. These waste streams represent significant opportunities to divert more waste from landfill.

The composition of the overall waste stream being disposed of to the Kate Valley landfill from Southbrook RRP was calculated by combining four separate waste streams that were assessed in the audit; kerbside rubbish bag collection from the Council; privately collected domestic kerbside bins; general waste and waste from the Oxford transfer station.

Figure 4 Composition of overall waste received at the Southbrook RRP (SWAP 2017)
Figure 4 gives the waste composition breakdown of the general waste that is sent to landfill from the Southbrook RRP in 2017. Organic waste (garden and food waste) made up the largest proportion of the waste (37.2% of total). Timber was the second largest (18.0%), followed by plastics (10.6%), rubble (9.3%), paper (6.5% each) and textiles (6.0%). There remains a significant opportunity to divert more waste from landfill at Southbrook RRP.

**Sewage treatment residuals**

Screenings are removed from all of Council’s wastewater treatment plants and are taken to Christchurch City Council’s Bromley wastewater treatment plant for further treatment. Oxidation pond sludge is placed in geotextile tubes to dewater over a number of years. Once dried the sludge will be tested and disposed of in accordance with relevant environmental and health requirements. It is proposed that this practice will continue.

### 3.4 Forecast future demand

Population growth, and to a lesser extent economic growth, is expected to increase and total waste is expected to increase accordingly. Diversion services are required to limit the pressure on the landfill and other waste handling facilities to be able to manage the associated increase in demand for waste services. Council has adopted a growth scenario for the purposes of infrastructure planning between the medium and high growth scenarios from Statistics NZ, with a District expected population in 2048 of approximately 97,000.

![Projected Population](image)

Figure 5 Projected Population

### 3.5 Cost of the current level of service

Council provides its waste services and facilities at an annual cost of $6,200,000 (FY2015/16). Funding is predominantly provided through user charges (facility gate fees and rubbish bag sales; $4,900,000) and rates (general and targeted; $1,300,000). Solid waste accounts for approximately 8% of Council’s total operating costs and approximately 4% of Council’s rates funding. Due to growth, it is anticipated that the current level of service will cost $7,300,000 by 2017/18.

On average, ratepayers inside the serviced areas pay $86 per household per year in targeted rates from 2017/18, and households either purchase WDC-branded bags to use Council’s rubbish bag service or have a private wheelie bin service. Council bags cost $3.00 each (from 2017/18). The annual cost for 52 bags plus the targeted rate for the recycling service would be $242.
Private wheelie bin services cost from $202 to $740 per year depending on the size of the wheelie bin requested and the frequency of collection. This cost is additional to the $86 per household targeted rate for the recycling service.

In addition, households and commercial customers pay for waste disposal when using the Southbrook RRP or Oxford Transfer Station.

Table 2 Council services currently provided and their funding methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council Service</th>
<th>Funding Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waste minimisation education, promotion, enforcement (e.g. by law), communication, monitoring and policy development</td>
<td>• National waste disposal levy&lt;br&gt;• Sale of recyclables&lt;br&gt;• General rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerbside collection of waste</td>
<td>• Targeted rate&lt;br&gt;• User charges (via refuse bag purchase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerbside collection of recyclables</td>
<td>• Targeted rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste disposal, Southbrook RRP and Oxford Transfer Station</td>
<td>• User charges&lt;br&gt;• General rate&lt;br&gt;• Sale of recyclables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversion at Southbrook RRP and Oxford Transfer Station and</td>
<td>• General rate&lt;br&gt;• Local waste disposal charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public drop off points</td>
<td>• General rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of public litter bins</td>
<td>• General rate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 Policies, plans and regulation

There is a clear legislative and policy framework within which the Council provides waste services and facilities within its District. A summary of the framework and legislation is outlined below, however a full and complete list of the legislation, plans and regulations that create the waste framework within which this WMMP is based, is included in Appendix B.

While the Waste Minimisation Act sets out the legislative requirements regarding waste, the New Zealand Waste Strategy 2010 (NZWS) provides the Government’s strategic direction for waste management and minimisation in New Zealand. The goals of this WMMP replicate those from the NZWS.

Local, regional and national plans and policies affect the Council’s provision of waste and diverted material services. Primarily, they are requirements under the WMA and the Local Government Act 2002. Figure 6 below illustrates the statutory planning requirements that the Council is required to follow.

Figure 6 Statutory planning sequence

4.1 Key legislation

A summary of the key legislation affecting waste is listed below. A more detailed description of this legislation and a list of other related legislation is included in Appendix B:

- Waste Minimisation Act 2008
- Local Government Act 2002
- Resource Management Act 1991
- Climate Change Response Act 2002 (Emissions Trading)
- Litter Act 1979
- Health Act 1956
4.2 Other relevant documents

The Council and Environment Canterbury have a number of other strategic documents that are integral to waste management, including:

- Canterbury Hazardous Waste Management Strategy 2006
- Canterbury Regional Policy Statement
- Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan
- Proposed Canterbury Air Regional Plan
- Waimakariri District Council Long Term Plan 2015-2025 (note the 2018-2028 Plan will be informed by this WMMP)
- Solid Waste and Waste Handling Licensing Bylaw 2016
- Waimakariri District Council Solid Waste Activity Management Plan 2015
5 Proposed methods for achieving effective and efficient waste management and minimisation

5.1 Council’s role

In undertaking this WMMP Council has considered what options are available for it to achieve effective and efficient waste management and minimisation to meet future demands for services and facilities.

The role of the Council includes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service provision</th>
<th>Providing or facilitating the provision of waste management or waste minimisation service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Council further investigating demand and the cost effectiveness of services and options to meet demand, either alone or in collaboration with other councils or private sector parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation</td>
<td>The Council using a legal mechanism to facilitate or promote waste management and waste minimisation e.g. bylaws and District Plan rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community leadership</td>
<td>Providing information and promoting awareness and involvement in waste management and waste minimisation activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>Promoting actions to address waste reduction and waste management issues which are outside the Council’s direct control e.g. advocate for appropriate legislation, standards and guidelines to the Regional Council and the Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financier</td>
<td>Investing in initiatives that facilitate waste management and minimisation activities, e.g. grants and subsidies, developing a waste minimisation industry cluster</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In providing waste management and minimisation services, the Council will aim to make existing services more cost effective and ensure that any increases to levels of services are both cost effective and affordable. The Council will, as far as practicably possible, make services accessible to the majority of the District.

5.2 Opting out of providing waste services

As an alternative to Council continuing to provide waste services and facilities, Council could decide to opt out of providing waste services all together. This would require the commercial sector to provide all waste services for the District.

In 2008, the Council sought the public’s view on Council withdrawing from collecting waste as part of the consultation on the WMMP. The feedback from the public was clear that they did not want that to happen, and Council has subsequently continued to provide waste services.

5.3 Identified district waste issues

Council has reviewed progress against the previous WMMP action plan and has identified waste issues that need to be addressed. The options considered to deal with these issues include education, regulation, and service provision. Options were assessed for alignment with the vision, goals and objectives, costs and ease of implementation before a preferred option was identified. Table 3 below provides a summary of the issues and Council’s preferred option to deal with each issue.
Table 3 Summary of District specific issues and preferred option to respond to each issue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Preferred option to respond to issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. | A high volume of domestic divertible material is going to landfill   | • Provide information to customers on how to responsibly dispose of organic and recyclable waste, including using private waste collection services  
• Provide separate organic bin and collection service  
• Investigate the provision of additional recycling drop off points or facilities |
| 2. | Meeting differing needs of rural and urban households and businesses | • Refine and publish Council policy regarding extent of kerbside collection service, both the urban/rural boundary and residential/commercial extent of service |
| 3. | Lack of capacity at Southbrook Resource Recovery Park                | • Upgrade the Southbrook Resource Recovery Park including the recycling recovery area, refuse disposal pit re-use shop and education facility |
| 4. | Inappropriate farm waste / rural disposal practices result in damage to the environment | • Adopt a proactive and collaborative approach working with Environment Canterbury, the Canterbury Waste Joint Committee, Ministry for the Environment and private sector parties such as AgRecovery and Federated Farmers on farm waste management in addressing the potential for harm to the environment and adverse community health effects |
| 5. | High volume and increasing proportion of construction and demolition waste going to landfill | • Adopt a proactive and collaborative approach to work with the construction and demolition industry to change behaviours through education, promote waste separation, recycling of materials and beneficial reuse  
• Support regional development of clean fill regulation |
| 6. | The inappropriate disposal of e-waste and hazardous waste            | • Ensure that residents are aware that household hazardous waste is rates funded and that e-waste disposal is partially subsidised |

A full description of these issues and a high-level assessment of all options is included in Part 3 of the WA which is attached as Appendix A.

5.4 Kerbside options

The Council has considered eight options for its kerbside collection service, a key part of Council’s waste management service. The Council selected two preferred options from these original eight to consult on. For full information on the eight kerbside collection options, refer to Part 3 of the Waste Assessment in Appendix A.

Overall, Council wanted to increase diversion but retain customer choice and this was considered in selecting the preferred options to consult with the community on through the WMMP review. The two options consulted upon are the enhanced service option and the advanced service option.

The enhanced service option would:
• Introduce bins for waste  
• Retain an option to opt out and use bags or private bins for waste  
• Retain 240L recycling bins collected fortnightly
• Offer a range of bin sizes for waste (140L or 80L) and recycling (240L or 140L)
• Indicative household cost $86-$281 depending on service choice selected

The **advanced** service option would:

• Introduce organics (food waste and green waste) bins
• Provide an option to opt out of the organics service
• Introduce bins for waste
• Retain an option to opt out and use bags or private bins for waste
• Retain 240L recycling bins collected fortnightly
• Offer a range of bin sizes for waste (140L or 80L), recycling (240L or 140L) and organics (240L, 140L or 80L)
• Indicative household cost $86-$381 depending on service choice selected

Following a Special Consultative Procedure to seek public feedback on the options, the hearings panel recommended to Council that the **advanced** service option be approved. Council adopted this recommendation on 4th December 2017, and this option will now be included in the draft 2018-2028 LTP for further consultation.

The specific wording of the resolution is: “*Insert Option C as the preferred kerbside collection service in Section 5.4 comprising service choices of: rates-funded recycling bin, collected fortnightly; user-pays WDC rubbish bag OR rates-funded rubbish bin, collected fortnightly; AND/OR rates-funded mixed organics bin, collected weekly.*”

*(finalise wording of this section upon conclusion of the 2018-2028 LTP process)*

### 5.5 Southbrook RRP upgrade options

The Council has considered three options in relation to the Southbrook RRP, those options were:

• Status quo – no change to the Southbrook RRP
• Enhanced service option – increased width and depth of refuse tipping area; relocate and upsize re-use store and increase recycling activities
• Advanced service option – enhanced service plus introduce sort line for construction and demolition waste

The preferred option is the enhanced service option due to the high cost to implement the advanced option.
Part B
1 Action Plan

1.1 Action Plan

The proposed action plan shows how Council’s proposed actions address the key issues and how the activities will be funded.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>New/existing</th>
<th>Implementation timeframe</th>
<th>Funding source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Our community has opportunities for avoiding or reducing waste at source</td>
<td>Circulate educational information to promote Council’s waste management and minimisation services</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Levy Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide educational programmes and support other programmes aimed at waste management and minimisation and sustainability e.g. boomerang bags and ‘no plastic straw’ campaign</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Levy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish an educational facility for promotion of waste management and minimisation at the Southbrook RRP as part of the planned upgrade of the Southbrook RRP</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>By 2022/23</td>
<td>Levy Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support organisations leading litter clean-up and campaigns at raising awareness of waste minimisation, potentially by means of grants</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborate with other councils, to promote waste management and minimisation and waste acceptance criteria in a regionally and nationally consistent way</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Levy Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promote and support existing waste minimisation and resource efficiency initiatives targeting local industry</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Levy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Council works with other councils, central government, industry and other parties to improve product stewardship</td>
<td>Advocate to government, possibly via a coordinated approach with other organisations, such as Canterbury Waste Joint Committee, Local Government New Zealand and WasteMINZ</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promote and support product stewardship programmes operating in-district</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Rates Levy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>New/ existing</td>
<td>Implementation timeframe</td>
<td>Funding source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Our community has opportunity to maximise the diversion of material</td>
<td>Refine and publish Council’s policy regarding the extent of kerbside</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for reuse, recycling or recovery</td>
<td>collection service, both the urban/rural boundaries and the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>residential/commercial extent of services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve RRP and Transfer Station facilities (Oxford TS and Southbrook</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Gate fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RRP) to expand associated services for diverted material.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upgrade Southbrook RRP and Oxford TS facilities to increase capacity</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>2018 to 2022</td>
<td>Gate fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>when required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Optimise the separation of diverted material at the RRP and TS</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>2018/19 and ongoing</td>
<td>Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>facilities through procurement processes and contractual agreements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use financial incentives to encourage the separation of reusable and</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Gate Fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>recyclable materials from the waste stream.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Investigate the feasibility of providing recycling bins alongside</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>litter bins in the District, and implement where appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintain existing drop-off points for diverted material in beach</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>townships and investigate the feasibility of establishing recycling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>drop-off points at suitable locations for rural resident use,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>including trialing new locations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The range of diverted material will be improved and the quality of</td>
<td>Continue monitoring the composition of waste going to landfill through</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Levy Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>these materials enhanced</td>
<td>SWAP studies and investigate further waste minimisation measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>when warranted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>New/existing</td>
<td>Implementation timeframe</td>
<td>Funding source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Our community has access to services for effective and efficient management of waste that comply with current environmental and health practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continue to provide litter collection bins at certain locations throughout the District</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure that littering and illegal dumping in public places is managed effectively</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintain existing RRP and Transfer Station facilities (Oxford TS and Southbrook RRP) and associated services for waste disposal, including domestic hazardous waste disposal.</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure all resource consent requirements for Council owned solid waste services, facilities and closed landfills are complied with.</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>The disposal of sewage treatment residuals complies with current environmental and health practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disposal of screenings from the Council’s wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) at Kate Valley landfill and dewatered sewage sludge at Christchurch City Council’s Bromley WWTP, or alternative facility or site if feasible.</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Our community is informed and educated about hazardous waste and residual waste.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carry out educational campaigns to raise awareness about littering, including larger scale illegal dumping, when warranted.</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Rates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 Funding

2.1 Funding the plan

The action plan will be funded using the suite of tools available to Council in the delivery of solid waste services. The activities will be funded by:

- General rates
- Targeted rates
- Fees and charges (including gate fees, licensing fees, user pays)
- Subsidies and grants
- Debt (if required)

Through the action plan, it is expected that the cost for the provision of the services will increase from $7,300,000 in 2017/18 to $11,100,000 in 2022/23 when new services are fully introduced and facility upgrades are complete.

2.2 Waste minimisation levy funding expenditure

Council will continue to use the Waste Minimisation Levy funding income to fund waste education, investigations, trials, and to fund capital expenditure for diversion facility upgrades.

2.3 Grants

Section 47 of the Waste Minimisation Act gives councils the ability to give grants to a person, organisation or group to promote or achieve waste management and minimisation. Under this WMMP the Council will continue to give grants at its discretion and on any terms of condition it deems appropriate provided there is an allocated and approved budget for that activity.
3 Monitoring, evaluating and reporting progress

3.1 Monitoring and evaluation

The Council intends to monitor and report on progress regarding the WMMP and will develop and implement a clear, transparent monitoring and reporting system. Accurate information on how services provided by Council are performing is essential for monitoring the effectiveness of the Plan’s vision, objectives, goals and methods and planning for future demand.

Council’s current levels of service and performance measures are in the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan and are focussed on:

- The availability of transfer facilities
- Providing a kerbside waste and recycling collection service
- Reducing the amount of annual waste per capita
- Increasing the annual per capita quantity of materials diverted

Council will review its key performance indicators as part of the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan. Data will be gathered through community satisfaction surveys, Council records (Call Centre records, KPIs, etc.), contractors and Solid Waste Analysis Protocol Audits (SWAPs). Progress will be reported through Council publications, website and the annual report.

3.2 Reporting

The Council will report progress of the implementation and effectiveness of this WMMP through:

- Annual Reports
- Council’s website

The Council will also provide progress reports of expenditure of its waste levy funds to the Ministry for the Environment.
## Glossary

### Key Definitions and abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clean fill/clean fill material</td>
<td>inert materials disposed of, into or onto land, at a consented clean fill. Materials typically include construction and demolition waste such as concrete, uncontaminated soil and rock.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial waste</td>
<td>waste from premises used wholly or mainly for the purposes of trade or business, recreation or entertainment, excluding, mines, quarries and agricultural waste. May also include some household waste collected by commercial operators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverted material</td>
<td>anything no longer required for its original purpose and, but for commercial or other waste minimisation activities, would be disposed of or discarded, and includes any materials that are recyclables, compostable, or can be recovered and/or re-used, as determined by the Council by resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous waste</td>
<td>waste that is potentially harmful to human and/or environmental health. It typically has one or more of the following hazard properties: explosive, flammable, oxidising, corrosive, radioactive, toxic or ecotoxic, or it may react with air or water to have one of these properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household waste</td>
<td>solid waste generated by households. Household waste does not include divertible waste, hazardous waste, commercial waste, prohibited waste, trade waste or liquid waste of any nature, or any material banned or prohibited under the Council’s solid waste bylaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic waste</td>
<td>compostable materials that are organic in origin and appropriate to be used as feedstock for composting, and includes green waste and food waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling</td>
<td>the reprocessing of waste or diverted material to produce new materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Recovery Park (RRP)</td>
<td>a facility where solid waste materials such as residual waste, construction and demolition waste, recyclables, organics waste and household hazardous wastes are delivered for sorting or before taken away for treatment, processing, recycling or disposal, and which may also include a retail outlet for the re-sale of used goods and materials deposited at the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reuse shops</td>
<td>items that are salvaged or diverted from the waste stream undergo little or no modification and are sold at shops run by the community or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewage treatment residuals</td>
<td>solid wastes generated through the process of wastewater treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste Analysis Protocol (SWAP):</td>
<td>a study to determine the composition of waste as described by the Ministry for the Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Station (TS)</td>
<td>a facility where solid waste materials such as residual waste, construction and demolition waste, recyclables, organics waste and household hazardous wastes are delivered for consolidation before being taken away for treatment, processing, recycling or disposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste</td>
<td>anything disposed of, or discarded, and:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• includes a type of waste that is defined by its composition or source (for example, organic waste, electronic waste, or construction and demolition waste), and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• to avoid doubt, includes any component or element of diverted material, if the component or element is disposed of or discarded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste disposal levy</td>
<td>a levy imposed under the Waste Minimisation Act 2008 on waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste minimisation</td>
<td>the reduction of waste and the reuse, recycling and recovery of waste and diverted material</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part C
Appendix A – Waste assessment
Appendix B – Legislative context

The New Zealand Waste Strategy 2010

The New Zealand Waste Strategy 2010 provides the Government’s strategic direction for waste management and minimisation in New Zealand. This strategy was released in 2010 and replaced the 2002 Waste Strategy. The New Zealand Waste Strategy has two goals. These are to:

- Reduce the harmful effects of waste
- Improve the efficiency of resource use

The strategy’s goals provide direction to central and local government, businesses (including the waste industry), and communities on where to focus their efforts to manage waste. The strategy’s flexible approach ensures waste management and minimisation activities are appropriate for local situations.

Under section 44 of the Waste Management Act 2008, in preparing their waste management and minimisation plan (WMMP) councils must have regard to the New Zealand Waste Strategy, or any government policy on waste management and minimisation that replaces the strategy. Guidance on how councils may achieve this is provided in section 4.4.3.

Waste Minimisation Act 2008

The purpose of the Waste Minimisation Act 2008 (WMA) is to encourage waste minimisation and a decrease in waste disposal to protect the environment from harm and obtain environmental, economic, social and cultural benefits.

The WMA introduced tools, including:

- Waste management and minimisation plan obligations for territorial authorities
- A waste disposal levy to fund waste minimisation initiatives at local and central government levels
- Product stewardship provisions

Part 4 of the WMA is dedicated to the responsibilities of a council. Councils “must promote effective and efficient waste management and minimisation within its district” (section 42). Part 4 requires councils to develop and adopt a WMMP. The development of a WMMP in the WMA is a requirement modified from Part 31 of the Local Government Act 1974, but with even greater emphasis on waste minimisation. To support the implementation of a WMMP, section 56 of the WMA also provides councils the ability to:

- Develop bylaws
- Regulate the deposit, collection and transportation of wastes
- Prescribe charges for waste facilities
- Control access to waste facilities
- Prohibit the removal of waste intended for recycling
Waste disposal levy

From 1 July 2009, the Waste Minimisation Act introduced a waste disposal levy on all waste disposed of at disposal facilities, currently $10 per tonne, to:

- Raise revenue for promoting and achieving waste minimisation
- Increase the cost of waste disposal, to recognise that disposal imposes costs on the environment, society, and the economy

Half of the levy money is given to territorial authorities on a population basis, and the remainder of the levy is available via a contestable fund. The portion returned to Council can only be spent to promote or achieve waste minimisation and in accordance with a council’s WMMP.

Local Government Act 2002

The Local Government Act 2002 (LGA) provides the general framework and powers under which New Zealand’s democratically elected and accountable local authorities operate. The LGA contains various provisions that may apply to councils when preparing their WMMPs, including consultation and bylaw provisions. For example, Part 6 of the LGA refers to planning and decision-making requirements to promote accountability between local authorities and their communities, and a long-term focus for the decisions and activities of the local authority. This part includes requirements for information to be included in the long-term plan (LTP), including summary information about the WMMP.

Bylaws

The Act enables councils to make bylaws. A bylaw can allow for licences to collect and transport waste from households, and require reporting on the quantity, composition, and destination of waste. The Council adopted the Solid Waste Handling Licensing Bylaw on 6 September 2016.

The purpose of the Bylaw is to:

- To prevent the contamination of recoverable resources and maximise the recovery of recyclable resources.
- Also ensure that waste is collected in a safe and efficient manner, and that waste does not cause a nuisance
- Regulate and monitor operators collecting, managing, storing and using waste within the district through a licensing process
- Protect, promote and maintain public health and safety
- Provide comprehensive data and information for planning and waste management and minimisation purposes

The Bylaw requires specified waste operators to hold a waste licence with the Council in order to operate within the District, and to report to the Council quarterly on the quantity of waste they handle.
Resource Management Act 1991

The Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) promotes sustainable management of natural and physical resources. Although it does not specifically define 'waste', the RMA addresses waste management and minimisation activity through controls on the environmental effects of waste management and minimisation activities and facilities through national, regional and local policy, standards, plans and consent procedures. In this role, the RMA exercises considerable influence over facilities for waste disposal and recycling, recovery, treatment and others in terms of the potential impacts of these facilities on the environment. Under section 30 of the RMA, regional councils are responsible for controlling the discharge of contaminants into or on to land, air or water. These responsibilities are addressed through regional planning and discharge consent requirements. Other regional council responsibilities that may be relevant to waste and recoverable materials facilities include:

- Managing the adverse effects of storing, using, disposing of and transporting hazardous wastes
- The dumping of wastes from ships, aircraft and offshore installations into the coastal marine area
- The allocation and use of water

Under section 31 of the RMA, Council responsibility includes controlling the effects of land-use activities that have the potential to create adverse effects on the natural and physical resources of their district. Facilities involved in the disposal, treatment or use of waste or recoverable materials may carry this potential. Permitted, controlled, discretionary, noncomplying and prohibited activities, and their controls, are specified in district planning documents, thereby defining further land-use-related resource consent requirements for waste-related facilities.

In addition, the RMA provides for the development of national policy statements and for the setting of national environmental standards (NES). There is currently one enacted NES that directly influences the management of waste in New Zealand – the Resource Management (NES for Air Quality) Regulations 2004. This NES requires certain landfills (e.g. those with a capacity of more than one million tonnes of waste) to collect landfill gases and either flare them or use them as fuel for generating electricity. Unless exemption criteria are met, the NES for Air Quality also prohibits the lighting of fires and burning of wastes at landfills, the burning of tyres, bitumen burning for road maintenance, burning coated wire or oil, and operating high-temperature hazardous waste incinerators. These prohibitions aim to protect air quality.

New Zealand Emissions Trading Scheme

The Climate Change Response Act 2002 and associated regulations is the Government’s principal response to manage climate change. A key mechanism for this is the New Zealand Emissions Trading Scheme (NZ ETS). The NZ ETS puts a price on greenhouse gas emissions, providing an incentive for people to reduce emissions and plant forests to absorb carbon dioxide.

Certain sectors are required to acquire and surrender emission units to account for their direct greenhouse gas emissions or the emissions associated with their products. Landfills that are subject to the waste disposal levy are required to surrender emission units to cover methane emissions generated from landfill. These disposal facilities are required to report the tonnages landfilled annually to calculate emissions.
Climate Change Response Act 2002 (Emissions Trading) and the Climate Change Amendment Act 2008

The Climate Change Response Act 2002, Climate Change (Waste) Regulations 2010 and Amendments to the Climate Change (Unique Emissions Factors) Regulations are implemented through the New Zealand Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS). The purpose of the ETS is to reduce the amount of greenhouse gases emitted in New Zealand. The waste sector is affected by the ETS, as those who operate landfills are required to participate in the scheme and report emissions.

Although the Council no longer operates a landfill within the District, there are implications for the Council from disposing of waste to the regional landfill.

The Climate Change Amendment Act 2008 provides for disposal facility regulations and the ETS.

Litter Act 1979

Under the Litter Act 1979 it is an offence for any person to deposit litter of any kind in a public place, or onto private land without the approval of the owner. The Litter Act is enforced by territorial authorities, who have the responsibility to monitor litter dumping, act on complaints, and deal with those responsible for litter dumping. Councils reserve the right to prosecute offenders via fines and infringement notices administered by a litter control warden or officer. The maximum fines for littering are $5,000 for a person and $20,000 for a corporation. Council powers under the Litter Act could be used to address illegal dumping issues that may be included in the scope of a council’s waste management and minimisation plan.

Health Act 1956

The Health Act 1956 places obligations on councils (if required by the Minister of Health) to provide sanitary works for the collection and disposal of refuse, for the purpose of public health protection (Part 2 – powers and duties of local authorities, section 25). The Act specifically identifies certain waste management practices as nuisances (section 29) and offensive trades (Third Schedule). The Health Act enables councils to raise loans for certain sanitary works and/or to receive government grants and subsidies, where available. Health Act provisions to remove refuse by local authorities have been repealed.

Other legislation

Other legislation that relates to waste management and/or reduction of harm, or improved resource efficiency from waste products includes:

- Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act 1996
- Biosecurity Act 1993
- Radiation Protection Act 1965
- Ozone Layer Protection Act 1996
- Health and Safety in Employment Act 1992 (soon to be replaced by the outcome of the Health and Safety Reform Bill)
- Agricultural Chemicals and Veterinary Medicines Act 1997
Canterbury Hazardous Waste Management Strategy

The Canterbury Hazardous Waste Management Strategy has been developed as part of the commitment by local authorities in Canterbury to work together to achieve integrated and environmentally sound management of hazardous wastes. It is not a statutory document but seeks to provide guidance for local authority statutory plans, service delivery and regulation. While the Strategy is primarily designed to provide direction for local authorities, including Environment Canterbury, it also provides guidance for hazardous waste generators and those individuals or organisations involved in the waste management industry.

The vision for hazardous waste management in Canterbury is achieving zero hazardous waste by 2020.

The long-term objective is:

*To eliminate the adverse effects of hazardous waste on the environment*

The Council has adopted the Canterbury Hazardous Waste Management Strategy, and is committed to supporting its implementation programme. However, the Council currently has no provision to manage and appropriately dispose of hazardous wastes that are stored and used within the District beyond the provision of domestic hazardous waste disposal facilities. Instead commercial and rural hazardous waste management is achieved by industry taking responsibility for their own disposal, or by Canterbury Councils coordinating on specific materials.

Other waste related legislation

Other legislation relevant to waste management and minimisation includes:

- Health and Safety at Work Act 2015 (HSWA) is New Zealand’s workplace health and safety law. HSWA sets out the principles, duties and rights in relation to workplace health and safety
- Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act 1996 that provides regulations and standards related to hazardous substances
- Local Government (Rating) Act 2002
- Health Act 1956 and its provisions for local authorities to provide for collection and disposal of refuse and other offensive matter and for the licensing of offensive trades
- Freedom Camping Act 2011 which controls freedom camping on all land controlled or managed by a particular local authority

Regional policy statements, regional plans and strategies

Environment Canterbury Regional Council has a Regional Policy Statement and Regional Plan which contains rules relating to discharges to air, land and water, which are relevant for facilities (e.g. resource recovery parks, transfer stations, landfills) and waste processing (e.g. composting, biosolids processing).

The focus of regional waste strategies is co-operation between councils. Waimakariri District Council is a member of the Canterbury Waste Joint Committee.

International commitments

New Zealand is party to the following key international agreements:

- Montreal Protocol - to protect the ozone layer by phasing out the production of numerous substances
- Basel Convention - to reduce the movement of hazardous waste between nations
- Stockholm Convention - to eliminate or restrict the production and use of persistent organic pollutants
- Waigani Convention - bans export of hazardous or radioactive waste to Pacific Islands Forum countries
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1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to seek approval from the Council to consult with the community about the Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan (Waste Plan), which contains proposals to offer additional kerbside collection services to those offered by the Council at present and to proceed with the proposed site upgrades at Southbrook resource recovery park.

1.2. In May 2015, Council requested that that staff report back to Council on cost-effective ways/methods to further advance waste minimisation.

1.3. Under the guidance of the Solid and Hazardous Waste Working Party, and with assistance from waste consultants Morrison Lowe, staff have considered a number of options for kerbside waste services, and selected two options as potential additional services to the existing ones for consultation with the community.

1.4. Kerbside collection services were encompassed within the wider context of a Waste Assessment, which looks at the waste situation within the Waimakariri District, and considers how improvements can be made to the way in which solid waste is handled. The outcomes from the Waste Assessment are summarised in the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan.

1.5. The three kerbside collection options are:

   1.5.1. **Option 1**: The status quo, consisting of a recycling bin collection fortnightly, funded via a targeted rate, and a weekly refuse bag collection service, funded by user pays bags. This would not divert any additional materials from landfill.

   1.5.2. **Option 2**: The addition to the current services, of an optional wheelie bin as an alternative weekly collection service for refuse. Households could choose to have a rates-funded bin or continue buying bags for their refuse. Two different sized wheelie bins would be offered. In the Waste Plan this is called the Enhanced Option and would divert a small amount of material (mainly recyclables) from landfill.
1.5.3. **Option 3:** The addition of an optional refuse wheelie bin and an optional organics waste wheelie bin service to the current services. If option 3 was adopted the refuse wheelie bin and bags would be collected fortnightly on alternate weeks to the fortnightly recycling, while the organics collection (to include garden waste and food waste) would be collected weekly.

Households could still choose to remain buying bags for refuse, and could also choose not have the organics collection. Different sized wheelie bins would be offered for both refuse and organics. In the Waste Plan this is called the Advanced Option, and would divert the most material away from landfill.

Details, including costs are shown in **Attachment i**

1.6. Different options were considered for site upgrades at Southbrook resource recovery park, with the currently proposed refuse pit upgrade and recycling and recovery facility extension considered as an Enhanced option, and the construction of a purpose built automated commercial waste sorting facility as the Advanced Option.

1.7. The Waste Plan also proposes that the Council will continue providing education initiatives that provide practical information to residents, schools and businesses about waste minimisation and management, including how to dispose of hazardous waste, and to collaborate with other Councils to promote waste minimisation regionally and nationally, and to lobby for improved national product stewardship.

**Attachments:**

i. Kerbside collection option details (170501042140)
ii. Waste Assessment (170516049162(v3))
iii. Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan (170516049172[v2])
iv. Table of effect on household costs of service options proposed (170501042239)
v. Draft communications plan (170503043815)
vi. Composition of Solid Waste in Waimakariri District (170519050658[v2]) Appendix 2 of Waste Assessment

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 170501042046.
(b) **Initiates** the Special Consultative Procedure to review Council’s Waste Management and Minimisation Plan.
(c) **Approves** the attached proposed draft *Waste Management and Minimisation Plan* (TRIM 170516049172) and its companion document the *Waste Assessment* (TRIM 170516049162) for release for public consultation in accordance with the requirements of the Special Consultative Procedure outlined in the Local Government Act 2002.
(d) **Appoints** Councillor Brine as Chairman of the Solid and Hazardous Waste Working Party to be Chair of the hearings panel.
(e) **Appoints** Councillor ................. and Councillor ................. as the other two members of a 3 member panel to hear submissions on the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan and to recommend decisions to the 7 November 2017 Council meeting.
(f) **Delegates** authority to the Hearings Panel to approve the communications plan and collateral.
(g) **Circulates** report No. 170501042046 to the Community Boards for their information.
(h) **Notes** the period of consultation between Friday 9 June and Friday 11 August

(i) **Notes** the expected hearing and deliberations timeframe of September

3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

3.1. **Background**

3.1.1. Section 43 of the Waste Minimisation Act 2008 requires that territorial authorities adopt a waste management and minimisation plan (Waste Plan), and Section 42 requires that "a territorial authority must promote effective and efficient waste management and minimisation within its district".

3.1.2. Council adopted its first Waste Plan in 2012 and the Waste Minimisation Act requires that waste plans be reviewed at intervals of not greater than 6 years.

3.1.3. There was a commitment in the 2012 Waste Plan to investigate the feasibility of introducing either a two bin or three bin kerbside collection system, and in Oct 2014 the Council embarked on a public consultation process seeking community views about bin based collection systems for household waste.

3.1.4. Overall, 60% of the 1,208 submissions favoured the concept of introducing bin based systems, and accordingly bin services, funded by targeted rates, were included in the draft 2015-2025 LTP.

3.1.5. However, following LTP submissions and deliberations Council decided to continue providing the current level of kerbside collection services because 70% of the 130 submitters opposed the bin services owing to:

- Concerns about cost for low income ratepayers
- Concern that low waste generators would be subsidising high waste generators
- Some concern about adverse effects on private collectors

3.1.6. At the same meeting, on 20 May 2015 there was a Council resolution that: "Requests that staff report back to Council on ways/methods to further advance waste minimisation".

3.1.7. While slightly early in terms of a 6 year Waste Plan review cycle, staff have been working with waste consultants Morrison Lowe on updating the Council waste assessment and Waste Plan, with a focus on kerbside services, and have held four workshops with the Solid and Hazardous Waste Working Party to seek feedback on possible additional kerbside collection options. At the final workshop consideration was also given to the other waste issues in the district, and the actions to address those issues (both those to be continued, and new) that are proposed in the draft waste plan.

3.1.8. The 2016 customer satisfaction survey of Council services indicates that while there is a 94.8% satisfaction level with kerbside recycling and a 74.4% satisfaction level with kerbside refuse, there is still a desire from a portion of the community for Council provided kerbside collection bin services. From the survey respondents that received the Council kerbside collections (362 households) 167 chose to provide specific comments about kerbside services. The top three "categories" commented on are as follows:

a. Need to introduce a 3 bin system like Christchurch (49 comments)

b. Bag collection should be replaced by wheelie bin (28 comments)

c. Introduce a green waste wheelie bin collection (23 comments)
Another 13 categories attracted 80 comments, ranging between 1 and 11 comments per category. Some respondents made more than one comment, and this accounts for a total of 180 comments from 167 respondents.

3.2. Draft Waste Assessment (Attachment ii)

3.2.1. The draft waste assessment has been prepared in accordance with S51 of the Waste Minimisation Act. It provides details of the following:
- Existing waste services provided in the district (Council and non-Council)
- Waste quantities, composition and flows
- Identification of issues
- Future demand for services
- Vision, goals, objectives and targets for waste management and minimisation (these are subject to decisions about which services Council will provide)
- An options assessment of proposals for both kerbside collection services and the district issues identified

3.2.2. It is proposed that the vision, goals and objectives remain unchanged from the 2012 Waste Management and Minimisation Plan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 1: Improving the efficiency of resource use</th>
<th>Objective 1:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Our community has opportunities for avoiding or reducing waste at source.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“The Council works with other councils, central government, industry and other parties to improve product stewardship (i.e. aiming to reduce the environmental impact of the life cycle of products).”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 3:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Our community has the opportunity to maximise the diversion of material for reuse, recycling or recovery.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 4:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“The range of diverted material will be improved and the quality of these materials enhanced.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 2: Reducing harmful effects of waste</th>
<th>Objective 5:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Our community has access to services for effective and efficient management of waste that comply with current environmental and health practices.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 6:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“The disposal of sewage treatment residuals complies with current environmental and health practices.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 7:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Our community is informed and educated regarding issues regarding hazardous waste and residual waste.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.3. Options to address district specific issue identified in the assessment fall into three broad categories – education, regulation and provision of services. Each option has been assessed against its alignment with the vision, goals and objectives; for its cost; and for its ease of implementation. The assessment process is shown in tables 3 and 5 of the Waste Assessment.
3.3. Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan (Attachment iii)

3.3.1. The draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan (WMMP) summarises the outcome of the Waste Assessment. It states the vision, goals, objectives and targets, summarises the waste situation within the district, and the legislative framework within which the WMMP has to operate. It also sets out the proposed action plan from the Waste Assessment process to address the identified waste issues within the district, and provides information on how Council intends to fund the activities of the WMMP over the next 6 years.

3.4. Waste Composition from SWAP Audit

3.4.1. Waste Not Consulting carried out a SWAP (solid waste analysis protocol) waste audit of rubbish bags and private collector bins and at the refuse pit at Southbrook resource recovery park between 26 February and 2 March 2017. The SWAP report results are included in the Waste Assessment.

3.4.2. Kerbside waste from WDC and private collectors makes up 45% of waste going through the refuse pit and to landfill (7,433 tonnes): Recyclable materials make up 9% of kerbside waste (669 tonnes) and Compostable organic waste makes up 61% of kerbside waste (4,534 tonnes).

3.4.3. The table below identifies the principal sources of divertible materials in an estimated 17,200 tonnes of waste that has been sent to landfill through Southbrook resource recovery park over the past year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Divertible material</th>
<th>Percentage of total</th>
<th>All landfilled waste tonnes</th>
<th>Kerbside portion % and tonnes</th>
<th>Other sources % and tonnes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compostable greenwaste</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>3,125</td>
<td>84% 2,631</td>
<td>16% 494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compostable kitchen/food</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>2,363</td>
<td>80% 1,895</td>
<td>20% 468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper &amp; cardboard</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>29% 275</td>
<td>71% 688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferrous metals</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>6% 30</td>
<td>94% 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plastics (recyclable)</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>70% 216</td>
<td>30% 476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubble (cleanfill)</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>76% 164</td>
<td>24% 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass (recyclable)</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>61% 97</td>
<td>39% 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Ferrous metals</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>8% 7</td>
<td>92% 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total divertible</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>2,237</td>
<td>69% 5,315</td>
<td>31% 1,448</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4.4. Almost 45% of the District’s landfilled waste could be recycled or otherwise diverted from landfill. The remaining materials cannot currently be diverted from Landfill, e.g. 18% is timber, 6% is textiles & 5.4% is sanitary paper.

3.4.5. Compostable organic waste makes up 32% of all landfilled waste (5,488 tonnes). Kerbside waste contributes over 80% of this total (4,526 tonnes); therefore the largest component of waste that can be relatively easily diverted from landfill is garden and food waste arising from households.
3.4.6. Given that kerbside waste is compacted together when it is collected and cannot be easily sorted out once that occurs, the most effective method for diverting organic waste is giving households the ability to separate the organic waste ‘at source’ and providing a kerbside organic waste collection service.

3.4.7. The remaining recyclable or otherwise divertible materials in kerbside rubbish could be diverted from bags and bins by better informing the public on how they can reduce their rubbish and better manage their wastes.

3.4.8. The bulk of recyclable paper & cardboard, ferrous and non-ferrous metals come from other sources than kerbside refuse collections, and most likely come in loads that can be reasonably readily sorted by a skilled operator and ‘grab’ attachment on an excavator. Other recyclable or other divertible materials from those same sources that could be ‘grabbed’ could be retrieved in the same manner.

3.4.9. The second largest component of landfilled waste is timber at 3,095 tonnes (18%) – unfortunately, there is currently no viable disposal facility for treated timber apart from landfill and no cheap and easy way to tell treated and untreated timber apart. Should this be remedied in the future, timber could be relatively easy to sort from other waste to divert it from landfill.

3.5. Kerbside Services

3.5.1. It was important to the Working Party that the issue of affordability for waste services for those on low incomes be addressed.

3.5.2. Central to the options approved by the Working Party for inclusion in the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan therefore, is the flexibility for households to continue to receive the same services as they currently have. Any additional services that the Council may offer should not change the costs for customers continuing to receive their current services.

3.5.3. The draft WMMP contains three Council provided kerbside collection options. For each option the recycling service remains unchanged from the current level of service and rate. Full details of the services that it is proposed to consult upon, and estimated ratepayer costs, are detailed in Attachment I. A summary of Council’s proposed services is provided below, with the choices tabulated on the following page.

3.5.4. **Option 1**: The status quo. This won’t change current diversion from landfill.

**Option 2**: The choice between using refuse bags or a wheelie bin for the weekly collection service. In the WMMP this is called the Enhanced Option, and is estimated to increase diversion by around 6kg per capita, or a total of 350 tonnes based on current population and waste generation levels.

**Option 3**: The choice between using bags or a wheelie bin for a fortnightly refuse collection service and/or a weekly organics waste wheelie bin collection service. In the WMMP this is called the Advanced Option, and is estimated to increase diversion by around 42kg per capita, or a total of 2,440 tonnes based on current population and waste generation levels.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recycling collection still provided fortnightly</td>
<td>Use weekly WDC refuse bags</td>
<td>Use weekly WDC refuse bags</td>
<td>Use fortnightly WDC refuse bags</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Choice (a)</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Use weekly refuse bin</td>
<td>Use fortnightly refuse bin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Choice (b)</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Use fortnightly refuse bin and weekly organics bin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Choice (c)</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Use weekly organics bin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Choice (d)</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Use weekly organics bin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5.5. Note that in Option 3 for those choosing to continue using the refuse bag collection, the level of service would change, as bags would only be collected fortnightly, not weekly. This may not create a significant push back as householders who like to keep their refuse costs really low are not likely to be putting out bags on a weekly basis anyway.

3.5.6. The new bins would all have RFID tags inserted during manufacture, in order to ensure the bins can be tracked if they are removed from their allocated property, and to check that residents living close to Week 1 / Week 2 boundaries do not put the bins out on both collection weeks.

3.5.7. Once the technology of the RFID tag readers, databases and reporting are to a reliable standard, the Council could then consider looking to charge by bin-lift, or rebate part-disposal costs for unused collections, which would make this service more user pays.

3.6. Facility Upgrades

3.6.1. By increasing the size of the refuse pit and extending the pit building, more space can be provided for a machine and operator to sort through the waste from skips and some commercial trucks to divert into recycling, or clean-fill. As discussed in 3.4 there are sufficient quantities of divertible materials being delivered by skips, trailers and trucks to make this a cost-effective exercise.

3.6.2. The existing second-hand shop (the ReSale Store) is operating at or over-capacity. Relocating the ReSale Store to the Flaxton Road frontage, and having a much larger retail and storage area with a workshop to allow for repairs or dismantling to be carried out, will allow for more reusable items to be diverted from landfill. The recycling area could then be utilised for accepting and processing more materials.

3.6.3. An overall budget of $3.3M has been allocated in the Long Term Plan for these upgrades within the next 5 years. These upgrades were assessed in the Waste Assessment as potentially diverting around 925 tonnes of waste (5.4%) from landfill.

3.6.4. Construction of a purpose-built and automated sorting plant would have the potential to divert around another 1,503 (9%) tonnes from landfill. A budgetary allowance for such a facility, or another facility for otherwise sorting and processing recyclable materials, has been included in the Infrastructure Strategy, beyond the 10-year horizon of the LTP.
3.7. **Waste Reduction**

3.7.1. The table below shows the current WDC per capita waste to landfill quantity, and the per capita waste diverted from the landfill via recycling, and other waste minimisation initiatives. It also shows the estimated changes to those figures for both the Enhanced Option and the Advanced Option.

3.7.2. The draft waste plan contains a variety of initiatives to further improve the district’s waste minimisation. Some are already operating, some are new. Each initiative is categorised as either “enhanced” or “advanced’, and the figures shown in the table include the cumulative waste minimisation effects of all of the enhanced initiatives and all of the advanced initiatives. However, the biggest single effect is provided by the additional kerbside services, and in particular the inclusion of a organics collection service has the most effect, by quite some margin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Per capita/annum waste to landfill</th>
<th>Per capita/annum materials diverted from landfill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current</strong></td>
<td>294 kg</td>
<td>170 kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enhanced Services</strong></td>
<td>243 kg</td>
<td>221 kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advanced Services</strong></td>
<td>161 kg</td>
<td>303 kg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.7.3. The estimated reduction in per-capita waste to landfill is shown in the graph below:

![Waste Stream Projections](image)

3.8. The Management Team has reviewed this report and supports the recommendations.
4. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

4.1. It is a statutory requirement that the Council use the special consultative procedure (section 83 of LGA 2002) prior to adopting its WMMP, and in doing so the most recent waste assessment must be notified with the statement of proposal.

4.2. As outlined in the Communications plan (Attachment v) it is proposed that a roll out of information will start immediately, through a variety of channels, which will include:

- Council’s website
- Facebook and other social media
- Visits to retirement villages
- Discussions with managers of Council owned pensioner housing
- Newspapers
- Stands at supermarkets or in front of Council facilities
- Static displays and videos screening at Council facilities (service centres, libraries, aquatic facilities)

- Engage directly with organisations and groups such as:
  - Community Boards
  - Te Ngai Tuahuriri
  - Private Bin Collectors
  - Grey Power
  - Residents Associations or similar organisations
  - Service groups (Lions, Rotary, etc.).

4.3. The proposed timetable would see submissions closing on Friday 11 August after a 9 week advertising and awareness raising campaign. Hearings/deliberations would be during the week starting 4 September, and a final report would be presented to the Council on 7 November seeking a decision as to whether to include the additional kerbside service options in the budgets going forward into the LTP.

5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

5.1. There are no direct financial implications arising from Council adopting the recommendation of this report. However, should the result of the consultation process be that additional kerbside services are included in the draft 2018-2028 LTP, and Council subsequently approves the provision of those services, there will be an impact on the rates for those households that choose to use the offered bin service(s).

5.2. The amount of that effect will vary considerable depending on the service options chosen by the household. Furthermore, the effect on the household costs for waste services may be different than the effect on rates, for the same household. For example in the enhanced services scenario, a household using 52 bags per year choosing to have an 80 litre bin service (weekly), would be paying an additional $135 in rates, but would be saving $156 in bag purchase costs. The net household cost saving would therefore be $21.

In contrast, in the advanced services scenario for a household currently using 52 bags per year that chooses a 140 litre for refuse (fortnightly), and the large 240 litre organics bin, rates would increase by $285, but household costs for waste services would
increase by only $129. However, this figure does not include the price differential between the new service and the household’s original costs for disposal of garden waste.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPTION 1</th>
<th>Standard Service</th>
<th>Cost for standard service</th>
<th>Alternatives offered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recycling</td>
<td>240 L bin fortnightly</td>
<td>$86 targeted rate</td>
<td>Change to 80L bin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No rate change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change to 140L bin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuse</td>
<td>Buy official bags</td>
<td>$3.00 per bag</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPTION 2</th>
<th>Standard Service</th>
<th>Cost for standard service</th>
<th>Alternatives offered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recycling</td>
<td>240 L bin fortnightly</td>
<td>$86 targeted rate</td>
<td>Change to 80L bin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No rate change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change to 140L bin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuse</td>
<td>140L bin weekly</td>
<td>$195 via rates</td>
<td>Change to 80L bin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$135 via rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stopping the bin service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Range</td>
<td>$86 + bag costs</td>
<td>$281 p.a. rate</td>
<td>140L refuse bin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPTION 3</th>
<th>Standard Service</th>
<th>Cost for standard service</th>
<th>Alternatives offered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recycling</td>
<td>240 L bin fortnightly</td>
<td>$86 targeted rate</td>
<td>Change to 80L bin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No rate change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change to 140L bin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuse</td>
<td>140L bin <strong>Fortnightly</strong></td>
<td>$125 via rates</td>
<td>Change to 80L bin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$95 via rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stopping the bin service (<strong>not rated</strong>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organics</td>
<td>140L bin weekly</td>
<td>$110 via rates</td>
<td>Change to 80L bin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$80 via rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change to 240L bin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$160 via rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stopping the bin service (<strong>not rated</strong>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Range</td>
<td>$86 + bag costs</td>
<td>$371 p.a. rate</td>
<td>140L refuse bin &amp; 240L organics bin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Further scenarios for the different options available to be chosen, and the costs, are shown in Attachment iv

5.3. The biggest risk to Council in introducing additional waste services relates to market share. Under the current arrangements, Council provides a service that is also offered by the private sector for waste collection services: at present Council has approximately 35% of the market. Offering households the option of taking up any new Council services that might be offered means that Council would be affecting the private sector’s market share for those services. Uncertainty about the Council’s potential market share creates a number of risks:

- At the procurement phase, an estimate of the expected market share will need to be made, and a contract signed up to collect from a specific number of households. This will fix the costs, and through the LTP, the prices for the additional services will have been advertised, as required by statute. Should the market share prove to be less than estimated, then the Council faces fixed costs to provide the services, and a lower than anticipated income. It may also take some time for the market share to settle down, after the introduction of any new services.

- The fact that Council is required to fix its fees and charges in advance in the LTP, provides private collection companies with an opportunity to undercut Council’s prices, to boost their market share.

- Not having the full market makes any collection operation less efficient, and therefore more costly per household, as fixed costs need to be shared amongst a smaller number of customers, and variable costs are higher due to the greater average distance between pick-ups.

5.4. If large numbers of households decide to stay with a bag collection, there is the potential for those using the bin system to be subsidising those using bags. This could be checked in the future from time to time and an adjustment made to the pricing structure of rates and bags if required.

5.5. Recycling, funded through a targeted rate is a popular and well used service. Offering the organics collection as an optional extra potentially runs the risk of a low uptake, and therefore a lower level of waste diversion.

5.6. Continuing to offer bag collection services has some risk from the health and safety aspect. It is well documented that manual kerbside collections are riskier operations than automated wheele bin collections, and in general, the industry is keen to move away from them. However, the proposed joint bag and wheele bin collection proposal, which operates in Selwyn District, offers a lower level of risk than the current bag-only collection.

5.7. On the basis of comments that have been made from at least one of the large industry operators, there is a small risk that they would not tender for a collection service that included bag collections.

5.8. Having a differential rate for different sized bins, and allowing ratepayers to choose not to be rated for one or two bins will be more administratively complex than the current system. Retaining bags will continue to require administration time around ordering, sale of and invoicing supermarkets for the bags. However rural ratepayers will still be able to purchase the bags and dispose of them at no additional cost at our disposal sites therefore should not feel disadvantaged by the Council moving to a bin service.
6. **Context**

6.1. **Policy**

This matter is a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance Policy. In addition, it is a requirement of the Waste Minimisation Act that the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan is consulted upon via a special consultative procedure if there are significant changes made during the review.

6.2. **Legislation**


6.3. **Community Outcomes**

This report relates to the following community outcomes:

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

6.4. **Ta matou mauri**

This report and proposed options fit well with the Council’s customer promise “we will be professional, approachable and solutions-focused” and relates to the following value from Ta matou mauri:

- We will work with you and each other

Simon Collin
Infrastructure Strategy Manager

Kitty Waghorn
Solid Waste Asset Manager
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE HEARINGS FOR THE WASTE MANAGEMENT AND MINIMISATION PLAN REVIEW HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA ON MONDAY 28 AUGUST AND THURSDAY 31 AUGUST 2017 COMMENCING AT 4.30PM.

MINUTES OF THE DELIBERATIONS MEETING HELD ON MONDAY 4 SEPTEMBER 2017 IN THE UPSTAIRS FUNCTION ROOM, RANGIORA TOWN HALL, 303 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA COMMENCING AT 4.30PM

MINUTES OF THE RECONVENED DELIBERATIONS MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY 7 SEPTEMBER 2017 IN RAKAHURI COMMITTEE ROOM, RANGIORA SERVICE CENTRE, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA AT 4.30PM

MINUTES OF THE RECONVENED DELIBERATIONS MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY 13 SEPTEMBER 2017 IN OROHAKI MEETING ROOM, FARMERS BUILDING, WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL, HIGH STREET, RANGIORA AT 12.00PM

HEARING PANEL PRESENT: (for all hearings and deliberations)

Councillors R Brine (Chairperson), W Doody and P Williams.

IN ATTENDANCE: (for hearings 28 and 31 August)

K Waghorn (Solid Waste Asset Manager), S Collin (Infrastructure Strategy Manager), Sean de Roo (Utilities Engineering Officer), A Smith (Committee Advisor)

IN ATTENDANCE: (for deliberations 4, 7 and 13 September)

G Cleary (Manager Utilities and Roading), K Waghorn (Solid Waste Asset Manager), S Collin (Infrastructure Strategy Manager), A Smith (Committee Advisor)

Councillor Brine introduced the Hearing Panel and Council staff to those in the public gallery, and provided an overview of the process to date to review the Waste Management and Minimisation Plan. The Plan will also be part of the Long Term Plan submission process in 2018, with more details available at that time. The public will get another chance to submit at that time.

1. APOLOGIES

There were no apologies.

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

There were no conflicts of interest noted.
### 3. HEARING OF SUBMISSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitter/Organisation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Janice Watkins</td>
<td>Ms Watkins is a resident of a unit and is the Chair of Body Corporate 366454 which runs from Victoria Street to Ivory Street, Rangiiora. Ms Watkins noted that the consultation process has determined that three bins system is the most popular but she is happy with the current service of rubbish bag collection and recycling bin. The concerns of residents are around the management of bins and space required to store them. The complex has a group of 18 elderly people who live in 13 units and a lot of these residents use walking frames or walking sticks. There are concerns of residents not being able to handle using bins, at the same time as having to use a walking frame or stick. Regarding storing the three bins if this system was introduced, there is very limited space around the units in the complex. Each unit has a very small area of lawn and a small concrete area outside the lounge and residents didn’t really want to put the bins there. Ms Watkins said she wouldn’t want to have to call an ambulance because someone has fallen trying to manage a bin. Councillor Brine asked, does this submission reflect the view of all the neighbours in the Body Corporate and Ms Watkins said this is definitely the case. Councillor Doody asked if the option of a bag or another small bin was available, what would be the preference. Mrs Watkins said she would only put a rubbish bag out every two to three weeks and the preference is for rubbish bags and the recycling bin, as is used now. Ms Watkins said she goes walking frequently but didn’t think that having the extra bins on the footpath would be a problem as they are usually placed on the verge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Stewart, and Miles Jackson, Grey Power (North Canterbury)</td>
<td>Linda Stewart and Miles Jackson spoke on behalf of the Grey Power (North Canterbury) group members. There are currently 700 members of the group in Waimakariri, with the membership number increasing each week. There had been good dialogue with Council staff and the group members appreciated this. Kitty Waghorn has spoken at two Grey Power meetings in recent months. There had been further questions asked by group members and Council staff had provided answers to these (included in the submission). It was suggested that some of the questions could be carried forward with a bit more explanation. Linda noted the three bin system has been accepted in Christchurch and new people coming from Christchurch feel the system here is draconian. It was also acknowledged that any updated system needs to be affordable. There needs to be a more concrete idea as to what it is going to cost individual ratepayers. Some members are very opposed to a three bin system. Mr Jackson noted that many members of Grey Power are on fixed income, and some expenses are not within their control, such as insurance and rates. Members come from the generation where there is no waste. Two years ago members were opposed to a three bin system, but there have been some adjustments made to the systems offered. One of the criticisms from the Christchurch three bin system, is that the green waste bin is too small. Recycling infrastructure currently works, but there is pressure right across the country to minimise. The group had further questions that they considered would provide more clarity in the proposed three bin system and the costs involved. What is going to be built to cope with</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the three bin system? Will there be a recycling plant to turn green waste into compost? Why is it only the urban area that the Council is looking at, when the whole district could be going onto a changed system (not necessarily a three bin system).

The major concern is the costs to members, and suggested there could be deferred rates. Mr Jackson noted that the LTP states that the demographics of the population shows the older population numbers in the district are increasing.

Councillor Doody asked on the size of bins in Christchurch, and Linda stated that the green waste bins are not considered to be big enough for most household sections, to accommodate both garden and food waste.

| Valerie Kenyon | Mrs Kenyon spoke to her submission. She stated she is speaking on behalf of a lot of pensioners that she knows, and supports having the three bin system. From a personal view, Ms Kenyon said the smaller bins are much more convenient and more cat, dog and rat proof. Suggested these would be a good idea for people living on their own and pensioners. Noted the instances of the rubbish bags getting ripped open by these animals. Not having to purchase the plastic rubbish bags each week would be an advantage and much more convenient for everybody.

Councillor Brine noted that some previous submitters have had concern with not having room to store three bins. Mrs Kenyon said she lives on a smaller section but would have room for the three bins. Mrs Kenyon would not need to use a big bin though, noting that it takes her a long time to fill her current yellow bin.

Councillor Williams questioned why Mrs Kenyon doesn’t use three bin system now, noting the opportunity to use private operators. Mrs Kenyon noted there is a cost involved with this and would prefer to use the Council service. |

| Gillian Giller | Mrs Giller lives in a rural area, noted that she has for a long time made every effort to reduce waste, and as a consequence does not generate a lot of waste from their property. She is in support of the three bin system and likes the flexibility of the choices in Option C. Mrs Giller would like to see a continued education programme to encourage people to reduce waste, and acknowledged that there are already some good education systems in place – noting the current programme with the local business’s for not using plastic straws. The black plastic bags for rubbish are not ideal, but with using these, there is control of the costs, which wouldn’t be available if a bin system was introduced. In this regard the bins would be more expensive for her as she would have to pay for a bin regardless of whether it was used or not. Would not like to see a system introduced that was not flexible enough to support all users of the kerbside system.

Mrs Giller considers green waste as a resource and she would not want to send it away from her property. She would use it in her garden.

Question from Councillor Williams, Mrs Giller said that it is possible that residents could generate more rubbish if there was rubbish bin collection instead of using the rubbish bags. |

The hearing adjourned at 6.00pm for meal break and resumed at 7.00pm.
Karina Cobb

Ms Cobb supports the introduction of a three bin system. With all the new developments in the district, she also suggested the possibility of introducing small compost bins that could be collected on a regular basis. She had a sample of the compost bin to show the hearing panel members. Ms Cobb questioned how the service will be paid for, would it be weekly or monthly and also asked if the bins were going to be bar coded for charging purposes? This would mean data could be accurately collected at pickup and charged accordingly.

Chair Brine noted the different variation that is suggested here in Ms Cobbs submission (the suggested inclusion of a compost bin) and said that there have been several variations that have been submitted on throughout the process. The hearing panel will need to consider all of these suggestions.

Ms Cobb explained use of the compost bins, which can be used with biodegradable bags inside which break down over time. Ms Cobb added that she prefers to use her bin with a paper towel in the bottom.

Shona Powell, Chairperson
Woodend-Seton Community Board

Shona Powell presented the Woodend-Seton Community Boards submission. The Board unanimously supports Option C, but Board members have concerns with the cost. Mrs Powell noted some of the issues raised in Christchurch prior to the three bin system being introduced – such as, no room for three bins on section; bins tipping over and spilling rubbish and recycling in wind, but none of these concerns had proved to be an issue once the new services were introduced. The ability to choose a bin size was a good strategy. The waste minimisation part of the Plan was not promoted a lot. The life of Kate Valley was also important, and supported having less waste would mean a longer life of the landfill. The Board suggested the Council could look at reducing waste from construction sites and supported Council working with building companies to help them to reduce waste. Rubbish collection and disposal is seen by most residents as a core business of Council, though the Board believes that private operators would still have a place.

In support of bins, rather than bags, the Board suggests that it is safer for people to be able to put bins out the afternoon/evening prior to collection, rather than rubbish bags being put out the morning of collection so not being damaged by stray dogs, cats etc and also the hazard of icy footpaths on winter’s mornings.

It was noted that there is an expectation in the community that the three-bin system is going to be introduced soon. Residents have little understanding of the process and believe that it is imminent that the three bin system is going to be introduced. The public are not aware that the recommendation following this process has to go to Council.

Councillor Williams asked what costs do the Board members think would be acceptable? Mrs Powell said this is a difficult question to have an answer to, realising that it is harder on the smaller households and elderly.

Councillor Doody asked if Mrs Powell knew how many of the Woodend-Seton Community Board members used the current Council kerbside waste collection. It was confirmed that all members did, with one member also composting green waste.

The Board supports the phasing out the use of the rubbish bags as the way to go. It can be difficult for the elderly to adjust to change. Mrs Powell pointed out that the initial concerns with residents in
Christchurch prior to the introduction of three bin system, quietened down very quickly following the system being introduced.

| Jim Gerard, Chairperson | Jim Gerard, Chairperson of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board presented the Boards submission. Mr Gerard advised that the Board held a workshop to fully discuss the issues that needed to be addressed. The Board has concerns with the information provided in the consultation document and noted five issues that needed addressing. |
| Rangiora-Ashley Community Board | Health and Safety of workers -The Board questioned the figures for number of accidents involving collection of plastic rubbish bags, noting the advice received that there had been only two serious accidents in the past five years. |
| Jackie Watson, Chairperson | Jackie Watson spoke to the submission on behalf of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board. Sustainability is the key word, but it also needs to be affordable. Many residents in the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi ward have previously used the three bin system in Christchurch and support it. The prime factor is the increase in rates as a consequence of the introduction of the three bin system. The Board had a variety of opinions as to whether there should be a change in the system or not and the Board went with what it felt the Community wanted. Not enough consideration was given to the Clarkville or Tuahiwi areas of... |

**Jackie Watson, Chairperson**
Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board

**Jim Gerard, Chairperson**
Rangiora-Ashley Community Board
its Ward, and in light of the previous submitter, supports the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board submission. The private operators provide a valuable service and the Board would wish to have them continuing to operate. Would not support the three bin system if it impacted on these private operators and them having to go out of business. The Board supported the three bin system, but questions the opt in/opt out system and how this would be managed. The Board members felt they (and any others who submitted) were being asked to comment on something they didn’t know enough about to comment. The Board would need to know more about this and how it would work. The waste bin system is a “nice to have” but not actually an affordable one.

Councillor Doody asked if there could be an opportunity for a gradual reduction in the use of black rubbish bags. Jackie suggested this could be an option though did comment on the health and safety issues with using the plastic rubbish bags.

Councillor Williams questioned the issue of health and safety, when there are only two accidents notified. Ms Watson noted that she had personally had accidents with items piercing through the rubbish bags and that this could be the case in many households.

Councillor Brine questioned if the Board did not support the opt in/ opt out availability. Mrs Watson said the Board didn’t understand how this opt in-opt out system would be managed, it was complicated and how this was going to be managed. Though doesn’t support a resident being forced to use a waste bin when they didn’t want to. Supports composting as an immediate reduction in waste.

If ratepayers had an option, if they could save money somewhere, the Board would prefer to retain use of rubbish bags rather than having rubbish bins introduced.

Mrs Watson supports educating people on the ease of the use of composting bins. If this was encouraged and even if a small percentage of residents started using this, it would reduce the amount of waste going to landfill.

The hearing adjourned at 7.45pm, and reconvened on Thursday 31st August at 4.30pm.
**Hearings reconvened on Thursday 31st August at 4.30pm**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitter/ Organisation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lynda Perham</td>
<td>Ms Perham has concerns that there is still the option of using plastic rubbish bags, and questions the Council even considering offering this option. There are too many plastic bags! Plastic bags can also be dangerous for collectors, and always a mess on collection day if dogs, cats or other animals get into bags. The Council could do better by not having plastic bags. Christchurch City Council do not have this option, and Ashburton Council have recently introduced bins, with this option. Ms Perham believes the logical offer is everyone encouraged to have a large recycling bin, to maximise recycling and to encourage people to use a smaller red bin, to minimise waste going to the landfills. Green bins are a very good idea, and Ms Perham welcomes this suggestion. She strongly recommends ditching plastic bags. Councillor Williams asked what Ms Perham currently uses – and she does use the Council’s plastic bags for her rubbish collection. There is the option of using private operators who currently use bins, but this costs individuals further. The cost to individuals for Council collection is the $3 per rubbish bag and the actual collection of rubbish bags is a proportion of rates. Councillor Doody noted that a lot of residents are already doing measures to reduce waste, composting and recycling. It was confirmed that it would take many years for a council rubbish plastic bag to break down in the environment. Ms Perham said even though she is a pensioner, she would be more than willing to pay for a three bin system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Crowe</td>
<td>John Crowe, owns Rangiora Rubbish Removals a local service which offers three bins on a user pays system. The introduction of a Council three bin system would put all the local private firms out of business. These businesses employ local people who spend their money locally. The private companies employ 20 people directly and spend about $1.5m a year on running their businesses. Mr Crowe has recently upgraded his trucks as he was unaware that the possible introduction of this three bin service was happening so soon. The service offered by his company is on an as required basis, i.e. less green waste created over the winter months so customers don’t pay for that service when not needed. Mr Crowe understands that the Council will not be buying the bins, but that Waste Management will be purchasing them. He questioned then how can small operators tender for the business? He suggests that if this is the case, the control of collection, transfer station and a major shareholding in Kate Valley, will be a monopoly by Canterbury Waste. Mr Crowe suggests this is a dangerous situation. There needs to be clarity in the options that are being offered on the consultation document. Mr Crowe acknowledged that there would be a saving in truck movements to Kate Valley but that there are more large trucks collecting bins and travelling back and forth to Christchurch, and questions is this really a saving? The number of submissions received was mentioned, but also noted does this mean that the over 20,000 households are happy with the current collections arrangements? Mr Crowe believes there was not enough marketing of the consultation process and some residents did not know it was even happening. Mr Crowe believes there could be a lot more work done with local businesses to reduce rubbish. Questioned with the three bin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
system can there be any guarantee that there won’t be any contaminated waste going to Kate Valley? Mr Crowe hopes that the Council will think very hard before it makes a decision that could impact on local businesses, local residents losing their jobs and sending profits overseas. Mr Crowe added that he is already committed to a recycling business targeting building sites.

Councillor Williams asked would it be profitable for Mr Crowe to continue his business in the rural areas if the Council went to the three bin system. Mr Crowe said the rural collection would only be a part time job, maybe with a collection day on a Saturday. It would not be viable on its own and any business would end up having to charge up to $50 to make it viable due to the mileage to be covered. Currently Mr Crowe has approximately 2,500 – 3,000 wheelie bins and the remainder of up to 5,000 are 44 gallon drums. New wheelie bins are $80 to buy new, and not worth much to sell second hand. Does also do a recycling business from commercial areas. Green waste all goes to a local business Andrew Giles at Southbrook to be composted and currently stays within the district. Some of this also goes into fundraising projects for local groups.

Councillor Brine asked are the private operators bins tagged? Mr Crowe noted this has been looked at previously but there is an issue with people moving addresses. It was noted that this could be discussed again if needed. Councillor Brine noted the Council is currently in consultation and there is no decision made yet as to who may provide the bins, if that is the way the Council decides to go. This related to the comment Mr Crowe made on information he had heard regarding who would be owning the bins. Regarding submitting a tender for any of the kerbside collection process, Mr Crowe said it would cost him about $20,000 to put a tender in to do any of the work.

Following a question from Councillor Doody, Mr Crowe advised that the liners for the plastic bins are actually biodegradable, but they are currently in the process of negotiating a price for corn starch bags to use within the liners. He noted that a lot of people don’t use the bin liners, which are mostly just to keep the bins clean.

Kirstyn Barnett and Maria Cassin (former Chairperson)
Cust Community Network

Mrs Barnett and Cassin presented the submission on behalf of the Cust Community Network. Mrs Barnett is the current Chairperson and Ms Cassin is a former Chairperson. The group would like to have a mixed recycling drop facility established somewhere in the Cust area. The impact on the environment and oceans on plastics is not good and becoming an increasing problem. Communities have to do everything possible to encourage recycling and reuse in the environment. Having such a facility in Cust would save the trip into Southbrook or Oxford. A lot of Cust residents live on lifestyle blocks who previously lived close to recycling facilities or were farmers (who are used to putting rubbish in pits or burning it). This is no longer an appropriate solution for the environment. There is an increasing population in the Cust area and the group believe there is now more of a need for such a facility. Noted how busy the Southbrook facility is on the weekends. Having such a facility in Cust would alleviate pressure on the Southbrook station and potentially Oxford as well.

98% of residents who were surveyed informally in May this year, supported having this recycling drop off being put in place. Strong levels of support. Members of the Cust Community network have indicated that they would be happy to be the guardians of such a local facility in their community if it was introduced. The group would like to see a trial introduced to see how it would work and to see the level of use by the community. Maria noted from a personal point of view, and
observed there is still a number of people who use pits to dump rubbish or burn it on properties (polluting the atmosphere), thinks this would be a great idea.

Mrs Barnett noted that there are recycling yellow top bins in the Cust township urban area only, but there is no collection on lifestyle blocks. Living on a lifestyle block, Mrs Barnett makes regular trips to the Southbrook Transfer Station.

Councillor Doody asked if the group had any ideas on where the proposed drop off station would be located? Mrs Barnett said this had been discussed by members and possible options included the Community Centre area or the Cust Domain area, or the old tip on O’Farrells Road. Kirstyn believes it should be on a sealed road. The group is seeking approval for investigations on a suitable location, consultation with the community and getting resource consent.

| Bruce Bellis |
| Mr Bellis lives in Mulcocks Road Flaxton on a 4ha lifestyle block. He has previously lived in Christchurch City Council area for many years and noted when the three bin system was introduced there this was greatly appreciated. It was much cleaner and tidier and certainly recommends it to this Council. He suggests that a green waste bin is not necessary here as this is a rural environment, and most people compost grass clippings. This would mean a 30% saving in the cost of the bin system being introduced. The cost of a green bin would vastly outweigh its usefulness. A red bin and yellow bin are 100% useful on a fortnightly collection, but a green bin would only be 20% useful. Mr Bellis said he would not put out a green bin, as he re-uses grass clippings and food scraps in compost. |

| Doug Nicholl |
| Doug Nicholl spoke on behalf of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board. The Board has suggested that both West Eyreton and Cust have a recycling drop off depot. The Board would like to see the withdrawal of rubbish bags as soon as possible, and only have a bin system. In relation to the previous presenter, Doug believes there is a need for green waste bins in the residential areas, but perhaps not so much in the rural areas. Noted that glass bottles are currently not recycled and re-used. This would be a huge saving on a national level and Mr Nicholl believes this is worth being considered. The Council needs to have some consideration for the private operators who are potentially going to lose their livelihoods. |

Questions

Councillor Williams asked if the three bin system was introduced in urban areas in the Board area, there could possibly be no service available in rural areas. This is due to the private operators not being able to continue a viable business only in the rural areas. Doug noted that the Board did not discuss any alternatives for these rural residents if the three bin system was introduced.

The hearing adjourned at 5.15pm and reconvened at 5.50pm.

| Hayley Wilkins |
| Ms Wilkins spoke to her submission. Having previously lived in Christchurch and moved to the Waimakariri District in 2016. Ms Wilkins misses having the bins available for green waste, and household rubbish. She has a small section and uses a compost system and has not considered using a private operator for green waste. Does not like using plastic rubbish bags or having to drive to a transfer station to drop off either rubbish or green waste. |
The hearing adjourned at 5.55pm and reconvened at 7.00pm.

| Andrew Giles | Mr Giles presented his submission. Mr Giles has a composting business and currently processes the green waste in the district. He believes there is better ways in dealing with rubbish and green waste.

Mr Giles asked: There are approximately 19,000 households in the district, 1986 people that were in favour of the three bin system, high percentage that didn’t respond. What percentage do the Council need to action this? Is the process gauged on the response percentage or the percentage across the district? Is the assumption that people who didn’t respond are not interested or do they want the three bin system?

Is it opt in, or opt out, regarding the three bin system goes? Is the assumption that the people who didn’t respond want it, or don’t want it?

People are busy with life, don’t have any great interest until something happens (i.e. when the recycling bins were first introduced and that some of these were subsequently returned). Mr Giles has support for local businesses and believes the Council could be supporting these businesses better than what they are. If services are already there, then point the community in that direction. The set up of a three bin system would cost quite a lot of money and suggested it would be more economic for the Council to use systems that are already in place – as in local operators. What is proposed to be done with the organic waste collected? Mr Giles is the local green waste processing business and works closely with Biogro New Zealand, which is the organisation that the majority of organic farmers certification. Noted the stringent classification of organics anywhere around the world. Organic is not as simple as straightforward to produce as standard green waste compost. Regarding the transport of green waste or organic waste anywhere is quite an expensive business if it is transported out of the district. With impact on the environment with effects of diesel and impact on infrastructure. Mr Giles acknowledge that it makes sense to get the green waste out of the refuse stream and use it elsewhere, but there are other costs to be taken into account. And asked the question, where do you put it? What is done with it and is it economically viable to do it? Will organics be a separate collection from other green waste. The current collection requires quite a lot of effort to keep the green waste clean to prevent contamination. Believes this issue will become more prevalent if collection is done kerbside. Question is what would be done with the organic products once it is processed?

Local schools and sports groups as fundraisers, where the products are bagged up and sold. Looking after the community. Fear that if the suggested system was brought in it will have detrimental effects and loss of support for local communities.

Suggests that there needs to be two separate collections, green waste to go to transfer station and continued organics separate collection. There is an option for this to work, but the two collections need to be separate. Not sure where that could be processed. Organics could still be used in this council’s parks and reserves and the Council should show its support for local business.

A lot of local residents are unaware that the three bin system is currently available through private collection companies. Suggested that the Council could be supporting these businesses by promoting them on their website. |
Mr Giles noted the benefits of using corn starch bags for composting, to replace plastic bags for lining of rubbish bins, or a rubbish bin in houses, these bags are fully biodegradable and compostable.

Councillor Williams – do you have space to expand for composting facility if the Council did take on the green waste from houses? Mr Giles said if the opportunity arose, he does have options on other land around the district, but would be pushed to fit any expansion on the current site. They have a reasonable stockpile of product from recent years, and once this stockpile has been reduced, there would be more room in the two current yards. Would there be the demand for the additional compost product that would be generated? Mr Giles said there could be a demand for a blended product, though this does downgrade a premium product to a midway product. There is a market there for the product and does not see this as being a problem.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justine and Wayne Hemmingson, Friendly Binz</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Justine Hemmingson spoke to the Friendly Binz business submission. It was noted that it was commendable that the Plan encourages green waste and recycling but has concerns with the manner in which it is being suggested. Their business is small, a one-man band, which they have owned for 18 months. Justine questioned the figures quoted on the Council website information provided, based on which people made assessments, was the costs per litre that is being proposed out of the consultation process versus the actual market rate. These rates worked out for Option B at .267c per litre, for the 140litre option on a weekly basis at $195 per year and Option C with the same calculation was at .3c per litre. Local providers range from .625 (Friendly Binz) to the more expensive of 0.75. The figures on the Council website then suggest that this is less than half the local providers and Justine doesn't understand how that works. This would be 50% off the revenue of the local providers business, with no change to the structure. This would decimate their business entirely. How is this rate attained if it doesn’t bear any relationship to the current rates provided by the local businesses in the community? It was noted that local providers already provide, green waste services, recycling as well as rubbish services. This proposed system would only cover those areas in the district currently covered by a kerbside system. Costs for other areas (rural) would need to increase to subsidise the costs quoted for the urban areas, where there is much high density of customers. This would mean prices would be varied depending on the part of the district and an unfair situation on ratepayers depending on where they live. They’ve spent a lot of time and effort building up their current business, but with the rate, they cannot compete. The only provider she can see who could provide this system at that price would be Waste Management. They would not provide the service across the district, only on certain areas, as they have the infrastructure to do it. This is then putting pressure on local businesses and local jobs. A fairer allocation might be to have a user pays system, which would mean putting up the price of landfill which gets applied to all providers equally, still encouraging recycling, green waste and effectively discouraging use of landfill. This means that all local businesses would have the same cost structure and issues to deal with and doesn’t create an uneven playing field.

Councillor Williams – suggested townships are already subsidising the rural collections, so these will either go expensive, or there will be no collection at all, or the Council will have to subsidise these areas. There is no differentiated cost across the different areas. The margin made on more populated areas is used to cross subsidise rural areas.
Their business is entirely local with trucks serviced in the area. Justine would like to get an understanding as to the disparity for the local market rate and the basis for the calculations of what is stated on the Council website. This is such a fundamental difference.

The hearing adjourned at 7.40pm on Thursday 31 August 2017 and reconvened for Deliberations on Monday 4 September 2017 at 4.30pm.

**DELIBERATIONS – reconvened on Monday 4 September 2017**

The Hearing Panel reconvened for deliberations on Monday 4 September 2017 at 4.30pm in the upstairs Function Room at the Rangiora Town Hall. 303 High Street, Rangiora.

On behalf of the Hearing Panel, Chairperson Brine acknowledged receipt of all the submissions received and thanked submitters for taking the time to advise the Council their thoughts on the matters for consideration.

The panel discussed the submission from the Cust Community Network group on having rural recycling drop off stations. Councillor Williams suggested this could possibly prompt other smaller rural communities in the district to request having a similar facility set up. He raised questions on the logistics and cost to the Council of having several of these facilities operating. Councillor Brine noted that a possible location has been identified by staff that could house a facility in Cust and that the group who submitted did appear to be pro-active. Staff are still to provide information on the population numbers for the Cust township.

**Alterations at the Southbrook Resource Centre.**

There is Council approved budget of $200,000 in the 2016/17 Annual Plan for construction of a building to provide shelter for recycling collected at kerbside, in order to remove the recycling from the refuse pit.

It was noted that there will be an item on the agenda for the Council meeting of Tuesday 5 September, requesting reallocation of funding from three other Solid Waste capital projects to fund the shortfall for the construction of the Southbrook recycling compactor shelter at Southbrook Resource Recovery Park.

**Kerbside collection Options**

Councillor Brine suggested that the Opt-In or Opt-Out choice be put on property titles.

G Cleary provided an explanation of the Opt-in or Opt-out process. If the Council decided on Option A, B or C, it could cause some confusion. This was highlighted by the submission of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board. Councillor Williams also noted that Woodend- Sefton Community Board submission supported Option C, but only if there was the Opt-in or Opt-Out availability, otherwise they supported Option A.

Mrs Waghorn advised that when Christchurch City Council introduced the three bin system, residents were given the option of different bin sizes for a trial period of three months. It was discussed that if an Opt-In was chosen for a property, there could be a three month trial, after which residents would be able to change the bin size at the end of the trial period, but not revert back to using a bag.
The Hearing Panel briefly discussed ownership of the bins if the three bin system is recommended, and it was agreed that the preferred option would be that the Council should own the bins.

There was discussion on the positive and negative aspects of each of the Options put out to the public during the consultation process. The comments received from the three panel members are included in the table below; (it should be noted, that these comments were provided from the individual hearing panel members, and are not necessarily supported by the Panel as a whole).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPTION A POSITIVES</th>
<th>NEGATIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>Health and Safety issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If corn starch bags introduced, better for environment</td>
<td>Currently Council still using plastic bags</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeps local private operators in business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPTION B POSITIVES</th>
<th>NEGATIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>Not enough submitters in favour of this Option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not encourage any waste minimisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No green waste service provided by the Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPTION C POSITIVES</th>
<th>NEGATIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bin compost</td>
<td>Impact on private contractors and there is already green waste collection available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility of choices</td>
<td>Lack of space for residents to store three bins in high density housing units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwaste collection included</td>
<td>Financial risk to Council – investing in quantities of bins and then too many people opting out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Costs of maintenance of bins</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Councillor Williams said if too many people take the Opt-in option, the private operators will go out of business. Councillor Brine noted that the Council needs to be competitive.

Councillor Williams suggested that there is already a green waste collection system that could be used by the public. Councillor Williams also highlighted the proposed fundraising opportunity for local groups and sports clubs to sell compost, though it was noted that the actual benefits of this proposal are not known at this stage.
Councillor Brine said he cannot comment on financial risks until figures are provided by staff, which will be at a further meeting.

Councillor Doody asked re the methane that is used to generate power at Kate Valley. G Cleary advised that just 7% of the waste going into Kate Valley comes from the Waimakariri district.

Councillor Brine noted that the proposed three bin system would cost less for his household than the system currently used, which is a private collection for waste each week, so does not buy Council rubbish bags and composes all green waste.

Councillor Williams noted that the private operators only charge for green waste collection when it is collected, so during winter months there are not many collections need and as a result customers pay less over the course of a 12 months period. Also rubbish is only collected once it is full. Councillor Williams suggested this system is less cost than the proposed Council three bin system. Also commented on the size of the bins. Councillor Williams believes Option A should be the preference, with green waste collection business being directed to the current private contractors and believes the Council could be helping promote these businesses. He also supports green waste being processed locally and not going out of the community.

Councillor Doody noted the submitters who have previously lived in Christchurch support introduction of the three bin system here in Waimakariri, but people who have lived here for a long time did not appear to be in favour of it.

If the bin system is introduced, in the future bins will be tagged and will subsequently be charged on this basis.

The hearing panel deliberations adjourned at 5.35pm to allow time for the Hearing Panel members to read further information provided by staff on costings and questions that were asked by submitters during the hearing process. The deliberations reconvened at 5.48pm.

In answer to some of the questions asked at the hearings on Thursday 31 August by Friendly Binz, regarding the prices of the bin collections of waste, Councillor Williams questioned the validity of figures that has been provided by staff. It was agreed that staff will provide further spreadsheets which will show the workings of how estimated costs for bin collection are calculated.

Councillor Brine said that if the choice is Option C, staff to provide the costs with 50%, 60% or 70% uptake of the three bin system to be provided. It was noted that there will be cost increase for those who chose the Opt out (as staying with A), with still using the plastic bag for rubbish. This would need two different types of trucks with two types of service. Staff advised that there are trucks available (currently used by Selwyn District Council). Information requested from staff on the costs of bins to purchase outright, costs of maintenance of bins and the cost of staff administration of a three-bin system.

Councillor Williams: Would only support Option C, with the Opt-In option only, subject to financial information to be provided, but residents may choose which size bin to have.

Councillor Doody does not support Option A. Option C, if people Opt-out collections of rubbish bags, and recycling bins need to be fortnightly.

There was brief discussion on the small composting bins, a sample of which was brought to the hearings by a submitter. It was agreed that it was not practical to include these in
any kerbside collection service, but the Council could promote use of these, as part of the education of the public to reduce waste going to landfill. There could also be information available on where people are able to purchase these bins.

The hearing was adjourned at 6.15pm on Monday 4 September and reconvened on Thursday 7th September commencing at 4.35pm, in the Rakahuri Committee Room, Waimakariri District Council, Rangiora Service Centre, 215 High Street, Rangiora..

Councillor Brine provided a summary of the deliberations from Monday night, noting that staff had been asked to provide information on the situation with motels.

Figures were also provided on the costs to the Council, of variations of different percentages of residences opting in, or opting out. Councillor Brine noted that these figures included some commercially sensitive information so this information will not be open for discussion in the open part of deliberations.

Motels

There was discussion on the charges for motel owners and the charges for this. It was agreed that motels will only be charged for one recycling targeted rate per property and a recommendation has been added accordingly. Extra bins can be ordered by the owners and paid for accordingly.

Opt In/Out Choice

There was discussion on the costs to the Council with change of ownerships and new residence changing their property collection. Kitty advised currently there is a $80 charge for a change to a size of bin for recycling and council administration costs. This charge would be similar if there was a change from opting in or opting out. This figure would need to be tagged.

Tag to reflect if a household chooses to change their service (opt-in to opt-out), there will be a fee that the Council will charge for any change.

All collections will include a Yellow bin, choice of refuse bag or bin, and there will be the choice if they have a green waste bin.

Bin ownership – information provided from other Council’s on bin ownership. Information provided by staff. Councillor Williams suggested by the Council owning the bins it makes it more competitive and more of a level playing field for contractors tendering. No matter which contractor is, the Council has a better borrowing rate.

Mr Cleary noted that the Council’s debt ceiling needs to be taken into consideration. Councillor Williams suggested that either way there is a risk to Council. Currently the bins are owned by the Contractor. If a three bin system was introduced, there would be an unfair advantage if a contractor did own the bins, when the time came for a renewal of the contract.

This matter does not need to be decided on during this process, but would need to be noted for future decisions by the Council.

Further information provided to the Hearing Panel from staff on the tendering process. Councillor Williams noted that the tender process could have individual options for contractors i.e. a contractor may be interested in just tendering for the green waste part of the business. After discussion, it was noted that under the resolution in the staff report, this is not an option such a tender would be a non-confirming tender. Mr Cleary said there
is time for Council staff to provide advice to Councillors, this is an operational decision. Staff noted that there could be complications with having more than one contractor involved in the collection service.

Staff administration – it is considered that there is the need for one to two extra staff in the lead up and roll out of bins, but once they have been introduced this could cut down to one extra staff.

Following a question from Councillor Doody on the impact of private contractors currently operating in the district – it was confirmed that if there is significant uptake of the proposed Council three bin service, this would impact on private contractors. There would still be the need for a service in the rural areas.

At this time, Councillor Brine advised those members of the public present that there was information from Council staff to be provided to the Hearing Panel which was of a commercially sensitive nature and would therefore need to be considered in public excluded.

**MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED**

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

Moved Councillor Brine seconded Councillor Doody

**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>Information</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>Additional Commercially sensitive Information</td>
<td>Council contracted rates vs Private contractor rates</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>Reason for protection of interests</th>
<th>Ref NZS 9202:2003 Appendix A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To carry out commercial activities without prejudice</td>
<td>A2(b)(ii)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CARRIED
**CLOSED MEETING**

**Recommendation to Resume Open Meeting**

Moved Councillor Brine seconded Councillor Doody

**THAT** the open meeting resumes and the additional information provided by Council staff to the Hearing Panel on 7 September 2017, remains public excluded but the discussion and recommendation be made public.

**CARRIED**

**OPEN MEETING**

**FURTHER INFORMATION PROVIDED TO THE HEARING PANEL BY K. WAGHORN AND S. COLLIN**

S Collin spoke to the pricing information that was provided to the Hearing Panel and the workings as to how the Council staff came to the prices (Commercially Sensitive information used in calculations costs sensitivity analysis, Trim 170921102146 and Council Contracted Rates vs Private Contractor Rates Trim 170921102173). Noted the questions from the Friendly Binz submitter, and pointed out that with the service provided in the residential areas by the Council operators, the short distances between pickups means the rates can be low. Information that has been sourced by staff on the rates compared to other Councils shows that the estimated WDC rates are similar.

Councillor Williams pointed to the use of the term "waste minimisation", and does not believe the bin system will encourage this, noting that people will get much more in a bin than a rubbish bag. Councillor Williams emphasized his preference with option (a), and for the Council to provide information on the website to encourage people to have a green waste bin, which will promote minimisation. If there is a high uptake the three bin system, the cost to the Council will be in the range of $1.5m - $2m. This is a big cost to the Council, and there is no guarantee that this will minimize waste – Councillor Williams suggested that people will attempt to cram more into the bins. Having the three bin system will definitely put private contractors out of business.

Councillor Brine, noted the health and safety issues with using plastic bags – Councillor Williams does not believe this is a big issue – with collectors having reported two accidents. Councillor Brine believes that two accidents, is two too many. Councillor Williams suggested bag collectors should wear suitable gloves and be encouraged to wear leggings. Councillor Brine also noted the submitters who mentioned bags being ripped open by animals. Councillor Williams replied he has also seen bins left out for collection that have been blown over by the wind.

Councillor Brine commented that this option would see the Council then promoting higher collection costs by private collectors. Councillor Williams does not agree with this, and suggests that smaller private contractors are flexible with their pick up service. It would encourage residents to source the best price from the operators to suits their needs.

Councillor Williams suggested that an alternative arrangement could be for the Council to withdraw from providing a kerbside collection altogether.

K Waghorn noted to the panel, that the Council does provide information on the website of the collection services available, but Councillor Williams believes this could be done better.

Figures of the volume in tonnage of kerbside and rural collections, show that currently 70% of this is collected by private operators and 30% by the Council collectors. It was also
noted that at least half of the tonnage of private operators collection comes from commercial properties.

Councillor Doody noted the number of submitters who were formally residents of Christchurch and wanted the three bin system introduced here in Waimakariri. Suggested it is possible that the introduction of Option C may increase waste from some households who choose to use the bin. G Cleary said the advice they have received from the consultants said the three bin system would reduce the amount of waste. Mr Collin noted that there is no evidence that having the three bins would encourage people to generate more waste. Councillor Doody also considered that for the people who have previously used the three bins when living in other districts and have indicated a preference for this option, questioned is the Council then making it too easy for these ratepayers with this choice, rather than looking for alternatives such as composting and reducing waste leaving their properties. Councillor Williams believes that ratepayers are not well informed that there is also private operators working in the district. Councillor Williams also said there needs to be consideration given to the rural areas that are not surfaced now by Council, and are looked after by the private collectors.

Councillor Brine said if the three bin service is introduced, there will be areas in the district that will not be serviced by Council, as now, and this will have impact on two or three operators. This possible new three bin system will not be introduced tomorrow, it will be three years before it is introduced. Councillor Brine believes that most ratepayers would know that there was private waste and green waste collection businesses operating in the district.

Councillor Brine asked the question: Is Waimakariri going to be the only Council in Canterbury to stick with an antiquated system with using rubbish bags? Suggests that the three bin system needs to be offered and people can use the Opt-Out system if they wish, but he believes that over time most people will make the choice of using the three bins. Bins are much more hygienic, cleaner and safer than using plastic bags. The bin system promotes waste minimisation and the way forward is to offer the three bins with an opt out. Some people in retirement units will not have space to keep three bins and will prefer to stay with the using rubbish bags. Councillor Brine does not believe that people will use a private contractor if the Council did not have any solid waste collection service, alternatively he suggests there will be an increase in the instances of waste being dumped down at the river and on roadsides.

Councillor Williams said if Option C was introduced, that the private operators will have to gradually shrink their businesses and reduce staff numbers. Rural ratepayers will not be looked after. The Council needs to go with Option (a), with the least cost to ratepayers, and the Council not having to cover $2m cost or administration costs.

The panel deliberations adjourned at 5.45pm and resumed at 5.50pm

4. STAFF REPORT

4.1. Draft Waste Management & Minimisation Plan Consultation - Kitty Waghorn (Solid Waste Asset Manager)

Moved Councillor Brine seconded Councillor Doody

THAT the Hearing Panel

(a) Receives report No. 170807083752.

(b) Recommends that the Council:
i. Approve the following inclusions and amendments in the 2017 Waste Management & Minimisation Plan
   1) Insert Option C as the preferred kerbside collection service in Section 5.4 with an Opt Out position as per Option A.
   2) Insert the below targets in Section 2.2
      a. Reduce annual per capita waste to landfill from 294kg per capita in 2015/16 to **236kg per capita** by 2029
      b. Increase the annual per capita quantity of materials diverted from 170kg per capita in 2015/16 to **228kg per capita** by 2029

   ii. Note that the final version of the 2017 Waste Management & Minimisation Plan will be brought to the Council for approval in December 2017
   iii. Note that the Long Term Plan solid waste budgets, Solid Waste Activity Management Plan and solid waste section in the Infrastructure Strategy will be prepared using the kerbside collection methodology as approved in 2(b).1.
   iv. Change the rating policy so that motels and other similar businesses only pay for one recycling targeted rate per property. Additional bins would be provided and rated, on request.
   v. Requests staff to bring further advice to the Council following the LTP consultation regarding the option of the Council or the Contractor owning the bins.
   vi. Increase the level of education to the public on the reduction of waste including diversion to green waste.

CARRIED
Councillor Williams did not support
rubbish created by residents living in these smaller units. As a result, this recommendation includes an Opt Out essentially maintaining the status quo for those who do not wish to avail the opportunity of a three bin system. Councillor Brine sees this as middle ground in a very complex issue. Councillor Brine believes this recommendation to Council positions the Council for the best way forward with regard to waste minimizing in the future.

Councillor Doody explained her reasoning for the Opt Out offer, which gives comfort to those who do not want the three bins. With the bins being available for those, this option is also there for them. Councillor Doody has looked at the cost factor involved, noting that this is a user pays system. Education of ratepayers is exceedingly important, and Councillor Doody supports the Council promoting waste reduction, and the value of that to waste minimisation. There is a lot of new residents coming into the area and the Council needs to promote that it wants people to recycle and reduce their waste. As far as private industry is concerned, this now gives them an option to promote themselves and entice ratepayers to use their services instead of the Council. They have a lead in time to do a full scale advertising of their businesses, which previously hasn’t been done to a greater degree. Personally, Councillor Doody suggested that this has been a difficult decision to make to go with Option C, and had previously considered that Option A was the right decision. However, having read and considered the large number of submissions, of which a considerable number were from ex Christchurch residents supporting the three bin system, Councillor Doody puts a high priority on Option C.

Councillor Williams supported Option A to retain businesses and employment for some of the private collection operators currently in business in Waimakariri. Councillor Williams said he is sorry he has failed their jobs and their futures. This includes the other businesses that they, in turn, support in the local area, who will also suffer. Councillor Williams suggested there is an affordable existing three-bin system available in Waimakariri from these private operators and reiterated his earlier comment that most submitters did not realize that there was such services available in Waimakariri.

Councillor Brine in reply, is also concerned the impact this could potentially have on private operators, by moving this motion. There is considerable lead in time for the businesses to consider repositioning and there is not going to be an overnight impact on the recommendation of this hearing panel. The Council will consider this recommendation, and the next stage is for it to be part of the Long Term Plan consultation process in 2018. Council then has to secure the asset if it chooses to go with the three bin system. Councillor Brine said there would still be a market in Waimakariri for private operators if the Council chose to introduce a three bin system. When the three bin system was introduced in Christchurch, there were in excess of 50 private operators in business at the time and these operators expressed concern at the time. There was much less lead in time for the introduction of the three bin system in Christchurch than is planned for here in Waimakariri. There are many matters that need to be given consideration and Councillor Brine regrets any impact that this decision will have on current private business operators. With regard to the lack of knowledge of the three bin system currently offered by private operators, Councillor Brine confirmed his earlier comment that he does not accept that this service is not widely known by the public of Waimakariri.

OPEN MEETING

There being no further business the meeting closed at 6.20pm.
At the request of the Hearing Panel Chair Councillor Robbie Brine, the Hearing Panel reconvened on Wednesday 13th September in the Orohake Meeting Room, Farmers Building, Waimakariri District Council, High Street, Rangiora at 12.00pm.

The Chair tabled additional information at this reconvened deliberations, which provided clarification of any possible confusion resulting from the recommendation to be forwarded to Council, as had been Carried at the previous deliberations meeting on Thursday 7 September. In explanation, the additional information stated:

Option C

Councillor Brine moved this as the preferred position for multiple reasons which he outlined when speaking to the motion.

For clarification Councillor Brine always intended that it would be an opt in opt out for those on the Council’s existing Solid Waste collection hence, his question for staff is to price percentages showing what the cost would be on a 50%, 60%, 70% etc uptake. There is no point delivering bins to addresses only to have them returned days later.

Councillor Brine was mindful of the impact this will have on existing contractors. This recommendation, if accepted by Council, allows contractors to consider their fees and charges over the next two to three years. Contractors will still be essential in our district as there are large areas that are not on Council’s collection network.

Clients currently with a contractor may chose to remain with their existing contractor – Councillor Brine noted that this will be a position that some will take and reasons for this will include such things as loyalty and convenience.

If a property owner chooses to Opt out after being on the three bin scheme, there will be an administration charge for picking up the bins and changing the charges for this address.

Option A

Part of Councillor Brine’s consideration for moving Option A (which is the existing bag and recycling bin) as the opt out position was after submissions around the amount of waste our mature population put out for collection. It was emphasized by some submitters that they currently only put out a bag every two to three weeks. Also comment was made on the amount of space available in retirement villages etc for storage of multiple bins.

Councillor Brine wished to clarify that in moving the motion it was intended that Option A would be a two weekly black bag collection as opposed to that written in the consultation document which is a weekly collection. He extended apologies for any confusion with this recommendation.

The Hearing Panel discussed this and agreed with the clarification and a replacement recommendation to Council, as follows:

Moved Councillor Brine seconded Councillor Doody

(a) Receives report No. 170807083752.

(b) Recommends that the Council:

i. Approve the following inclusions and amendments in the 2017 Waste Management & Minimisation Plan

1) Insert Option C as the preferred kerbside collection service in Section 5.4 comprising service choices of: rates-funded
recycling bin, collected fortnightly; user-pays WDC rubbish bag OR rates-funded rubbish bin, collected fortnightly; AND/OR rates-funded mixed organics bin, collected weekly.

2) Insert the below targets in Section 2.2
   a. Reduce annual per capita waste to landfill from 294kg per capita in 2015/16 to **236kg per capita** by 2029
   b. Increase the annual per capita quantity of materials diverted from 170kg per capita in 2015/16 to **228kg per capita** by 2029

   ii. **Note** that the final draft version of the 2017 Waste Management & Minimisation Plan will be brought to the Council for approval in December 2017

   iii. **Note** that the Long Term Plan solid waste budgets, Solid Waste Activity Management Plan and solid waste section in the Infrastructure Strategy will be prepared using the kerbside collection methodology as approved in 2(b)i.

   iv. **Change** the rating policy so that motels and other similar businesses only pay for one recycling targeted rate per property. Additional bins would be provided and rated, on request.

   v. **Requests** staff to bring further advice to the Council following the LTP consultation regarding the option of the Council or the Contractor owning the bins.

   vi. **Requests** staff to bring the proposed engagement method and material for asking property owners which service option they choose to Council for approval prior to release.

   vii. **Requests** that staff provide information on proposed fees and charges for properties to change their future service option following their initial choice.

   viii. **Requests** staff, prior to the introduction of the new services, to enquire of each eligible household which services they wish to use. If no choice is made the default position will be that the property continues to receive a fortnightly recycling service and has access to the Council’s user pays fortnightly bag collection service.

   ix. **Increase** the level of education to the public on the reduction of waste including diversion to green waste.

   **CARRIED**

**Cust Community Network Submission**

The Hearing Panel further discussed the submission from the Cust Community Network seeking to have a trial recycling drop off facility established somewhere in the Cust area. Staff advised that there is sufficient funds in the budget to undertake this trial and that this matter can be considered by the Solid and Hazardous Waste Working Party at its following meeting, the date of which is still to be confirmed.
Councillor Brine took this opportunity to thank the Hearing Panel and as there was no further business, the meeting closed at 12.10pm on Wednesday 13 September 2017.

CONFIRMED

___________________________  
Chairperson

___________________________  
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1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to provide information on the consultation process for the draft Waste Management & Minimisation Plan, to provide comment on submissions received, and to report on the trends of the submissions.

1.2. This report does not provide any statistical analysis of the submissions as this is covered in a separate report included in the hearings pack.

1.3. A total of 3,148 submissions have been received, and 2,604 have been analysed. A total of 544 submissions have not been processed or included in the statistical analyses because they were anonymous, duplicate, ‘silent’ (i.e. no option choice or comments were made) or late submissions.

1.4. In all, 35 submitters wish to be heard as at the time this report was prepared. They will make their presentations to the Hearings Panel over a three day period, on 28 August and 31 August 2017. The information pack provided to the Hearings Panel will contain copies of submissions from only those submitters who wish to be heard, and an analysis of the trends from all submissions. Copies of the remaining submissions and comments will also be provided prior to the Hearing Panel’s deliberations.

1.5. The Hearings Panel will consider all of the submissions during their deliberations on 4 September, and will make recommendations to the Council on a number of waste management issues such as:

1.5.1. Preferred range of kerbside collection servicing choices

1.5.2. Waste diversion targets and timeframes

1.5.3. Preferred way forward for a range of other services and waste minimisation projects, for example:
1.5.3.1. Upgrades at Southbrook resource recovery park: refuse pit, recycling area, and ReSale store  
1.5.3.2. Provision of solid waste services for unserviced (rural) areas, particularly recycling services  
1.5.3.3. Waste minimisation education and information  
1.5.3.4. Assistance for households, schools and businesses to minimise waste  

Attachments:  
i. Hearings Pack  
ii. Summary of “Other Comments” not related to kerbside option choices (170821090004)  

2. RECOMMENDATION  
THAT the Hearings Panel:  
(a) Receives report No. 170807083752.  
(b) Notes that a full set of all relevant submissions will be provided to the Hearings Panel by Wednesday 23 August, for their consideration prior to deliberations on 4 September 2017  
(c) Recommends that the Council:  
   i. Approve the following inclusions and amendments in the 2017 Waste Management & Minimisation Plan  
      1. Insert Option … as the preferred kerbside collection service in Section 5.4  
      2. Insert the below targets in Section 2.2  
         a. Reduce annual per capita waste to landfill from 294kg per capita in 2015/16 to **272kg per capita** OR **236kg per capita** by 2029  
         b. Increase the annual per capita quantity of materials diverted from 170kg per capita in 2015/16 to **192kg per capita** OR **228kg per capita** by 2029  
   ii. Notes that the final version of the 2017 Waste Management & Minimisation Plan will be brought to the Council for approval in December 2017  
   iii. Notes that the Long Term Plan solid waste budgets, Solid Waste Activity Management Plan and solid waste section in the Infrastructure Strategy will be prepared using the kerbside e collection methodology as approved in 2(c).1.  

3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS  
   Background  
   3.1. The review of the Council’s 2012 Waste Management & Minimisation Plan (WMMP) in 2017 has been necessitated by a number of key drivers:  
   3.1.1. The per-capita waste to landfill has not changed significantly since 2011 when the wheelie bin service for recycling was implemented and the resource recovery park at Southbrook was opened. The quantity of waste being sent to landfill from Waimakariri District is also continuing to rise with population growth.  
   3.1.2. The Waste Minimisation Act 2008 requires Councils to adopt Waste Management and Minimisation Plans and to review their WMMP on a 6-yearly cycle, with the current review deadline being no later than 1 July 2018.  
   3.1.3. In May 2015, Council requested that that staff report back to Council on cost-effective ways/methods to further advance waste minimisation.  
   3.1.4. The review of the 2012 WMMP has been undertaken one year early to bring the review timing into line with the Council’s LTP timelines. Significant changes to
levels of service that could arise from the WMMP Special Consultative Procedure (SCP), would also have implications for the Council’s Long term Plan.

3.1.5. Both the kerbside collection contract and the resource recovery park & transfer station operations & maintenance contracts are due for renewal. Once the LTP has been adopted and the Council’s kerbside collection methodology is confirmed, the Council will be in a position to put these service contracts out to tender.

3.2. Under the guidance of the Solid and Hazardous Waste Working Party, and with assistance from waste consultants Morrison Lowe, staff have considered a number of options for kerbside waste services, and selected two options that provide an additional range of service choices to the current service, for consultation with the community. The waste diversion options included for consideration in the WA were workshopped with the Solid & Hazardous Waste Working Party in order to make that selection. The options consulted on were:

3.2.1. **Option A.** One standard service: rates-funded recycling bin, collected fortnightly; user-pays WDC rubbish bag, collected weekly.

3.2.2. **Option B.** Two service choices: rates-funded recycling bin, collected fortnightly; user-pays WDC rubbish bag OR a rate-funded rubbish bin, collected weekly.

3.2.3. **Option C.** Four service choices: rates-funded recycling bin, collected fortnightly; user-pays WDC rubbish bag OR rates-funded rubbish bin, collected fortnightly; AND/OR rates-funded mixed organics bin, collected weekly.

3.3. Kerbside collection services were encompassed within the wider context of a Waste Assessment, which looks at the waste situation within the Waikarariri District, and considers how improvements can be made to the way in which solid waste is handled. The outcomes from the Waste Assessment (WA) are summarised in the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan.

3.4. Different options were considered for site upgrades at Southbrook resource recovery park (RRP), with the currently proposed refuse pit upgrade and recycling and recovery facility extension considered as an Enhanced option, and the construction of a purpose built automated commercial waste sorting facility as the Advanced Option. The Enhanced upgrade option at Southbrook RRP was included in the draft WMMP.

3.5. The draft WMMP includes targets for reduction of waste to landfill and increase in waste diversion targets combining the Enhanced upgrades at Southbrook RRP and the different kerbside collection options. Option C is the advanced kerbside collection servicing option.

3.6. The enhanced option targets are:

3.6.1. Reduce annual per capita waste to landfill from 294kg per capita in 2015/16 to 272kg per capita over a 10 year period

3.6.2. Increase the annual per capita quantity of materials diverted from 170kg per capita in 2015/16 to 192kg per capita over a 10 year period

3.7. The advanced option targets are:

3.7.1. Reduce annual per capita waste to landfill from 294kg per capita in 2015/16 to 236kg per capita over a 10 year period over a 10 year period

3.7.2. Increase the annual per capita quantity of materials diverted from 170kg per capita in 2015/16 to 228kg per capita over a 10 year period

3.8. The draft Waste Plan also proposed that the Council would continue providing education initiatives that provide practical information to residents, schools and businesses. Waste
minimisation and management education includes how to recycle correctly, how to reduce and reuse materials and otherwise divert waste from landfill, and correctly dispose of hazardous waste. It also proposes to continue collaboration with other Councils to promote waste minimisation regionally and nationally, and to lobby for improved national product stewardship.

3.9. The Council approved the draft WMMP for consultation at their meeting on 6 June 2017. Consultation was launched on 9 June through local newspapers and social media, and copies of the draft WMMP and WA were available for viewing at all council service centres. Information about the kerbside collection service choices and an on-line submission form went live on the Council’s website on 16 June. Information brochures and submission forms were posted out to ratepayers on 14 July. Regular posts and advertisements made throughout June, July and August to keep awareness high, and a series of weekend drop-in events were held during July and early August for people to come and talk to staff and elected members. The consultation closed at 5pm on 11 August 2017.

Number of Submissions

3.10. A total of 3,148 submissions have been received, and 2,604 have been analysed. One hundred and thirty submissions were received after the closing date for submissions, 370 did not include the name and contact details of the submitter, a further 9 included the submitter’s names & details but did not include an option choice or comments, and there were 35 duplicate submissions received. The 544 anonymous, duplicate, ‘silent’ and late submissions have not been processed or included in the statistical analyses.

3.11. Staff estimate that 30% of the submissions were made on-line, and 70% were ‘written’ e.g. submission forms returned to the Council, and letters or emails sent through to the Council. In total, 35 individuals or organisations wish to present their submissions verbally.

3.12. Facebook comments have not been captured as submissions, however a total of 227 comments were made on the nine “Let’s Talk Rubbish” posts on the Council’s Facebook page, plus another 85 on the initial ‘teaser video’ post on 8 June. The general tenor of comments were similar to those noted in the submissions.

Submission Analysis

3.13. People were asked how many kerbside collection service choices the Council should be offering in the upcoming Long Term Plan:

3.13.1. Option A. One standard service: rates-funded recycling bin, collected fortnightly; user-pays WDC rubbish bag, collected weekly.

3.13.2. Option B. Two service choices: rates-funded recycling bin, collected fortnightly; user-pays WDC rubbish bag OR a rate-funded rubbish bin, collected weekly.

3.13.3. Option C. Four service choices: rates-funded recycling bin, collected fortnightly; user-pays WDC rubbish bag OR rates-funded rubbish bin, collected fortnightly; AND/OR rates-funded mixed organics bin, collected weekly.

3.14. Most submitters appeared to indicate their personal preference for a service, however some commented that while they selected a waste bin option they would still intend to use bags or their current services. The statistics for the three options are shown on the following page:
### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Submissions</th>
<th>Percentage of Total</th>
<th>Percentage of Total With Option Choice Selected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option A</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option B</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option C</td>
<td>1,606</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Option selected</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,604</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Themes from Submissions

3.15. Comments were also invited, and many submitters chose to add comments to their forms. The option choices and comments have been entered into the Council’s consultation database (Submission Accomplished). A range of themes have been identified and these are summarised in the below table:

#### Key themes & sub-themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kerbside Collection Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Comments supporting option choice Option A | I/we don’t throw away much, compost at home, prefer private collector; bins encourage waste; using injury to the operators as a reason to get rid of bags… is just a smoke screen; bins are unwieldy, too big, are costly; 140L rubbish too small; too many bins to store; environmental cost to produce bin and are urban eyesore & clutter roads; means more huge Council collection trucks on streets |

| Comments supporting option choice Option B & C | Support Council offering people a choice of bags or bins; a user pays model like this is good; works well in Christchurch/Timaru; bins are better for environment/more sustainable, better for nappies/food, easier to move than bags; make people more mindful of separating waste; better than bags/cleaner; bags are a nuisance/get ripped open by animals/attract vermin; bags are too high a risk for collector |

| Cost of kerbside collection options & rates | Fixed incomes/elderly can’t afford a rate increase; will push rents up; the option(s) is/are cheaper than what I pay now; make it more user pays (bar codes/ID tags); why should we pay more for this, the rates are high enough; like idea of lower costs for smaller bins; Costs for larger bins should be higher; no control over price/rate increases with 1 supplier |

| Multiple occupancy properties/motels | Rate Motels per land title not per unit like in City; consider how to service and rate body corporate properties & retirement villages; 3 bins per unit too many (96 units = 288 bins) |

<p>| Private collectors | They offer better service; don’t offer organic service to areas like Pines Beach; too many different trucks on streets; better charges/no control over charges; cheaper/more expensive than WDC option; this will put them out of business; tell people what other collectors are out there and let people make their choice on who to use; no mention of value to local economy of private collectors &amp; what job losses would be |
| <strong>Other Kerbside collection service suggested</strong> | under Options B &amp; C; risk that rural collection costs will increase if private collectors lose revenue from urban areas |
| <strong>Collection service in rural/semi-rural areas</strong> | Different frequencies (e.g. weekly rubbish &amp; fortnightly organics with Option C); Option D (3x80L bins) for retired people; get rid of the bags; just provide a uniform bin service like in City; decrease bag cost and increase rates; put bag prices up to encourage ‘recycling’ and make ‘recycling’ cheaper; provide smaller bags at lower cost; provide paper rubbish bags |
| <strong>Other comments</strong> | Want / don’t want Council bin service in rural area; Council should provide to whole District not just built up areas; should not force organic bins on rural/large block owners; organics bin in semi-rural area will mean fewer people composting at home |
| <strong>Repeat of consultation</strong> | Risky for Council to predict uptake from Opt Out proposal; Opt Out option is not clear in the documentation; why can’t it be Opt In? How much extra will it be when you buy the bins? Council should use local business for contract; need a liner in the bins to keep clean |
| <strong>b Council Facilities</strong> | This is long overdue; just do it; why are we talking about this again? Stop procrastinating; cost of consulting on this again? |
| <strong>Resource recovery park / transfer station</strong> | Keep Oxford transfer station open at least 1 day a week / open more days during spring to get rid of grass clippings; have a community garden by the ‘dump’ to help educate people |
| <strong>Composting facility</strong> | Council should compost organics &amp; sell it |
| <strong>Individuals driving to transfer station</strong> | Is inefficient; prefer to drive there than have Council collection in my rural area; no tow-bar so can’t take green waste to the tip |
| <strong>c Waste Minimisation &amp; Sustainability</strong> | |
| <strong>Environment &amp; Sustainability</strong> | Reducing waste to landfill is important; |
| <strong>Extend or expand services</strong> | Extend recycling/waste bins into rural areas; want more recycling options for rural people; Recycling drop-off in Cust, in West Eyreton; locate recycling drop-offs (including for batteries) at supermarkets; Council should provide an inorganic collection at resident’s gates |
| <strong>Special Wastes</strong> | E-waste/tyre/battery disposal needs to be cheaper/easier; disposable nappies processed by new plant |
| <strong>Education in schools or of residents</strong> | Support WDC programme in schools; teach householders about reducing waste; run courses on composting; tell us more about what we can recycle |
| <strong>Other disposal methods</strong> | Ban in-sink waste disposal units |
| <strong>Reduce packaging, plastics; recycle more materials</strong> | Container deposit to encourage recycling; ban plastic bags; advertise soft plastics recycling points; |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composting/mulching</th>
<th>Rural residents won’t need an organic bin; Householder’s own responsibility; Council should offer subsidised composter bins and water butts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>d Rubbish/Littering</strong></td>
<td><strong>e Disposal costs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of littering</td>
<td>Ripped bags create litter; high disposal costs encourage littering / fly tipping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish bags</td>
<td>Council continue to supply bags for people to pre-purchase &amp; take to transfer station especially rural residents; Council should provide bags to ratepayers per neighbouring Councils; Cost far too much; people should realise they're paying for the collection fees in the bags</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support user pays</td>
<td>User pays encourages waste diversion; use of ID tags to charge for use / rebate for non-use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of dumping rubbish, recycling, organics</td>
<td>Rubbish costs too high / too low and should be increased to encourage diversion; garden waste costs should be lower to encourage people to separate garden waste; should provide 'free dumping' periods to reduce fly tipping; Council should share in profits from recycling cardboard by (transfer station operations?) contractor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.16. The above table contains only a snapshot of the comments, and there are a number of conflicting statements and views. A full list of comments will be with the Hearings Pack.

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

4. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

4.1. The community’s views have been sought through a special consultative procedure, and the submissions have been received as a result of that process. We have had a 9 week long consultation period (a SCP requires a month-long period), and are required to follow certain procedures as to handling and processing the submissions.

4.2. Consultation was soft-launched on 9 June, with information made available at Council service centres and on the website. Submissions could initially be made on-line and by e-mail, with a cost-calculator available on the Council’s “Let’s Talk Rubbish” web page on 16 June. Publicity around the “Let’s Talk Rubbish” campaign included posts on social media and regular advertisements in local papers.

4.3. On 14 July around 17,500 information brochures and submission forms were posted out with the rates to all ratepayers that owned properties inside the refuse and recycling kerbside collection areas – this included those rural areas that have been identified in the rating maps as potential new or extended service areas. The submission forms were printed with a Freepost Council address on the reverse to remove one of the barriers people may have faced to making a submission.

4.4. For properties within the boundary of the extended Ohoka recycling collection area, a letter was sent to all ratepayers explaining what their options were, given that their Status Quo did not include a refuse bag collection service, and what the rating impacts may be on their properties if levels of service were to change.

4.5. Staff provided stakeholders and members of the public with opportunities to ask questions and discuss the options in person. These opportunities included:
4.5.1. A meeting with private waste collection companies on 6 July;
4.5.2. Weekend public drop-in sessions in Pegasus, Oxford, Kaiapoi, Rangiora and Mandeville during July and August;
4.5.3. Staff presentations to the Community Boards in June and July;
4.5.4. Staff presentations to Grey Power, University of the Third Age (U3A) and the Rangiora Combined Friendship Club in July and August.

4.6. A total of 3,148 submissions have been received, and 2,604 have been analysed. One hundred and thirty submissions were received after the closing date for submissions, 370 did not include the name and contact details of the submitter, a further 9 included the submitter’s names & details but did not include an option choice or comments, and there were 35 duplicate submissions received. The 544 anonymous, duplicate, ‘silent’ and late submissions have not been processed or included in the statistical analyses.

4.7. Staff estimate that 30% of the submissions were made on-line, and 70% were ‘written’ e.g. submission forms returned to the Council, and letters or emails sent through to the Council. The written submission returns show a 10.6% response rate based on eligible properties within the current and potential kerbside collection areas, which is a similar return to the response rate in 2008. This response rate could be skewed by residents from rental properties in the serviced areas and ratepayers & residents in unserviced areas collecting submission forms from the Council in order to make their views known.

4.8. In total, 35 individuals or organisations wish to present their submissions in person at one of the hearing days.

4.9. Facebook comments have not been captured as submissions, however a total of 227 comments were made on the nine “Let’s Talk Rubbish” posts on the Council’s Facebook page, plus another 85 on the initial ‘teaser video’ post on 8 June. The general tenor of comments were similar to those noted in the submissions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Post</th>
<th>No. People Reached</th>
<th>No. Comments made</th>
<th>WDC responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 June Teaser video</td>
<td>69,567</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,500 views</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 June Website Launch</td>
<td>15,777</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 July Service Choices</td>
<td>3,660</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 July Have you Talked Rubbish?</td>
<td>13,516</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 July Pegasus Talking Rubbish</td>
<td>5,695</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 July Talk Rubbish in person</td>
<td>3,216</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 July Talk Rubbish in person</td>
<td>2,408</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 July Talk Rubbish in person</td>
<td>2,963</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 July Talk Rubbish in person</td>
<td>3,808</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 August Closing Soon</td>
<td>4,061</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.10. Consultation closed at 5pm on 11 August 2017.
5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

5.1. Under the Waste Minimisation Act 2008 Territorial Local Authorities (TLA’s) are required to adopt Waste Management and Minimisation Plans, the latest review must be undertaken not later than 1 July 2018, and at not more than 6-year intervals. TLA’s may only receive and spend any landfill levy moneys on matters to promote or achieve waste minimisation, and in accordance with its WMMP; and levy moneys may be withheld if a TLA has not adopted or reviewed its WMMP within the stated deadlines.

5.2. The kerbside collection cost estimates were prepared based on calculations by our own engineers in house as well as Morrison Lowe who were the consultants engaged to prepare our Waste Minimisation Plan. Morrison Lowe have very detailed methodologies that they use nationally to carry out this sort of assessment and have used local market rates in their calculations.

5.3. Some uncertainty does arise from the estimates having to include an assumption about the market share that Council would have, however the assumptions have been conservative (generally based on a 60% of market share for a Council bin service), and the estimated rates fall within the range charged by other Canterbury Councils providing similar collection services.

5.4. If the Council decides, following consultation, to proceed with option B or C, the true test would come at the time of tendering. It should always be expected that the cost estimate will not be exactly correct. The best we could expect is to be within plus or minus 10%. As noted in the 6 June report, if the Council estimate of the likely market share is incorrect, the Council will be exposed to financial risk.

5.5. Once the final Waste Management Plan has been prepared, and the preferred solid waste management options confirmed by the Council at its November meeting, the costs of implementing the action plans will be included in the Long Term Plan (LTP) budgets for public consultation.

5.6. A change to collection services would impact on the quantity and type of waste flowing through the Council’s transfer stations, which would in turn impact on operations and site capacities and potentially operational costs. Budgets to undertake upgrades of the refuse pit and resource recovery park have been included in the LTP, however the timing of these upgrades has been delayed until the outcomes of this WMMP consultation process have been finalised.

5.7. The Waste Assessment, waste audit, and Waste Management & Minimisation Plan review cost $62,589, these costs lie in the 16/17 year and were covered by the three Solid Waste Accounts. A total of $8,830 has been spent to date on the development and printing of the consultation documentation, on advertising and the additional staff resourcing necessary to process the submissions. Approximately 50% of these costs were incurred in 16/17 and the remainder in 17/18.

5.8. Final advertising and processing costs have yet to be received or processed. Final changes to the Waste Management Plan have yet to be made, but this can be done in-house at no additional cost to the Council. We do not propose to make bound hardcopies of the documents available, however electronic copies will be available online and these can be printed off as and when requested.

5.9. The following issues are not relevant to the current consultation process and deliberations, but have been included for information.

5.9.1. Both the kerbside collection contract and the resource recovery park & transfer station operations & maintenance contracts are due for renewal. Once the LTP...
has been adopted and the Council’s kerbside collection methodology is confirmed, the Council will be in a position to put these service contracts out to tender. The final targeted rates would depend on contract prices.

5.9.2. Should a two or three bin service be the approved collection service, prior to going out to tender the Council would have to decide:

5.9.2.1. Whether the bins would be owned and maintained by the Council or the Contractor;

5.9.2.2. Where mixed organic waste would be sent for composting;

5.9.2.3. If ratepayers do not respond to the given choice about bags or bins, whether the default collection service would be status quo (opt in) or a standard bin service (opt out). This decision could impact on Council’s market share, overall costs and potential rates: a “status quo default” might result in a far lower take-up of bins than a “bin service default” would.

5.9.3. Council would also need to canvass ratepayers to confirm whether they want to continue with the status quo or get bin(s) and if the latter, what type and size of bin they would want. This will be necessary to confirm final bin details before the tendering process has been completed so that bins can be ordered with sufficient lead-time for manufacture and delivery of bins prior to contract commencement.

5.9.4. A legal review of the proposed services has been sought in response to a suggestion that the service options are in some way anti-competitive. The advice is that the provisions of the Commerce Act relating to contracts, arrangements and understandings with third parties (including competitors) will not apply with the service options that have been consulted on.

6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. **Policy**

This matter is a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance Policy.

6.2. **Legislation**


6.3. **Community Outcomes**

The Waste Management Plan links to the following community outcomes:

*Core utility services are provided in a timely, economic, sustainable and affordable manner (solid waste is minimised and residues do not cause harm to the environment)*

6.4. **Ta matou mauri**

The Waste Management Plan and consultation around alternative collection service choices links to the Council’s vision of being a respectful, progressive team delivering value for our customers, and the following Council values:

*Working with you and each other; doing better every day; and keeping you informed*

Kitty Waghorn
Solid Waste Asset Manager
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DATE OF MEETING: 5 December 2017

FROM: Lynley Beckingsale, Policy Analyst
Malcolm Johnston, Environmental Services Manager

SUBJECT: Review of the Local Alcohol Policy and Liquor Ban Bylaw

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to seek feedback and support from Council for the Project Control Plans and timeline to review the Council’s Local Alcohol Policy 2015 (LAP) and Liquor Ban Bylaw 2007.

1.2. With the adoption of the Local Alcohol Policy in 2015 Council confirmed the intention of reviewing this policy in three years, rather than the statutory six years. This decision was made because the policy, and the process for applying/enforcing it through the District Licensing Committee, was new legislation and it was considered prudent to undertake an early review to consider if the policy was appropriately cast.

1.3. The review of the Liquor Ban Bylaw 2007 is a statutory review, being 10 years since the last review. Changes to the Local Government Act 2002 with the commencement of the Local Government (Alcohol Reform) Amendment Act 2012 on 18 December 2013, s11 Existing Bylaws to Expire, also mean that this bylaw must be reviewed by 18 December 2018.

1.4. By establishing a Project Control Group and appointing a project manager, the project will be co-ordinated across departments and with key external partners ensuring issues can be identified at an early stage.

Attachments:

i. Project Plan: Local Alcohol Policy Review (TRIM: 171024114791)
iii. Project Timeline (TRIM: 171024114796)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 171108121520

(b) Supports the proposal to establish a Project Control Group (PCG) and a Project Manager to oversee the review of both the Local Alcohol Policy 2015 and the Liquor Ban Bylaw 2007.
(c) **Notes** the appointment of the District Licensing Committee Chair, Cr Neville Atkinson, Nick Harrison, Malcolm Johnston, Sharon Stevenson and Lynley Beckingsale as the Project Control Group and Lynley Beckingsale as the Project Manager.

(d) **Notes** these reviews will be undertaken in conjunction with representatives of Community and Public Health and New Zealand Police as partner agencies and key stakeholders.

### 3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

3.1. The Local Alcohol Policy 2015 and Liquor Ban Bylaw 2007 are both due for review within the next 12 months. After discussion with the District Plan and Regulation Committee it was decided to review the policy and bylaw at the same time to manage community responses to alcohol related issues in the one consultation rather than separating the processes.

3.2. It was felt this would be a good use of staff resources and reduce the burden on submitters wanting to express their views on alcohol-related issues.

3.3. The statutory review for a LAP is six years but when this Council adopted its policy it decided to review the policy in three years. The Waimakariri District was the third Council in New Zealand to have an operational LAP developed under the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012. At the time it was decided to have an earlier review date than that prescribed in the legislation to give a formal opportunity for the Council, its partnership agencies and key stakeholders as well as the wider community, to consider the application and efficacy of the policy under the new regime.

3.4. Legal opinion was sought as to whether the review date could be changed by Council resolution if the Council felt they would rather put off this review until the statutory date. Martin Bell (Solicitor, Corcoran French) advised that the date is an integral part of the policy and any change would bring into effect the requirements of the Act, s95 Amendment of local alcohol policies. Feedback from the District Licensing Committee and the District Plan and Regulation Committee confirmed they would like a full review of the policy as originally intended.

3.5. The Waimakariri District has had a Liquor Ban Bylaw in effect for many years. It was last reviewed in 2007 and amended to include areas in Oxford in 2008. This is the ten year statutory review of the bylaw.

3.6. Over the years the Police have been very supportive of this bylaw and would like the liquor ban areas maintained and possibly extended. Police enforce the bylaw under the provisions of the LGA 2002.

3.7. The **Local Government (Alcohol Reform) Amendment Act 2012** commenced on 18 December 2013. The amendments under s147, 147A and 147B require a higher level of evidence to be provided to maintain and/or introduce liquor ban areas. A s155 report determining whether a bylaw made under the LGA 2002 is appropriate to address the perceived problem must be prepared as part of the review process. Section 147A stipulates that Council must be satisfied that:

- **(a)** the bylaw can be justified as a reasonable limitation on people’s rights and freedoms; and

- **(b)** a high level of crime or disorder (being crime or disorder caused or made worse by alcohol consumption in the area to which the bylaw is intended to apply if the bylaw is not made; and
(c) the bylaw is appropriate and proportionate in the light of that likely crime or disorder.

3.8. The two review processes will be managed side-by-side until the deliberation meetings at which point they will be considered separately by the Hearing Panel. It is proposed the bylaw review will be completed by August 2018 and the updated bylaw adopted by Council. After the hearing and deliberations the provisional Local Alcohol Policy will be publically notified and the appeal process (as described by the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012) will commence.

3.9. The LAPs developed by neighbouring Councils (Hurunui, Christchurch City and Selwyn) will be considered as part of this process.

3.10. The Management Team/CE have reviewed this report and support the recommendations.

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. The process for reviewing both the Bylaw and the LAP are subject to the special consultative procedure provided in the Local Government Act 2002.

4.2. The New Zealand Police and Medical Officer of Health are partner agencies in the review of the LAP and will be involved throughout the process.

4.3. Key Council staff and stakeholders will be consulted as the reviews progress. The wider community will have an opportunity to express their views through the public consultation submissions process.

4.4. The review of the Bylaw and LAP will be discussed with the Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga executive at one of their monthly meetings with Council staff.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. The cost of reviewing both the Liquor Ban Bylaw 2007 and Local Alcohol Policy 2015, is programmed and met from existing budgets and staff resources.

5.2. The Liquor Ban Bylaw 2007 review must be completed before 18 December 2018 or it will lapse under s11 of the Local Government (Alcohol Reform) Amendment Act 2012.

6. CONTEXT

6.1. Policy

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

The Local Alcohol Policy 2012 will continue to be operative until such time as the review is complete and the Council adopts the reviewed policy and signals the commencement date.

6.2. Legislation

Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012

i. The object of this Act is that:

(a) The sale, supply and consumption of alcohol should be undertaken safely and responsibly; and
(b) The harm caused by the excessive or inappropriate consumption of alcohol should be minimised.

ii. For the purposes of subsection (1), the harm caused by the excessive or inappropriate consumption of alcohol includes –

(a) Any crime, damage, death, disease, disorderly behaviour, illness, or injury, directly or indirectly caused, or directly or indirectly contributed to, by the excessive or inappropriate consumption of alcohol; and

(b) Any harm to society generally or the community, directly or indirectly caused, or directly or indirectly contributed to, by any crime, damage, death, disease, disorderly behaviour, illness or injury of a kind described in paragraph (a).

Sale and Supply of Alcohol Regulations 2013

Local Government Act 2002

Local Government (Alcohol Reform) Amendment Act 2012

New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990

6.3. Community Outcomes

There is a safe environment for all

- Harm to people from natural and man-made hazards is minimised and our district has the capacity and resilience to respond to natural disasters.

- Crime, injury and harm from road accidents, gambling, and alcohol abuse are minimised.

The distinctive character of our towns, villages and rural areas is maintained

- The centres of our main towns are safe, convenient and attractive places to visit and do business.

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.
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PROJECT PLAN

BACKGROUND:

The Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012 (the Act) enabled the Council to develop a Local Alcohol Policy (LAP) to further control the location of licensed premises, the number of licensed premises in the District or any part of the District, the maximum trading hours, impose discretionary conditions on the issue of licences and impose one-way door restrictions. The District Licensing Committee (DLC) and Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority (ARLA) are required to consider the LAP when making licensing decisions.

The Waimakariri District Council adopted its Local Alcohol Policy on 3 February 2015 with a review period of three years. This review is due in 2018.

The Waimakariri District Licensing Committee has expressed the view that there are elements of the current policy that could be improved.

Recent community consultation regarding alcohol licence applications indicate ongoing interest in the sale and supply of alcohol and support for the Local Alcohol Policy.

SCOPE:

The scope of this project includes the following:

- Review of the Waimakariri Local Alcohol Policy

PROJECT AIMS AND OBJECTIVES:

Aims:
To review the local alcohol policy to ensure that it continues to meet the needs of the community as expressed in the Waimakariri Community Outcome:

There is a safe environment for all

- Harm to people from natural and man-made hazards is minimised,
- Crime, injury and harm from road accidents, gambling and alcohol abuse are minimised.

Objectives:

- To ensure the project is carried out in the most efficient and time effective manner taking into account the needs of the community and other stakeholders.
- To engage with the community, the Police, the Medical Officer of Health, HANZ, retailers and licence holders to ensure they are involved in the decision making relating to the project and their views are taken into account.
- To ensure alignment with other legislation, policies and plans of the Council.
- To complete the project within the agreed time.
- To keep the community and affected parties informed of progress.

METHODOLOGY:

The following methodology will be used to deliver this project:

- **Planning / Procurement**
  - Develop and confirm project plan (this plan)
  - Procure necessary skills for delivery of the project – this involves selecting appropriate staff either internally or externally to carry out required work
  - Develop and confirm communication plan, including nature and point of engagement with key stakeholders, Council, Community Boards etc
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- Consultation
  o Develop a consultation plan including information about submissions, hearings and appeals
  o Workshop LAP with Community Boards and the District Plan and Regulation Committee (DP&R)

CO-ORDINATION WITH OTHER PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Contact name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>District Plan issues</td>
<td>Matt Bacon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Engaging the Community for Alcohol Action</td>
<td>Wendy Howe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Services</td>
<td>Liquor Ban Bylaw</td>
<td>Malcolm Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy and Strategy</td>
<td>Liquor Ban Bylaw</td>
<td>Lynley Beckingsale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>Matt McIlraith</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY STAKEHOLDERS

Internal:
All of the above WDC Units
Council
Rangiora-Ashley, Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi, Oxford-Ohoka, Woodend-Sefton Community Boards

External:
New Zealand Police Local stations – Oxford, Kaiapoi, Rangiora, Alcohol Team Christchurch
Ministry of Health
Community and Public Health
Retailers/Publicans (HANZ/SCANZ)/Licence Holders;
Health Promotion Agency
Community

DELIVERABLES AND APPROVALS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Approval by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Plan</td>
<td>PCG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Plan</td>
<td>PCG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Policy</td>
<td>DP&amp;R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation Plan and Report (SCP process)</td>
<td>DP&amp;R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Alcohol Policy</td>
<td>Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PROJECT TIMELINE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL ALCOHOL POLICY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Plan and Timeline</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>5 December 2017 (Council)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Plan</td>
<td>LB/MMC1</td>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish and Facilitate Reference Group</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board workshops</td>
<td>MJ/LB</td>
<td>April meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft policy signed off by DP&amp;R for SCP</td>
<td>LP/LB</td>
<td>17 April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft policy notified and open for consultation</td>
<td>LB/MMI</td>
<td>11 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission period closes</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>8 June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearings and Deliberations</td>
<td>MJ/LB</td>
<td>End July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed policy public notice</td>
<td>LB/RC</td>
<td>15 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal period</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>30 day appeal period commences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy effective 30 days after appeals resolved</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROJECT BUDGET:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal costs</td>
<td>$33,000 (estimate, without Court costs for appeals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approved Total Budget

RISKS:

Table of Risks (Acceptable for small simple projects)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
<th>Acceptable level of residual risk?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appeal process doesn’t allow LAP to be finalised in anticipated time-frame</td>
<td>Public and stakeholder consultation robust and thorough.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HEALTH AND SAFETY:

Is a H&S plan required? Yes [ ] No [X]

Covered by the Working in the Field Procedures
PROJECT PLAN

REGULAR REPORTING:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Control Group</td>
<td>Update on progress</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>PCG</td>
<td>monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Group</td>
<td>Update on progress</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>two-monthly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SIGN-OFF

Prepared By: ____________________________________________________________

Signed: ___________________________ Date: ________________________________

Reviewed By: __________________________________________________________

Signed: ___________________________ Date: ________________________________

Approved By: __________________________________________________________

Signed: ___________________________ Date: ________________________________
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## PROJECT ORGANISATION:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Sponsor</th>
<th>Nick Harrison – Manager Planning and Regulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Control Group</td>
<td>Malcolm Johnston – Environmental Services Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lynley Beckingsale – Policy &amp; Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sharon Stevenson – ESU Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council Representative (DP&amp;R)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Partnership Agencies  | New Zealand Police                             |
|                       | Medical Officer of Health                      |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council Staff</th>
<th>Environmental Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greenspace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business and Centres Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Governance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Stakeholders</th>
<th>Community Boards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Wellbeing North Canterbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presbyterian Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waimakariri Health Advisory Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hotel Association of NZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Licensees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Project Manager       | Lynley Beckingsale – Policy & Strategy         |
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BACKGROUND:

The Local Government Act 2002 (the Act) enables the Council to develop a Liquor Ban Bylaw (the Bylaw) to further control the consumption, carrying and possession of alcohol in public places in the Waimakariri District. Changes to the Act in 2012 (S147, 147A and 147B) mean that a higher level of evidence for justifying the continuance of the Bylaw is required. The Council must be satisfied that:

(a) the bylaw can be justified as a reasonable limitation on people’s rights and freedoms; and
(b) a high level of crime or disorder (being crime or disorder caused or made worse by alcohol consumption in the area concerned) is likely to arise in the area to which the bylaw is intended to apply if the bylaw is not made; and
(c) the bylaw is appropriate and proportionate in the light of that likely crime or disorder.

The Waimakariri District Council adopted its Liquor Ban Bylaw 2007 on 11 October 2007, which was amended in 2008 to include areas of Oxford. This review is a 10 year statutory review.

SCOPE:

The scope of this project includes the following:

- Review of the Liquor Ban Bylaw 2007

PROJECT AIMS AND OBJECTIVES:

Aims:
To review the Liquor Ban Bylaw to ensure that it continues to meet the needs of the community as expressed in the Waimakariri Community Outcome:

There is a safe environment for all

- Harm to people from natural and man-made hazards is minimised,
- Crime, injury and harm from road accidents, gambling and alcohol abuse are minimised.

Objectives:

- To ensure the project is carried out in the most efficient and time effective manner taking into account the needs of the community and other stake holders.
- To engage with the community, the Police, the Medical Officer of Health, retailers and licence holders to ensure they are involved in the decision making relating to the project and their views are taken into account.
- To ensure alignment with other legislation, policies and plans of the Council.
- To complete the project within the agreed time,
- To keep the community and affected parties informed of progress.

METHODOLOGY:

The following methodology will be used to deliver this project:

- Planning / Procurement
  - Develop and confirm project plan (this plan)
  - Procure necessary skills for delivery of the project – this involves selecting appropriate staff either internally or externally to carry out required work
  - Develop and confirm communication plan, including nature and point of engagement with key stakeholders, Council, Community Boards etc
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- **Consultation**
  - Develop a consultation plan including information about submissions, hearings and appeals
  - Workshop the Bylaw with Community Boards and the District Plan and Regulation Committee (DP&R)

**CO-ORDINATION WITH OTHER PROJECTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Contact name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>District Plan issues</td>
<td>Matt Bacon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Engaging the Community for Alcohol Action</td>
<td>Wendy Howe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Services</td>
<td>Local Alcohol Policy</td>
<td>Malcolm Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy and Strategy</td>
<td>Local Alcohol Policy</td>
<td>Lynley Beckingsale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenspace</td>
<td>Parks and Reserves Management</td>
<td>Chris Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>Matt McIlraith</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY STAKEHOLDERS**

**Internal:**
- All of the above WDC Units
- Council
- Rangiora-Ashley, Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi, Oxford-Ohoka, Woodend-Sefton Community Boards
- Youth Council

**External:**
- New Zealand Police Local stations – Oxford, Kaiapoi, Rangiora, Alcohol Team Christchurch
- Community and Public Health and Medical Officer of Health
- Retailers/Publicans (HANZ/SCANZ)/Licence Holders
- Health Promotion Agency
- Community

**DELIVERABLES AND APPROVALS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Approval by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Plan</td>
<td>PCG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Plan</td>
<td>PCG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Policy</td>
<td>DP&amp;R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation Plan and Report (SCP process)</td>
<td>DP&amp;R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor Ban Bylaw</td>
<td>Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PROJECT TIMETABLE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIQUOR BAN BYLAW REVIEW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Plan and Timeline</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>5 December 2017 (Council)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Plan</td>
<td>LB/MMcl</td>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish and Facilitate Reference Group</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board workshops</td>
<td>MJ/LB</td>
<td>April meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Bylaw signed off by DP&amp;R for SCP</td>
<td>LP/LB</td>
<td>17 April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Bylaw notified and open for consultation</td>
<td>LB/MMI</td>
<td>11 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission period closes</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>8 June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearings and Deliberations</td>
<td>MJ/LB</td>
<td>End July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor Ban Bylaw 2018 adopted by Council</td>
<td>MJ/LB</td>
<td>4 September 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROJECT BUDGET:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal costs</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approved Total Budget

RISKS:

Table of Risks (Acceptable for small simple projects)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
<th>Acceptable level of residual risk?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidence not available to justify continuing with a Bylaw</td>
<td>Early collection of evidence from Police and Council teams, rigorous review of evidence to ensure compliance with the Act.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HEALTH AND SAFETY:

Is a H&S plan required?  [ ] Yes  [X] No

Covered by the Working in the Field Procedures
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## REGULAR REPORTING:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Control Group</td>
<td>Update on progress</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>PCG</td>
<td>monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Staff and Key Stakeholders</td>
<td>Update on progress</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>PCG</td>
<td>two-monthly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SIGN-OFF

Prepared By: 

Signed: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

Reviewed By: 

Signed: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

Approved By: 

Signed: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________
Project Timeline

Local Alcohol Policy Review
Liquor Ban Bylaw Review

Milestone dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Liquor Ban Bylaw</th>
<th>Local Alcohol Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 December 2017</td>
<td>Report to Council advising process to review both the bylaw and policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 April 2018</td>
<td>Report to DP&amp;R Committee requesting permission to consult</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 May 2018</td>
<td>Consultation opens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 June 2018</td>
<td>Consultation closes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WO 2 July 2018</td>
<td>Hearings/Deliberations</td>
<td>Hearings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WO 23 July 2018</td>
<td>Deliberations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 August 2018</td>
<td>Council adopts reviewed bylaw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 September 2018</td>
<td>Council Approves provisional LAP for public notification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 September 2018</td>
<td>Public notification of provisional LAP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 day appeal period commences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appeals heard by ARLA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elements of policy reviewed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewed elements confirmed by ARLA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewed LAP adopted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Personnel
Council Staff

- Environmental Services
- Policy and Strategy
- Community
- Greenspace
- Communications
- Business and Centres Manager
- Governance

Partnership Agencies

- New Zealand Police
- Canterbury District Health Board

Key stakeholders

- Community Boards
- Community Wellbeing North Canterbury (Deidre Ryan)
- Presbyterian Support (Vicki Lucas)
- HANZ
- Local Licensees
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>What</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>Review of research report underway</td>
<td>LAP</td>
<td>Lynley ESU staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>Meet with Community Wellbeing NC and Presbyterian Support re potential data/information</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Lynley Community Team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 November</td>
<td>Meet with Alcohol Action Group with Wendy Howe</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Lynley</td>
<td>Meeting cancelled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 November</td>
<td>Meet with Police re Liquor Ban Bylaw Review and advise LAP review process</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Lynley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 November</td>
<td>Meeting with partnership agencies</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>ESU staff</td>
<td>Police CDHB Lynley Nick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>Confirm Solicitor</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Malcolm Nick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 December</td>
<td>Report to Council advising of reviews (MT agenda 23/11)</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Lynley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 December</td>
<td>DLC meets to discuss LAP review</td>
<td>LAP</td>
<td>Malcolm Lynley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>Research report update completed</td>
<td>LAP</td>
<td>Lynley</td>
<td>ESU staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>Staff and partnership agencies review elements of bylaw and LAP and make recommendations</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>All staff</td>
<td>Police CDHB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>Meet with:</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Lynley Community Team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Social Services Waimakariri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Waimakariri Health Advisory Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Workshops with Community Boards and key stakeholders</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Confirm process with Solicitor</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Lynley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 April 2018</td>
<td>Report to DP&amp;R requesting permission to consult</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Lynley</td>
<td>Malcolm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 May 2018</td>
<td>Consultation opens</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Comms Key Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May/June</td>
<td>Public meetings/community engagement</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Comms Key Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 June 2018</td>
<td>Consultation closes</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WO 8 July 2018</td>
<td>Hearings/deliberations</td>
<td>Bylaw</td>
<td>Police CDHB Key Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WO 8 July</td>
<td>Hearings</td>
<td>LAP</td>
<td>Police CDHB Key Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WO 23 July</td>
<td>Deliberations</td>
<td>LAP</td>
<td>Police CDHB Key Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WO 23 July</td>
<td>Workshop with partnership agencies to confirm LAP elements</td>
<td>LAP</td>
<td>Police CDHB Key Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Approver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 August</td>
<td>Council adopts reviewed bylaw (MT Agenda 26 July)</td>
<td>Bylaw</td>
<td>Lynley Malcolm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early August</td>
<td>Provisional LAP reviewed by Police and CDHB</td>
<td>LAP</td>
<td>Police CDHB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid August</td>
<td>Provisional LAP reviewed by Solicitor</td>
<td>LAP</td>
<td>Solicitor Lynley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 September</td>
<td>Council approves provisional LAP for notification</td>
<td>LAP</td>
<td>Lynley Malcolm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 September</td>
<td>Public notification of provisional LAP</td>
<td>LAP</td>
<td>Comms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 day appeal period commences</td>
<td>LAP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appeals heard by ARLA</td>
<td>LAP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elements of policy reviewed</td>
<td>LAP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewed elements confirmed by ARLA</td>
<td>LAP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewed LAP adopted</td>
<td>LAP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT

FILE NO and TRIM NO: BYL-52 / 171116124725
REPORT TO: Council
DATE OF MEETING: 5 December 2017
FROM: Veronica Spittal, Senior Policy Analyst; for the Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 Implementation Plan Working Party
SUBJECT: Adoption of Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 Implementation Plan and Establishment of Advisory Group

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

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to seek the adoption of the Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 Implementation Plan. The Council approved the draft Implementation Plan for release for public consultation in August 2017. An informal hearing was held in November 2017 to consider submissions to the draft plan, most of which were very positive. The Plan has now been finalised and minor changes made as a result of the consultation process are high-lighted in this report.

1.2. The other purpose of the report is to seek Council’s approval of the terms of reference for the advisory group proposed to replace the Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 Implementation Plan Working Party.

Attachments:
  i. Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 Implementation Plan (Trim No. 171122126489)
  ii. Northern Pegasus Bay Advisory Group Terms of Reference (Trim No. 171122126942)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw Implementation Plan 2016 Working Party recommends:

THAT the Council:
  (a) Receives report No. 171116124725.
  (b) Adopts the attached Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 Implementation Plan for implementation (Trim No. 171122126489).
  (c) Approves the establishment of the Northern Pegasus Bay Advisory Group.
  (d) Approves the Terms of Reference for the Northern Pegasus Bay Advisory Group (Trim No. 171122126942).
  (e) Appoints Councillor xxx to the Northern Pegasus Bay Advisory Group, as Chairperson.
3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

3.1. The Council approved the establishment of a working party to prepare an implementation plan for the Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 on 6 December 2016. The draft plan was approved for release for public consultation at a Council meeting on 1 August 2017 (Trim No: 170713072738). Public consultation, including two Saturday drop-in sessions at the beaches was carried out between 7 and 28 August 2017 and 25 submissions were received in response to this.

3.2. Groups that submitted to the draft plan were the Pegasus Residents Group, Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust, the Kaiapoi-Tuahiti and Woodend-Sefton Community Boards, Ashley Fishermens Association Inc, Environment Canterbury, Waikuku Beach Kitesurfing Group and the NZ Riding Clubs and Bridleways. Other groups represented on the Working Party were the Ashley-Rakahuri Rivercare Group, Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga and the Department of Conservation.

3.3. At the 1 August 2017 meeting the Council also mandated the Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 Implementation Plan Working Party to consider public submissions received on the Implementation Plan and recommend any necessary changes to Council. This was because a special consultative procedure was not required for the consultation and members of the Working Party were familiar with the practicalities of implementing the Bylaw.

3.4. Working Party members considered the 25 submissions received, in conjunction with the accompanying Policy and Strategy officer’s report, the views of the groups they represented and those of Ecan and Green Space staff primarily responsible for implementing the actions, at a meeting on 13 November 2017, chaired by Councillor Kevin Felstead.

**Response to Submissions**

3.5. The majority of submitters were very supportive of the Plan, with only three submitters requesting changes to Bylaw rules. This is outside of the scope of the Implementation Plan and the effectiveness of the existing Bylaw rules will be considered during a statutory review in 5 years time.

3.6. The future management and protection of the Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary was a clear priority for submitters, as was the education of beach users through effective communication, signage and enforcement. Other issues were vehicle access into the Estuary from State Highway One and Kings Ave, educating beach users entering at Ashworths Beach about new Bylaw rules, the proposal to name the coastal strip a park, continuing to engage with the Hurunui District Council about coastal management and the need to adequately resource the advisory group and enforcement services.

3.7. The Ecan representative advised the Working Party it was not desirable to totally block off access from State Highway 1 or Kings Ave as the area was heavily used for recreational activity. Fenton Reserve Trustees and Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga strongly objected to a previous proposal to install a gate to block off access from Kings Ave. In light of this the Working Party recommends to Council that the status quo prevail.

3.8. It was agreed the Hurunui District Council should be invited to be a member of the proposed Northern Pegasus Bay Advisory Group. The different Bylaw rules applying to the northern and southern stretches of the coastal strip was problematic but manageable as long as good communication was established between the two.
Councils. It was also acknowledged that enforcement efforts to date have been concentrated in the area between the Waimakariri and Ashley-Rakahuri Rivers and there was a need to educate users entering the coastal strip from Ashworths Beach. It was agreed the Ecan rangers would programme time over weekends this coming summer to hand out Waimakariri District Council Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 information to beach users entering at Ashworths Beach.

3.9. It was proposed that the coastal strip be called a park as a significant change in attitudes and behaviour was observed by Ecan Rangers when the Waimakariri and Ashley-Rakahuri river bed land was developed and promoted as regional parks. The level of support for this proposal was canvassed as part of the draft Implementation Plan consultation and most people supported the concept, although some had reservations about whether it would result in further restrictions being imposed. Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust strongly objected to the proposal citing potential user confusion between the beach area and Tūhaitara Coastal Park. The Trust submitted that it was the strength of the commitment to the active management of the Bylaw and Plan implementation that would bring about the desired change in behaviours and uptake of community stewardship rather than a name change. As the Trust is a significant partner to the Plan, the Working Party agreed, although some disappointment was expressed, to call the Bylaw area the ‘coastal strip’ rather than a park, but manage it as a ‘park space’.

3.10. Another $20,000 was added by the Council and Ecan to the enforcement budget during the development of the 2016 Bylaw. Additional enforcement resources are not considered to be necessary at this stage although it is acknowledged more targeted enforcement is required. The Working Party agreed the community’s desire for a more visible ranger presence outside of standard work hours when the beach is likely to be the most heavily used needed to be considered during the renewal of the level of service agreement between Council and Ecan. This is programmed to be completed by February 2018.

3.11. In response to submitters concerns about the need for the Advisory Group to be properly resourced to enable it to be effective, Green Space staff advised a dedicated member of their team would be available to provide administrative support for the group. Budgets would also be available for specific identified projects such as signage. Funding for future projects identified by the Advisory Group would need to be applied for through the Council’s normal Long Term Plan planning process.

3.12. A number of minor changes have been made to incorporate the feedback from the consultation process into the Plan. While the Working Party agreed education, publicity and signage, combined with effective enforcement was a priority, a number of the timeframes were pushed out due to delays in having the Plan ready for adoption by Council.

3.13. Other recommendations from the Working Party, arising from the consultation process, to be passed onto the Advisory Group when it is established are as follows:

- That the Advisory Group prioritises initiating discussions with other parties to decide on a process/funding/timeframe for developing a management plan for the Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary

- That the Advisory Group liaises with the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee about projects of mutual interest
• That the Advisory Group considers the merits of submitters suggestions to extend the cable at Pegasus Beach, install a second red post near the ocean outfall, and maintain and develop new cycle tracks and walkways when implementing action PS.2 ‘Identify the existing structures used to enforce the bylaw and review their effectiveness environmental impact and accessibility’ and PS.3 ‘Identify opportunities for new structures, including park furniture, that will assist with bylaw enforcement, direct people to destination points and enhance users experience’

• That the Advisory Group prioritises the development and installation of effective signage and consider submitters suggestions for signage when developing the signage programme as per action S.2 ‘Determine the minimum signage needed to inform beach users, taking into account important access points and key issues at each site. Assess the adequacy of existing signage within this framework and prepare a signage programme including estimated costs, priorities and timeframes’

• That the Advisory Group makes educational activities a priority and considers the merits of the suggestion to install pictorial bird stations around the Estuary when implementing S.5 ‘Develop interpretation sign/s highlighting the significant wildlife and other values of the Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary in consultation with other relevant parties and place in key locations’.

**Northern Pegasus Bay Coastal Advisory Group**

3.14. The lack of a representative umbrella group to provide feedback to the Council and ECan on Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 issues and to drive many of the actions contained within the Implementation Plan, was previously identified as an issue, and the Working Party recommended to Council on 1 August 2017 that an Advisory Group be established to supersede it once the plan had been adopted by Council.

3.15. The Advisory Group will be responsible for overseeing the implementation of the Plan, carrying out annual reviews of the user agreements associated with the Bylaw, developing a research and monitoring programme in conjunction with other parties, overseeing a review of the Ecan Ranger Service contract with the Council, encouraging user groups, residents associations and community boards to educate the community about the Bylaw to bring about a cultural shift in attitudes and reporting back to Council on the effectiveness of the Implementation plan and associated Bylaw.

3.16. In addition to the organisations represented on the Working Party it is recommended the membership of the Advisory Group is extended to include representation from user groups and beach communities. It is proposed that each of the following groups be invited to select one person to represent them on the Northern Pegasus Bay Advisory Group:

• Waimakariri District Council – Councillor (Chairperson)
• Kairaki-Tuahiwi Community Board
• Woodend-Selton Community Board
• Department of Conservation
• Environment Canterbury
• Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga
• Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust
• Hurunui District Council
• Ashley-Rakahuri Rivercare Group
• Waikuku Beach Kite Surfers User Agreement Group
• Ashley Fishermens Association Inc
• Woodend Beach Commercial Horse Trainers User Agreement Group
• Fenton Reserve Trustees

It is also proposed that residents living at each of the four beach settlements are represented. This representative may be a committee member of the relevant community association or alternatively a resident selected by the association with the time and interest to represent the beach community’s views on the Northern Pegasus Bay Advisory Group. Additional membership to include:

• A representative for Waikuku Beach residents (to be determined by the Northern Pegasus Bay Advisory Group)
• A representative for Pegasus Beach residents nominated by the Pegasus Residents Group Inc
• A representative for Pines/Kairaki Beach residents nominated by the Pines Kairaki Beaches Association
• A representative for Woodend Beach residents nominated by the Woodend Community Association.

While this appears to be a large group to manage, in reality not all the representatives will turn up to every meeting and the level of commitment required from representatives will vary depending on the nature of the actions being implemented at the time.

3.17. The majority of submitters to the draft Implementation Plan indicated they would like to become involved with the future management of the District’s beaches. The Working Party recommends these people are contacted regarding specific opportunities as they arise. A number of people that have been involved in the bylaw process have extensive knowledge of various aspects of the coastal environment and have demonstrated significant commitment to improving the District’s beaches. It is anticipated the Advisory Group will co-opt individuals and representatives from other user groups onto sub-groups as necessary.

3.18. Green Space staff will provide the Advisory Group with staff support and Policy and Strategy staff will assist with monitoring activities.

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

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. The views of submitters to both the Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 and the draft Implementation Plan were taken into account in finalising the Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 Implementation Plan.

4.2. Working party members were also responsible for ensuring the views of the organisations they represent were incorporated into the document.

4.3. Some of the actions involve Council units other than Green Space and Policy and Strategy. The managers of these Units were consulted about actions that require input from their staff and their views have been incorporated into the document.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. The Implementation Plan has resource implications for five of the organisations party to it, including the Council, ECAn, Department of Conservation, Ashley-Rakahuri Rivercare Group, Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga and Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust. All of
these groups have confirmed their commitment to implementing plan actions apart from Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga.

5.2. Most of the actions relating to the Council and ECan are covered within existing operational budgets. Having a staff member available to support the Advisory Group to drive the Implementation Plan is vital to its success and a new Green Space Community Project Officer, Mike Kwant, has been employed with key responsibilities in this area, to address this issue.

5.3. Two big items of expenditure are sealing the Kairaki Beach car park and improving access to the beach for people with mobility issues. Budgetary provision of $50,000 has been made in year 2 and another $50,000 in year 5 of the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan to improve access at Waikuku and Pegasus beaches. This will be discussed by Council as part of the Long Term Plan deliberations. $80,000 has been included in year 2 as a 50/50 share with ECan for sealing the Kairaki Beach car park. Again this is subject to Council approval.

5.4. Owners for a few of the actions, in particular some of the research necessary to ensure the next bylaw review is informed by more than anecdotal evidence, have not yet been identified and it is hoped that people or organisations willing to participate in this way will be identified as part of the on-going work of the Advisory Group. An expert member of Birds NZ offered his assistance with action M.7 ‘Establish a baseline for bird species in the Estuary and carry out ongoing monitoring’ via his submission to the draft plan.

6. CONTEXT

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

6.2. Legislation
The legislation and associated documents relevant to the Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 and therefore the implementation plan are as follows:

- Treaty of Waitangi;
- New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990;
- Resource Management Act 1991;
- Local Government Act 2002;
- Marine and Coastal Area (Tukutai Moana) Act 2011;
- Wildlife Act 1953;
- Marine Mammals Protection Act 1978;
- Conservation Act 1987;
- Ngai Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998;
- Land Transport Act 1998;
- Reserves Act 1977;
- Dog Control Act 1996;
- Forest and Rural Fires Act 1977;
- New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010;
- Regional Coastal Environment Plan for the Canterbury Region;
- Proposed Canterbury Conservation Management Strategy;
• Waimakariri District Council District Plan;
• Tuhaitara Coastal Reserve and Waikuku Beach Reserves Management Plan;
• WDC Memorandum of Understanding with Te Ngāi Tūhuriri Rūnanga;
• Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan 2013;
• Kemp’s Deed;
• WDC Northern Pegasus Bay 2016 Bylaw;
• WDC Dog Control Bylaw 2009;
• WDC Fire Control Bylaw 2014;
• Environment Canterbury Navigation Safety Bylaws 2010;
• Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust Strategic Plan 2015-2025

6.3. **Community Outcomes**

- Harm to people from natural and manmade hazards is minimised and our district has the capacity and resilience to respond to natural disasters;
- Harm to the environment from the spread of contaminants into ground and water is minimised;
- Conservation of significant areas of vegetation and/or habitats is encouraged;
- Different cultures are acknowledged and respected;
- People enjoy clean water at our beaches and rivers;
- There are wide ranging opportunities for people to enjoy the outdoors;
- There are wide ranging opportunities for people of different ages to participate in community and recreational activities;
- The particular recreational needs of children and young people are met;
- 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;
- The Council and Te Ngāi Tūhuriri Rūnanga through the Memorandum of Understanding continue to build their relationship.

Veronica Spittal
SENIOR POLICY ANALYST
Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016
Implementation Plan
Making it happen
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Introduction

After a lengthy public consultation process the first Bylaw for Northern Pegasus Bay was adopted by the Council and became operative on 1 July 2010. The Bylaw was originally established to give effect to the agreements arising from the Northern Pegasus Bay Coastal Management Plan. The Waikuku Beach Reserves Management Plan was revised and a Plan Change approved for the Waimakariri District Council District Plan in association with the introduction of the Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2010.

In accordance with Section 158 of the Local Government Act 2002 (the Act), the first review of a bylaw made under the Act is required to be undertaken no later than five years after the bylaw was made. In April 2014 the Council established a multi-agency Working Party to review the effectiveness of the 2010 Bylaw. A report to Council on 3 February 2015 recommended that the Bylaw proceed on the basis that it was still the most appropriate mechanism for controlling public behaviour and recreation activities on the beaches.

The proposed Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2015 was released for public consultation from 7 February 2015 until 11 March 2015 and 221 submissions were received. The Hearing Panel recommended substantial changes to the proposed Bylaw at the 4 August 2015 Council meeting in order to address the concerns raised by submitters. A number of the recommended changes were more restrictive in nature necessitating another round of consultation.

A Statement of Proposal for the Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 was released for public comment between 9 April and 10 May 2016 attracting 70 submissions.

A number of compliments were received about the effort the Bylaw Review Working Party, Hearing Panel and Council had made to develop the Bylaw and the Council’s willingness to go out for another round of consultation. A significant number of submitters agreed with the Bylaw’s focus on health and safety and approved of the balance achieved between conflicting uses and conflicting use/environmental values.

“The Council is to be congratulated on the effort it has put into the compilation of the proposed Bylaw in producing a document that is well balanced, fair minded and caters well for the needs of the various interest groups.” Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw Submitter 2016

The Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 Implementation Plan Working Party (NPBBIPWP) was established by the Waimakariri District Council in late 2016 to ensure the effective implementation of the new Bylaw. This group consisted of representatives from the Waimakariri District Council, Kaaipo-Tuahiwi Community Board, Woodend-Sefton Community Board, Environment Canterbury, Department of Conservation, Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust, Te Ngāi Tūahuriri Rūnanga and the Ashley-Rakahuri Rivercare Group.

A draft Implementation Plan was released for public consultation in August 2017 and 25 submissions were received and considered by the Working Party. The future management and protection of the Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary was a clear priority for submitters, as was the education of beach users through effective communication, signage and enforcement.

The NPBBIPWP recommended in the draft Plan that it be replaced by an advisory group that also included representation from beach communities and user groups, once the Implementation Plan had been adopted by Council.

The Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 Implementation Plan was adopted by Council on 5 December 2017.
Northern Pegasus Bay Advisory Group

The Northern Pegasus Bay Advisory Group is responsible for carrying out the following tasks:

- Overseeing the implementation of the Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 Implementation Plan, reviewing its effectiveness after two years of operation and reporting to Council on any need to carry out an early review.

- Establishing a Bylaw research and monitoring programme in conjunction with other interested parties, including investigating the possibility of finding a research partner to study the effectiveness of Bylaw provisions in protecting Ashley- Rakahuri Estuary wildlife values from the impact of recreation use.

- Carrying out annual reviews of the kite surfing and commercial horse training user agreements.

- Overseeing a review of the Ecan Ranger Service contract with the Council.

- Encouraging user groups, residents associations and community boards to educate the community about the Bylaw to bring about a cultural shift in attitudes.

The Advisory Group is proposed to be made up of representatives from the following organisations and communities:

- Waimakariri District Council
- Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board
- Woodend-Sefton Community Board
- Department of Conservation
- Environment Canterbury
- Ashley-Rakahuri Rivercare Group
- Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust
- Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga
- Hurunui District Council
- Waikuku Beach Kite surfers
- Ashley Fishermens Association Inc
- Woodend Beach Commercial Horse Trainers
- Fenton Reserve Trustees
- Waikuku Beach residents
- Pegasus Beach residents
- Pines/Kairaki Beach residents
- Woodend Beach residents.
Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016

Vision

Northern Pegasus Bay coastal strip valued, protected and enjoyed by all.

Purpose

The Bylaw is in place to ensure wildlife and the natural environment are not harmed and so that everyone can enjoy the district’s beaches. The new Bylaw applies to all of the beaches within the Waimakariri District and became operative on Monday 15 August 2016.

The aims of the Bylaw are to:

- Manage recreational use for the benefit and enjoyment of all users
- Minimise any negative environmental impact from beach activity
- Promote public health and safety
- Minimise nuisance and offensive behaviour.

Protecting foreshore habitats, dune systems, and the wildlife and vegetation in the estuaries and lagoons was identified as a priority during the review and consultation process as was minimising the potential for conflict between different recreation activities and promoting a safe environment for beach users.
1. Cultural Values

“Our kaumatua should not have to walk for miles to get their cockles and pipi, and they should not have to go and get a key for access to their traditional mahinga kai places.”

Clare Williams, Ngāi Tūhuriri, Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan 2013
Key issues identified through the consultation process

Scattering of ashes
A ban on scattering or burying human ashes on the beach was proposed in the draft Bylaw because people can be distressed to see ashes in a public place and the practice may be offensive for cultural reasons. This position was strongly opposed by 84% of the submitters who commented on the issue, many of whom said they had a strong spiritual connection to the coast and wished their remains to be scattered there. The clause was dropped from the final Bylaw due to the difficulty in enforcing such a sensitive issue and because ashes were often scattered in the deeper water not covered by the Bylaw. In acknowledging the cultural issue raised by Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga, the Hearing Panel considered it would be important to help educate beach users and discourage this practice. Identifying an alternative site for members of the public to scatter ashes was also thought to be important.

Lack of public awareness of the significance of the coastal area to Maori
The significance of the land and resources within the Bylaw area to Ngāi Tahu and Ngāi Tūāhuriri was highlighted during the Bylaw submission process. As a result a section on Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri values was included in the Bylaw’s preamble and the Hearing Panel thought it was important for beach users to be made more aware of the history of the area, the rights associated with this and Ngāi Tahu and Ngāi Tūāhuriri values.

Continued access for mahinga kai gathering
The Northern Pegasus Bay coastal area and in particular the Waimakariri River Mouth, Rakahuri Awa/Ashley River and associated wetlands was a significant mahinga kai area for Ngāi Tahu and Ngāi Tūāhuriri. In an economic sense, the resources of an area determined the welfare and mana (prestige) of the people. The community effort to collect the resources also formed a very important part of the community’s strength. The seasonal activities were a time for Whanaungatanga – renewing contacts with distant relations,

Whakatinana o ngā ura – of reinforcing traditional and cultural values, Tikanga – of maintaining controls and Manaakitanga – hospitality towards guests.

Mahinga kai describes the natural resources gathered by Maori and the places and practices in doing so. It was specifically recognised and protected in Kemp’s Deed in 1848 and advanced within Te Kerēme, the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998.

Mahinga kai is an important value and activity that will be acknowledged and provided for within the Bylaw process and through ongoing partnership. Achieving a balance between minimising the impact of vehicles on the beach and in the Estuary and providing for traditional rights is a key issue to be resolved.

Fenton Reserves access and rights
Refer to section 8, User Agreements.
Our aspirations

1.1 Ngāi Tahu and Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri history and values regarding the use of coastal land, water and natural resources are acknowledged and promoted.

1.2 Relevant Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan 2013 objectives and policies are taken into account in implementing the Bylaw.

How we'll know we've succeeded

- Interpretation information outlining Ngāi Tahu and Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri history and values is available to the general public. (1.1)
- Discussions have been held regarding an alternative site for scattering the ashes of deceased persons. (1.1)
- Implementation actions are consistent with Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan 2013 objectives and policies. (1.1, 1.2)
### Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>PARTIES INVOLVED</th>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>BY WHEN</th>
<th>PRELIMINARY ESTIMATED COST / FUNDING SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CV.1</td>
<td>Ecan Ranger Service and WDC Green Space Team in consultation with Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga</td>
<td>Within 2 years</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Ecan, WDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV.2</td>
<td>Ecan Ranger Service in consultation with Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga and Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust</td>
<td>Within 2 years</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Funding available in existing Ecan Ranger Service operational budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV.3</td>
<td>WDC Green Space Team and Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>At WDC/Rūnanga annual hui and executive meetings</td>
<td>Salary only. Covered in existing WDC Green Space operational budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV.4</td>
<td>WDC Green Space Team, in consultation with Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga and Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust</td>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
<td>June 2018</td>
<td>Salary only. Covered in existing WDC Green Space operational budget</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OTHER RELATED ACTIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ED.2</th>
<th>Develop educational videos involving members of the community and utilise social media to educate beach users about key Bylaw issues and the cultural significance of the area. (1.1, 5.1, 5.3, 6.2, 7.2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ED.3</td>
<td>Revise Bylaw educational brochures and make available for distribution to beach users. (1.1, 5.1, 5.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED.7</td>
<td>Promote the cultural and ecological values of the Tūhaitara Coastal Park. (1.1, 5.1, 5.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.4</td>
<td>Develop interpretation signs explaining the rich cultural history of the coastal area in consultation with Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga and place in key locations. (1.1, 4.5, 5.1, 5.3, 7.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.5</td>
<td>Develop interpretation sign/s highlighting the significant wildlife and other values of the Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary in consultation with other relevant parties and place in key locations. (1.1, 2.1, 2.4, 4.4, 4.5, 5.1, 5.3, 7.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA.1</td>
<td>Develop a Fenton Reserve Code of Conduct for sign off by the Council and Fenton Reserve Trustees. (1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.3, 7.2, 7.3, 8.1, 9.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA.2</td>
<td>Sign a Fenton Reserve Agreement between the Council, Environment Canterbury and Fenton Reserve Trustees (1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.3, 7.2, 7.3, 8.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary

“Offshore people ring me wanting to see a braided river, especially the birds, and most especially the weka. My response is: "no problem, give me a call when you reach NZ." What I don’t want to happen is you getting such a call in 30 years’ time, and having to reply: "no problem showing you a braided river, but I’m afraid the last weka was sighted 3 years ago."

Nick Ledgard, Chairperson Ashley-Rakahuri River Care Group talking to school children 2016
Key issues identified through the consultation process

Adequate protection of the environment
During the consultation process, conservation-oriented organisations and bird specialists identified a number of activities that could have a negative impact on the important ecological and wildlife values of the Ashley-Rakahuri and Saltwater Creek estuarine areas. All but one submitters who commented on the Estuary expressed their support for the Bylaw clauses protecting the environment and its flora and fauna with some wanting it to be designated a Ramsar site or wildlife sanctuary. The Hearing Panel considered that a management plan, incorporating a long-term vision and agreed outcomes, needed to be developed for the Estuary and thought the Council should take a lead role in promoting this with the other organisations concerned, such as Environment Canterbury, the Department of Conservation, Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga and Fenton Reserve Trustees. Research and monitoring activities also need to be coordinated.

Lack of awareness of the significant values of the Estuary
The Ashley-Rakahuri estuarine area is recognised by the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) as a wetland of international significance and it is designated as an ‘important bird area’ by Birdlife International. The wetlands are the feeding, roosting and breeding grounds of a large number of native birds, including some threatened and critically endangered species such as the black-billed gull, the black-fronted tern, banded dotterel and wrybill. The area is also listed in the Regional Coastal Plan as having ‘significant natural value’ with Maori cultural values, wetlands, estuaries, coastal lagoons, marine mammals, birds, ecosystems, flora and fauna habitats, historic places and coastal landforms and associated processes. The need to educate people about the significance of the Estuary in order to better protect its values was identified during the Bylaw consultation process. Refer to section 5, Education.

Vehicles in the Estuary
Vehicle access is provided for whitebaiting from 15 August to 30 November each year via the whitebait gate. People seeking access through the gate at other times of the year are able to apply to the Council for an exemption. There is a need for increased resources to better monitor the vehicle permit system.

Currently vehicles are able to access the Estuary via the Ashley-Rakahuri River bed. Vehicle access into the river bed is managed by Environment Canterbury through the development of the Ashley-Rakahuri Regional Park and the management plan for the area.

Entrance to the Estuary from Kings Ave is unable to be completely blocked off because of the need to provide vehicle access for Fenton Reserve Trustees and the popularity of the area for recreational activity.

Vehicles also enter the northern margins of the Estuary from the northern part of the coastal strip. Open access at Ashworths Beach makes this difficult to control. Refer also to section 7, Working with Others. Other vehicle access points are the Raupo Berm and SH1 bridge.

Fenton Reserve access
Refer to section 8, User Agreements.

Estuary signage
The need for additional signage at the entrances to the Estuary was highlighted. This included interpretation signage and signage outlining Bylaw rules, particularly those relating to vehicle use and dog control. Refer to section 4, Signage.

Predator control
There is a need to support predator control in the Estuary by locals.

Monitoring the impact of kite surfing on Estuary wildlife
Refer to section 10, Research and Monitoring.

Monitoring the number of motorised craft in the Estuary and their impact on wildlife
Refer to section 10, Research and Monitoring.
Our aspirations

2.1 The community, Ecan, DOC, Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri, Fenton Reserve Trustees and the Council recognise the Estuary is a wetland of international significance and actively seek to protect it.

2.2 Recreation activities carried out in the Estuary are compatible with protecting the Estuary ecosystem.

2.3 The wildlife in the Estuary thrives with safe feeding, resting and breeding areas for all species.

2.4 Organisations and community members work together to achieve an agreed vision for the Estuary.

How we’ll know we’ve succeeded

• A clear vision and management framework is developed for the Estuary. (2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4)
• The community educates other Estuary users on how to behave to protect the environment and wildlife. (2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4)
• Ecan rangers report a decrease in complaints and observations regarding behavior not permitted in the Estuary. (2.1, 2.2, 2.3)
• Use of the Estuary for active recreation declines and is replaced by passive activities such as walking and bird watching. (2.2, 2.3)
• Recreation use of the Estuary causes no further degradation of bird habitats. (2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4)
Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>PARTIES INVOLVED</th>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>BY WHEN</th>
<th>PRELIMINARY ESTIMATED COST / FUNDING SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARE.1</td>
<td>Investigate the feasibility and benefits of providing Te Kōhaka o Tūhātararo and the Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary with sentient status. (2.1, 2.4)</td>
<td>Te Kōhaka o Tūhātararo Trust and Te Ngāi Tūhātararo Rūnanga</td>
<td>Within 2 years</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARE.2</td>
<td>Initiate discussions with other organisations to decide on a process, timeframe and funding for the development of a management plan for the Estuary. (2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 7.3, 8.1)</td>
<td>Advisory Group</td>
<td>Within 1 year</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OTHER RELATED ACTIONS**

| ED.4    | Inform microlight operators at the Rangiora Airfield about the wildlife values of the Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary and the need to protect the birds there. (2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 5.3, 7.2) |
| ED.5    | Make whitebaiters aware of wildlife issues, including the importance of driftwood areas above high tide for nesting birds, and whitebaiting rules, by handing out educational brochures when keys are given out and during interactions with Rangers. (2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 5.1, 5.3, 7.2) |
| E.6     | Encourage Estuary users via promotional material and on signage to report offences to Ecan for follow up, including recording licence plate numbers. (2.1, 7.1, 7.2, 9.1, 9.2) |
| M.4     | Monitor levels and characteristics of the kite surfing activity in the Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary using the Ecan Ranger Service Info tool. (2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 8.3, 10.1c, 10.1e, 11.1) |
| M.5     | Monitor the effectiveness of the Fenton Reserve Agreement and Code of Conduct as per agreed methodology. (2.1, 2.3, 2.4, 8.1, 10.1d, 11.2) |
| M.6     | Monitor levels of motorised water sports occurring in the Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary using the Ecan Ranger Service Info tool. (2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 10.1e) |
| M.7     | Establish a baseline for bird species in the Estuary and carry out ongoing monitoring. (2.1, 2.3, 7.2, 7.3, 10.1e) |
| M.8     | Ensure research carried out within the Northern Pegasus Bay coastal strip is prioritised and coordinated. (2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 7.3, 10.3) |
| M.9     | Investigate the possibility of finding a research partner to study the effectiveness of Bylaw provisions in protecting Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary wildlife values from the impact of recreation use. (2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 7.3, 8.1, 8.3, 10.2, 10.3) |
| S.5     | Develop interpretation sign/s highlighting the significant wildlife and other values of the Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary in consultation with other relevant parties and place in key locations. (1.1, 2.1, 2.4, 4.4, 4.5, 5.1, 5.3, 7.4) |
| S.6     | Ensure clear signage is provided about the Bylaw rules relevant to the Estuary, such as dog control and no-go areas. (2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.5) |
| UA.1    | Develop a Fenton Reserve Code of Conduct for sign off by the Council and Fenton Reserve Trustees. (1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.3, 7.2, 7.3, 8.1, 9.1) |
| UA.2    | Sign a Fenton Reserve Agreement between the Council, Environment Canterbury and Fenton Reserve Trustees (1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.3, 7.2, 7.3, 8.1) |
| W.6     | Support predator control efforts in the Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary by locals. (2.1, 2.3, 2.4, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3) |
3. Physical Structures

"The irresponsible access and rutting of the sensitive dune area by motorbikes, quad bikes, and some 4WDs is reprehensible and needs to be addressed by fencing off these areas."

Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw submitter 2015
Identification of the Woodend Beach commercial horse training area

The spokesperson for the Woodend Beach commercial horse training area has requested that each end of the designated horse training area be clearly marked to enable trainers to adhere to the user agreement and let members of the public know where there might be fast moving horses.

Alternative routes for recreational horse riders

From mid-December to mid-January, recreational riders need to plan their trip to avoid the designated horse training area. Submitters made a number of suggestions regarding the development of alternative long horse trails that are worth investigating.

Horse faces

Several submitters objected to the amount of horse faces being left on the beach and as rider numbers increase this issue is also likely to increase. The Hearing Panel was of the opinion that riders needed to be mindful of impacting on beach users enjoyment of the environment and clean up where possible. The Bylaw now requires any person in charge of a horse to remove faeces passed by the animal from the horse float carpark as this was considered a practical option for horse riders and a step towards cleaning up the environment.

Clear identification of the northern coastal Bylaw boundary

The Implementation Plan Working Party was tasked with considering submitters' suggestions for additional or improved physical structures and identifying those that would aid the enforcement of the Bylaw in the most cost-effective way.

Clear identification of the northern coastal Bylaw boundary

The Implementation Plan Working Party was tasked with considering submitters' suggestions for additional or improved physical structures and identifying those that would aid the enforcement of the Bylaw in the most cost-effective way.

Better definition of the Ocean Outfall prohibited vehicle access point

A number of submitters thought the red posts delineating the northern end of the permitted vehicle access area starting at Kairaki Beach were not obvious, particularly when sand built up around them. The stop point has been moved southward to the Ocean Outfall to provide additional vehicle access points, barriers and markers, in the coastal area to prevent ecologically sensitive areas. Further restrict vehicle access and raise awareness of vehicle restrictions.
Our aspirations

3.1  The design and location of physical structures are appropriate to their setting and intended purpose and user-friendly.

3.2  ‘Less is better’. Physical structures installed to enforce the Bylaw are the most effective solution to an identified problem.

3.3  Continued pedestrian access for beach users, including those with mobility issues and young children is given priority over physical structures required for enforcement reasons.

3.4  Physical structures are provided to support the development of the coastal strip as a managed park space.

How we’ll know we’ve succeeded

- There is less observable and reported damage to structures. (3.1)
- Structures are fit for purpose and do not visually detract from their natural surroundings. (3.1, 3.2)
- Defined access routes are used and minimal use of alternatives observed. (3.1, 3.2)
- Opportunities for passive recreation are enhanced. (3.3, 3.4)
- People recreate in areas where structures, such as picnic tables and seats, have been provided. (3.4)
## Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>PARTIES INVOLVED</th>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>BY WHEN</th>
<th>PRELIMINARY ESTIMATED COST / FUNDING SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PS.1</td>
<td>Create design guidelines for signs and physical structures used in the Northern Pegasus Bay coastal strip. (3.1, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4)</td>
<td>Ecac in consultation with WDC Green Space Team and the advisory group</td>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
<td>June 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS.2</td>
<td>Identify the existing physical structures used to enforce the Bylaw and review their effectiveness, environmental impact and accessibility. (3.2)</td>
<td>WDC Green Space Team and Ecac Rangers</td>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
<td>June 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS.3</td>
<td>Identify opportunities for new structures, including park furniture, that will assist with Bylaw enforcement, direct people to destination points and enhance users park experience, for example, a viewing platform for people with mobility issues. (3.2, 3.3, 3.4)</td>
<td>WDC Green Space Team, Ecac Rangers and Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust in consultation with the advisory group</td>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
<td>June 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS.4</td>
<td>Prepare a programme of physical structures to be installed including estimated costs, priorities and timeframes for inclusion in WDC and Ecac 2018-2028 LTP’s. (3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4)</td>
<td>WDC Green Space Team, Ecac Rangers and Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust</td>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
<td>December 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS.5</td>
<td>Investigate the feasibility of providing alternative loop horse trails within the Northern Pegasus Bay coastal strip and Tūhaitara Coastal Park. (3.4, 7.4)</td>
<td>Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust in consultation with WDC Green Space Team and Ecac Rangers</td>
<td>Within 5 years</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS.6</td>
<td>Investigate the feasibility of sealing the Kairaki Beach car park as a joint Ecac/WDC project. (3.1, 3.2, 3.4, 7.3)</td>
<td>WDC Green Space Team and Ecac Rangers</td>
<td>Now</td>
<td>For inclusion in WDC and Ecac 2018-2028 LTP’s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## OTHER RELATED ACTIONS

W3 | Discuss with the Waikuku Beach Surf Club options for providing disabled access at Waikuku Beach and recommend a solution for consideration by WDC and Ecac Councillors. (3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 7.3, 7.4)
4. Signage

“Clear, unambiguous signage, regularly repeated in exactly the same format will both remove the excuses around misunderstanding or not seeing and help the general public in supporting council-led initiatives and policing.”

Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw submitter 2015
Key issues identified through the consultation process

Ineffective and confusing Bylaw signage
The Working Party reviewing the effectiveness of the 2010 Bylaw identified there was a need to improve the enforcement-related signage at various places along the coastal strip so that beach users were very clear about permitted and non-permitted activities.

A number of submitters requested improved or additional signage with some of these providing examples of ineffective and confusing beach signs at the 2015 Hearing.

As a result the Hearing Panel recommended that a review of existing signage be carried out by the Implementation Plan Working Party.

Submitters to the draft Implementation Plan also considered it to be a priority to highlight bylaw rules and coastal values through the provision of effective signage and a number had suggestions for signage improvements. The Working Party has recommended these suggestions be considered by WDC, Ecan and Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust staff when developing the signage programme.

Too many signs, lack of co-ordination between organisations providing signage, lack of design cohesion
A number of organisations erect signage on the coastal strip, for example, Environment Canterbury, Waimakariri District Council, Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust, Fish and Game, Department of Conservation and the Ashley-Rakahuri Rivercare Group. While some attempts have been made to co-ordinate some of this signage, the beach entrances are characterised by too many signs displaying different logos and graphics and providing different information.

Other areas of the beach have no signs where signs are clearly needed to provide directional or Bylaw information.

Lack of interpretive signage – wildlife values
The need to provide interpretive signage to improve awareness of coastal values, particularly the wildlife values of the Ashley-Rakahuri River and Saltwater Creek estuarine areas, was identified by people and groups submitting on environmental issues.

Lack of interpretive signage – cultural values
The Hearing Panel thought it was important for beach users to be made more aware of the history of the area and the rights associated with this, for example the right for Ngāi Tahu and Ngāi Tūāhuriri descendants to gather mahinga kai (refer to section 1, Cultural Values) and the right for Fenton Reserve owners and entitlement holders to access Fenton Reserves (refer to section 8, User Agreements).

Scattering the ashes of deceased people on the beach and in waterways was contrary to Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga values and the Hearing Panel also thought it was important to try and discourage this practice by educating beach users (refer to section 1, Cultural Values).
Our aspirations

4.1 Visitor information is well sited, appropriate to its setting and fit for purpose.

4.2 Signage provides clear, consistent messaging and is visually appealing and engaging.

4.3 The amount of signage in the Northern Pegasus Bay coastal strip is minimised.

4.4 There is a coordinated approach amongst organisations installing signage.

4.5 Beach users are educated through the use of interpretive signage.

How we’ll know we’ve succeeded

- Clear, consistent signs are placed at agreed points. (4.1, 4.2)
- The signage review has been completed and new signs installed. (4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5)
- The Ecan Rangers and Council Green Space Team receive positive feedback about the new signage. (4.1, 4.2)
- Multi-agency signage is used where appropriate. (4.3, 4.4)
### Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>PARTIES INVOLVED</th>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>BY WHEN</th>
<th>PRELIMINARY ESTIMATED COST / FUNDING SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S.1</td>
<td>Ecac Ranger Service</td>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
<td>June 2018</td>
<td>Salaries only. Covered in existing Ecac Ranger Service operational budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.2</td>
<td>Ecac Rangers in conjunction with WDC Green Space Team and in consultation with Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust</td>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
<td>June 2018</td>
<td>Salaries only. Funded in existing WDC Green Space and Ecac Ranger Service operational budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.3</td>
<td>Ecac Rangers in conjunction with WDC Green Space Team and Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust</td>
<td>Within 1 year (November 2018 (most signs))</td>
<td>Funding available in existing WDC Green Space and Ecac Ranger Service operational budgets. Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust is a possible partner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.4</td>
<td>Ecac in consultation with WDC Green Space Team, Te Ngāi Tuāhuriri Rūnanga and Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust</td>
<td>Within 2 years</td>
<td>2019 (interpretation signs)</td>
<td>$8000 available in existing Ecac Ranger Service operational budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.5</td>
<td>Ecac in consultation with WDC Green Space Team, Te Ngāi Tuāhuriri Rūnanga and Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust</td>
<td>Within 2 years</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$8000 available in existing Ecac Ranger Service operational budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.6</td>
<td>Ecac Rangers in conjunction with the WDC Green Space Team</td>
<td>Within 1 year</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
<td>Salaries only. Funded in existing WDC Green Space and Ecac Ranger Service operational budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.7</td>
<td>Ecac in consultation with the WDC Green Space Team</td>
<td>Within 1 year</td>
<td>September 2018</td>
<td>Salaries only. Covered in existing Ecac Ranger Service operational budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTION</td>
<td>PARTIES INVOLVED</td>
<td>PRIORITY</td>
<td>BY WHEN</td>
<td>PRELIMINARY ESTIMATED COST / FUNDING SOURCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S.9</strong> Carry out consultation on the design of interpretation panels prior to installation. (4.1, 4.2, 4.4, 4.5, 7.4)</td>
<td>Ecan, WDC Green Space Team in consultation with Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga, Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust, Ashley-Rakahuri Rivercare Group, Waikuku Kite Surfers</td>
<td>Within 2 years</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Salaries only. Covered in existing Ecan Ranger Service and WDC Green Space operational budgets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OTHER RELATED ACTIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>PARTIES INVOLVED</th>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>BY WHEN</th>
<th>PRELIMINARY ESTIMATED COST / FUNDING SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CV1</td>
<td>Erect interpretation panels at each beach entrance and at the Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary. (1.1, 1.2, 4.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS.1</td>
<td>Create design guidelines for signs and physical structures used in the Northern Pegasus Bay coastal strip. (3.1, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.1</td>
<td>Develop a publicity campaign for when the new Bylaw signage is installed. (4.5, 5.1, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Education

“Education is the most powerful weapon which you can use to change the world.”

Nelson Mandela
Key issues identified through the consultation process

Education as a management tool

The Working Party reviewing the effectiveness of the Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2010 identified there was a need to educate beach users about Bylaw rules and coastal values, particularly the wildlife and cultural values associated with the Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary, in order to bring about a change in user behaviour. A number of submitters to both the Bylaw and Implementation Plan also supported the use of education as a Bylaw management tool and made specific suggestions for improvements. The Bylaw submissions were referred onto the Northern Pegasus Bay Implementation Plan Working Party for its consideration. The Working Party recommended that the Advisory group make educational activities a priority.

The need to educate beach users entering at Ashworths Beach about the new Bylaw rules was raised as an issue in a submission to the Implementation Plan.

Aerial activities in the Estuary

Aerial activities can be seen as a threat to some birds who stay in the air while these are taking place. This interferes with their normal feeding, resting, nesting and roosting activities and puts chicks at risk of overheating or predation. Submitters raised the issue of aircraft flying low or hovering over the Estuary and this was discussed with the Rangiora Airfield Advisory Group who advised the use of air space was controlled by the Civil Aviation Authority and all aircraft were required to operate 500 ft above ground level. Members of the Advisory Group had not been aware of the issue and were supportive of education being used as a management tool in the first instance, for example, interpretative panels and brochures being located in the microlight clubrooms at the Rangiora Airfield.

Kite Surfing in the Estuary

The possible impact of kitesurfing on the birdlife in the Estuary was highlighted during the consultation process (refer to section 8 - User Agreements). A user agreement that sat alongside the Bylaw was developed as a control mechanism and educating kite surfers about this agreement is necessary to ensure people commit to it. Kite surfers who participated in the development of the agreement agreed to help educate other kite surfers about the Bylaw rules and reported on positive steps already taken in their submission to the Implementation Plan. In its submission to the proposed Bylaw, the Canterbury Windsports Association Inc, which works to foster and encourage local participation in windsports within the Canterbury region, also offered its support to educate the kiteboarding community.

Commercial horse training

Similarly, a commercial horse trainers’ agreement was developed for the Woodend Beach Commercial Horse Training Area and as part of the Agreement, horse trainers have agreed to take responsibility for making sure other commercial horse trainers are aware of the Bylaw rules (refer to section 8, User Agreements).

Cultural values

Tāngata whenua have a long and enduring relationship with the coastal and marine environment. It is part of the cultural heritage of Ngāi Tahu. The need to educate beach users about cultural values associated with the coast was identified (refer to section 1, Cultural Values). Particular issues are educating people about:

- wahi tapu and wahi taonga in order to discourage the practice of scattering human ashes on the beach or in the water
- customary access to the coastal environment
- the statutory rights of Fenton Reserve owners and entitlement holders.

User safety around long lines

Concern was expressed about long lines lying on the sand being hard for horse riders to see and it was requested that people using these lines fly a flag beside them. It has also been suggested that the hooks on the line can be a safety issue for curious dogs. The Hearing Panel thought consultation would need to be carried out with the fishing community in order to determine the extent of the problem and identify a solution. Educating people about this issue was considered to be more appropriate than including a rule in the Bylaw. The Ecan Ranger Service has agreed to monitor the situation.

Maahana Iwi Management Plan 2013
Our aspirations

5.1 Education is used as a tool to prevent and resolve user conflict and conflicts between use and environmental values.

5.2 Beach communities, user groups, Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust and the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi and Woodend-Sefton Community Boards play a role in bringing about a ‘cultural shift’ in attitudes towards the Northern Pegasus Bay coastal strip, both in how it can be protected and enjoyed for recreational purposes.

5.3 Beach users are informed of the significant wildlife and environmental values and rich cultural history associated with the Northern Pegasus Bay coastal strip and Tūhaitara Coastal Park.

How we’ll know we’ve succeeded

- Coastal education programmes are developed and implemented. (5.1, 5.2, 5.3)
- There is better compliance with Bylaw rules. (5.1, 5.2, 5.3)
- Interpretation information highlighting significant environmental and cultural values is provided in key locations along the coastal strip. (5.3)
## Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>PARTIES INVOLVED</th>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>BY WHEN</th>
<th>PRELIMINARY ESTIMATED COST / FUNDING SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ED.1</td>
<td>Advisory group in conjunction with the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi and Woodend-Sefon Community Boards and other interested parties</td>
<td>Within 1 year</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>Salaries only. Funded in existing WDC Green Space and Ecan Ranger Service operational budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED.2</td>
<td>WDC Communications and Engagement Team in consultation with the WDC Green Space Team, Ecan Rangers, Te Köhaka o Tūhaitara Trust and the advisory group</td>
<td>Within 1 year</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
<td>To be determined. Approximately $2,500 per day to develop video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED.3</td>
<td>Policy and Strategy in consultation with the WDC Green Space Team and Ecan</td>
<td>Now</td>
<td>December 2017</td>
<td>Funded in existing Policy and Strategy operational budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED.4</td>
<td>Ashley-Rakahuri Rivercare Group Supported by Ecan Ranger Service</td>
<td>Within 1 year</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Ashley-Rakahuri Rivercare Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED.5</td>
<td>WDC Green Space Team and Ecan Ranger Service</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>December 2017</td>
<td>Covered in existing WDC Green Space and Ecan Ranger Service operational budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED.6</td>
<td>Ecan Rangers</td>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>Salaries only. Covered in existing Ecan Ranger Service budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTION</td>
<td>PARTIES INVOLVED</td>
<td>PRIORITY</td>
<td>BY WHEN</td>
<td>PRELIMINARY ESTIMATED COST / FUNDING SOURCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED.7 Promote the cultural and ecological values of the Tūhaitara Coastal Park (1.1, 5.1, 5.3)</td>
<td>Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Covered in existing Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust budget</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OTHER RELATED ACTIONS**

W.1 Investigate community support for reinvigorating a residents group at Waikuku Beach to support the Implementation Plan actions. (5.2, 7.1, 7.2)

S.4 Develop interpretation signs explaining the rich cultural history of the coastal area in consultation with Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga and place in key locations. (1.1, 4.5, 5.1, 5.3, 7.4)

S.5 Develop interpretation sign/s highlighting the significant wildlife and other values of the Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary in consultation with other relevant parties and place in key locations. (1.1, 2.1, 2.4, 4.4, 4.5, 5.1, 5.3, 7.4)

P.1 Develop a publicity campaign for when the new Bylaw signage is installed. (4.5, 5.1, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3)

P.2 Carry out an annual Bylaw publicity programme highlighting Bylaw rules and coastal values and addressing any current issues, for example, vehicle use of the beach. (5.1, 5.3, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 7.3)

P.3 Work with relevant recreation organisations to ensure their members are aware of Bylaw rules. (5.1, 6.2, 7.3)
6. Publicity

“Hopefully implementing the Bylaw will help to raise awareness of everyone’s needs and educate the public, resulting in a common approach to sharing the space.”

Kaiapoi Community Board 2016
Key issues identified through the consultation process

Lack of awareness of Bylaw rules

Many submitters thought members of the public were generally unaware of Bylaw rules and a publicity campaign needed to be carried out when the new rules were introduced. The approach taken by the Hearing Panel recognised that while issues had been identified, there was a lack of documented evidence as to the extent of the problem and further restriction of people’s rights and freedoms under the NZ Bill of Rights Act 1990 required proper justification. As such, less restrictive strategies, such as raising public awareness of the Bylaw rules and environmental values, should be employed in the first instance, where appropriate.

The Bylaw is a legal document and as such does not have a particularly user-friendly format or style of expression. It is therefore important Bylaw rules are well publicised using a variety of methods. Since its introduction a set of brochures focusing on various aspects has been developed and the Council and Ecan have participated in coastal open days. The need to liaise with organised groups such as the Canterbury Windsports Association, Canterbury Blokart Club (land yachts) and four wheel drive clubs to ensure members are aware of the rule changes and how to apply for exemptions, where these apply, was also identified.

Lack of awareness of off-road alternatives for motorbikes

Some submitters wanted greater publicity to be given to alternative off-road options. Public off-road areas for motorbikes are provided by Environment Canterbury in the Waimakariri and Ashley-Rakahuri Regional Parks. Rangers provide coastal users with brochures about the regional parks when appropriate.

Contacting enforcement agencies

There was some confusion about who enforced the Bylaw and who to contact when a problem occurred and some submitters thought this should be better publicised.

Treating the beach as a coastal park

The need for people to see the beach as a managed public park space and act accordingly towards the environment and other users was identified by the Ecan Ranger Service. The Rangers report a significant change in attitudes towards the Waimakariri and Ashley- Rakahuri river bed land developed and promoted as regional parks.

The level of support for this proposal was canvased as part of the draft Implementation Plan consultation and most people supported the concept, although some had reservations about whether it would result in further restrictions being imposed. Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust objected to the proposal because of potential user confusion between the beach area and Tūhaitara Coastal Park. The Trust submitted that it was the strength of the commitment to the active management of the Bylaw and Plan implementation that would bring about the desired change in behaviours and uptake of community stewardship rather than a name change. As the Trust is a significant partner to this document, the Working Party agreed the coastal strip would not be called a park, however, it would be managed as a ‘park space’.

Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 Implementation Plan
Our aspirations

6.1 Beach users are aware they are in a managed environment when entering the coastal strip.

6.2 Beach users and community groups and organisations working and recreating in the Northern Pegasus Bay coastal strip are well informed about the new Bylaw’s objectives and rules.

6.3 People know who to contact to report a Bylaw-related issue.

How we’ll know we’ve succeeded

- Northern Pegasus Bay coastal strip messaging has a consistent look and feel. (6.1)
- Fewer breaches of Bylaw rules are observed by Ecan Rangers. (6.2)
- Few complaints are received about difficulties in reporting Bylaw breaches. (6.3)
### Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>PARTIES INVOLVED</th>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>BY WHEN</th>
<th>PRELIMINARY ESTIMATED COST / FUNDING SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P.1</td>
<td>WDC Communications and Engagement Team in consultation with WDC Green Space Team</td>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
<td>June 2018</td>
<td>Covered in existing WDC Green Space and Communication and Engagement Team operational budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.2</td>
<td>WDC Communications and Engagement Team in conjunction with WDC Green Space Team, Ecan and Te Kōhaka o Tūhailara Trust</td>
<td>Within 1 year</td>
<td>Before Christmas Holidays 2018 and every year thereafter</td>
<td>Covered in existing WDC Green Space and Communication and Engagement Team and Ecan Ranger Service operational budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.3</td>
<td>Ecan Ranger Service, WDC Green Space Team and Te Kōhaka o Tūhailara Trust</td>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
<td>June 2018</td>
<td>Covered in existing WDC Green Space, Ecan Ranger Service and Te Kōhaka o Tūhailara Trust operational budgets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### OTHER RELATED ACTIONS

**ED.2**
Develop educational videos involving members of the community and utilise social media to educate beach users about key Bylaw issues and the cultural significance of the area. (1.1, 5.1, 5.3, 6.2, 7.2)
7. Working with Others

“We welcome discussions to reach a mutually beneficial outcome so we can all enjoy wide-ranging opportunities for people to participate in community and recreational activities.”

Waikuku Beach Kite Surfers 2015
Key issues identified through the consultation process

Coordinating activities
A number of agencies own or manage land within or adjacent to the area covered by the Bylaw. These are the Waimakariri District Council, Environment Canterbury, Department of Conservation, Land Information NZ, Hurunui District Council, Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust and Fenton Reserve Trustees. The North Canterbury Fish and Game Council is also responsible for implementing policies and regulations relating to sports fish and game established under the Wildlife Act 1953 and the Conservation Act 1987. Most of these organisations worked closely with the Council to develop the Bylaw and there is a need for partnership in its implementation.

Inconsistent policy on adjoining coastal strips
Some submitters expressed their concern about a lack of consistent policy between the Council and Hurunui District Council with regard to the management of adjoining coastlines. The open vehicle access at Ashworths Beach makes it difficult for the Waimakariri District Council to control vehicles entering the northern margins of the Estuary and could increase the cost of enforcing the Bylaw. The Hurunui District Council was represented on the Council’s Bylaw Review Working Party and proceeded with its own coastal bylaw while the Waimakariri District Council negotiated the inclusion of Department of Conservation land in its Bylaw. The Hearing Panel agreed with submitters that it was important the two Councils met and discussed a coordinated approach to coastal management.

Submitters to the Implementation Plan also commented on the need for the Council to continue to engage with the Hurunui District Council and suggested the latter should be represented on the Advisory Group. The Working Party agreed the Hurunui District Council should be offered the opportunity to participate.

Beach clean up days
One submitter requested that commercial horse operators be encouraged to carry out beach clean-up days to show good faith for the use of the beach for commercial purposes and respect for the environment. The Hearing Panel thought this idea worth considering by the advisory group. Developing this idea as an annual community event would provide an opportunity for positive interaction between horse trainers and other beach users. The Working Party thought it would be good to include any groups that wanted to participate.

Empowering beach communities and user groups
A key theme emerging from the consultation process was the need to provide opportunities for people living in the beach communities and user groups to become involved with the management and protection of the proposed Northern Pegasus Bay coastal strip. Bringing people on board with the project was considered to be more effective than enforcement over the longer term.

Many submitters wanted to see the values of the coastal environment protected for future generations and showed interest in participating in projects. One submitter, for example, set up a website during the Bylaw consultation process called “Safer Beaches” to highlight issues and encourage others to become involved.

At the moment a number of residents groups represent people living in the coastal settlements. These are the Pines-Kairaki Beaches Association, Woodend Community Association, Pegasus Residents Group Inc and the Waikuku Beach Community group which is currently in recess. The advisory group will need to work closely with the beach communities and volunteer groups if the Bylaw is to be effectively implemented.

The majority of submitters to the draft Implementation Plan indicated they would like to become involved with the future management of the District’s beaches. The Working Party recommends these people are contacted regarding specific opportunities as they arise, as a number have extensive knowledge of various aspects of the coastal environmental and all have demonstrated their commitment to the project.
Our aspirations

7.1 Beach communities are empowered to take positive action to protect the beach environment.

7.2 Community members help to change the ‘beach culture’ by acting as role models and promoting stewardship.

7.3 Agencies and community groups involved with the coast collaborate and work closely together.

7.4 Development in the Northern Pegasus Bay coastal strip is done in consultation with relevant community groups and affected parties.

How we’ll know we’ve succeeded

- Beach communities are actively involved in Northern Pegasus Bay coastal strip activities. (7.1, 7.2, 7.3)
- Community actions to support the Implementation Plan are initiated by the community. (7.1, 7.2, 7.3)
- Groups benefiting from the coastal environment participate in coastal protection activities. (7.2, 7.3)
- Bylaw objectives and rules are generally understood and accepted by beach communities and community groups associated with the Northern Pegasus Bay coastal strip. (7.1, 7.2, 7.3)
- Regular liaison meetings occur between the agencies concerned with the coast. (7.3)
- Consultation has been carried out for planned development along the coast. (7.4)
- Local schools are involved in coastal conservation programmes. (7.2)
## Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>PARTIES INVOLVED</th>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>BY WHEN</th>
<th>PRELIMINARY ESTIMATED COST / FUNDING SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W.1</td>
<td>WDC Community Team in conjunction with the advisory group</td>
<td>Within 1 year</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Covered in existing WDC Community Team budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust in conjunction with schools and community groups and supported by WDC Green Space Team, Ecan Ranger Service and the advisory group</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Funded by Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust. Some funding may be available in existing WDC Green Space and Ecan Ranger Service operational budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.3</td>
<td>WDC Green Space Team, Ecan Rangers, Waikuku Beach Surf Club</td>
<td>Within 1 year</td>
<td>July 2018</td>
<td>Investigations funded within existing WDC Green Space and Ecan Ranger Service operational budgets. Structure to be considered for funding 50/50 between Ecan/ WDC in 2018-2028 LTP’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.4</td>
<td>WDC Green Space Team, Ecan Rangers and Hurunui District Council</td>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
<td>June 2018</td>
<td>Salaries only. Funded in existing WDC Green Space and Ecan Ranger Service operational budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.5</td>
<td>WDC Green Space Team, beach user groups, other voluntary groups, the advisory group, Community Boards and WDC Communications and Engagement Team</td>
<td>Within 1 year</td>
<td>February 2018</td>
<td>Salaries covered in existing WDC Green Space, Communications and Engagement Team and Ecan Ranger Service budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.6</td>
<td>DOC and Ecan</td>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Existing Ecan budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTION</td>
<td>PARTIES INVOLVED</td>
<td>PRIORITY</td>
<td>BY WHEN</td>
<td>PRELIMINARY ESTIMATED COST / FUNDING SOURCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.7</td>
<td>WDC Green Space Team</td>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
<td>Community &amp; Recreation Committee meeting - 27 March 2018</td>
<td>Covered in existing WDC Green Space operational budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.8</td>
<td>WDC Green Space Team</td>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
<td>December 2017</td>
<td>Covered in existing WDC Green Space operational budget</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OTHER RELATED ACTIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>PARTY INVOLVED</th>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>BY WHEN</th>
<th>PRELIMINARY COST / FUNDING SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER RELATED ACTIONS CONTINUED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ED.5</strong></td>
<td>Make whitebaiters aware of wildlife issues, including the importance of driftwood areas above high tide for nesting birds, and whitebaiting rules, by handing out educational brochures when keys are given out and during interactions with Rangers. (2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 5.1, 5.3, 7.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P.2</strong></td>
<td>Carry out an annual Bylaw publicity programme highlighting Bylaw rules and coastal values and addressing any current issues, for example, vehicle use of the beach. (5.1, 5.3, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 7.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P.3</strong></td>
<td>Work with relevant recreation organisations to ensure their members are aware of Bylaw rules. (5.1, 6.2, 7.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PS.5</strong></td>
<td>Investigate the feasibility of providing alternative loop horse trails within the Northern Pegasus Bay coastal strip and Tūhaitara Coastal Park. (3.4, 7.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PS.6</strong></td>
<td>Investigate the feasibility of sealing the Kairaki Beach car park as a joint Ecan/WDC project. (3.1, 3.2, 3.4, 7.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARE.2</strong></td>
<td>Initiate discussions with other organisations to decide on a process, timeframe and funding for the development of a management plan for the Estuary. (2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 7.3, 8.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UA.1</strong></td>
<td>Develop a Fenton Reserve Code of Conduct for sign off by the Council and Fenton Reserve Trustees. (1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.3, 7.2, 7.3, 8.1, 9.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UA.2</strong></td>
<td>Sign a Fenton Reserve Agreement between the Council, Environment Canterbury and Fenton Reserve Trustees (1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.3, 7.2, 7.3, 8.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CV.3</strong></td>
<td>Hold discussions with Te Ngāi Tūhuriri Rūnanga about the opportunities for developing partnerships in the achievement of the Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 Implementation Plan. (1.1, 1.2, 7.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. User Agreements

“Fentons were supposed to move with the water; this was the intent of the settlement. Water goes with the Fenton. You can’t have a Fenton without water.”

Nga Tūākurū Rūnanga representative, Mahaau iwi Management Plan 2013
Key issues identified through the consultation process

Kite Surfing User Agreement – Ashley River/ Rakahuri Estuary

The tension between protecting Estuary birds and continuing to provide a safe venue within the District for kite surfing was highlighted during the Bylaw consultation process. The Hearing Panel amended the proposal to restrict rather than prohibit kite surfing for the following reasons:

- There were low numbers of people using the Estuary for the sport
- The kite surfing community was respectful of the environmental issues raised by submitters and willing to compromise to find an acceptable solution. Members were also willing to play a role in educating and monitoring the activities of kite surfers using the Estuary
- There was a lack of site-specific data about any negative effects
- There was no other safe training area for kite surfing in the District.

It was agreed that a kite surfing user agreement, sitting alongside the Bylaw, would be the most appropriate control mechanism given the dynamic nature of the physical environment. The effectiveness of the agreement is to be reviewed at an annual meeting between kite surfers, WDC, Ecian, DOC and environmental groups. Issues to be addressed are educating kite surfers about the agreement and monitoring the effectiveness of the agreement in mitigating the impact of kitesurfing on estuarine birds.

Access to Fenton Reserves

The Rakahuri Awa/Ashley River and Northern Pegasus Bay Coastal area was a significant area for mahinga kai. Fenton Reserves and entitlements were set aside for occupation and access to mahinga kai and some of these are located in or close to the Estuary. Fenton Reserve owners and holders of Fenton Entitlements have a legal right to access waterways associated with these reserves and entitlements for mahinga kai purposes. The Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998 makes provision for Fenton Reserve owners and holders of Fenton Entitlements to have access up to 210 days per year for the above purposes, including the erection of temporary camping shelters. In the preparation of this Bylaw these rights have been considered and applied via the development of a user agreement between the Council, Environment Canterbury and the Fenton Reserve Trustees.

The agreement is to be consistent with the principles of kaitiakitanga (the intergenerational responsibility and right of tangata whenua to take care of the environment and resources upon which they depend), the underlying rights/purposes of the reserves and entitlements and the values expressed in the Bylaw.

Issues to be addressed are:

- Educating the public about the legal rights of Fenton Reserve owners and entitlement holders
- Finding the correct balance between protecting the Estuary’s natural values and providing Fenton Reserve owners and entitlement holders with vehicle access
- Monitoring the effectiveness of the Agreement.

The agreement does not form part of the Bylaw but will sit alongside it, in a similar manner to the other two user agreements that have been successfully negotiated and will show how the balance between providing vehicle access and protecting the ecological values of the Estuary will be achieved. A code of conduct will be developed as part of this agreement.

Woodend Beach Commercial Horse Trainer’s User Agreement

Commercial horse training has been restricted to an area extending 3.2 km’s (2 mile training run) either side of the beach entrance to the Woodend Beach Horse Float Car Park and Access Trail. This was a compromise between opposing views and provides some restrictions while still allowing horse trainers to train over the correct distance. A Woodend Beach commercial horse training user agreement has been negotiated to address the concerns of some submitters and this is to be reviewed annually. Representatives of the horse trainers have agreed to an early review of the designated area if an increase in the number of people using Pegasus Beach results in increased user conflict.
Our aspirations

8.1 Fenton Reserve Trustees act as katiakitanga for waterways associated with Fenton Reserves and entitlements located within and adjacent to the Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary.

8.2 The Woodend Beach Commercial Horse Trainer’s User Agreement is an effective tool for managing user conflict.

8.3 The Kite Surfing User Agreement – Ashley River-Rakahuri Estuary is effective in achieving the necessary balance between using the Estuary for kite surfing and protecting environmental and wildlife values.

How we’ll know we’ve succeeded

- A Fenton Reserves Agreement and code of conduct for the use of the Estuary by Fenton Reserve owners and entitlement holders is developed and adhered to. (8.1)

- The impact of vehicle access in the Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary by Fenton Reserve owners and entitlement holders is minimised. (8.1)

- Few public complaints are received about the use of the beach for commercial horse training. (8.2)

- The advisory group is satisfied that kite surfing has little impact on bird activity in the Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary. (8.3)
## Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>PARTIES INVOLVED</th>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>BY WHEN</th>
<th>PRELIMINARY ESTIMATED COST / FUNDING SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UA.1</td>
<td>Fenton Reserve Trustees and Council</td>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
<td>March 2018</td>
<td>Fenton Reserve Trustees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UA.2</strong></td>
<td>WDC Policy and Strategy and Green Space Units, Ecan, Fenton Reserve Trustees</td>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
<td>June 2018</td>
<td>Salaries only. Covered in existing WDC Policy and Strategy and Green Space budgets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER RELATED ACTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARE.2</th>
<th>Initiate discussions with other organisations to decide on a process, timeframe and funding for the development of a management plan for the Estuary. (2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 7.3, 8.1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.3</td>
<td>Regularly monitor the use of the designated commercial horse training area at Woodend Beach as per agreed methodology. (8.2, 10.1b, 11.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.4</td>
<td>Monitor levels and characteristics of the kite surfing activity in the Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary using the Ecan Ranger Service Info tool. (2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 8.3, 10.1c, 10.1e, 11.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.5</td>
<td>Monitor the effectiveness of the Fenton Reserve Agreement and Code of Conduct as per agreed methodology. (2.1, 2.3, 2.4, 8.1, 10.1d, 11.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.9</td>
<td>Investigate the possibility of finding a research partner to study the effectiveness of Bylaw provisions in protecting Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary wildlife values from the impact of recreation use. (2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 7.3, 8.1, 8.5, 10.2, 10.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.2</td>
<td>Carry out an annual review of the Commercial Horse Trainers User Agreement prior to the start of summer as per Bylaw clause 10.4 (8.2, 11.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.3</td>
<td>Carry out an annual review of the Kite Surfing User Agreement prior to the start of the kite surfing season or whenever significant changes to the coastal environment during this period necessitate additional reviews as per Bylaw clause 13.2. (8.2, 11.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Enforcement

“The community needs to know the Council is in earnest. No law works until people know it will be enforced.”

Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw submitter 2015
Key issues identified through the consultation process

Effectiveness of enforcement services
This was a key issue for many of the people submitting on the Bylaw with some of the opinion that the 2010 Bylaw provisions would have been adequate had they been more effectively enforced. The Council concluded that effective implementation, particularly enforcement, was critical to the Bylaw’s success in resolving the issues identified during the review and consultation processes. Some issues were reported about difficulties in contacting Ecan’s hotline, obtaining a prompt response and ensuring follow up. The need to prioritise enforcement was also raised by submitters to the draft Implementation Plan.

The need to coordinate enforcement efforts
Enforcement is undertaken by Environment Canterbury’s Ranger Services and the cost of this service is split between Ecan and Waimakariri and Hurunui District Councils. Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust also enforces the Bylaw over Trust land. Establishing clear communication processes and procedures was identified as a way of increasing the effectiveness of Bylaw enforcement.

The Council’s Environmental Services Unit has staff that can give out infringement notices for unwarrented and unregistered vehicles on the beach and offences against the Dog Control Act 1996. The NZ Police have greater powers to enforce driving offences on the beach than the Council and DOC has responsibilities for protecting endangered species under the Wildlife Act 1953. Utilising these agencies and different Council units for joint enforcement operations from time to time was identified as a way of coordinating enforcement efforts and achieving a greater enforcement presence.

Inconsistent adjoining coastal Bylaws
Some submitters expressed their concern about the lack of consistent policy between the Council and Hurunui District Council with regard to the management of adjoining coastlines (refer to Section 7, Working with Others). The interface between the Christchurch City Council and Waimakariri District Council coastal areas is less problematic due to the separation provided by the Waimakariri River. The open vehicle access at Ashworths Beach makes it difficult for the Council to control vehicles entering the northern margins of the Estuary. The different rules are confusing for beach users and could lead to increased enforcement costs. The Hearing Panel agreed with submitters it was important the two Councils met and discussed a coordinated approach to coastal management.

Increased funding for enforcement services
During the review process it became clear that additional funding was required to improve Bylaw enforcement and this was supported by a number of submitters who commented on the need to resource enforcement adequately. In the 2015/16 financial year the Council made another $10,000 available per annum for its contribution to the Ecan Ranger Service and equivalent additional funding was obtained from Ecan in 2017.

Additional indirect costs are also incurred. For example, Council Green Space Unit and Dog Control Unit staff also spend time resolving issues relating to Bylaw enforcement and vandalised signs are regularly replaced.

Comments by submitters, to both the Bylaw and the draft Implementation Plan, that enforcement needs to be more targeted were supported. The Hearing Panel and the Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 Implementation Plan Working Party recommended the existing enforcement service agreement be reviewed and consideration be given to targeting particular issues or problem areas and having a more visible ranger presence on summer evenings and during the weekends.

Lack of consequences for Bylaw breaches
The Hearing Panel acknowledged people needed to know there were consequences for breaking the Bylaw if the necessary ‘culture shift’ in attitudes towards driving on the beach was to be achieved. This meant the Ecan Ranger Service had to be backed up by Local Council willingness to prosecute serious offences. Meetings were held between Ecan and WDC staff to discuss enforcement options and update agreed enforcement procedures. These are to be finalised once the Council has entered into a new service agreement with Ecan.

Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 Implementation Plan
Our aspirations

9.1 There is a coordinated approach to enforcing activities occurring within the Northern Bay coastal strip.

9.2 Environment Canterbury Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw Ranger Services are highly visible, effectively targeted and well supported by local beach communities.

9.3 Systems are in place to ensure complaints are promptly responded to and followed up.

9.4 Waimakariri District Council and Environment Canterbury have appropriate processes in place to ensure breaches of the Bylaw are effectively enforced.

How we’ll know we’ve succeeded

- Combined agency enforcement operations are carried out. (9.1)

- Organisations operating within the Bylaw area are aware of each other’s activities. (9.1)

- Beach communities support and are generally satisfied with the enforcement services provided. (9.2, 9.3, 9.4)

- The number of public complaints received by the Council and Ecan about the lack of Bylaw enforcement decrease over time. (9.2, 9.3, 9.4)

- Beach users are generally aware of the consequences of breaching the Bylaw. (9.2, 9.3, 9.4)

- WDC and Ecan have an agreed Bylaw enforcement process in place. (9.1, 9.3, 9.4)

- Serious breaches of the Bylaw are investigated for suitability for prosecution. (9.4)
### Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>PARTIES INVOLVED</th>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>BY WHEN</th>
<th>PRELIMINARY ESTIMATED COST / FUNDING SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.1 Carry out a combined agency enforcement operation in the Northern Pegasus Bay coastal strip each year. (9.1)</td>
<td>NZ Police, WDC ESU Unit, WDC Green Space, Ecan Ranger Service, DOC and Te Kōhaka o Tūhātara Trust</td>
<td>Within 1 year</td>
<td>December 2018 and every year thereafter</td>
<td>Each participating agency to cover the cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2 Report regularly to the advisory group on beach users perceived level of awareness of Bylaw rules and number of incidences recorded on the Ecan database. (9.2)</td>
<td>Ecan Ranger Service and the advisory group</td>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
<td>Advisory group programmed meetings</td>
<td>Salaries only, Covered in existing Ecan Ranger Service operational budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.3 Establish a 2016/17 baseline for monitoring the number of incidents received by Ecan and WDC related to Bylaw enforcement. (9.2, 10.2)</td>
<td>Ecan Ranger Service and WDC Green Space Team</td>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
<td>June 2018</td>
<td>Salaries only, Covered in existing Ecan Ranger Service and WDC Green Space operational budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.4 Review the Enforcement Services contract between Ecan and the Council, including the determination of new levels of service. (9.1, 9.2)</td>
<td>Ecan Ranger Service and WDC Green Space Team</td>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
<td>February 2018</td>
<td>Salaries only, Covered in existing Ecan Ranger Service and WDC Green Space operational budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.5 Review annually the effectiveness of the agreed WDC/Ecan enforcement process. (9.3, 10.1a, 11.1)</td>
<td>Ecan Ranger Service and WDC Green Space Team</td>
<td>Within 1 year</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Salaries only, Covered in existing Ecan Ranger Service and WDC Green Space operational budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.6 Encourage Estuary users via promotional material and on signage to report offences to Ecan for follow up, including recording licence plate numbers. (2.1, 7.1, 7.2, 9.1, 9.2)</td>
<td>Ecan Ranger Service, and WDC Green Space Team</td>
<td>Within 1 year</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
<td>Covered in existing WDC Green Space and Ecan Ranger Service operational budgets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER RELATED ACTIONS

**UA.1**
Develop a Fenton Reserve Code of Conduct for sign off by the Council and Fenton Reserve Trustees. (1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.3, 7.2, 7.3, 8.1, 9.1)

**W.8**
Establish a database of residents and groups willing to become involved with Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 Implementation Plan activities. (7.1, 7.2, 9.2)
10. Research and Monitoring

“Form partnerships to carry out research to identify the impact of activities on the coastal environment.”

Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw submitter 2016
Key issues identified through the consultation process

The need for evidence to inform future Bylaw reviews
The opinions of those submitters who commented on the effectiveness of the 2010 Bylaw were wide-ranging, with some stating it had failed to address environmental and safety concerns, others noting some improvements had been made, particularly with regard to vehicle access, and others wanting to maintain the status quo as they considered the Bylaw to be working well. This has highlighted a need for a research and monitoring programme to be put in place so that more than anecdotal evidence is available to inform future reviews.

Commercial horse training
Although most submitters were not concerned about horse training on the beach, with some saying how much they enjoyed watching it and others actively participating in it, there were some who were strongly opposed. Anecdotal evidence as to the numbers involved and extent of the problem varied and the Hearing Panel thought it would be helpful to collect hard evidence prior to the next Bylaw review.

The need to keep an eye on the number of people using Pegasus Beach at the time horse training is occurring has also been identified.

Impact of game bird dogs on protected Estuary wildlife
All dogs, apart from game bird dogs belonging to holders of Fish and Game Hunting Licenses in the gamebird hunting season, are prohibited from the Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary. Some submitters objected to this prohibition for some dogs and not others. The impact of game bird dogs on protected bird species is unknown and would need to be assessed before any further restrictions were put in place.

Impact of recreational activities on Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary environmental values and wildlife
The prohibition of hovercrafts, jet boats and jet skis in the Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary was requested by a few submitters but this was not agreed to by the Hearing Panel as the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990 prohibits limiting freedom of movement unless there is adequate justification. Little is currently known about the nature and levels of use of the Estuary by motorised craft and the impact of this on ecological values. Motorised craft are currently restricted to travelling no faster than 5 knots.

Horse riding, dogs, model aircraft and drones, microlights and helicopters, land yachts, kite surfing and vehicles were also highlighted as being activities that could have a detrimental impact on estuarine wildlife. The Hearing Panel recommended that priority be given to monitoring the impact of various activities on Estuary ecological values so that any future decisions made by the Council about appropriate use could be evidence-based.

Impact of horses and vehicles on health of coastal dunes
Vehicles in the dunes continue to be a problem, particularly at Waikuku, Pines and Kairaki Beaches. A number of submitters provided the Hearing Panel with photographic evidence of the damage done to the coastal environment by vehicles. Some submitters also observed recreational horse riders in the dunes. The dunes provide beach settlements with some protection against coastal hazards and damage to vegetation accelerates coastal erosion. The health of the dune eco-system and the impact recreational use is having on this is currently unknown.

Monitoring Bylaw implementation and effectiveness
The Hearing Panel considered that effectively implementing the Bylaw would be vital to its success. Regular progress reporting is planned to ensure the project remains on track.

Making sure Bylaw provisions are effective in addressing key issues is also essential so that adjustments can be made in accordance with review clause 21.2 if necessary.

The above will ensure the identified environmental, health and safety issues and user conflicts are resolved as much as possible and that the good faith and enthusiasm of members of the local beach communities who became engaged in the Bylaw development process is maintained.
Our aspirations

10.1 Monitoring programmes are in place for the following identified priority areas:
   a. effectiveness of Bylaw enforcement
   b. effectiveness of the Woodend Beach Commercial Horse Trainer’s User Agreement
   c. effectiveness of the Kite Surfing User Agreement – Ashley River/Rakahuri Estuary
   d. effectiveness of the Fenton Reserve MOU
   e. the effectiveness of Bylaw provisions in protecting Ashley/Rakahuri Estuary wildlife values from the impact of recreation use
   f. the effectiveness of Bylaw provisions in protecting coastal dune systems from the impact of recreation use
   g. the achievement of the Implementation Plan.

10.2 Research programmes are in place where a knowledge gap has been identified.

10.3 Research efforts in the Northern Pegasus Bay coastal strip are coordinated and research partners are actively sought.

How we’ll know we’ve succeeded

- The reviews of the effectiveness of the Implementation Plan and the beach user agreements are informed by robust evidence. (10.1 a-g)

- Measurable progress has been made towards achieving stated Bylaw objectives by 2021. (10.1)

- Robust evidence relating to issues identified during the development of the Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 is available to inform the 2021 Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw review. (10.1a-g, 10.2, 10.3)

- Multiple agencies are involved in coordinating, supporting and carrying out research. (10.3)
## Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>PARTIES INVOLVED</th>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>BY WHEN</th>
<th>PRELIMINARY ESTIMATED COST / FUNDING SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.1</td>
<td>Monitor progress on achieving the Implementation Plan and report annually to the advisory group and Council. (10.1g, 11.1)</td>
<td>WDC Policy and Strategy in consultation with the advisory group, WDC Green Space Team and Ecan Ranger Service</td>
<td>Within 1 year</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.2</td>
<td>Report on an annual basis to the advisory group on progress with the Bylaw research and monitoring programme. (10.1 a-f, 11.1, 11.2)</td>
<td>WDC Policy and Strategy in consultation with WDC Green Space Team and the Ecan Ranger Service</td>
<td>Within 1 year</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.3</td>
<td>Regularly monitor the use of the designated commercial horse training area at Woodend Beach as per agreed methodology. (8.2, 10.1b, 11.2)</td>
<td>Ecan Ranger Service</td>
<td>Within 1 year</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.4</td>
<td>Monitor levels and characteristics of the kite surfing activity in the Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary using the Ecan Ranger Service Info tool. (2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 8.3, 10.1c, 10.1e, 11.1)</td>
<td>Ecan Ranger Service, user groups and residents feeding into Ecan database</td>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.5</td>
<td>Monitor the effectiveness of the Fenton Reserve Agreement and Code of Conduct as per agreed methodology. (2.1, 2.3, 2.4, 8.1, 10.1d, 11.2)</td>
<td>Fenton Reserve Trustees in consultation with Ecan Rangers and the advisory group</td>
<td>Within 2 years</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.6</td>
<td>Monitor levels of motorised water sports occurring in the Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary using the Ecan Ranger Service Info tool. (2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 10.1e)</td>
<td>Ecan Ranger Service, user groups and residents feeding into Ecan database</td>
<td>Within 1 year</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.7</td>
<td>Establish a baseline for bird species in the Estuary and carry out ongoing monitoring. (2.1, 2.3, 7.3, 10.1e)</td>
<td>Birds NZ and Ashley-Rakahuri Rivercare Group</td>
<td>Within 2 years</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTION</td>
<td>PARTIES INVOLVED</td>
<td>PRIORITY</td>
<td>BY WHEN</td>
<td>PRELIMINARY ESTIMATED COST / FUNDING SOURCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M.8</strong></td>
<td>Ensure research carried out within the Northern Pegasus Bay coastal strip is prioritised and coordinated. (2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 7.3, 10.3)</td>
<td>The advisory group in conjunction with Ecan, WDC, DOC, Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust, and tertiary education providers</td>
<td>Within 1 year</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M.9</strong></td>
<td>Investigate the possibility of finding a research partner to study the effectiveness of Bylaw provisions in protecting Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary wildlife values from the impact of recreation use. (2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 7.3, 8.1, 8.3, 10.2, 10.3)</td>
<td>Advisory group</td>
<td>Within 4 years</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M.10</strong></td>
<td>Monitor the impact of vehicle use on the coastal dune system. (10.2, 10.3)</td>
<td>WDC Green Space Team in conjunction with Ecan Ranger Service</td>
<td>Within 1 year</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M.11</strong></td>
<td>Continue to develop working relationships with tertiary education providers. (10.2, 10.3)</td>
<td>The advisory group, Ecan, Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust and Te Ngāi Tuahuriri Runanga</td>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OTHER RELATED ACTIONS**

| E.3 | Establish a 2016/17 baseline for monitoring the number of incidents received by Ecan and WDC related to Bylaw enforcement. (9.2, 10.2) |
| E.5 | Review annually the effectiveness of the agreed WDC/Ecan enforcement process. (9.3, 10.1a, 11.1) |
| ED.6 | Monitor and provide advice about the use of long lines on the beach with a view to keeping all beach users safe. (5.1, 10.2) |
11. Review

“Mā tātou, ā, mā kā uri ā muri ake nei. For us and our children after us.”

Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan 2013
Key issues identified through the consultation process

Review period

The first proposed Bylaw released for public consultation had a 10 year review period and some submitters were concerned that environmental values could deteriorate significantly during this period if the objectives of the Bylaw were not able to be achieved.

The Council received legal advice that the 2016 Bylaw was a new Bylaw as the changes to its purpose and the restrictions on people were significantly different than those in the 2010 Bylaw. This meant the Bylaw was required, under section 158 (1) of the Local Government Act 2002, to be reviewed in 5 rather than 10 years’ time as would have been the case if it had not been substantially altered, and the review period was changed in the second proposal.

Partial review

Some submitters thought there was a need to undertake an early review to see whether the Bylaw was achieving its intended purpose and whether it had been effective in addressing identified issues. The Hearing Panel recommended an implementation plan be developed using a combined-agency/community approach and the effectiveness of this plan be reviewed after two years of operation.

A new clause was inserted into the Bylaw allowing Council to review any aspect that had not been found to be effective in addressing identified user conflicts, health and safety concerns, matters of public nuisance and environmental issues.

It was considered appropriate to limit any early review of the Bylaw to the above aspects because carrying out a comprehensive review of the Bylaw is an expensive exercise and the uncertainty of the outcome can be unsettling for members of the community.

User agreement reviews

Two user agreements were negotiated during the Bylaw development process and were well supported by submitters. Another is currently in the process of being negotiated (refer to section 8, User Agreements). While both of these sit outside of the Bylaw to provide flexibility for amendment as necessary, they are referenced by the Bylaw. User agreements haven’t been used by the Council as a management tool in this context before and therefore regular reviews of their effectiveness in addressing the issues raised by submitters were considered to be important.
Our aspirations

11.1 User related issues are identified before they escalate or before irreversible environmental damage occurs and prompt action is taken to address these.

11.2 The annual reviews of user agreements, as required by the Bylaw, are completed.

How we'll know we've succeeded

- The Bylaw and user agreements are effective in addressing identified concerns and issues. (11.1, 11.2)
- The user agreements are adhered to. (11.2)
- The Bylaw does not require major change in relation to currently identified issues when it is reviewed in 2021. (11.1)
### Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>PARTIES INVOLVED</th>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>BY WHEN</th>
<th>PRELIMINARY ESTIMATED COST / FUNDING SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R.1</td>
<td>Carry out a review of the effectiveness of the Implementation Plan in addressing identified issues after two years of implementation as required by Bylaw clause 21.2. (11.1)</td>
<td>WDC Policy and Strategy in consultation with the advisory group</td>
<td>Within 2 years</td>
<td>By December 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.2</td>
<td>Carry out an annual review of the Commercial Horse Trainers User Agreement prior to the start of summer as per Bylaw clause 10.4 (8.2, 11.2)</td>
<td>The advisory group supported by WDC Green Space Team and Ecan Ranger Service</td>
<td>Within 1 year</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.3</td>
<td>Carry out an annual review of the Kite Surfing User Agreement prior to the start of the kite surfing season or whenever significant changes to the coastal environment during this period necessitate additional reviews as per Bylaw clause 13.2 (8.2, 11.2)</td>
<td>The advisory group supported by WDC Green Space Team and Ecan Ranger Service</td>
<td>Within 1 year</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER RELATED ACTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E.5</th>
<th>Review annually the effectiveness of the agreed WDC/Ecan enforcement process. (9.3, 10.1a, 11.1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.1</td>
<td>Monitor progress on achieving the Implementation Plan and report annually to the advisory group and Council. (10.1, 11.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.2</td>
<td>Report on an annual basis to the advisory group on progress with the Bylaw research and monitoring programme. (10.1 a-f, 11.1, 11.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.3</td>
<td>Regularly monitor the use of the designated commercial horse training area at Woodend Beach as per agreed methodology. (8.2, 10.1b, 11.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.4</td>
<td>Monitor levels and characteristics of the kite surfing activity in the Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary using the Ecan Ranger Service Info tool. (2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 8.3, 10.1c, 10.1e, 11.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.5</td>
<td>Monitor the effectiveness of the Fenton Reserve Agreement and Code of Conduct as per agreed methodology. (2.1, 2.3, 2.4, 8.1, 10.1d, 11.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendices

Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 Maps:

- Bylaw Area Boundary
- Legislative Boundaries
- Vehicle Access Map - Schedule 2
- Ashley River / Rakahuri and Saltwater Creek Estuarine Areas - Vehicle Access - Schedule 3
- Horse Access Map - Schedule 4
- Ashley River / Rakahuri and Saltwater Creek Estuarine Areas - Access for Recreational Activity - Schedule 5
- Land Yacht Map - Schedule 6
- Kite Surfing Areas - Ashley River / Rakahuri and Saltwater Creek Estuarine Areas.
Bylaw applies to area within the Waimakariri District Council Boundary.
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1. INTRODUCTION

- The Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 regulates recreational activities along the coastal strip from the north side of the Waimakariri River (Kairaki Beach) to the District boundary south of Ashworth’s Beach and includes the environmentally significant Ashley – Rakahuri River Estuary.

- The aims of the Bylaw are to manage recreational use, minimise negative environmental impacts, promote public health and safety and minimise nuisance and offensive behaviour.

- The Implementation Plan (the Plan) was developed by the Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 Implementation Plan Working Party, through a public consultation process and amendments made where appropriate in response to submissions received. The Plan was adopted by Council in December 2017.

- Implementation action W.7 – ‘Establish an advisory group to supercede the Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 Implementation Plan Working Party’ arose from the adoption of the Plan.

2. MEMBERSHIP

Each of the following groups shall be invited to select one representative to be a member of the Northern Pegasus Bay Advisory Group:

- WaimakaririDistrict Council
- Kaipoi-Tuahiwi Community Board
- Woodend-Sefton Community Board
- Department of Conservation
- Environment Canterbury
- Hurunui District Council
- Ashley-Rakahuri Rivercare Group
- Te Kōhaka o Tūharta Trust
- Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga.
- Waikuku Beach Kite Surfers User Agreement Group
- Ashley Fishermens Association Inc
- Woodend Beach Commercial Horse Trainers User Agreement Group
- Fenton Reserve Trustees

Residents living at each of the four beach settlements will also be invited to be represented on the Northern Pegasus Bay Advisory Group. This representative may be a committee member of the relevant community association or alternatively a resident selected by the association with the time and interest to represent the beach community’s views on the Northern Pegasus Bay Advisory Group. Additional membership to include:

- A representative for Waikuku Beach residents (to be determined by the Northern Pegasus Bay Advisory Group)
- A representative for Pegasus Beach residents nominated by the Pegasus Residents Group Inc
- A representative for Pines/Kairaki Beach residents nominated by the Pines Kairaki Beaches Association
Northern Pegasus Bay
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- A representative for Woodend Beach residents nominated by the Woodend Community Association.

3. QUORUM
A quorum will be four Advisory Group members. At least one member of the Advisory Group must be present at any sub-group meeting.

4. OBJECTIVES
4.1 To ensure the purposes of the Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 are achieved.
4.2 To ensure the successful implementation of the Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 Implementation Plan.
4.3 To monitor and ensure the effectiveness of the user agreements associated with the Bylaw.
4.4 To co-ordinate the efforts of organisations working to enhance coastal values (including estuarine values) where these are relevant to the Bylaw.
4.5 To improve coastal management by encouraging and enabling beach communities to become involved with the Implementation Plan.
4.6 To ensure future Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw reviews are evidence-based.

5. TERMS OF REFERENCE
5.1 The Northern Pegasus Bay Advisory Group will have responsibility for:
- Overseeing the implementation of the Plan
- Reviewing the effectiveness of the Plan after two years of operation
- Providing a report to Council (if necessary) on the need to carry out an early review of any aspect of the Plan or Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 that has not been found to have been effective in addressing:
  - identified user conflicts
  - health and safety concerns, or
  - matters of public nuisance or environmental issues
- Prioritising and coordinating the establishment of a Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 research and monitoring programme in conjunction with other interested organisations (M.8)
- Continuing to develop working relationships with tertiary education providers (M.11)
- Carrying out annual reviews of the:
  - Commercial Horse Trainers User Agreement – Woodend Beach Commercial Horse training Area as per clause 10.4 of the Bylaw (R.2)
  - Kite Surfing User Agreement – Ashley River/Rakahuri Estuary as per clause 13.2 of the Bylaw (R.3)
- Overseeing a review of the Ecan Ranger Service contract with the Council (E.4)
Northern Pegasus Bay
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- Encouraging user groups, residents associations and community boards to educate the community about the Bylaw to bring about a cultural shift in attitudes (ED.1)
- Investigating the possibility of finding a research partner to study the effectiveness of Bylaw provisions in protecting Ashley- Rakahuri Estuary wildlife values from the impact of recreation use (M.9).

5.2 As part of the implementation of the Plan, the Northern Pegasus Bay Advisory Group will:

- Prioritise educational activities through effective communication, signage and enforcement
- Prioritise effective management and protection of the Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary through developing close working relationships with stakeholders
- Co-ordinate, carry out or organise any necessary research
- Consult with other organisations and individuals as required
- Form sub-groups to work on implementing various aspects of the Plan as considered necessary to achieve the desired outcome
- Co-opt representatives from other organisations or other community members onto sub-groups as required
- Identify ways of involving beach communities in the achievement of the Implementation Plan actions.

6. OPERATIONAL AND FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

The Northern Pegasus Bay Advisory Group will not have responsibilities in relation to day to day operational activities nor management of finances associated with the implementation of the Plan.

7. MEETING FREQUENCY

As required, but the Northern Pegasus Bay Advisory Group will meet at least 6 monthly.

8. STAFF EXECUTIVE

The ongoing work of the Northern Pegasus Bay Advisory Group will be supported and coordinated by the Waimakariri District Council Community Green Space Unit. Policy and Strategy will assist with monitoring activities.

9. DURATION

The ongoing need for the Northern Pegasus Bay Advisory Group will be reviewed after its final report to Council on the effectiveness of the Implementation Plan, two years after Council adoption of the Plan (December 2019).
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT

FILE NO and TRIM NO: GOV-01-11/ 171115124385

REPORT TO: Council

DATE OF MEETING: 5 December 2017

FROM: Edwina Cordwell, Governance Adviser

SUBJECT: Adoption of Council Standing Orders

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is seek the Council’s adoption of amended Standing Orders.

1.2. Adoption or amendment of the Council’s Standing Orders requires a resolution supported by 75% or more of the members present.

Attachments:

i. Draft Waimakariri District Council, Committee, Sub-Committee and Hearing Panel Standing Orders 2017 (Trim 171121126177)

ii. Current WDC Standing Orders (Trim 120313013431)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 171115124385.

(b) Adopts the Draft Waimakariri District Council, Committee and Sub-Committee and Hearing Panel Standing Orders 2017 (Trim 171121126177), effective from 8 January 2018.

(c) Notes that the current WDC Standing Orders (Trim 120313013431) remain active for Community Boards until the Community Boards consider the matter during their February 2018 meetings, for proposed adoption from 1 March 2018.

(d) Recommends that any proposed Standing Orders for Community Boards should be consistent with the Council, Committee, Sub-Committee and Hearing Panel Standing Orders except for those areas which relate specifically to Community Boards.

(e) Requests that this report is circulated to Community Boards.

3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. A Council is required to operate with Standing Orders for the conduct of its meetings and the meetings of its Committees and Sub-Committees. Community Boards must also adopt Standing Orders. Standing Orders must not contravene any Act.
3.2. Local Government New Zealand (LGNZ) undertook a fundamental review of Standing Orders during 2015 and a Generic Model was developed in 2016 for both Councils and Community Boards.

3.3. The current WDC Standing Orders (Trim 120313013431) remained in force after the triennial election in October 2016 to enable a detailed and thorough assessment of those proposed by LGNZ to be undertaken. A line by line, clause by clause comparison of the current WDC and LGNZ offering has now been conducted.

3.4. A detailed and thorough comparison of the current WDC Standing Orders (Trim 120313013431) with the LGNZ Generic Model was undertaken to ensure consistency, relevance and to identify any areas of significant difference.

3.5. The Mayor, Chief Executive, Governance Manager and Councillors have all participated in the development of these Draft Waimakariri District Council, Committee, Sub-Committee and Hearing Panel Standing Orders.

3.6. Whilst the sequence and presentational style of the LGNZ Generic Model of Standing Orders is very different to that of the current WDC document, making it easier to read (plain English), navigate and it also embodies virtually all of the existing WDC elements.

3.7. A detailed briefing was conducted with Mayor Ayers on 8 November 2017 to ensure that those areas of difference identified between the current WDC Standing Orders and the LGNZ Generic Model could be reviewed and where necessary the existing WDC provisions were retained. A full Council Briefing was conducted on 14 November 2017 to share and refine this process of comparison.

The following changes and/or additions are proposed:

**Draft Standing Orders Ref: 10.5**  
Meeting lapses where no quorum

**Current Standing Orders Ref: 3.5.1**  
Proposed change to time limit from 10 minutes to 15 minutes

**Draft Standing Orders Ref: 14.1**  
Proposed addition of confirmatory statement

**Draft Standing Orders Ref: 15.4**  
Proposed addition of confirmatory statement

**Draft Standing Orders Ref: 16.1**  
Proposed change from 50 to 100 words and ‘at least 20 signatures’.

**Current Standing Orders Ref: 3.20.1**  
Forms of Petition

**Draft Standing Orders Ref: 19.7 and 19.8**  
Proposed addition of confirmatory statement

**Current Standing Orders Ref: 3.14.11**  
Conflicts of Interest

**Draft Standing Orders Ref: 19.11**  
Proposed addition

**Draft Standing Orders Ref: 22.9**  
Proposed addition

**Draft Standing Orders Ref: 26.7**  
Proposed amendment from 6 to 12 months

**Current Standing Orders Ref: 3.11.1**  
Repeat Notices of Motion
3.8. It was also noted that LGNZ have defined protocols for elected member attendance at meetings via audio/visual link, however the Council has indicated they will consider this aspect of Standing Orders at a point in the future when such technology may be introduced to the Chambers setting.

3.9. Standing Orders may be revised at any time subject to a resolution of 75% or more of the members present.

3.10. It is proposed that the Community Boards will consider amended Standing Orders during their February 2018 meetings for adoption and implementation on 1 March 2018.

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

4. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

Not applicable.

5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

The Council is required by legislation to adopt Standing Orders. There are no financial implications as Standing Orders relates to a process of orderly conduct of meetings.

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: *Clause 27(1) & (2) Schedule 7.*

6.3. **Community Outcomes**

There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision-making by local, regional and national organisations that affect our District.

Edwina Cordwell
Governance Adviser
Waimakariri District Council

Standing Orders

For Meetings of the Council Committees, Sub Committees and Hearing Panels
Preface: Local Government New Zealand

Standing orders contain rules for the conduct of the proceedings of local authorities, committees, subcommittees and subordinate decision-making bodies, and local and community boards. Their purpose is to enable local authorities to exercise their decision-making responsibilities in a transparent, inclusive and lawful manner.

In doing so the application of standing orders contributes to greater public confidence in the quality of local governance and democracy in general.

These standing orders have been designed specifically for local authorities, their committees and subcommittees. They fulfil the requirements of the Local Government Act 2002 and the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 with regard to the conduct of meetings.

Please note standing orders do not apply to advisory bodies or workshops unless incorporated in their specific terms of reference.

It is mandatory that councils adopt standing order for the conduct of their meetings and the meetings of any subordinate bodies, such as committees and subcommittees (see cl. 27 Schedule 7 of the Local Government Act 2002).

For clarity’s sake whenever a question about the interpretation or application of these standing orders is raised, particularly where a matter might not be directly provided for, it is the responsibility of the Chairperson of each meeting to make a ruling.

All members of a local authority must abide by standing orders.
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1. **Introduction**

These standing orders have been prepared to enable the orderly conduct of local authority meetings. They incorporate the legislative provisions relating to meetings, decision making and transparency. They also include practical guidance on how meetings should operate so that statutory provisions are complied with and the spirit of the legislation fulfilled.

To assist elected members and officials the document is structured in three parts:

- Part 1 deals with general matters
- Part 2 deals with pre-meeting procedures
- Part 3 deals with meeting procedures.

Following Part 3 the Appendices provide templates and additional guidance for implementing provisions within the standing orders. Please note; the Appendix is an attachment to the standing orders and not part of the standing orders themselves, consequently amendments to the Appendix do not require the agreement of 75% of those present).

### 1.1 Principles

Standing orders are part of the framework of processes and procedures designed to ensure that our system of local democracy and in particular decision-making within local government is transparent and accountable. They are designed to give effect to the principles of good governance, which include that a local authority should:

- conduct its business in an open, transparent and democratically accountable manner;
- give effect to its identified priorities and desired outcomes in an efficient and effective manner;
- make itself aware of, and have regard to, the views of all of its communities;
- take account, when making decisions, of the diversity of the community, its interests and the interests of future communities as well;
- ensure that any decisions made under these standing orders comply with the decision-making provisions of Part 6 of the LGA; and
- ensure that decision-making procedures and practices meet the standards of natural justice.

These are reinforced by the requirement that all local authorities act so that “governance structures and processes are effective, open and transparent” (s. 39 LGA 2002).

### 1.2 Statutory references

The Standing Orders combine statutory provisions with guidance on their application. Where a statutory provision has been augmented with advice on how it might be implemented the advice (so as not to confuse it with the statutory obligation) is placed below the relevant legislative reference. In some cases the language in the statutory provision has been modernised for ease of interpretation or amended to ensure consistency with more recently enacted statutes.
It is important to note that during a meeting any statutory references in the standing orders apply throughout the period of the meeting, regardless of whether or not parts or all of the Standing Orders have been suspended. These provisions must also be carried through into any amendment of the standing orders that might be made. Please note, where it is employed the word ‘must’, unless otherwise stated, identifies a mandatory legislative requirement.

1.3 Acronyms

LGA 2002 Local Government Act 2002
LGOIMA Local Government Official Information Act 1987
LAMIA Local Authority Members’ Interests Act 1968

1.4 Application

For the removal of any doubt these standing orders do not apply to workshops or meetings of working parties and advisory groups.

2. Definitions

Adjournment means a break in the proceedings of a meeting. A meeting, or discussion on a particular business item, may be adjourned for a brief period, or to another date and time.

Advisory group means a group of people convened by a local authority for the purpose of providing advice or information that is not a committee or subcommittee. These standing orders do not apply to such groups. This definition also applies to workshops, working parties, working group, panels, forums, portfolio groups, briefings and other similar bodies.

Agenda means the list of items for consideration at a meeting together with reports and other attachments relating to those items in the order in which they will be considered. It is also referred to as an ‘order paper’.

Amendment means any change of proposed change to the original or substantive motion.

Briefing (this has a specific meaning and is NOT the same as a Workshop) it is any non-decision making, information sharing session, update for elected members by staff or other individuals and which is specifically Public Excluded.

Chairperson means the person presiding at a meeting – the presiding member.

Chief executive means the chief executive of a territorial authority or regional council appointed under section 42 of the LGA 2002, and includes, for the purposes of these standing orders, any other officer authorized by the local authority.

Clear working days means the number of working days (business hours) prescribed in these standing orders for giving notice and excludes the date of the meeting and date on which the notice is served.
Committee includes, in relation to a local authority:

(a) A committee comprising all the members of that authority;
(b) A standing committee or special committee appointed by that authority;
(c) A joint committee appointed under clause 30A of Schedule 7 of the LGA 2002; and
(d) Any subcommittee of a committee described in (a), (b) and (c) of this definition.

Community board means a community board established under s.49 of the LGA 2002.

Contempt means being disobedient to, or disrespectful of, the chair of a meeting, or disrespectful to any members, officers or the public.

Council means, in the context of these standing orders, the governing body of a local authority.

Deputation means a request from any person or group to make a presentation to the local authority which is approved by the Chairperson and which may be made in English, te reo Māori or New Zealand Sign Language.

Extraordinary meeting has the same meaning as defined in cl. 22 of Schedule 7 of the LGA 2002.

Foreshadowed motion means a motion that a member indicates their intention to move once the debate on a current motion or amendment is concluded.

Joint committee means a committee in which the members are appointed by more than one local authority in accordance with clause 30A of Schedule 7 of the LGA 2002.

Karakia timatanga means an opening prayer.

Karakia whakamutunga means a closing prayer.

Lawfully excluded means a member of a local authority who has been removed from a meeting due to behaviour that a Chairperson has ruled to be contempt.

Local authority means in the context of these standing orders a regional council or territorial authority, as defined in s. 5 of the LGA 2002, which is named in these standing orders, and any subordinate decision-making bodies established by the local authority.

Mayor means the Mayor of a territorial authority elected under the Local Electoral Act 2001.

Meeting means any first, inaugural, ordinary, or extraordinary meeting of a local authority, subordinate decision-making bodies and any community board of the local authority convened under the provisions of LGOIMA.

Member means any person elected or appointed to the local authority.

Mihi whakatau means a brief welcome typically delivered by one person without any further formalities.

Minutes means the record of the proceedings of any meeting of the local authority.
Motion means a formal proposal to a meeting.

Mover means the member who initiates a motion.

Newspaper means a periodical publication published (whether in New Zealand or elsewhere) at intervals not exceeding 40 days, or any copy of, or part of any copy of, any such publications; and this includes every publication that at any time accompanies and is distributed along with any newspaper.

Notice of motion means a motion given in writing by a member in advance of a meeting in accordance with, and as provided for, in these standing orders.

Open voting means voting that is conducted openly and in a transparent manner and may be conducted by electronic means. The result of the vote must be announced immediately it has concluded. Secret ballots are specifically excluded.

Order paper means the list of items for consideration at a meeting together with reports and other attachments relating to those items set out in the order in which they will be considered. An order paper is also referred to as an agenda.

Ordinary meeting means any meeting, other than the first meeting, of a local authority publicly notified in accordance with sections 46(1) and (2) of LGOIMA.

Petition means a request to a local authority which contains at least 20 signatures.

Powhiri means a formal welcome involving a Karanga from the Tangata Whenua (the home people) followed by formal speech making. A Powhiri is generally used for formal occasions of the highest significance.

Presiding member means the person chairing a meeting.

Procedural motion means a motion that is used to control the way in which a motion or the meeting is managed as specified in standing orders 24.1 – 24.8.

Public excluded information refers to information which is currently before a public excluded session, is proposed to be considered at a public excluded session, or had previously been considered at a public excluded session and not yet been released as publicly available information. It includes:

- any minutes (or portions of minutes) of public excluded sessions which have not been subsequently released by the local authority;
- any other information which has not been released by the local authority as publicly available information.

Public excluded session, also referred to as confidential or in-committee session, refers to those meetings or parts of meetings from which the public is excluded by the local authority as provided for in LGOIMA.
Public forum refers to a period set aside, usually at the start of a meeting, for the purpose of public input.

Publicly notified means notified to members of the public by a notice contained in a newspaper circulating in the district of the local authority, or where there is no such newspaper, by notice displayed in a public place. The notice may also be replicated on a council’s website.

Qualified privilege means the privilege conferred on member by s. 52 and s. 53 of LGOIMA.

Quasi-judicial means a meeting involving the consideration of issues requiring the evaluation of evidence, the assessment of legal argument and/or the application of legal principles.

Quorum means the minimum number of members required to be present in order to constitute a valid meeting.

Regional Council Chairperson means the member of the governing body of a regional council elected as Chairperson of that regional council under cl.25 Schedule 7 LGA 2002.

Resolution means a motion that has been adopted by the meeting.

Right of reply means the right of the mover of a motion to summarise the debate and reply to those who have spoken against the motion. (The right can also apply to an amendment.)

Seconder means the member who seconds a motion.

Sub judice means under judicial consideration and therefore prohibited from public discussion elsewhere.

Subordinate decision-making body means committees, subcommittees, and any other bodies established by a local authority that have decision-making authority, but not local or community boards or joint committees.

Substantive motion means the original motion. In the case of a motion that is subject to an amendment, the substantive motion is the original motion incorporating any amendments adopted by the meeting.

Substantive resolution means the substantive motion that has been adopted by the meeting or a restatement of a resolution that has been voted on in parts.

Subcommittee means a subordinate decision-making body established by a council, or a committee of a council or community board. See definition of “Committee”.

Working day means any day of the week other than:

(a) Saturday, Sunday, Waitangi Day, Good Friday, Easter Monday, Anzac Day, the Sovereign’s Birthday, Canterbury Anniversary Day and Labour Day and, if Waitangi Day or Anzac Day falls on a weekend, the following Monday.

(b) A day in the period commencing with the 25th day of December in any year and ending with the 15th day of January in the following year.
Should a local authority wish to meet between the 25th of December and the 15th day of January in the following year any meeting must be notified as an extraordinary meeting unless there is sufficient time to notify an ordinary meeting before the commencement of the period.

**Working party** means a group set up by a local authority to achieve a specific objective that is not a committee or subcommittee and to which these standing orders do not apply.

**Workshop** (this is NOT a Briefing and can be open to the public) means in the context of these standing orders, a gathering of elected members for the purpose of considering matters of importance to the local authority at which no decisions are made and to which these standing orders do not apply. Workshops may include non-elected members and could be attended by the public. See definition of “advisory group”. Workshops are also described as briefings.
General matters

3. Standing orders

3.1 Obligation to adopt standing orders

A council is required to operate in accordance with standing orders for the conduct of its meetings and the meetings of its committees and subcommittees. Community boards must also adopt standing orders. Standing orders must not contravene any Act.

cl. 27(1) & (2), Schedule 7, LGA 2002.

3.2 Process for adoption and alteration of standing orders

The adoption of standing orders and any amendment to standing orders must be made by the Council and by a vote of not less than 75% of the members present. (Similarly, in the case of a local and community board the adoption of standing orders and any amendments also requires a vote of not less than 75% of the members of the specific board).

cl. 27(3) Schedule 7, LGA 2002.

3.3 Members must obey standing orders

All members of the local authority, including members of committees and subcommittees, must obey these standing orders.

cl. 16(1) Schedule 7, LGA 2002.

3.4 Application of standing orders

These standing orders apply to all meetings of the local authority, its committees, subcommittees and subordinate decision-making bodies. They will also apply to any community boards unless stated otherwise. This includes meetings and parts of meetings that the public are excluded from.

3.5 Temporary suspension of standing orders

Any member of a council, committee, subcommittee, subordinate body, and community board, may move a motion to suspend standing orders at a meeting of which they are a member. Any such motion must also include the reason for the suspension. If seconded, the Chairperson must put the motion without debate and at least 75 per cent of the members present and voting must support the motion for it to be carried.

cl. 27(4), Schedule 7, LGA 2002.

A motion to suspend standing orders may also identify the specific standing orders to be suspended. In the event of suspension those standing orders prescribed in statute will continue to apply, such as the quorum requirements.
3.6 Exclusions for meetings at which no resolutions or decisions are made

For the avoidance of doubt, any provision of these standing orders relating to the making of decisions and the passing of resolutions does not apply to any meeting of the local authority or of any committee or subcommittee or other subordinate decision-making body of the local authority which has been properly constituted as a meeting at which no resolutions or decisions are to be made under the Local Government Act 2002 or the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987.

3.7 Quasi-judicial proceedings

For quasi-judicial proceedings the local authority or community board may amend meeting procedures. For example, committees hearing applications under the RMA 1991 have additional powers under the Commissions of Inquiry Act 1908.

3.8 Physical address of members

Every member of a local authority and community board must give to the chief executive a physical residential or business address within the district or region of the local authority and, if desired, an electronic or other address, to which notices and material relating to meetings and local authority business may be sent or delivered. Members are to provide their address within 5 working days of the publication of the declaration of the election results.

4. Meetings

4.1 Legal requirement to hold meetings

The local authority must hold meetings for the good government of its city, district or region. The same requirement applies to community boards in respect of their communities. Meetings must be called and conducted in accordance with:

(a) Schedule 7 of the LGA 2002;
(b) Part 7 of LGOIMA; and
(c) These standing orders.

A meeting can be adjourned to a specified time and day if required by resolution of the meeting.

4.2 Meeting duration

A Council meeting cannot continue more than ten hours from when it starts (including any adjournments) or after 10.30pm, unless the meeting resolves to continue. If there is no such resolution any business on the agenda that has not been dealt with must be adjourned, transferred to the next meeting or transferred to an extraordinary meeting.

No meeting can sit for more than three hours continuously without a break of at least ten minutes unless the meeting resolves to extend the time before a break.
4.3 Language

A member may address a meeting in English, te reo Māori or New Zealand Sign Language. A Chairperson may require that a speech is translated and printed in English or te reo Māori.

If a member intends to address the meeting in New Zealand Sign Language, or in te reo Māori when the normal business of the meeting is conducted in English, they must give prior notice to the Chairperson not less than 2 working days before the meeting. Where the normal business of the meeting is conducted in te reo Māori then prior notice of the intention to address the meeting in English must also be given to the Chairperson not less than 2 working days before the meeting.

4.4 First meeting (inaugural)

The first meeting of a local authority following a local authority triennial general election must be called by the chief executive as soon as practicable after the results of the election are known. The chief executive must give elected members not less than 7 days’ notice of the meeting. However in the event of an emergency the chief executive may give notice of the meeting as soon as practicable.

_cl. 21(1) - (4), Schedule 7, LGA 2002._

4.5 Requirements for the first meeting

The chief executive (or, in the absence of the chief executive, their nominee) must chair the first meeting until the Chairperson has made an oral declaration and attested the declaration (see cl. 21(4), Schedule 7 (LGA 2002)).

The business to be conducted at the first meeting following a general election must include the following:

(a) The making and attesting of the declarations required of the mayor (if any) and members under cl. 14, Schedule 7, (LGA 2002), and

(b) The election of the Chairperson (if any) and the making and attesting of the declaration required of the Chairperson under cl. 14 Schedule 7, (LGA 2002), and

(c) A general explanation, given or arranged by the chief executive, of:

i. LGOIMA; and

ii. Other laws affecting members, including the appropriate provisions of the Local Authorities (Members Interests) Act 1968; and sections 99, 105, and 105A of the Crimes Act 1961; and the Secret Commissions Act 1910; and the Financial Markets Conduct Act 2013;

(d) The fixing of the date and time of the first meeting of the local authority, or the adoption of a schedule of meetings; and

(e) The election of the deputy Mayor or deputy Chairperson in accordance with cl.17 Schedule 7, (LGA 2002).

_cl. 21(5), Schedule 7, LGA 2002._
It is common for councils to adopt standing orders at the first meeting; however this is not always necessary as, if not amended, standing orders will remain in force after each triennial election.

Please note that the election of a deputy mayor is not required if the Mayor has already made the appointment under s. 41A (3)(a) of the LGA 2002 prior to the meeting. Nothing limits a territorial authority from removing a deputy Mayor from office in accordance with cl.18 of Schedule 7 LGA 2002.

5. Appointments and elections

5.1 Mayoral appointment of deputy Mayor, committee chairs and members

A Mayor may appoint the deputy Mayor, the Chairperson and the members of each committee of the territorial authority. The names of any appointments made by the Mayor must be tabled at the first meeting of the council after the appointments are made. The Mayor may also appoint him or her self.

s. 41A (3) LGA 2002.

5.2 Council Discharge of a Mayoral Appointment

Nothing, however, limits or prevents a territorial authority from discharging deputy Mayor, a Chairperson or a member of a committee appointed by the Mayor. Any decision by the territorial authority to discharge a deputy Mayor shall follow the procedure in Standing Order 5.5.

If the Mayor declines to appoint a deputy Mayor or committee Chairpersons in accordance with s.41A LGA 2002, the council (or a committee, if so directed by the council) must elect those positions in accordance with standing order 5.4.

cl. 31, Schedule 7 LGA 2002

5.3 Establishment of committees by the Mayor

The Mayor may establish committees of the territorial authority. Where a Mayor exercises this right a list of the committees and their terms of reference must be tabled at the next following meeting of the Council. Should the Mayor decline to establish committees under s. 41A then any decision to establish committees must follow the processes set out in these standing orders.

Nothing, however, limits or prevents a territorial authority from discharging or reconstituting, in accordance with cl. 30 of Schedule 7, LGA 2002, a committee established by the Mayor or appointing, more committees in addition to any established by the Mayor.

s. 41A (3) and (4) LGA 2002.
5.4 Elections of regional Chairpersons, deputy Mayors and deputy Chairpersons

The council (or a committee responsible for making the appointment) must decide by resolution to use one of two voting systems (see standing order 5.6) when electing people to the following positions:

- the Chairperson and deputy Chairperson of a regional council;
- the deputy Mayor;
- the Chairperson and deputy Chairperson of a committee; and
- a representative of a local authority.

Please note, this provision does not apply in situations where a mayor has used their appointment powers under s.41A to appoint a deputy Mayor or committee chairs. See Appendix 7.

cl. 25 Schedule 7, LGA 2002.

5.5 Removal of a deputy Mayor

A deputy Mayor, whether appointed by the Mayor under standing order 5.1 or elected by the council, can only be removed in accordance with cl. 18, Schedule 7, of the LGA 2002. See Appendix 8.

cl. 18, Schedule 7, LGA 2002.

5.6 Voting system for chairs, deputy Mayors and committee chairs

When electing a regional council chair, a deputy Mayor or a committee chair the local authority must resolve to use one of the following two voting systems.

System A

The candidate will be elected or appointed if he or she receives the votes of a majority of the members of the local authority or committee who are present and voting. This system has the following characteristics:

(a) there is a first round of voting for all candidates;
(b) if no candidate is successful in the first round, there is a second round of voting from which the candidate with the fewest votes in the first round is excluded; and
(c) if no candidate is successful in the second round, there is a third round, and if necessary subsequent rounds, of voting from which, each time, the candidate with the fewest votes in the previous round is excluded.

In any round of voting, if two or more candidates tie for the lowest number of votes, the person to be excluded from the next round is resolved by lot.
System B

The candidate will be elected or appointed if he or she receives more votes than any other candidate. This system has the following characteristics:

(a) there is only one round of voting; and
(b) if two or more candidates tie for the most votes, the tie is resolved by lot.

cl. 25 Schedule 7, LGA 2002.

6. Delegations

6.1 Limits on delegations

Unless clearly stated in the LGA or any other Act, a council may, for the purposes of efficiency and effectiveness, delegate to a committee, subcommittee, subordinate decision-making body, community board, member, or officer of the local authority, any of its responsibilities, duties, or powers except:

(a) the power to make a rate;
(b) the power to make a bylaw;
(c) the power to borrow money, or purchase or dispose of assets, other than in accordance with the long-term plan;
(d) the power to adopt a long-term plan, annual plan, or annual report;
(e) the power to appoint a chief executive;
(f) the power to adopt policies required to be adopted and consulted on under the LGA in association with the long-term plan or developed for the purpose of the local governance statement;
(g) Repealed;
(h) the power to adopt a remuneration and employment policy.

cl. 32 (1) Schedule 7, LGA 2002.

6.2 Committees may delegate

A committee, subcommittee, subordinate decision-making body, community board, member, or officer of the local authority, may delegate any of its responsibilities, duties, or powers to a subcommittee or person, subject to any conditions, limitations, or prohibitions imposed by the body that made the original delegation.

cl. (2) & (3), Schedule 7, LGA 2002.
6.3 Use of delegated powers

The committee, subcommittee, other subordinate decision-making body, community board, or member or officer of the local authority to which or to whom any responsibilities, powers, duties are delegated may, without confirmation by the council, committee or body or person that made the delegation, exercise or perform them in the like manner and with the same effect as the local authority could itself have exercised or performed them.

cl. 32(2) & (3)(4) Schedule 7, LGA 2002.

6.4 Decisions made under delegated authority cannot be rescinded or amended

Nothing in these standing orders allows a council, committee and subcommittee to rescind or amend a lawfully made decision of a subordinate decision-making body carried out under a delegation authorising the making of that decision. The same requirement applies to a community board in relation to any committees or subcommittees with delegated authority.

cl. 30 (6), Schedule 7, LGA 2002.

6.5 Committees and sub committees subject to the direction of the local authority

A committee, subcommittee or other subordinate decision-making body is subject in all things to the control of the local authority, and must carry out all general and special directions of the local authority given to them.

cl. 30 (3) & (4), Schedule 7, LGA 2002.

6.6 Duty to consider delegations to community boards

The council of a territorial authority must consider whether or not to delegate to a community board if the delegation would enable the community board to best achieve its role.

cl. 32(6) Schedule 7, LGA 2002.

6.7 Delegations related to bylaws and other regulatory matters

A local authority may delegate to any other local authority, organisation, or person the enforcement, inspection, licensing, and administration related to bylaws and other regulatory matters.

(cl. 32(5) Schedule 7, LGA)
7. Committees

7.1 Appointment of committees and subcommittees

A council may appoint the committees, subcommittees, and other subordinate decision-making bodies that it considers appropriate. A committee may appoint the subcommittees that it considers appropriate, unless it is prohibited from doing so by the council.

cl. 30(1) & (2), Schedule 7, LGA 2002.

7.2 Discharge or reconstitution of committees and subcommittees

Unless expressly provided otherwise in legislation or regulation:

(a) a local authority may discharge or reconstitute a committee or subcommittee, or other subordinate decision-making body; and

(b) a committee may discharge or reconstitute a subcommittee.

A committee, subcommittee, or other subordinate decision-making body is, unless a council resolves otherwise, discharged when members elected at a subsequent triennial general election come into office.

cl. 30 (5) & (7), Schedule 7, LGA 2002.

Please note: s.12 (2) of the Civil Defence and Emergency Management Act 2002 states that a Civil Defence and Emergency Management Group is not deemed to be discharged following a triennial election.

7.3 Appointment or discharge of committee members and subcommittee members

A council may appoint or discharge any member of a committee and, if established by the council, a subcommittee. A committee may appoint or discharge any member of a subcommittee appointed by the committee unless directed otherwise by the council.

cl. 31 (1) & (2), Schedule 7, LGA 2002

7.4 Committees and subordinate decision-making bodies subject to direction of local authority

A committee or other subordinate decision-making body is subject in all things to the control of the local authority, and must carry out all general and special directions of the local authority given in relation to the committee or other body or the affairs of the committee or other body. A subcommittee is subject in all things to the control of the committee that appointed it, and must carry out all general and special directions of the committee given in relation to the subcommittee or its affairs. Nothing in this (standing order) entitles a local authority or committee to rescind or
amend a decision made under a delegation authorising the making of a decision by a committee, a subcommittee, or another subordinate decision-making body.

(cl. 30(3), (4) & (6), Schedule 7, LGA)

7.5 **Elected members on committees and subcommittees**

The members of a committee or subcommittee may be, but are not required to be, elected members of a local authority. A council or committee may appoint a person who is not a member of the local authority to a committee or subcommittee if, in the opinion of the council or committee, the person has the skills, attributes or knowledge to assist the committee or subcommittee.

At least one member of a committee must be an elected member of the council. In the case of a committee established by a community board at least one member must be a member of that board. A staff member of the local authority, in the course of their employment, can be a member of a subcommittee but not a committee.

*cl. 31(4) Schedule 7, LGA 2002.*

7.6 **Local authority may replace members if committee not discharged**

If a local authority resolves that a committee, subcommittee or other subordinate decision-making body is not to be discharged under cl. 30 (7) Schedule7, LGA 2002, the local authority may replace the members of that committee, subcommittee or subordinate decision-making body after the next triennial general election of members.

*cl. 31(5) Schedule 7, LGA 2002.*

7.7 **Minimum numbers on committees and subcommittees**

The minimum number of members is three for both committees and subcommittees.

*(cl. 31(6), Schedule 7, LGA)*

7.8 **Membership of Mayor**

The Mayor is a member of every committee of the local authority.

*s. 41A (5), LGA 2002.*

7.9 **Ex Officio Member**

The chairperson or any member of the local authority may be appointed an ex-officio member of any committee other than a community board or a quasi-judicial committee.

7.10 **Decision not invalid despite irregularity in membership**

For the purpose of these standing orders a decision of a local authority, committee and community board is not invalidated if:
1. there is a vacancy in the membership of the local authority, committee, local or community board at the time of the decision; or
2. following the decision some defect in the election or appointment process is discovered and/or that the membership of a person on the committee at the time is found to have been ineligible.

cl. 29, Schedule 7, LGA 2002.

7.11 Appointment of joint committees

A local authority may appoint a joint committee with another local authority or other public body if it has reached agreement with each local authority or public body. The agreement must specify:

(a) the number of members each party may appoint; and
(b) how the Chairperson and deputy Chairperson are to be appointed; and
(c) the terms of reference of the committee; and
(d) what responsibilities, if any, are to be delegated to the committee by each party; and
(e) how the agreement may be varied.

The agreement may also specify any other matter relating to the appointment, operation, or responsibilities of the committee agreed by the parties.

cl. 30A (1) & (2), Schedule 7, LGA 2002.

7.12 Status of joint committees

A joint committee is deemed to be both a committee of a council and a committee of each other participating local authority or public body.

cl. 30A (5), Schedule 7, LGA 2002.

7.13 Power to appoint or discharge individual members of a joint committee

The power to discharge any individual member of a joint committee and appoint another member in their stead must be exercised by the council or public body that made the appointment and

(a) The meeting quorum is as outlined in 10.3 and
(b) The committee may appoint and remove its own chairperson or deputy chairperson.

cl. 30A (6)(a), Schedule 7, LGA 2002.
Pre-meeting

8. Giving notice

Please note; the processes described in this section (standing orders 8.1 – 8.13) apply as appropriate to community boards.

8.1 Public notice – ordinary meetings

All meetings scheduled for the following month must be publicly notified not more than 14 days and not less than 5 days before the end of every month, together with the dates on which and the times and places at which those meetings are to be held. In the case of meetings held on or after the 21st day of the month public notification must be given not more than 10 nor less than 5 working days before the day on which the meeting is to be held.

s. 46, LGOIMA.

8.2 Notice to members - ordinary meetings

The chief executive must give notice in writing to each member of the local authority of the time and place of any meeting. Notice must be given at least 14 days before the meeting unless the council has adopted a schedule of meetings, in which case notice must be given at least 14 days before the first meeting on the schedule.

cl. 19 (5), Schedule 7, LGA 2002.

8.3 Extraordinary meeting may be called

An extraordinary council meeting may be called by:

(a) resolution of the council, or
(b) a requisition in writing delivered to the chief executive which is signed by:
   i. the Mayor or Chairperson, or
   ii. no less than one third of the total membership of the council (including vacancies).

cl. 22 (1) Schedule 7, LGA 2002.

8.4 Notice to members - extraordinary meetings

Notice in writing of the time and place of an extraordinary meeting called under standing order 8.3 and of the general nature of business to be considered must be given by the chief executive to each member of the council at least 3 working days before the day appointed for the meeting. If the meeting is called by a resolution then notice must be provided within such lesser period as is specified in the resolution, as long as it is not less than 24 hours.

cl. 22 (3), Schedule 7, LGA 2002.
8.5 Public notice - extraordinary meetings

Where an extraordinary meeting of a local authority was called and notice of that meeting was inconsistent with these standing orders the local authority must, as soon as practicable following the meeting, give public notice stating that:

(a) the meeting has occurred;
(b) the general nature of business transacted; and
(c) the reasons why it was not correctly notified.

s. 46 (3) & (4), LGOIMA.

8.6 Process for calling an extraordinary meeting at an earlier time

If the nature of business requires a meeting to be held at an earlier time than is allowed by the notice requirements specified in standing order 8.4, a meeting may be called by the Mayor or Chairperson, or if the Mayor and Chairperson are not available, the chief executive.

cl. 22 (2) Schedule 7, LGA 2002.

8.7 Notification of extraordinary meetings held at an earlier time

Notice of the time, place and matters to be considered of a meeting called under Standing Order 8.6, must be given by the person calling the meeting or by another person on that person’s behalf. Notice must be given to each member of the council and the chief executive by whatever means is reasonable in the circumstances and at least 24 hours before the time appointed for the meeting.

cl. 22 (4), Schedule 7, LGA 2002.

8.8 Chief executive may make other arrangements

The chief executive is to make any other arrangement for the notification of meetings, including extraordinary meetings, as the local authority may, from time to time, determine.

s. 46(5) LGOIMA.

8.9 Meetings not invalid

The failure to notify a public meeting under these standing orders does not of itself make that meeting invalid. However, where a local authority becomes aware that a meeting has been incorrectly notified it must, as soon as practicable, give public notice stating:

- that the meeting occurred without proper notification;
- the general nature of the business transacted; and
- the reasons why the meeting was not properly notified.

s. 46 (6), LGOIMA.
8.10 Resolutions passed at an extraordinary meeting

A local authority must, as soon as practicable, publicly notify any resolution passed at an extraordinary meeting of the local authority unless -

(a) the resolution was passed at a meeting or part of a meeting from which the public was excluded; or

(b) the extraordinary meeting was publicly notified at least 5 working days before the day on which the meeting was held.

s. 51A, LGOIMA.

8.11 Meeting schedules

Where the local authority adopts a meeting schedule it may cover any period that the council considers appropriate and may be amended. Notification of the schedule, or an amendment, will constitute notification to members of every meeting on the schedule or the amendment. This does not replace the requirements under LGOIMA to also publicly notify each meeting.


8.12 Non-receipt of notice to members

A meeting of a local authority is not invalid if notice of that meeting was not received, or not received in due time, by a member of the local authority or board unless:

(a) it is proved that the person responsible for giving notice of the meeting acted in bad faith or without reasonable care; and

(b) the member concerned did not attend the meeting.

A member of a local authority may waive the need to be given notice of a meeting.

cl. 20 (1) & (2) Schedule 7, LGA 2002.

8.13 Meeting cancellations

The Chairperson of a scheduled meeting may cancel the meeting if, in consultation with the chief executive, they consider this is necessary for reasons that include lack of business, lack of quorum or clash with another event.

The chief executive must make a reasonable effort to notify members and the public as soon as practicable of the cancellation and the reasons behind it.
9. Meeting agenda

9.1 Preparation of the agenda

It is the chief executive’s responsibility to prepare an agenda for each meeting listing and attaching information on the items of business to be brought before the meeting so far as is known, including the names of the relevant members.

When preparing business items for an agenda the chief executive should consult the Chairperson.

9.2 Order of business

At the meeting the business is to be dealt with in the order in which it stands on the agenda unless the Chairperson, or the meeting, decides otherwise. An example of a default order of business is set out in Appendix 9.

The order of business for an extraordinary meeting must be limited to items that are relevant to the purpose for which the meeting has been called.

9.3 Chairperson’s recommendation

A Chairperson, either prior to the start of the meeting and/or at the meeting itself, may include a recommendation regarding any item on the agenda brought before the meeting. Where a Chairperson’s recommendation varies significantly from an officer’s recommendation the reason for the variation must be explained.

9.4 Chairperson’s report

The Chairperson of a meeting has the right, through a report, to direct the attention of a meeting to any matter which is on the agenda or which falls within the responsibilities of that meeting.

9.5 Public availability of the agenda

All information provided to members at a local authority or community board meeting must be publicly available except where an item included in the agenda refers to a matter reasonably expected to be discussed with the public excluded.

s. 5 & 46A, LGOIMA.

9.6 Public inspection of agenda

Any member of the public may, without payment of a fee, inspect, during normal office hours and within a period of at least 2 working days before a meeting, all agendas and associated reports circulated to members of the local authority and community boards relating to that meeting. The agenda:
(a) must be available for inspection at the public offices of the local authority (including service centres), at public libraries under the authority’s control and on the council’s website, and:

(b) must be accompanied by either:

i. the associated reports; or

ii. a notice specifying the places at which the associated reports may be inspected.

s. 46A (1), LGOIMA.

9.7 Agenda to be made available to public who are at meetings

Additional copies of the agenda and further particulars indicating the nature of the items to be discussed must be available at meetings in sufficient numbers to enable any spare copies to be provided for members of the public to take away with them free of charge.

(s. 49, LGOIMA)

9.8 List of committee members publicly available

The members of each committee are to be named on the relevant agenda.

9.9 Withdrawal of agenda items

If justified by circumstances an agenda item may be withdrawn by the chief executive. In the event of an item being withdrawn the chief executive should inform the Chairperson.

9.10 Distribution of the agenda

The chief executive must send the agenda to every member of a meeting at least two clear working days before the day of the meeting, except in the case of an extraordinary meeting (see Standing Order 8.4).

The chief executive may send the agenda, and other materials relating to the meeting or other council business, to members by electronic means.

9.11 Status of agenda

No matter on a meeting agenda, including recommendations, may be considered final until determined by formal resolution of that meeting.

9.12 Items of business not on the agenda which cannot be delayed

A meeting may deal with an item of business that is not on the agenda where the meeting resolves to deal with that item and the Chairperson provides the following information during the public part of the meeting:
(a) the reason the item is not on the agenda; and
(b) the reason why the discussion of the item cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting.

s. 46A (7), LGOIMA

Items not on the agenda may be brought before the meeting through a report from either the chief executive or the Chairperson.

Please note that nothing in this standing order removes the requirement to meet the provisions of Part 6, LGA 2002 with regard to consultation and decision-making.

9.13 Discussion of minor matters not on the agenda

A meeting may discuss an item that is not on the agenda only if it is a minor matter relating to the general business of the meeting and the Chairperson explains at the beginning of the public part of the meeting that the item will be discussed. However, the meeting may not make a resolution, decision or recommendation about the item, except to refer it to a subsequent meeting for further discussion.

s. 46A (7A), LGOIMA.

9.14 Public excluded business on the agenda

Items that are likely to be discussed under public excluded must be indicated on each agenda and state the general subject of the item. The chief executive, however, may exclude public access to any reports, or parts of reports, which are reasonably expected to be discussed with the public excluded.

s. 46A (9), LGOIMA.

9.15 Qualified privilege relating to agenda and minutes

Where any meeting is open to the public and a member of the public is supplied with a copy of the agenda, or the minutes of that meeting, the publication of any defamatory matter included in the agenda or in the minutes is privileged. This does not apply if the publication is proved to have been made with ill will or improper advantage has been taken of the publication.

s. 52, LGOIMA.
Meeting Procedures

Opening and closing

Local authorities and community boards may, at the start of a meeting, choose to recognise the civic importance of the occasion through some form of reflection. This could be an expression of community values, a reminder of the contribution of members who have gone before or a formal welcome, such as a mihi whakatau. Options for opening a meeting could include a karakia timitanga, mihi whakatau, or powhiri as well as a karakia whakamutunga to close a meeting where appropriate.

10. Quorum

10.1 Councils

The quorum for a meeting of the council is:

(a) half of the members physically present, where the number of members (including vacancies) is even; and

(b) a majority of the members physically present, where the number of members (including vacancies) is odd.

cl. 23 (3)(a) Schedule 7, LGA 2002.

10.2 Committees and subcommittees

A council sets the quorum for its committees and subcommittees, either by resolution or by stating the quorum in the terms of reference. Committees may set the quorums for their subcommittees by resolution provided that it is not less than two members.

In the case of subcommittees the quorum will be two members unless otherwise stated. In the case of committees at least one member of the quorum must be a member of the council, or if established by a community board, the relevant board.

cl. 23 (3)(b) Schedule 7, LGA 2002.

10.3 Joint Committees

The quorum at a meeting of a joint committee must be consistent with Standing Order 10.1. Local authorities participating in the joint committee may decide, by agreement, whether or not the quorum includes one or more members appointed by each local authority or any party.

cl. 30A (6)(c) Schedule 7, LGA 2002.
10.4 Requirement for a quorum

A meeting is constituted where a quorum of members is present, whether or not they are all voting or entitled to vote. In order to conduct any business at a meeting, a quorum of members must be present for the whole time that the business is being considered.

cl. 23(1) & (2) Schedule 7, LGA 2002.

10.5 Meeting lapses where no quorum

A meeting must lapse, and the Chairperson vacate the chair, if a quorum is not present within 15 minutes of the advertised start of the meeting.

No business may be conducted while waiting for the quorum to be reached. Minutes will record when a meeting lapses due to a lack of a quorum, along with the names of the members who attended.

10.6 Business from lapsed meetings

Where meetings lapse the remaining business will be adjourned and be placed at the beginning of the agenda of the next ordinary meeting, unless the Chairperson sets an earlier meeting and this is notified by the chief executive.

10.7 Exclusions for meetings at which no resolutions or decisions are made

For the avoidance of doubt, these standing orders only apply to decision making meetings and do not apply to any non-decision making meeting of the local authority which has been properly constituted as a meeting under the Local Government Act 2002 or the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987.

11. Public access and recording

11.1 Meetings open to the public

Except as otherwise provided by Part 7 of LGOIMA, every meeting of the local authority, its committees, subcommittees, and community boards, must be open to the public.

s.47 & 49(a), LGOIMA.

11.2 Grounds for removing the public

The Chairperson may require any member of the public whose conduct is disorderly, or who is creating a disturbance, to be removed from the meeting.
If any member of the public who is required in accordance with Standing Orders to leave a meeting, refuses or fails to leave the meeting or, having left the meeting, attempts to re-enter the meeting without the permission of the chairperson, any police officer or employee of the local authority may, at the request of the chairperson, remove or exclude that member of the public from the meeting.

11.3 Local authority may record meetings

Meeting venues should contain clear signage indicating and informing members, officers and the public that proceedings may be recorded by the local authority and may be subject to direction by the Chairperson.

11.4 Public may record meetings

Members of the public may make electronic or digital recordings of meetings which are open to the public. Any recording of meetings must be notified to the Chairperson at the commencement of the meeting to ensure that the recording does not distract the meeting from fulfilling its business.

Where circumstances require the Chairperson may stop the recording for a period of time.

12. Attendance

12.1 Members right to attend meetings

A member of a local authority, or of a committee of a local authority, has, unless lawfully excluded, the right to attend any meeting of the local authority or committee.

*cl. 19(2), Schedule 7, LGA 2002.*

If the member of the local authority is not an appointed member of the meeting at which they are in attendance they may not vote on any matter at that meeting. However, they may, with the leave of the chair, take part in the meeting’s discussions.

A member attending a meeting of which they are not an appointed member is not a member of the public for the purpose of s.48 LGOIMA. Consequently, if the meeting resolves to exclude the public any members of the local authority who are present may remain unless they are lawfully excluded.

Please note: this section does not confer any rights to non-elected members appointed to committees of a local authority.

12.2 Attendance when a committee is performing judicial or quasi-judicial functions

When a committee is performing judicial or quasi-judicial functions members of the local authority who are not members of that committee are not entitled to take part in the proceedings.
12.3 **Leave of absence**

A council or community board may grant a member leave of absence following an application from that member.

*In addition a council or community board may delegate the power to grant a leave of absence to the Chairperson in order to protect a member’s privacy. The Chairperson will advise all members of the council or community board whenever a member has been granted leave of absence under delegated authority. Meeting minutes will record that a member has leave of absence as an apology for that meeting.*

12.4 **Apologies**

A member who does not have leave of absence may tender an apology should they be absent from all or part of a meeting. The Chairperson must invite apologies at the beginning of each meeting, including apologies for lateness and early departure. The meeting may accept or decline any apologies.

For clarification, the acceptance of a member’s apology constitutes a grant of ‘leave of absence’ for that meeting.

12.5 **Recording apologies**

The minutes will record any apologies tendered before or during the meeting, including whether they were accepted or declined and the time of arrival and departure of all members.

12.6 **Absent without leave**

Where a member is absent from the council or community board for four consecutive meetings without leave of absence (not including extraordinary meetings) then the office held by the member will become vacant. A vacancy created in this way is treated as an extraordinary vacancy.

*cl. 5 (d) Schedule 7, LGA 2002.*

---

13. **Chairperson’s role in meetings**

13.1 **Council meetings**

The Mayor or Chairperson of the council or community board must preside at meetings of the council or board unless they vacate the chair for a part or all of a meeting. If the Chairperson is absent from a meeting or vacates the chair, the deputy Mayor/chair must act as Chairperson. If the deputy Mayor/chair is also absent the local authority members who are present must elect a member to be Chairperson at that meeting. This person may exercise the meeting responsibilities, duties and powers of the Mayor/Chairperson for that meeting. This provision also applies to committees and subcommittees.

*cl. 26(1), (5) & (6) Schedule 7, LGA 2002.*
13.2 Committee meetings

The appointed Chairperson of a committee must preside at all committee meetings, unless they vacate the chair for a particular meeting or part of a meeting. If the Chairperson is absent from a meeting or vacates the chair, the deputy Chairperson (if any) will act as Chairperson. If the deputy Chairperson is also absent, or has not been appointed, the committee members who are present must elect a member to act as Chairperson at that meeting who may exercise the meeting responsibilities, duties and powers of the Chairperson.

This standing order also applies to subcommittees and subordinate decision-making bodies.

*cl. 26(2), (5) & (6), schedule 7 LGA 2002.*

13.3 Addressing the Chairperson

Members will address the Chairperson in a manner that the Chairperson has determined.

13.4 Chairperson’s rulings

The Chairperson will decide all procedural questions where insufficient provision is made by these standing orders and with regard to all points of order. Any refusal to obey a Chairperson’s ruling or direction constitutes contempt.

13.5 Chairperson standing

Whenever the Chairperson stands during a debate members are required to sit down and be silent so that they can hear the Chairperson without interruption.

13.6 Member’s right to speak

Members are entitled to speak in accordance with these standing orders. Members should address the Chairperson when speaking. They may not leave their place while speaking, unless they have the leave of the Chairperson.

13.7 Chairperson may prioritise speakers

When two or more members want to speak the Chairperson will name the member who may speak first. Other members who wish to speak have precedence where they intend to:

(a) raise a point of order, including a request to obtain a time extension for the previous speaker; and/or
(b) move a motion to terminate or adjourn the debate; and/or
(c) make a point of explanation; and/or
(d) request the chair to permit the member a special request.
14. Public Forums

Public forums are a defined period of time, usually at the start of a meeting, which, at the discretion of a meeting, is put aside for the purpose of public input. Public forums are designed to enable members of the public to bring matters to the attention of the local authority.

In the case of a committee, subcommittee, local or community board, any issue, idea or matter raised in a public forum must also fall within the terms of reference of that meeting.

14.1 Time limits

A period of up to 30 minutes, or such longer time as the meeting may determine, will be available for the public forum at each scheduled local authority meeting. Requests must be made to the meeting secretary at least one clear day before the meeting; however this requirement may be waived by the Chairperson.

Speakers can speak for up to 5 minutes. No more than two speakers can speak on behalf of an organisation during a public forum. Where the number of speakers presenting in the public forum exceeds 6 in total, the Chairperson has discretion to restrict the speaking time permitted for all presenters.

14.2 Restrictions

The Chairperson has the discretion to decline to hear a speaker or to terminate a presentation at any time where:

- a speaker is repeating views presented by an earlier speaker at the same public forum;
- the speaker is criticising elected members and/or staff;
- the speaker is being repetitious, disrespectful or offensive;
- the speaker has previously spoken on the same issue;
- the matter is subject to legal proceedings;
- the matter is subject to a hearing, including the hearing of submissions where the local authority or committee sits in a quasi-judicial capacity.

14.3 Questions at public forums

At the conclusion of the presentation, with the permission of the Chairperson, elected members may ask questions of speakers. Questions are to be confined to obtaining information or clarification on matters raised by a speaker.

14.4 No resolutions

Following the public forum no debate or decisions will be made at the meeting on issues raised during the forum unless related to items already on the agenda.
15. **Deputations**

The purpose of a deputation is to enable a person, group or organisation to make a presentation to a meeting on a matter or matters covered by that meeting’s terms of reference. Deputations are approved by the Chairperson or an official with delegated authority.

### 15.1 Deputations where heard

Deputations may be received by the local authority or any of its committees provided an application for admission setting forth the subject has been lodged with the Chief Executive or Governance Staff at least two working days before the date of the meeting concerned, and has been subsequently approved by the Chairperson. The Chairperson may refuse requests for deputations which are repetitious or offensive.

### 15.2 Urgency or major public interest

Notwithstanding Standing Order 15.1 where in the opinion of the chairperson the matter which is the subject of a deputation is one of urgency or major public interest, the chairperson may determine that the deputation be received.

### 15.3 Time limits

Speakers can speak for up to 10 minutes. No more than two speakers can speak on behalf of an organisation’s deputation.

### 15.4 Restrictions

The Chairperson has the discretion to decline to hear or terminate a deputation at any time where:

- a speaker is repeating views presented by an earlier speaker at the meeting;
- the speaker is criticising elected members and/or staff;
- the speaker is being repetitious, disrespectful or offensive;
- the speaker has previously spoken on the same issue;
- the matter is subject to legal proceedings;
- the matter is subject to a hearing, including the hearing of submissions where the local authority or committee sits in a quasi-judicial capacity.

### 15.5 Questions of a deputation

At the conclusion of the deputation members may, with the permission of the Chairperson, ask questions of speakers. Questions are to be confined to obtaining information or clarification on matters raised by the deputation.
15.6 Resolutions

Any debate on a matter raised in a deputation must occur at the time at which the matter is scheduled to be discussed on the meeting agenda, and once a motion has been moved and seconded.

16. Petitions

16.1 Form of petitions

Petitions may be presented to the local authority or any of its committees or community boards. Petitions must contain at least 20 signatures and consist of fewer than 100 words (not including signatories).

Petitions must not be disrespectful, use offensive language or include malicious statements (see standing order 19.9 on qualified privilege). They may be written in English or te reo Māori. Petitioners planning to make a petition in te reo Māori or sign language should advise the relevant Chairperson at least two working days before the meeting to enable the petition be translated and reprinted, if necessary.

16.2 Petition presented by petitioner

A petitioner who presents a petition to the local authority or any of its committees and subcommittees or community boards, may speak for 5 minutes (excluding questions) about the petition, unless the meeting resolves otherwise. The Chairperson must terminate the presentation of the petition if he or she believes the petitioner is being disrespectful, offensive or making malicious statements.

Where a petition is presented as part of a deputation or public forum the speaking time limits relating to deputations or public forums shall apply.

16.3 Petition presented by member

Members may present petitions on behalf of petitioners. In doing so, members must confine themselves to presenting:

(a) the petition;
(b) the petitioners’ statement; and
(c) the number of signatures.
17. Exclusion of public

17.1 Motions and resolutions to exclude the public

Members of a meeting may resolve to exclude the public from a meeting. The grounds for exclusion are those specified in section 48 of LGOIMA (see Appendix 1).

Every motion to exclude the public must be put while the meeting is open to the public, and copies of the motion must be available to any member of the public who is present. If the motion is passed the resolution to exclude the public must be in the form set out in schedule 2A of LGOIMA (see Appendix 2). The resolution must state:

(a) the general subject of each matter to be excluded;
(b) the reason for passing the resolution in relation to that matter; and
(c) the grounds on which the resolution is based.

The resolution will form part of the meeting’s minutes.

s. 48 LGOIMA.

17.2 Specified people may remain

Where a meeting resolves to exclude the public, the resolution may provide for specified persons to remain if, in the opinion of the meeting, they will assist the meeting to achieve its purpose. Any such resolution must state, in relation to the matter to be discussed, how the knowledge held by the specified people is relevant and be of assistance.

No such resolution is needed for people who are entitled to be at the meeting, such as relevant staff and officials contracted to the council for advice on the matter under consideration.

s.48 (6) LGOIMA.

17.3 Public excluded items

The chief executive must place in the public-excluded section of the agenda any items that he or she reasonably expects the meeting to consider with the public excluded. The public excluded section of the agenda must indicate the subject matter of the item and the reason the public are excluded.

s.46A (8) LGOIMA.

17.4 Non-disclosure of information

No member or officer may disclose to any person, other than another member, officer or person authorised by the chief executive, any information that has been, or will be, presented to any meeting from which the public is excluded, or proposed to be excluded.

This restriction does not apply where a meeting has resolved to make the information publicly available or where the chief executive has advised, in writing, that one or both of the following apply:
(a) there are no grounds under LGOIMA for withholding the information;
(b) the information is no longer confidential.

17.5 Release of information from public excluded session

A local authority may provide for the release to the public of information which has been considered during the public excluded part of a meeting.

Each public excluded meeting must consider and agree by resolution, what, if any, information will be released to the public. In addition the chief executive may release information which has been considered at a meeting from which the public has been excluded where it is determined the grounds to withhold the information no longer exist. The chief executive will inform the subsequent meeting of the nature of the information released.

18. Voting

18.1 Decisions by majority vote

Unless otherwise provided for in the LGA 2002, other legislation or standing orders, the acts of and questions before a local authority (or community boards) must be decided at a meeting through a vote exercised by the majority of the members of that meeting voting.

cl. 24 (1), Schedule 7, LGA 2002.

18.2 Open voting

An act or question coming before the local authority must be done or decided by open voting.

cl. 24 (3) Schedule 7, LGA 2002.

18.3 Chairperson does not have a casting vote

The Mayor, Chairperson or any other person presiding at a meeting has a deliberative vote and, in the case of an equality of votes, has NO casting vote.

cl. 24 (2) Schedule 7, LGA 2002.

18.4 Method of voting

The method of voting must be as follows:

(a) the Chairperson in putting the motion must call for an expression of opinion on the voices or take a show of hands, the result of either of which, as announced by the Chairperson, must be conclusive unless such announcement is questioned immediately by any member, in which event the Chairperson will call a division;
(b) the Chairperson or any member may call for a division instead of or after voting on the voices and/or taking a show of hands; and
(c) where a suitable electronic voting system is available that system may be used instead of a show of hands, vote by voices or division, and the result displayed notified to the Chairperson who must declare the result.

18.5 Calling for a division

When a division is called, the chief executive must record the names of the members voting for and against the motion and abstentions and provide the names to the Chairperson to declare the result. The result of the division must be entered into the minutes and include members’ names and the way in which they voted.

The Chairperson may call a second division where there is confusion or error in the original division.

18.6 Restating the motion

The chairperson may, immediately prior to any vote being taken, request the chief executive or the minute taker to restate the motion upon which the vote is to be taken.

18.7 Request to have votes recorded

If requested by a member immediately after a vote the minutes must record the member’s vote or abstention.

18.8 Members may abstain

Any member may abstain from voting.

19. Conduct

19.1 Calling to order

When the Chairperson calls members to order, they must be seated and stop speaking. If the members fail to do so, the Chairperson may direct that they should leave the meeting immediately for a specified time.

19.2 Disrespect

No member may speak or act in a manner which is disrespectful of other members or inconsistent with the local authority’s Code of Conduct at any meeting.

19.3 Retractions and apologies

In the event of a member or speaker who has been disrespectful of another member or contravened the council’s Code of Conduct, the Chairperson may call upon that member or speaker to withdraw the offending comments, and may require them to apologise. If the member refuses to do so the
Chairperson may direct that they should leave the meeting immediately for a specified time and/or make a complaint under the Code of Conduct.

**19.4 Disorderly conduct**

Where the conduct of a member is disorderly or is creating a disturbance the Chairperson may require that member to leave the meeting immediately for a specified time.

If the disorder continues the Chairperson may adjourn the meeting for a specified time. At the end of this time the meeting must resume and decide, without debate, whether the meeting should proceed or be adjourned.

The Chairperson may also adjourn the meeting if other people cause disorder or in the event of an emergency.

**19.5 Contempt**

Where a member is subject to repeated cautions by the Chairperson for disorderly conduct the meeting may, should it so decide, resolve that the member is in contempt. Any such resolution must be recorded in the meeting’s minutes.

**19.6 Removal from meeting**

A member of the police or authorised security personnel may, at the Chairperson’s request, remove or exclude a member from a meeting.

This standing order will apply where the Chairperson has ruled that the member should leave the meeting and the member has refused or failed to do so; or has left the meeting and attempted to re-enter it without the Chairperson’s permission.

**19.7 Financial conflicts of interests**

Every member present at a meeting must declare any direct or indirect financial interest that they hold in any matter being discussed at the meeting, other than an interest that they hold in common with the public.

No member may vote on, or take part in, a discussion about any matter in which they have a direct or indirect financial interest unless an exception set out in s.6 LAMIA applies to them, or the Auditor-General has granted them an exemption or declaration under s.6.

Members with a financial interest should physically withdraw themselves from the table unless the meeting is in public excluded in which case they should leave the room.

*Neither the Chairperson nor the meeting may rule on whether a member has a financial interest in the matter being discussed. The minutes must record any declarations of financial interests and the member’s abstention from any discussion and voting on the matter.*

s. 6 & 7 LAMIA.
19.8  Non-financial conflicts of interests

Non-financial interests always involve questions of judgement and degree about whether the responsibility of a member of a local authority (or local or community board) could be affected by some other separate interest or duty of that member in relation to a particular matter. If a member considers that they have a non-financial conflict of interest in a matter they must not take part in the discussions about that matter or any subsequent vote.

The member must leave the table when the matter is considered, but does not need to leave the room. The minutes must record the declaration and member’s subsequent abstention from discussion and voting.

Neither the Chairperson nor the meeting may rule on whether a member has a non-financial interest in the matter being discussed.

19.9  Qualified privilege for meeting proceedings

Any oral statement made at any meeting of the local authority in accordance with the rules adopted by the local authority for guiding its proceedings is privileged, unless the statement is proved to have been made with ill will or took improper advantage of the occasion of publication.

s. 53, LGOIMA.

19.10  Qualified privilege additional to any other provisions

The privilege referred to above is in addition to any other privilege, whether absolute or qualified, that applies as a result of any other enactment or rule of law applying to any meeting of the local authority.

s. 53, LGOIMA.

19.11  Electronic devices at meetings

Electronic devices and phones should only be used to support the business of the meeting. Where personal use is unforeseen prior to the meeting, members should seek permission from the chair to leave the meeting to deal with such matters. It is not deemed good practice or indeed appropriate to convey any aspect of meeting content or decision via personal electronic devices prior to the conclusion of the meeting.

20.  General rules of debate

20.1  Chairperson may exercise discretion

The application of any procedural matters in this section of the standing orders, such as the number of times a member may speak, is subject to the discretion of the Chairperson.
20.2 Time limits on speakers

The following time limits apply to members speaking at meetings:

(a) movers of motions when speaking to the motion – not more than 10 minutes;
(b) movers of motions when exercising their right of reply – not more than 5 minutes;
(c) other members – not more than 5 minutes.

Time limits can be extended if a motion to that effect is moved, seconded and supported by a majority of members present.

20.3 Questions to staff

During a debate members can ask staff questions about the matters being discussed. Questions must be asked through the Chairperson and how the question should be dealt with is at the Chairperson’s discretion.

20.4 Questions to be in writing

Questions shall be in writing and handed to the chairperson prior to the commencement of the meeting at which they are to be asked and in time for an appropriate answer to be prepared.

20.5 Questions may be deferred

If an answer to the question cannot be given at that meeting it shall, at the discretion of the Chairperson, be placed on the agenda for the next local authority meeting.

20.6 Questions to be concise

Questions and answers shall be submitted as briefly and concisely as possible. No discussion shall be allowed upon any question or upon the answer.

20.7 Questions of clarification

At any point of a debate a member may ask the Chairperson for clarification about the nature and content of the motion which is the subject of the debate and the particular stage the debate has reached.

20.8 Members may speak only once

A member may not speak more than once to a motion at a meeting of a local authority or any local or community board. This order does not apply to meetings of committees or subcommittees where a member may be permitted to speak twice.
20.9 Limits on number of speakers

If three speakers have spoken consecutively in support of, or in opposition to, a motion, the Chairperson may call for a speaker to the contrary. If there is no speaker to the contrary, the Chairperson must put the motion after the mover’s right of reply.

Members speaking must, if requested by the Chairperson, announce whether they are speaking in support of or opposition to a motion.

20.10 Seconder may reserve speech

A member may second a motion or amendment without speaking to it, reserving the right to speak later in the debate.

20.11 Speaking only to relevant matters

Members may speak to any matter before the meeting; a motion or amendment which they propose; and to raise a point of order arising out of debate, but not otherwise. Members must confine their remarks strictly to the motion or amendment they are speaking to.

20.12 Reading of speeches

Members shall not read their speeches, except with the permission of the chairperson, but may refresh their memory by reference to notes.

20.13 Personal explanation

Notwithstanding Standing Order 20.5, members may make a personal explanation with the permission of the chairperson, provided that the matter is personal to the member, deals with fact and not denigratory in nature. Such matters may not be debated.

20.14 Explanation of previous speech

With the permission of the chairperson, explanation of some material part of a previous speech in the same debate may be given by a member who has already spoken, but new matter may not be introduced.

The Chairperson’s rulings on any matters arising under this standing order are final and not open to challenge.

20.15 Restating motions

At any time during a debate a member may ask, for their information, that the Chairperson restate a motion and any amendments; but not in a manner that interrupts a speaker.

20.16 Criticism of resolutions

A member speaking in a debate may not unduly criticise the validity of any resolution except by a notice of motion to amend or revoke the resolution.
20.17 Objecting to words
When a member objects to any words used by another member in a speech and wants the minutes to record their objection, they must object at the time when the words are used and before any other member has spoken. The Chairperson must order the minutes to record the objection.

20.18 Right of reply
The mover of an original motion has a right of reply. A mover of an amendment to the original motion does not. In their reply, the mover must confine themselves to answering previous speakers and not introduce any new matters.

A mover’s right of reply can only be used once. It can be exercised either at the end of the debate on the original, substantive or substituted motion or at the end of the debate on a proposed amendment.

However, the original mover may reserve their right of reply and speak once to the principal motion and once to each amendment without losing that right of reply. If a closure motion is carried the mover of the motion has the right of reply before the motion or amendment is put to the vote.

20.19 No other member may speak
In exercising a right of reply, no other member may speak:
(a) after the mover has started their reply;
(b) after the mover has indicated that they want to forego this right;
(c) where the mover has spoken to an amendment to the original motion and the Chairperson has indicated that he or she intends to put the motion.

20.20 Adjournment motions
The carrying of any motion to adjourn a meeting must supersede other business still remaining to be disposed of. Any such business must be considered at the next meeting. Business referred to, or referred back to, a specified committee or local or community board, is to be considered at the next ordinary meeting of that committee or board, unless otherwise specified.

20.21 Chairperson’s acceptance of closure motions
The Chairperson may only accept a closure motion where there have been at least two speakers for and two speakers against the motion that is proposed to be closed, or the Chairperson considers it reasonable to do so.

However, the Chairperson must put a closure motion if there are no further speakers in the debate. When the meeting is debating an amendment, the closure motion relates to the amendment. If a closure motion is carried, the mover of the motion under debate has the right of reply after which the Chairperson puts the motion or amendment to the vote.
21. General procedures for speaking and moving motions

21.1 Speaking and moving

- The mover and seconder of a motion cannot move or second an amendment.
- Any members, regardless of whether they have spoken to the original or substituted motion, may move or second an amendment to it.
- The mover or seconder of an amendment that is carried can move or second a subsequent amendment. A mover or seconder of an amendment which is lost cannot move or second a subsequent amendment.
- Members can speak to any amendment and, provided they have not spoken to the main motion or moved or seconded an amendment, they can move or second further amendments.
- The meeting by agreement of the majority of members present may amend a motion with the agreement of the mover and seconder.

21.2 Procedure if no resolution reached

If no resolution is reached the Chairperson may accept a new motion to progress the matter under discussion.

22. Motions and amendments

22.1 Proposing and seconding motions

All motions and amendments moved during a debate must be seconded (including notices of motion). The Chairperson may then state the motion and propose it for discussion.

Amendments and motions that are not seconded are not in order and are not entered in the minutes.

22.2 Motions in writing

The Chairperson may require movers of motions and amendments to provide them in writing, signed by the mover.
22.3 Motions expressed in parts

The Chairperson, or any member, can require a motion that has been expressed in parts to be decided part by part.

22.4 Substituted motion

Where a motion is subject to an amendment the meeting may substitute the motion with the amendment, provided the mover and seconder of the original motion agree to its withdrawal. All members may speak to the substituted motion.

22.5 Amendments to be relevant and not direct negatives

Every proposed amendment must be relevant to the motion under discussion. Proposed amendments cannot be similar to an amendment that has already been lost. Any amendment which, if carried, would have the effect of defeating a previous motion that was carried is a direct negative and is therefore not allowed.

22.6 Foreshadowed amendments

The meeting must dispose of an existing amendment before a new amendment can be foreshadowed. However, members may notify the Chairperson that they intend to move further amendments and the nature of their content.

22.7 Lost amendments

Where an amendment is lost, the meeting will resume the debate on the original or substituted motion. Any member who has not spoken to that motion may speak to it, and may move or second a further amendment.

22.8 Carried amendments

Where an amendment is carried the meeting will resume the debate on the original motion as amended. This will now be referred to as the substantive motion. Members who have not spoken to the original motion may speak to the substantive motion, and may move or second a further amendment to it.

22.9 Where a motion is lost

In a situation where a motion that recommends a course of action is lost a new motion may be proposed, subject to the agreement of a majority of members present and voting. The new motion must be on a matter that has been previously publicly notified, on the Agenda, for that meeting.

22.10 Withdrawal of motions and amendments

Once a motion or amendment which has been seconded has been put to the meeting by the Chairperson the mover cannot withdraw it without the consent of the majority of the members who are present and voting.
The mover of an original motion, which has been subject to an amendment that has been moved and seconded, cannot withdraw the original motion until the amendment has either been lost or withdrawn by agreement, as above.

22.11 No speakers after reply or motion has been put

A member may not speak to any motion once:

(a) the mover has started their right of reply in relation to the motion; and
(b) the Chairperson has started putting the motion.

22.12 Amendment once moved

When a motion has been moved and seconded, then proposed by the chairperson for discussion, an amendment may be moved or seconded by any member who has not spoken to the motion, whether an original motion or a substituted motion. The mover or seconder of a motion for the adoption of the report of a committee, who desires to amend any item in the report, may also propose or second an amendment.

22.13 Procedure until resolution

The procedures in Standing Orders 22.12 and 22.6 must be repeated until a resolution is adopted.

23. Revocation or alteration of resolutions

23.1 Member may move revocation of a decision

A member may give the chief executive a notice of motion for the revocation or alteration of all or part of a previous resolution of the council, subordinate body or community board. The notice must set out:

(a) The resolution or part of the resolution which the member proposes to revoke or alter;
(b) The meeting date when the resolution was passed;
(c) The motion, if any, which the member proposes to replace it with; and
(d) Sufficient information to satisfy the decision-making provisions of sections 77-82 of the LGA 2002.

If the mover of the notice of motion is unable to provide this information, or the decision is likely to be deemed a significant decision, the notice of motion should provide that the proposal is referred to the chief executive for consideration and report.

A member must give notice to the chief executive at least 5 working days before the meeting at which it is proposed to consider the motion. The notice is to be signed by not less than one third of
the members of the local authority, including vacancies. Notice can be sent via email and include the
scanned electronic signatures of members.

The Chief Executive must then give members at least two clear working days notice in writing of the
intended motion and of the meeting at which it is proposed to move such motion.

23.2 Revocation must be made by the body responsible for the decision

If a resolution is made under delegated authority by a committee, subcommittee or subordinate
decision-making body or community board, only that body may revoke or amend the resolution,
assuming the resolution is legally made.

This provision does not prevent the body that made the delegation from removing or amending a
delegation given to a subordinate body or community board.

cl. 32 (2)/ Schedule 7, LGA 2002.

23.3 Restrictions on actions under the affected resolution

Once a notice of motion to revoke or alter a previous resolution has been received no irreversible
action may be taken under the resolution in question until the proposed notice of motion has been
dealt with. Exceptions apply where, in the opinion of the Chairperson:

(a) the practical effect of delaying actions under the resolution would be the same as if the
resolution had been revoked;
(b) by reason of repetitive notices, the effect of the notice is an attempt by a minority to
frustrate the will of the local authority or the committee that made the previous
resolution.

In either of these situations, action may be taken under the resolution as though no notice of motion
had been given to the chief executive.

23.4 Revocation or alteration by resolution at same meeting

A meeting may revoke or alter a previous resolution made at the same meeting where, during the
course of the meeting, it receives fresh facts or information concerning the resolution. In this
situation 75 per cent of the members present and voting must agree to the revocation or alteration.

23.5 Revocation or alteration by recommendation in report

The local authority, on a recommendation in a report by the Chairperson, chief executive, or any
committee or subcommittee, local or community board, may revoke or alter all or part of a
resolution passed by a previous meeting. The chief executive must give at least two clear working
days’ notice of any meeting that will consider a revocation or alteration recommendation.

cl. 30 (6) Schedule 7, LGA 2002.
24. Procedural motions

24.1 Procedural motions must be taken immediately

A procedural motion to close or adjourn a debate will take precedence over other business, except points of order and rights of reply. If the procedural motion is seconded the Chairperson must put it to the vote immediately, without discussion or debate.

24.2 Procedural motions to close or adjourn a debate

Any member who has not spoken on the matter under debate may move any one of the following procedural motions to close or adjourn a debate:

(a) that the meeting be adjourned to the next ordinary meeting (unless the member states an alternative time and place);
(b) that the motion under debate should now be put (a closure motion);
(c) that the item being discussed should be adjourned to a specified time and place and not be further discussed at the meeting;
(d) that the item of business being discussed should lie on the table and not be further discussed at this meeting;
(e) that the item being discussed should be referred (or referred back) to the relevant committee or local or community board.

A member seeking to move a procedural motion must not interrupt another member who is already speaking.

24.3 Closure motion on amendment

When an amendment to a motion is under debate, a closure motion relates to the amendment and not to the motion.

24.4 Voting on procedural motions

Procedural motions to close or adjourn a debate must be decided by a majority of all members who are present and voting. If the motion is lost no member may move a further procedural motion to close or adjourn the debate within the next 15 minutes.

24.5 Debate on adjourned items

When debate resumes on items of business that have been previously adjourned all members are entitled to speak on the items.
24.6 Remaining business at adjourned meetings

Where a resolution is made to adjourn a meeting, the remaining business will be considered at the next meeting.

24.7 Other business not superseded

The carrying of any motion to adjourn a meeting shall not supersede other business before the meeting remaining to be disposed of, and such other business is to be considered at the next meeting.

24.8 Business referred to the council, committee or community board

Where an item of business is referred (or referred back) to a committee or a local or community board, the committee or board will consider the item at its next meeting unless the meeting resolves otherwise.

25. Points of order

25.1 Members may raise points of order

Any member may raise a point of order when they believe these standing orders have been breached. When a point of order is raised, the member who was previously speaking must stop speaking and sit down (if standing).

25.2 Subjects for points of order

A member who is raising a point of order must state precisely what its subject is. Points of order may be raised for the following subjects:

(a) disorder – bringing disorder to the attention of the Chairperson;
(b) language – use of disrespectful, offensive or malicious language;
(c) irrelevance – the topic being discussed is not the matter currently before the meeting;
(d) misrepresentation – misrepresentation of any statement made by a member or by an officer or council employee;
(e) breach of standing order – the breach of any standing order while also specifying which standing order is subject to the breach;
(f) request the recording of words, such as a request that the minutes record words that have been the subject of an objection.

25.3 Contradictions

Expressing a difference of opinion or contradicting a statement by a previous speaker does not constitute a point of order.
25.4  Point of order during division

A member may not raise a point of order during a division, except with the permission of the Chairperson.

25.5  Chairperson’s decision on points of order

The Chairperson may decide a point of order immediately after it has been raised, or may choose to hear further argument about the point before deciding. The Chairperson’s ruling on any point of order, and any explanation of that ruling, is not open to any discussion and is final.

26.  Notices of motion

26.1  Notice of intended motion to be in writing

Notice of intended motions must be in writing signed by the mover, stating the meeting at which it is proposed that the intended motion be considered, and must be delivered to the chief executive at least 5 clear working days before such meeting. [Notice of an intended motion can be sent via email and include the scanned electronic signature of the mover.]

Once the motion is received the chief executive must give members notice in writing of the intended motion at least 2 clear working days’ notice of the date of the meeting at which it will be considered.

26.2  Refusal of notice of motion

The Chairperson may direct the chief executive to refuse to accept any notice of motion which:

(a) is disrespectful or which contains offensive language or statements made with malice; or
(b) is not related to the role or functions of the local authority or meeting concerned; or
(c) contains an ambiguity or a statement of fact or opinion which cannot properly form part of an effective resolution, and where the mover has declined to comply with such requirements as the chief executive officer may make; or
(d) is concerned with matters which are already the subject of reports or recommendations from a committee to the meeting concerned; or
(e) fails to include sufficient information as to satisfy the decision-making provisions of s.77-82 LGA 2002; or
(f) concerns a matter where decision-making authority has been delegated to a subordinate body or a local or community board.

Reasons for refusing a notice of motion should be provided to the mover. Where the refusal is due to (f) the notice of motion may be referred to the appropriate committee or board.

26.3  Mover of notice of motion

Notices of motion may not proceed in the absence of the mover unless moved by another member authorised to do so, in writing, by the mover.
26.4 Alteration of notice of motion

Only the mover, at the time the notice of motion is moved and with the agreement of a majority of those present at the meeting, may alter a proposed notice of motion. Once moved and seconded no amendments may be made to a notice of motion.

26.5 When notices of motion lapse

Notices of motion that are not put when called by the Chairperson must lapse.

26.6 Referral of notices of motion

Any notice of motion received that refers to a matter ordinarily dealt with by a committee of the local authority or a local or community board must be referred to that committee or board by the chief executive.

Where notices are referred the proposer of the intended motion, if not a member of that committee, must have the right to move that motion and have the right of reply, as if a committee member.

26.7 Repeat notices of motion

When a motion has been considered and rejected by the local authority or a committee, no similar notice of motion which, in the opinion of the Chairperson, may be accepted within the next 12 months, unless signed by not less than one third of all members, including vacancies.

Where a notice of motion has been adopted by the local authority no other notice of motion which, in the opinion of the Chairperson has the same effect, may be put while the original motion stands.

26.8 Second repeat where notice of motion rejected

If such a repeat notice of motion as provided for in Standing Order 26.7 is also rejected by the local authority, any further notice prior to the expiration of the original period of six months must be signed by a majority of all members, including vacancies.

27. Minutes

27.1 Minutes to be evidence of proceedings

The local authority, its committees, subcommittees and any local and community boards must keep minutes of their proceedings. These minutes must be kept in hard copy, signed and included in the council’s minute book and, when confirmed by resolution at a subsequent meeting and signed by the Chairperson, will be prima facie evidence of the proceedings they relate to.

cl. 28 Schedule 7, LGA 2002.
27.2 Matters recorded in minutes

The chief executive must keep the minutes of meetings. The minutes must record:

(a) the date, time and venue of the meeting;
(b) the names of the members present;
(c) the Chairperson;
(d) any apologies or leaves of absences;
(e) the arrival and departure times of members;
(f) any failure of a quorum;
(g) a list of any external speakers and the topics they addressed;
(h) a list of the items considered;
(i) the resolutions and amendments related to those items including those that were lost, provided they had been moved and seconded in accordance with these standing orders;
(j) the names of all movers, and seconders;
(k) any objections made to words used;
(l) all divisions taken and, if taken, a record of each members’ vote;
(m) the names of any members requesting that votes or abstentions be recorded;
(n) any declarations of financial or non-financial conflicts of interest;
(o) the contempt, censure and removal of any members;
(p) any resolutions to exclude members of the public;
(q) the time at which the meeting concludes or adjourns;
(r) the names of people permitted to stay in public excluded.

Please Note: hearings under the RMA, Dog Control Act 1996 and Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012 may have special requirements for minute taking.

27.3 No discussion on minutes

The only topic that may be discussed at a subsequent meeting, with respect to the minutes, is their correctness.

27.4 Minutes of last meeting before election

The chief executive and the relevant Chairpersons must sign the minutes of the last meeting of the local authority and its local and community boards before the next election of members.
28. Minute books

28.1 Inspection

A hard copy of the local authority’s minute books must be kept by the chief executive and be open for inspection by the public. This does not preclude the complementary use of electronic minutes in accordance with the Electronics Transactions Act.

The public is entitled to inspect, take notes from, or receive copies of, minutes of any meeting or part of any meeting from which the public was not excluded free of charge.

s. 51, LGOIMA

28.2 Inspection of public excluded matters

The chief executive must consider any request for the minutes of a meeting or part of a meeting from which the public was excluded as a request for official information in terms of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987.
Referenced documents

- Commissions of Inquiry Act 1908
- Sale of Alcohol Act 2012
- Crimes Act 1961
- Financial Markets Conduct Act 2013
- Local Authorities (Members' Interests) Act 1968 (LAMIA)
- Local Electoral Act 2001 (LEA)
- Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (LGOIMA)
- Marine Farming Act 1971
- Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA)
- Secret Commissions Act 1910
- Securities Act 1978
Appendix 1: Grounds to exclude the public

A local authority may, by resolution, exclude the public from the whole or any part of the proceedings of any meeting only on one or more of the following grounds:

A1 That good reason exists for excluding the public from the whole or any part of the proceedings of any meeting as the public disclosure of information would be likely:

(a) to prejudice the maintenance of the law, including the prevention, investigation, and detection of offences, and the right to a fair trial; or

(b) to endanger the safety of any person.

A2 That the public conduct of the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information where the withholding of the information is necessary to:

(a) Protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of deceased natural persons; or

(b) Protect information where the making available of the information would:
   i. disclose a trade secret; or
   ii. be likely unreasonably to prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied or who is the subject of the information; or,

(c) In the case only of an application for a resource consent, or water conservation order, or a requirement for a designation or heritage order, under the Resource Management Act 1991, to avoid serious offence to tikanga Māori i, or to avoid the disclosure of the location of waahi tapu; or

(d) Protect information which is subject to an obligation of confidence or which any person has been or could be compelled to provide under the authority of any enactment, where the making available of the information would:
   i. be likely to prejudice the supply of similar information, or information from the same source, and it is in the public interest that such information should continue to be supplied; or
   ii. be likely otherwise to damage the public interest; or

(e) Avoid prejudice to measures protecting the health or safety of members of the public; or

(f) Avoid prejudice to measures that prevent or mitigate material loss to members of the public; or

(g) Maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through –the protection of such members, officers, employees, and persons from improper pressure or harassment; or

(h) Maintain legal professional privilege; or

(i) Enable any Council holding the information to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities; or

(j) Enable any Council holding the information to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations); or
(k) Prevent the disclosure or use of official information for improper gain or improper advantage.

Provided that where A2 of this Appendix applies the public may be excluded unless, in the circumstances of the particular case, the exclusion of the public is outweighed by other considerations which render it desirable, in the public interest, that the public not be excluded.

A3 That the public conduct of the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information, the public disclosure of which would:

(a) Be contrary to the provisions of a specified enactment; or

(b) Constitute contempt of Court or of the House of Representatives.

A4 That the purpose of the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting is to consider a recommendation made to that Council by an Ombudsman under section 30(1) or section 38(3) of this Act (in the case of a Council named or specified in Schedule 1 to this Act).

A5 That the exclusion of the public from the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting is necessary to enable the Council to deliberate in private on its decision or recommendation in:

(a) Any proceedings before a Council where

i. A right of appeal lies to any Court or tribunal against the final decision of the Council in those proceedings; or

ii. The Council is required, by any enactment, to make a recommendation in respect of the matter that is the subject of those proceedings; and

(b) Any proceedings of a Council in relation to any application or objection under the Marine Farming Act 1971.
# Appendix 2: Sample resolution to exclude the public

**THAT** the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting, namely:

- *Name of report(s)* .................................................................

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>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>1 <em>Put in name of report</em></td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7.</td>
<td>That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists. Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7.</td>
<td>That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists. Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7.</td>
<td>That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists. Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This resolution is made in reliance on sections 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest or interests protected by section 7 of that Act, which would be prejudiced by the holding of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enable any local authority holding the information to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations) (Schedule 7(2)(i))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of deceased natural persons (Schedule 7(2)(a))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintain legal professional privilege (Schedule 7(2)(g))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prevent the disclosure or use of official information for improper gain or improper advantage (Schedule 7(2)(j))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No</td>
<td>Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protect information where the making available of the information (i) would disclose a trade secret; or (ii) would be likely unreasonably to prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied or who is the subject of the information (Schedule 7(2)(b))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the case only of an application for a resource consent, or water conservation order, or a requirement for a designation or heritage order, under the Resource Management Act 1991, to avoid serious offence to Tikanga Māori, or to avoid the disclosure of the location of waahi tapu (Schedule 7(2)(ba))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protect information which is subject to an obligation of confidence or which any person has been or could be compelled to provide under the authority of any enactment, where the making available of the information - (i) would be likely to prejudice the supply of similar information, or information from the same source, and it is in the public interest that such information should continue to be supplied; or (ii) would be likely otherwise to damage the public interest (Schedule 7(2)(c))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avoid prejudice to measures protecting the health or safety of members of the public (Schedule 7(2)(d))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avoid prejudice to measures that prevent or mitigate material loss to members of the public (Schedule 7(2)(e))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through the protection of members or officers or employees of the Council, and persons to whom Section 2(5) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 applies in the course of their duty, from improper pressure or harassment (Schedule 7(2)(f)(ii)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enable any local authority holding the information to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities (Schedule 7(2)(h))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THAT XXXX be permitted to remain at this meeting, after the public has been excluded, because of their knowledge of XXXX. This knowledge, which will be of assistance in relation to the matter to be discussed, is relevant to that matter because XXXX.**
Appendix 3: Motions and amendments (option A)

**Motions without amendments**

- Motion moved (Maximum 5 minutes)
  - Motion seconded (Seconder may reserve the right to speak in the double debate – maximum 5 minutes)
    - Motion debated (Maximum 5 minutes per speaker. If 3 consecutive speakers are in support or opposition, Chairperson may call for speaker to the contrary and if none, the motion may be put after mover and seconder has exercised right to speak).
      - Mover’s right of reply (Maximum 5 minutes)
        - Chairperson to put Motion
          - Motion LOST
            - No further action, move to next item.
          - Motion carried
            - No further discussion permitted, move to next item
            - Revocation, alteration or modification permitted at same meeting by 75% majority if fresh facts received during meeting.

**Motions with amendments**

- Amendment (not a direct negative) moved and seconded (Maximum 5 minutes for mover and 3 minutes for seconder)
  - NOTE:
    - Movers of the original motion may speak once to each amendment.
  - Amendment debated (Maximum 5 minutes per speaker. If 3 consecutive speakers are in support or opposition, Chairperson may call for speaker to the contrary and if none, the motion may be put).
    - Mover’s right of reply
      - Notice of intention to move further amendment maybe given. (Foreshadowed)
        - Mover of original motion may exercise right of reply here
          - Chairperson to put Amendment
            - Amendment CARRIED
              - Amendment to the original motion becomes the new substantive motion
              - Further relevant amendments to the new substantive motion moved and seconded by persons who have not yet spoken (Maximum 5 minutes for mover and 5 minutes for other speakers)
                - If CARRIED, amendment become substantive motion
                - If LOST original motion put, and either CARRIED or LOST
            - Amendment LOST
              - Further relevant amendments moved and seconded by person who have not yet spoken (Maximum 5 minutes for mover and 5 minutes for other speakers)
                - If CARRIED, substantive motion is put, either CARRIED or LOST
                - If LOST original motion put, and either CARRIED of LOST
### Appendix 4: Table of procedural motions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motion</th>
<th>Has the Chair already renewed this Motion?</th>
<th>Is second required?</th>
<th>Is discussion in order?</th>
<th>Are amendments in order?</th>
<th>Is mover of procedural motion entitled to reply?</th>
<th>Are previous speakers entitled to move this motion?</th>
<th>Can a speaker be interrupted by the mover of this motion?</th>
<th>If lost, can debate be moved after an interval?</th>
<th>Position if an amendment is already before the Chair</th>
<th>Position if a procedural motion is already before the Chair</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) “That the meeting be adjourned to the next ordinary meeting, or to a stated time and place”</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>As to time and date only</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes – 15 minutes</td>
<td>If carried, debate on the original motion and amendment are adjourned</td>
<td>If carried, debate on the original motion and procedural motion are adjourned</td>
<td>On resumption of debate, the mover of the adjournment speaks first. Members who have spoken in the debate may not speak again</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) “That the motion under debate be now put (closure motion)”</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes – 15 Minutes</td>
<td>If carried, only the amendment is put</td>
<td>If carried, only the procedural motion is put</td>
<td>The mover of the motion under debate is entitled to exercise a right of reply before the motion or amendment under debate is put</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) “That the item of business being discussed be adjourned to a stated time and place”</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>As to time and date only</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Yes – 15 minutes</td>
<td>If carried, debate on the original motion and amendment are adjourned</td>
<td>If carried, debate on the original motion and procedural motion are adjourned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion</td>
<td>Has the Chair already ruled on this motion?</td>
<td>Is second required?</td>
<td>Is discussion in order?</td>
<td>Are amendments in order?</td>
<td>Is mover of procedural motion entitled to reply?</td>
<td>Are previous debate entitled to move this motion?</td>
<td>Can a speaker be interrupted by the mover of this motion?</td>
<td>If lost, can the amendment be moved after an interval?</td>
<td>Position if an amendment is already before the Chair</td>
<td>Position if a procedural motion is already before the Chair</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) “That the item of business being discussed does lie on the table and not be discussed at this meeting”</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes – 15 minutes</td>
<td>If carried, the original motion and amendment are both laid on the table</td>
<td>Motion not in order</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) “That the item of business being discussed be referred (or referred back) to the local authority or to the relevant committee”</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>As to committee, time for reporting back etc only</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes – 15 minutes</td>
<td>If carried, the original motion and all amendments are referred to the committee</td>
<td>If carried, the procedural motion is deemed disposed of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) “Points of order”</td>
<td>No – but may rule against</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes – at discretion of Chairperson</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Point of order takes precedence</td>
<td>Point of order takes precedence</td>
<td>See standing order 3.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5: Powers of a Chairperson

This Appendix sets out the specific powers given to the Chairperson contained in various parts of these Standing Orders.

Chairperson to decide all questions

The Chairperson is to decide all questions where these standing orders make no provision or insufficient provision. The Chairperson’s ruling is final and not open to debate.

Chairperson to decide points of order

The Chairperson is to decide any point of order and may do so immediately after it has been raised or may first hear further argument before deciding. The ruling of the Chairperson upon any point of order is not open to any discussion and is final. No point of order may be raised during a division except by permission of the Chairperson.

Items not on the agenda

Major items not on the agenda may be dealt with at that meeting if so resolved by the local authority and the Chairperson explains at the meeting at a time when it is open to the public the reason why the item was not listed on the agenda and the reason why discussion of the item cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting.

Minor matters not on the agenda relating to the general business of the local authority may be discussed if the Chairperson explains at the beginning of the meeting, at a time when it is open to the public, that the item will be discussed at that meeting, but no resolution, decision or recommendation may be made in respect of that item except to refer it to a subsequent meeting.

Chairperson’s report

The Chairperson, by report, has the right to direct the attention of the local authority to any matter or subject within the role or function of the local authority.

Chairperson’s recommendation

The Chairperson of any meeting may include on the agenda for that meeting a Chairperson’s recommendation regarding any item brought before the meeting. The purpose of such a recommendation is to focus debate on a suggested motion.

Chairperson’s voting

The Chairperson at any meeting has NO casting vote.
Motion in writing

The Chairperson may require the mover of any motion or amendment to submit it in writing signed by the mover.

Motion in parts

The Chairperson may require any motion expressed in parts to be decided part by part.

Notice of motion

The Chairperson may direct the chief executive to refuse to accept any notice of motion which:

(a) Is disrespectful or which contains offensive language or statements made with malice; or
(b) Is not within the scope of the role or functions of the local authority; or
(c) Contains an ambiguity or statement of fact or opinion which cannot properly form part of an effective resolution, and the mover has declined to comply with such requirements as the chief executive may have made; or
(d) Is concerned with matters which are already the subject of reports or recommendations from a committee to the meeting concerned.

Reasons for refusing a notice of motion should be provided to the proposer.

Where a notice of motion has been considered and agreed by the local authority, no notice of any other motion which is, in the opinion of the Chairperson, to the same effect may be put again whilst such original motion stands.

Action on previous resolutions

If, in the opinion of the Chairperson the practical effect of a delay in taking action on a resolution which is subject to a notice of motion, would be equivalent to revocation of the resolution; or if repetitive notices of motion are considered by the Chairperson to be an attempt by a minority to frustrate the will of the meeting, action may be taken as though no such notice of motion had been given.

Repeat notice of motion

If in the opinion of the Chairperson, a notice of motion is substantially the same in purport and effect to any previous notice of motion which has been considered and rejected by the local authority, no such notice of motion may be accepted within six months of consideration of the first notice of motion unless signed by not less than one third of the members of the local authority, including vacancies.

Revocation or alteration of previous resolution

A Chairperson may recommend in a report to the local authority the revocation or alteration of all or part of any resolution previously passed, and the local authority meeting may act on such a recommendation in accordance with the provisions in these standing orders.
Chairperson may call a meeting

The Chairperson:

(a) May call a meeting to dispose of the business to be transacted following the lapsing of a meeting due to failure of a quorum, if such business cannot be delayed until the next meeting;

(b) May requisition an extra meeting to be held at a specified time and place, in order to conduct specified business.

Irrelevant matter and needless repetition

The Chairperson’s ruling preventing members when speaking to any motion or amendment from introducing irrelevant matters or indulging in needless repetition is final and not open to challenge.

Taking down words

The Chairperson may order words used and objected to by any member, to be recorded in the minutes, provided such objection is made at the time the words are used and not after any other members have spoken.

Explanations

The Chairperson may permit members to make a personal explanation in addition to speaking to a motion, and members who have already spoken, to explain some material part of a previous speech in the same debate.

Chairperson rising

Whenever the Chairperson rises during a debate any member then speaking or offering to speak is to be seated and members are to be silent so that the Chairperson may be heard without interruption.

Members may leave places

The Chairperson may permit members to leave their place while speaking.

Priority of speakers

The Chairperson must determine the order in which members may speak when two or more members indicate their wish to speak.

Minutes

The Chairperson is to sign the minutes and proceedings of every meeting once confirmed. The Chairperson and chief executive are responsible for confirming the correctness of the minutes of the last meeting of a local authority prior to the next election of members.
Questions of speakers

The Chairperson may permit members to ask questions of speakers under public forum or deputations/presentations by appointment, for the purpose of obtaining information or clarification on matters raised by the speaker.

Withdrawal of offensive or malicious expressions

The Chairperson may call upon any member to withdraw any offensive or malicious expression and may require the member to apologise for the expression.

Any member who refuses to withdraw the expression or apologise, if required by the Chairperson, can be directed to withdraw from the meeting for a time specified by the Chairperson.

Chairperson’s rulings

Any member who refuses to accept a ruling of the Chairperson, may be required by the Chairperson to withdraw from the meeting for a specified time.

Disorderly behaviour

The Chairperson may:

(a) Require any member or member of the public whose conduct is disorderly or who is creating a disturbance, to withdraw immediately from the meeting for a time specified by the Chairperson.

(b) Ask the meeting to hold in contempt, any member whose conduct is grossly disorderly and where the meeting resolves to find the member in contempt, that resolution must be recorded in the minutes.

Failure to leave meeting

If a member or member of the public who is required, in accordance with a Chairperson’s ruling, to leave the meeting, refuses or fails to do so, or having left the meeting, attempts to re-enter without the permission of the Chairperson, any member of the police or officer or employee of the local authority may, at the Chairperson’s request, remove or exclude that person from the meeting.
Appendix 6: Mayors’ powers to appoint under s.41A

The role of a Mayor is:

(a) to provide leadership to councillors and the people of the city or district.
(b) to lead development of the council’s plans (including the long-term and annual plans), policies and budgets for consideration by councillors.

The Mayor has authority to:

(a) Appoint the deputy Mayor.
(b) Establish Council committees, their terms of reference, appoint the Chairperson of each of those committees and the members.
(c) Appoint themselves as the Chairperson of a committee.
(d) Decline to exercise the powers under clause a) and b) above but may not delegate those powers to another person.

The Council retains the ability to:

(a) Remove a deputy Mayor appointed by the Mayor.
(b) Discharge of reconstitute a committee established by the Mayor.
(c) Discharge a committee Chairperson who has been appointed by the Mayor.

The Mayor is a member of each committee of the Council.
Appendix 7: Process for removing a Chairperson and deputy Mayor from office

1. At a meeting that is in accordance with this clause, a territorial authority or regional council may remove its Chairperson, deputy Chairperson, or deputy Mayor from office.

2. If a Chairperson, deputy Chairperson, or deputy mayor is removed from office at that meeting, the territorial authority or regional council may elect a new Chairperson, deputy Chairperson, or deputy mayor at that meeting.

3. A meeting to remove a Chairperson, deputy Chairperson, or deputy Mayor may be called by:
   (a) a resolution of the territorial authority or regional council; or
   (b) a requisition in writing signed by the majority of the total membership of the territorial authority or regional council (excluding vacancies).

4. A resolution or requisition must:
   (a) specify the day, time, and place at which the meeting is to be held and the business to be considered at the meeting; and
   (b) indicate whether or not, if the Chairperson, deputy Chairperson, or deputy Mayor is removed from office, a new Chairperson, deputy Chairperson, or deputy Mayor is to be elected at the meeting if a majority of the total membership of the territorial authority or regional council (excluding vacancies) so resolves.

5. A resolution may not be made and a requisition may not be delivered less than 21 days before the day specified in the resolution or requisition for the meeting.

6. The chief executive must give each member notice in writing of the day, time, place, and business of any meeting called under this clause not less than 14 days before the day specified in the resolution or requisition for the meeting.

7. A resolution removing a Chairperson, deputy Chairperson, or deputy Mayor carries if a majority of the total membership of the territorial authority or regional council (excluding vacancies) votes in favour of the resolution.

*cl. 18 Schedule 7, LGA 2002.*
Appendix 8: Workshops/Briefings

Definition of workshop/briefing

Workshops, however described, provide opportunities for members to discuss particular matters, receive information and provide guidance for officials. Workshops are not meetings and cannot be used to either make decisions or come to agreements that are then confirmed without the opportunity for meaningful debate at a formal meeting. A briefing is specifically Public Excluded (PX).

Application of standing orders to workshops and briefings

Standing orders do not apply to workshops and briefings (PX). The Chairperson or organisers will decide how the workshop, briefing (PX) or working party should be conducted.

Calling a workshop/briefing

Workshops, briefings (PX) and working parties may be called by:

(a) a resolution of the local authority or its committees
(b) the Mayor,
(c) a committee Chairperson or
(d) the chief executive
(e) by member or staff request.

Process for calling workshops/briefings

The chief executive or governance staff will give at least 24 hours’ notice of the time and place of the workshop/briefing and the matters to be discussed at it. Notice may be given by whatever means are reasonable in the circumstances. Any notice given must expressly:

(a) state that the meeting is a workshop or briefing (Public Excluded)
(b) advise the date, time and place
(c) confirm that the meeting is primarily for the provision of information and discussion, and will not make any decisions or pass any resolutions.

Public notice of a workshop or briefing is not required.

Workshops can be open to the public whereas Briefings are specifically public excluded.
Appendix 9: Sample order of business

Open section

Council

1. Apologies
2. Conflicts of Interest
3. Confirmation of Minutes
4. Deputations and Presentations
5. Adjourned Business
6. Regeneration Reports
7. Reports
8. Matters referred from Committees
9. Matters referred from Community Boards
10. Health & Safety (CE Report every month)
11. Committee Minutes for Information
12. Community Board Minutes for Information
13. Correspondence
14. Mayor’s Diary
15. Council Portfolio Updates
16. Questions Under Standing Orders
17. Urgent General Business Under Standing Orders
18. Matters to be considered with the public excluded
19. Date and Venue for next meeting

Standing Committees

Same order as above

Public excluded section

1. Reports of committees
2. Reports of the chief executive and staff
Appendix 10: Process for raising matters for a decision

Matters requiring a decision may be placed on an agenda of a meeting by a:

- report of chief executive or his/her delegate
- report of a Chairperson
- report of a committee
- report of a community board
- notice of motion from a member.

Where a matter is urgent and has not been placed on an agenda, it may be brought before a meeting as extraordinary business by a:

- report of chief executive or his/her delegate

Although out of time for a notice of motion, a member may bring an urgent matter to the attention of the meeting through the meeting chair.
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STANDING ORDERS FOR MEETINGS OF THE
WAIMAKARI DISTRICT COUNCIL AND COMMUNITY BOARDS

1. GENERAL

1.1 SCOPE AND GENERAL

This document sets out standing orders for the conduct of proceedings at meetings of the Waimakariri District Council (WDC), Kaiapoi Community Board (KCB) and Ward Advisory Boards (WABs) in the form of model orders for adoption with or without amendment. It incorporates new provisions in the Local Government Act 2002 as they affect the provisions of the model standing orders.

This Standard is presented in three parts. Part 1 is the general introduction. Part 2 covers constitutional and legislative matters, and Part 3 relates to meeting procedures.

Part 3 involves some repetition of Part 2, to ease use and to ensure each part can stand alone without the need for undue cross referencing.

1.2 INTERPRETATION

The terms “normative” and “informative” have been used in this Standard to define the application of the Appendix to which they apply. A “normative” appendix is an integral part of a Standard, whereas an “informative” appendix is only for information and guidance. Informative provisions do not form part of the mandatory requirements of the Standard.

In this Standard the word “shall” identifies a mandatory requirement for compliance with the Standard. The word “should” refers to practices which are advised or recommended.

Where direct quotations from the legislation are cited in these standing orders they are shown in bold type with quotation marks.

For the purposes of the Model Standing Orders for Meetings, references to persons of one gender shall refer to other natural persons also.

1.3 DEFINITIONS

In these standing orders, unless inconsistent with the context:

Agenda means the list of items for consideration at a meeting together with reports and other attachments relating to those items.

Chairperson means the mayor of the WDC, or chairperson of the KCB or WABs, including any person acting as the mayor of the WDC, or chairperson of the KCB or WABs, and any person presiding at any meeting of a committee or subcommittee of the WDC, KCB or WABs.

Chief executive means the chief executive of the WDC appointed under section 42 of the Local Government Act 2002, irrespective of their designation, and includes for the purposes of these standing orders, any other officer authorised by the WDC.

Clear working days means the number of working days prescribed in these standing orders for the giving of notice; and excluding the date of service of that notice and the date of the meeting, the subject of that notice.
Committee includes, in relation to a local authority:

(a) A committee comprising all the members of that local authority;
(b) A standing committee or special committee appointed by that local authority;
(c) A joint committee appointed under clause 30 of Schedule 7 of the Local Government Act 2002; and
(d) Any subcommittee of a committee described in items (a), (b) or (c) of this definition.

Deputation means a request from any person or interest group in the community to make a presentation to the local authority or any committee.

Extraordinary meeting has the same meaning as defined in clause 22 of Schedule 7 of the Local Government Act 2002.

Local authority means the local authority and/or the community boards covered by these standing orders, being a local authority or a community board as defined in section 5 of the Local Government Act 2002.

Mayor means the mayor of a territorial authority elected under the Local Electoral Act 2001.

Meeting means any first or extraordinary meeting of a local authority; and any meeting of any committee, standing committee, joint committee, special committee or subcommittee of the local authority. At any meeting of a local authority, or of any committee or subcommittee of a local authority, at which no resolutions or decisions are made, the provisions of these standing orders regarding public access and notification need not apply.

Member means any person elected or appointed to the local authority or to any committee or subcommittee of the local authority, and includes the mayor of a territorial authority and the chairperson of a regional council or community board, or of any committee or subcommittee of a regional council, territorial authority or community board.

Minutes means the record of the proceedings of any meeting of the local authority and its committees and subcommittees.

Public excluded information means any information which can be excluded from the public for reasons meeting the provisions of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987.

Public excluded session refers to those meetings or parts of meetings from which the public is excluded by the local authority as provided for in the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987.

Publicly notified means notified to members of the public by notice contained in some newspaper circulating in the district of the local authority, or where there is no such newspaper, by notice published on signboard affixed to public places in the district to which the notice relates.

Quorum means the minimum number of members needing to be present to constitute a valid meeting.

Working day means any day of the week other than:

(a) Saturday, Sunday, Waitangi Day, Good Friday, Easter Monday, Anzac Day, the Sovereign's Birthday, Labour Day, Canterbury Anniversary (taken as Show Day) and
(b) A day in the period commencing with the 25th day of December in any year and ending with the 15th day of January in the following year.
2. CONSTITUTIONAL AND LEGISLATIVE MATTERS

2.1 INTRODUCTION

2.1.1 Requirement for adoption of standing orders

"A local authority must adopt a set of standing orders for the conduct of its meetings and those of its committees. The standing orders of a local authority must not contravene (any provisions of the Local Government Act 2002), the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, or any other Act."

(cl. 27(1) & (2), Schedule 7, LGA)

2.1.2 Alteration of standing orders

"After the adoption of the first standing orders of the local authority, an amendment of the standing orders or the adoption of a new set of standing orders requires, in every case, a vote of not less than 75% of the members present."

(cl. 27(3), Schedule 7, LGA)

2.1.3 Temporary suspension of standing orders

"A local authority or committee may temporarily suspend standing orders during a meeting by a vote of not less than 75% of the members present and voting, and the reason for the suspension must be stated in the resolution of suspension."

(cl. 27(4), Schedule 7, LGA)

(See Standing Order 3.2.1)

2.1.4 All members to abide by standing orders

"A member of a local authority must abide by the standing orders adopted under clause 27 (of Schedule 7 of the Local Government Act)."

(cl. 16(1), Schedule 7, LGA)

(See Standing Order 3.1.1)

2.2 FIRST MEETING OF THE LOCAL AUTHORITY FOLLOWING ELECTION

2.2.1 Meeting called by chief executive

"The first meeting of a local authority following a triennial general election of members must be called by the chief executive as soon as practicable after the results of the election are known. The chief executive must give the persons elected to the local authority not less than seven days' notice of the meeting. (However) if an emergency exists, the chief executive may give notice of the meeting as soon as practicable. The chief executive (or, in the absence of the chief executive, a nominee of that officer) must chair the meeting until the mayor or chairperson has made and attested the declaration required under clause 14 (of Schedule 7 of the Local Government Act)."

(cl. 21(1) – (4), Schedule 7, LGA)
2.2.2 Business to be conducted

The business that must be conducted at the meeting must include –
the making and attesting of the declarations required of the
mayor (if any) and members under clause 14 (of Schedule 7 of
the Local Government Act); and
the election of the chairperson (if any) and the making and
attesting of the declaration required of the chairperson under
clause 14 (of Schedule 7 of the Local Government Act); and
a general explanation, given or arranged by the chief executive,
of –
the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act
1987; and
other laws affecting members, including – the appropriate
provisions of the Local Authorities (Members’ Interests) Act
1968; and sections 99, 105 and 105A of the Crimes Act 1961;
and the Secret Commissions Act 1910; and the Securities Act
1978; and
the fixing of the date and time of the first meeting of the local
authority, or the adoption of a schedule of meetings; and
the election of the deputy mayor or deputy chairperson in
accordance with clause 17 (of Schedule 7 of the Local
Government Act).”

(cl. 21(5), Schedule 7, LGA)

2.2.3 Members to give notice of addresses

Every member of a local authority must give to the chief executive a
residential or business address together with, if desired, a facsimile or
other address within the district or region of the local authority to which
notices and material relating to meetings and local authority business
may be sent or delivered.

2.3 Chairperson of meetings

2.3.1 Mayor or chairperson of local authority to preside

“The mayor or chairperson of the local authority must preside at each
meeting of the local authority at which he or she is present unless the
mayor or chairperson vacates the chair for a particular meeting … If the
mayor or chairperson of a local authority … is absent from a meeting,
the deputy mayor or deputy chairperson (if any) of the local authority
must preside … If a deputy mayor or deputy chairperson has not been
appointed, or if the deputy mayor or deputy chairperson is also absent
the members of the local authority … that are present must elect one of
their number to preside at that meeting, and that person may exercise
at that meeting the responsibilities, duties, and powers of the mayor or
chairperson.”

(cl. 26(1), (5) & (6), Schedule 7, LGA)
2.3.2

“... the chairperson vacates the chair for a particular meeting ... If the ... chairperson of a committee is absent from a meeting, ... the deputy chairperson (if any) ... of the committee must preside... If ... a deputy chairperson has not been appointed, or if ... the deputy chairperson is also absent, the members of ... the committee that are present must elect one of their number to preside at that meeting, and that person may exercise at that meeting the responsibilities, duties and powers of the chairperson.”

(cl. 26(2), (5) & (6), Schedule 7, LGA)

2.4 QUORUM AT MEETINGS

Requirement for a quorum

2.4.1

“A meeting is duly constituted if a quorum is present, whether or not all of the members are voting or entitled to vote.”

(cl. 23(1), Schedule 7, LGA)

Quorum to be present throughout the meeting

2.4.2

“Business may not be transacted at any meeting unless at least a quorum of members is present during the whole of the time at which the business is transacted.”

(cl. 23(2), Schedule 7, LGA)

Definition of quorum for local authority or joint committee meetings

2.4.3

The quorum at a meeting of a local authority or a committee or a subcommittee consists of —

(a) half of the members if the number of members (including vacancies) is even; or

(b) a majority of members if the number of members (including vacancies) is odd.

Definition of quorum for committee meetings

2.4.4

“The quorum at a meeting of a local authority or a committee or a subcommittee consists of —

(a) half of the members if the number of members (including vacancies) is even; or

(b) a majority of members if the number of members (including vacancies) is odd”.

(See Standing Order 3.4)
2.5 **Voting at Meetings**

**Acts and decisions of the local authority by majority vote at meetings**

2.5.1 "Unless otherwise provided in [the Local Government Act] or in any standing orders, —

(a) the acts of a local authority must be done, and the questions before the local authority must be decided, at a meeting by —

(i) vote; and

(ii) the majority of members that are present and voting."

[s26(7) Local Government Act 2002 Amendment Act 2004]

**Casting vote**

(2) "For the purposes of (2.5.1(1)), the mayor or chairperson or other person presiding at the meeting:

(a) Has a deliberative vote; and

(b) In the case of an equality of votes, does not have a casting vote (and therefore the act or question is defeated and the status quo is preserved)."

NOTE – This is based on the legislative default position of there being no casting vote. Where a local authority wishes to have a casting vote it should refer to Appendix H for alternative wording for this section. When adopting, amending or suspending Standing Orders to provide for a casting vote clause 27, schedule 7 of the Local Government Act 2002 applies.

**Open Voting**

(3) "An act or question coming before the local authority must be done or decided by open voting."

**Mandatory requirements**

(1) and (2) apply unless the Local Government Act 2002 provides otherwise.

(cl. 24, Schedule 7, LGA)

2.6 **Voting Systems for Certain Appointments**

**Provisions for election or appointment of deputy mayor, chairpersons and deputy chairpersons of local authorities and committees, and representatives of the local authority**

2.6.1 "(This Standing Order applies to) –

(a) the election or appointment of the chairperson and deputy chairperson of a regional council; and

(b) the election or appointment of the deputy mayor; and

(c) the election or appointment of the chairperson and deputy chairperson of a committee; and

(d) the election or appointment of a representative of a local authority.

If this (Standing Order) applies, a local authority or a committee (if the local authority has so directed) must determine by resolution that a person be elected or appointed by using one of the following systems of voting:

(a) (System A); or

(b) (System B),
System A
(a) requires that a person is elected or appointed if he or she receives the votes of a majority of the members of the local authority or committee present and voting; and
(b) has the following characteristics:
   i. there is a first round of voting for all candidates; and
   ii. if no candidate is successful in that round there is a second round of voting from which the candidate with the fewest votes in the first round is excluded; and
   iii. if no candidate is successful in the second round there is a third, and if necessary subsequent round of voting from which, each time, the candidate with the fewest votes in the previous round is excluded; and
   iv. in any round of voting, if two or more candidates tie for the lowest number of votes the person excluded from the next round is resolved by lot.

System B
(a) requires that a person is elected or appointed if he or she receives more votes than any other candidate; and
(b) has the following characteristics:
   i. there is only one round of voting; and
   ii. if two or more candidates tie for the most votes, the tie is resolved by lot.”

(cl. 25, Schedule 7, LGA)

2.7 APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES AND OTHER SUBORDINATE DECISION-MAKING BODIES

Appointment of committees, subcommittees and other subordinate decision-making bodies

2.7.1 “A local authority may appoint – the committees, subcommittees, and other subordinate decision-making bodies that it considers appropriate and ... a committee may appoint the subcommittees that it considers appropriate unless it is prohibited from doing so by the local authority.”

(cl. 30(1) & (2), Schedule 7, LGA)

Discharge or reconstitution of committees, subcommittees and other subordinate decision-making bodies

2.7.2 "Unless expressly provided otherwise in an Act, -
   (a) a local authority may discharge or reconstitute a committee or subcommittee or other subordinate decision-making body; and
   (b) a committee may discharge or reconstitute a subcommittee.

   A committee, subcommittee or other subordinate decision-making body is, unless the local authority resolves otherwise, deemed to be discharged on the coming into office of the members of the local authority elected or appointed at, or following, the triennial general election of members next after the appointment of the committee, subcommittee, or other subordinate decision-making body.”

(cl. 30(5) & (7), Schedule 7, LGA)
Committees and subordinate decision-making bodies subject to direction of local authority

2.7.3 “A committee or other subordinate decision-making body is subject in all things to the control of the local authority, and must carry out all general and special directions of the local authority given in relation to the committee or other body or the affairs of the committee or other body. A subcommittee is subject in all things to the control of the committee that appointed it, and must carry out all general and special directions of the committee given in relation to the subcommittee or its affairs … Nothing in this (standing order) entitles a local authority or committee to rescind or amend a decision made under a delegation authorising the making of a decision by a committee, a subcommittee, or another subordinate decision-making body.”
(cl. 30(3), (4) & (6), Schedule 7, LGA)

2.8 JOINT COMMITTEES

Appointment of joint committees

2.8.1 “A local authority may appoint … a joint committee with another local authority or other public body.”
(Cl. 30(1), Schedule 7, LGA)

Status of joint committees

2.8.2 “A joint committee … is deemed to be both a committee of the local authority and a committee of the other local authority or public body.”
(Cl. 30*8), Schedule 7, LGA)

Powers and responsibilities of joint committees

2.8.3 Part 1 of Schedule 7 of the Local Government Act applies to a joint committee except that –
(a) The powers to discharge any individual member and appoint another in his or her stead must be exercised by the local authority or public body that made the appointment; and
(b) The meeting quorum is as outlined in 2.4.3; and
(c) The committee may appoint and remove its own chairperson or deputy chairperson.
(cl. 30(9), Schedule 7, LGA)

Application to a public body that is not a local authority

2.8.4 For the purposes of a public body that is not a local authority, Standing Orders 2.8.2 and 2.8.3 apply to the extent that they are not inconsistent with the law applicable to committees of the public body.
(cl. 30(10), Schedule 7, LGA)
### 2.9 Membership of Committees and Subcommittees

#### 2.9.1 Appointment or discharge of committee members and subcommittee members

“A local authority may appoint or discharge any member of a committee. Unless directed otherwise by the local authority, a committee may appoint or discharge any member of a subcommittee appointed by the committee.”

(cl. 31(1) & (2), Schedule 7, LGA)

#### 2.9.2 Elected members on committees and subcommittees

“The members of a committee or subcommittee may, but need not be, elected members of the local authority, and a local authority or committee may appoint to a committee or subcommittee a person who is not a member of the local authority or committee if, in the opinion of the local authority that person has the skills, attributes or knowledge that will assist the work of the committee or subcommittee … at least one member of a committee must be an elected member of the local authority; and an employee of a local authority acting in the course of his or her employment may not act as a member of any committee unless that committee is a subcommittee.”

(cl. 31(3) & (4), Schedule 7, LGA)

#### 2.9.3 Local authority may replace members if committee not discharged

“If a local authority resolves that a committee, subcommittee, or other decision-making body is not to be discharged under clause 30 (7) (of Schedule 7 of the Local Government Act), the local authority may replace the members of that committee subcommittee or other subordinate decision-making body after the next triennial general election of members.”

(cl. 31(5), Schedule 7, LGA)

#### 2.9.4 Minimum numbers on committees and subcommittees

“The minimum number of members is three for a committee, and is two for a subcommittee.”

(cl. 31(6), Schedule 7, LGA)

#### 2.9.5 Mayor or chairperson of local authority an ex-officio member

“The mayor or chairperson or any member of the local authority may be appointed an ex-officio member of any committee other than a community board or a quasi-judicial committee”.

### 2.10 Powers of Delegation

#### 2.10.1 Delegations to committees, subcommittees, subordinate decision-making bodies, community boards, members and officers

(1) “Unless expressly provided otherwise in (the Local Government Act 2002), or in any other Act, for the purposes of efficiency and effectiveness in the conduct of a local authority’s business, a local authority may delegate to a committee or other subordinate decision-making body, community board, or member or officer of the local authority any of its members and officers responsibilities, duties, or powers except -

(a) the power to make a rate; or
(b) the power to make a bylaw; or
(c) the power to borrow money, or purchase or dispose of assets, other than in accordance with the long-term council community plan; or
(d) the power to adopt a long-term council community plan, annual plan, or annual report; or
(e) the power to appoint a chief executive; or
(f) the power to adopt policies required to be adopted and consulted on under (the Local Government Act 2002) in association with the long-term council community plan or developed for the purpose of the local governance statement.

(2) Nothing in this clause restricts the power of a local authority to delegate to a committee or other subordinate decision-making body, community board, or member or officer of the local authority the power to do anything precedent to the exercise by the local authority (after consultation with the committee or body or person) of any power or duty specified in … (a) – (f) above).

(3) A committee or other subordinate decision-making body, community board, or member or officer of the local authority may delegate any of its responsibilities, duties, or powers to a subcommittee or person, subject to any conditions, limitation, or prohibitions imposed by the local authority or by the committee or body or person that makes the original delegation.”

(cl. 32(1), (2) & (3), Schedule 7, LGA)

Use of delegated powers

2.10.2
“A committee, subcommittee, other subordinate decision-making body, community board or member or officer of the local authority to which or to whom any responsibilities, powers or duties are delegated may, without confirmation by the local authority or committee or body or person that made the delegation, exercise or perform them in the like manner and with the same effect as the local authority could itself have exercised or performed them.”

(cl. 32(4) Schedule 7, LGA)

Delegations related to bylaws and other regulatory matters

2.10.3
“A local authority may delegate to any other local authority, organisation, or person the enforcement, inspection, licensing, and administration related to bylaws and other regulatory matters.”

(cl. 32(5) Schedule 7, LGA)
2.11 PROCEEDINGS NOT INVALIDATED BY VACANCIES OR IRREGULARITIES

**Proceedings not invalidated by vacancies or irregularities**

2.11.1 “An act or proceeding of a local authority or committee, or of a person acting as a member of a local authority or committee, is not invalidated by a vacancy in the membership of the local authority or committee at the time of that act or proceeding, or the subsequent discovery of some defect in the election or appointment of the person acting as a member of the local authority or committee, or that that person was or is incapable of being a member.”

(cl. 29, Schedule 7, LGA)

2.12 GENERAL PROVISIONS AS TO MEETINGS

**Meetings to be held**

2.12.1 “A local authority must hold the meetings that are necessary for the good government of its region or district.”

(cl. 19(1), Schedule 7, LGA)

**Right to attend meetings**

2.12.2 “A member of a local authority, or of a committee of a local authority, has, unless lawfully excluded, the right to attend any meeting of the local authority or committee.”

(cl. 19(2), Schedule 7, LGA)

**Calling, public notification and conduct of meetings**

2.12.3 “A meeting of a local authority must be called and conducted in accordance with (Schedule 7 of the Local Government Act); and Part VII of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987; and the standing orders of the local authority.”

(cl. 19(3), Schedule 7, LGA)

**Agenda to be sent to members**

2.12.4 In the case of each meeting to which Standing Order 2.12.1 applies, an agenda detailing the business to be brought before that meeting together with relevant attachments must be sent to every member not less than two clear working days before the day appointed for the meeting (in the case of extraordinary meetings cl. 2.14.2 applies).

**Meetings not invalid because notice not received**

2.12.5 “A meeting of a local authority is not invalid if notice of that meeting was not received, or not received in due time, by a member of the local authority unless –

(a) it is proved that the person responsible for giving notice of the meeting acted in bad faith or without reasonable care; and

(b) the member concerned did not attend the meeting.

A member of a local authority may waive any requirement regarding the giving of notice of a meeting to that member.”

(cl. 20(1), (2), Schedule 7, LGA)
2.12.6 Minutes of proceedings

“A local authority must keep minutes of its proceedings. Minutes of proceedings duly entered and authenticated as prescribed by the local authority are prima facie evidence of those proceedings.”

(cl. 28(1), (2), Schedule 7, LGA)

2.13 NOTIFICATION OF MEETINGS TO MEMBERS

2.13.1 Period for notice in writing

“The chief executive must give notice in writing to each member of the time and place of (a) meeting –

(a) not less than 14 days before the meeting; or

(b) if the local authority has adopted a schedule of meetings, not less than 14 days before the first meeting on the schedule.”

(cl. 19(5)(a) & (b), Schedule 7, LGA)

2.13.2 Schedule of meetings

“If a local authority adopts a schedule of meetings, -

(a) the schedule may cover any future period that the local authority considers appropriate and may be amended; and

(b) notification of the schedule or any amendment to that schedule constitutes a notification of every meeting on the schedule or amendment.”

(cl. 19(6), Schedule 7, LGA)

2.13.3 Cancellation of scheduled meetings

If it is necessary to cancel a scheduled meeting, all reasonable effort shall be taken to notify elected members and the public as soon as practicable of the cancellation and of the reasons for the cancellation.

2.14 EXTRAORDINARY MEETINGS

2.14.1 Extraordinary meetings may be called

“If a resolution or requisition specifies the time and place at which the meeting is to be held and the general nature of the business to be brought before the meeting, a meeting may be called by –

(a) a resolution of the local authority; or

(b) a requisition in writing delivered to the chief executive and signed by –

(i) the mayor or chairperson; or

(ii) not less than one-third of the total membership of the local authority (including vacancies).”

(cl. 22(1), Schedule 7, LGA)
Notification of extraordinary meetings to members

2.14.2
“Notice in writing of the time and place of the meeting called under (Standing Order 2.14.1) and of the general nature of business must be given by the chief executive to each member of the local authority at least three working days before the day appointed for the meeting; or if the meeting is called by a resolution, within such lesser period of notice that is specified in the resolution, being not less than 24 hours.”
(cl. 22(3), Schedule 7, LGA)

Calling of extraordinary meetings at earlier time

2.14.3
“If the business to be dealt with requires a meeting to be held at a time earlier than is allowed by the notice requirements specified (in Standing Order 2.14.2), a meeting may be called by the mayor or chairperson; or if the mayor or chairperson are unavailable, the chief executive.”
(cl. 22(2), Schedule 7, LGA)

Notification of extraordinary meetings held at earlier time

2.14.4
“Notice of the time and place of a meeting called under (Standing Order 2.14.3) and of the matters in respect of which the meeting is being called must be given by the person calling the meeting or by another person on that person’s behalf, by whatever means is reasonable in the circumstances, to each member of the local authority and to the chief executive at least 24 hours before the time appointed for the meeting.”
(cl. 22(4) Schedule 7, LGA)

Public notice of resolutions of extraordinary meetings

2.14.5
“A local authority must, as soon as practicable, publicly notify any resolution passed at an extraordinary meeting of the local authority unless –
(a) the resolution was passed at a meeting or part of a meeting from which the public was excluded; or
(b) the extraordinary meeting was public notified at least five working days before the day on which the meeting was held.
For the purposes of this (Standing Order) resolution means the resolution on the matter or matters for which the extraordinary meeting was held.”
(s. 51A, LGOIMA)

2.15 PUBLIC AT MEETINGS, ACCESS TO AGENDAS, ETC

Meetings normally to be open to the public

2.15.1
“Except as otherwise provided by (Part VII of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act) every meeting of a local authority shall be open to the public ... For the purposes of (Part VII of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act) bona fide members of the news media shall be deemed to be members of the public and shall be entitled to attend any meeting or any part of a meeting for the purpose of reporting the proceedings for any news media.”
(s. 47 & 49(a), LGOIMA)
Information to be available to public

2.15.2
All information provided to members at local authority and committee meetings must be available to the public and news media unless any item included in the agenda refers to any matter reasonably expected to be discussed with the public excluded.
(s. 5 & 49, LGOIMA)

Public notification about meetings

2.15.3
All meetings scheduled for the following month must be publicly notified not more than 14 days and not less than five days before the end of every month, together with the dates on which and the times and places at which those meetings are to be held. Where any meeting is to be held on or after the 21st day of the month, such meetings may instead be publicly notified not more than 10 nor less than five working days before the day on which the meeting is to be held.
(s. 46, LGOIMA)

Public notification about extraordinary meetings

2.15.4
"Where any extraordinary meeting of a local authority is called and notice of that meeting cannot be given in the manner required or permitted by (Standing Order 2.15.3 as appropriate), the local authority shall cause that meeting and the general nature of business to be transacted at that meeting to be publicly notified or otherwise advertised as soon as practicable before the meeting is to be held as is reasonable in the circumstances."
(s. 46(3) & (4), LGOIMA)

Public notification additional requirements

2.15.5
The chief executive is to make any other arrangement for the notification of meetings including extraordinary meetings as the local authority may from time to time determine.

Meetings not invalid because not publicly notified

2.15.6
"No meeting of any local authority (is) invalid merely because that meeting was not publicly notified in accordance with (Standing Orders 2.15.3 - 2.15.5)."
(s. 46(5), LGOIMA)

Public notice of meetings not notified

2.15.7
"Where a local authority becomes aware that any meeting of that local authority has not been publicly notified in accordance with (Standing Orders 2.15.3 – 2.15.5), the local authority shall, as soon as practicable, give public notice that that meeting was not so notified, and shall, in that notice, state the general nature of the business transacted at that meeting; and give the reasons why that meeting was not so notified."
(s. 46(6), LGOIMA)

Availability of agendas and reports

2.15.8
"Any member of the public may, without payment of a fee, inspect, during normal office hours, within a period of at least 2 working days before every meeting, all agendas and associated reports circulated to
members of the local authority and relating to that meeting. The agendas –

(a) shall be available for inspection … at the public offices of the local authority (including service delivery centres) and the public libraries under the authority’s control; and

(b) shall be accompanied by either –

(i) the associated reports; or

(ii) a notice specifying the places at which the associated reports may be inspected.

... The associated reports shall be available for inspection at the public offices of the local authority. Any member of the public may take notes from any agenda or report inspected by that member of the public … Every member of the public who inspects an agenda or report made available and who requests a copy of any part of any such agenda or report and tenders the prescribed amount (if any) shall be given such a copy as soon as practicable. Where a meeting is an extraordinary meeting called pursuant to a resolution of the local authority, the agenda and any associated reports shall be made available as soon as is reasonable in the circumstances.”

(s. 46A(1) – (6), LGOIMA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exclusion from reports to be discussed with public excluded</th>
<th>2.15.9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The chief executive may exclude from the reports made available, reports or items from reports that are reasonably expected to be discussed with the public excluded. These items are to be indicated on each agenda.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Availability of agendas and reports for meetings of community boards</th>
<th>2.15.10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Where agendas and associated reports are for meetings of community boards, it is sufficient for the purposes of these standing orders that they be available for public viewing at the main office of the local authority and those service delivery centres and public libraries, if any, under the control of the local authority situated within the community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda to be made available to public who are at meetings</th>
<th>2.15.11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional copies of the agenda and further particulars indicating the nature of the items to be discussed must be available at meetings in sufficient numbers to enable any spare copies to be provided for members of the public to take away with them on payment of the prescribed amount (if any).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(s. 49, LGOIMA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List of committee members publicly available</th>
<th>2.15.12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The members of each committee are to be named on the relevant agenda.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public entitled to inspect minutes</th>
<th>2.15.13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The public is entitled without charge to inspect, take notes from, or receive copies of, minutes of any meeting or part of any meeting from which the public was not excluded.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(s. 51, LGOIMA)
Requests for minutes of meetings in closed session

2.15.14
The chief executive must consider any request for the minutes of a meeting or part thereof from which the public was excluded as a request for official information in terms of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987.
(s. 51, LGOIMA)

2.16 REASONS TO EXCLUDE PUBLIC

Lawful reasons to exclude public

2.16.1
A local authority may by resolution exclude the public from the whole or any part of the proceedings of any meeting only on one or more of the grounds specified in section 48 of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act (see Appendix A).
(s. 48, LGOIMA)

Form of resolutions to exclude public

2.16.2
Any resolution to exclude the public must be in the form set out in Schedule 2A to the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and state the general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing that resolution in relation to that matter, and the grounds on which the resolution is based. (For an example resolution refer to appendix B).

Motion to exclude public to be put with the public present

2.16.3
Every motion to exclude the public must be put at a time when the meeting is open to the public, and copies of the text of that motion must be available to any member of the public who is present. The resolution then forms part of the minutes of the local authority.
(s. 48(4), LGOIMA)

Provision for persons to remain after public excluded

2.16.4
A resolution in accordance with Standing Order 2.16.3 may provide for one or more specified persons to remain after the public has been excluded if those persons have, in the opinion of the local authority, knowledge that will assist the authority. Any such resolution is required to state the knowledge possessed by those persons which will be of assistance in relation to the matter to be discussed and how it is relevant to the matter. No such resolution is necessary in respect of the attendance of the chief executive and relevant staff during a public excluded session.
(s. 48(5) & (6), LGOIMA)

Release of public excluded information

2.16.5
A local authority may provide for the release to the public of information, which has been considered during the public excluded part of a meeting.
2.17 Application of Standing Orders to Public Excluded Session

Standing orders to apply

2.17.1 Standing orders apply to meetings or parts of meetings from which the public has been excluded.

2.18 Use of Public Excluded Information

Public excluded business not to be disclosed

2.18.1 Subject to the provisions of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, no member or officer is permitted to disclose to any person, other than a member or officer, any information which has been or is to be presented to any meeting from which the public is properly excluded, or where it is proposed that the public be properly excluded.

3. Meeting Procedures

3.1 Application of Standing Orders

All members to abide by standing orders

3.1.1 “A member of a local authority must abide by the standing orders adopted under clause 27 (of Schedule 7 of the Local Government Act).”
(cl. 16(1), Schedule 7, LGA)
(See Standing Order 2.1.4)

Additional to or substitution of standing orders

3.1.2 Notwithstanding the generality of standing order 3.1.1, for any quasi-judicial proceedings, the local authority may adopt meeting procedures and practices additional to, or in substitution of these standing orders for the conduct of the business to be transacted.

For example, committees appointed to hear applications under the Resource Management Act have powers under the Commissions of Inquiry Act 1908.
(s. 41, RMA)

Exclusions for meetings at which no resolutions or decisions are made

3.1.3 For the avoidance of doubt, any provision of these standing orders relating to the making of decisions and the passing of resolutions does not apply to any meeting of the local authority or of any committee or subcommittee or other subordinate decision-making body of the local authority which has been properly constituted as a meeting at which no resolutions or decisions are to be made under the Local Government Act 2002 or the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987.
3.2 Suspension of Standing Orders

Temporary suspension

3.2.1 A local authority or committee may temporarily suspend one or more standing orders during a meeting by a vote of not less than 75% of the members present and voting. The reason for the suspension and the specific order(s) suspended must be stated in the resolution of suspension (see Standing Order 2.1.3).

(cl. 27(4), Schedule 7, LGA)

3.3 Conduct of Meetings

Mode of address for chairperson

3.3.1 The person in the chair is to be addressed in such terms as denotes the statutory office of that person, the choice of mode of address being as determined by that person.

Chairperson to decide

3.3.2 The chairperson is to decide all questions where these standing orders make no provision or insufficient provision, and all points of order, and any member who refuses to obey any order or ruling of the chairperson shall be held guilty of contempt (see Standing Orders 3.1.1, 3.13.6 and appendix C.)

Chairperson rising

3.3.3 Whenever the chairperson rises during a debate any member then speaking or offering to speak is to be seated, and members are to be silent so that the chairperson may be heard without interruption.

Members to speak in places and address the chair

3.3.4 "Members granted the right to speak at meetings may remain seated. The member shall address the chairperson and shall not leave his/her place while speaking without the leave of the chairperson."

Priority of speakers

3.3.5 When two or more members seek the right to speak, the chairperson is to name the member who has the right to speak first, provided that the following members shall have precedence, where in order, when they state their intention to:

(a) Raise a point of order (see Standing Order 3.13.1), including any request to obtain a time extension for the previous speaker;
(b) Move a motion to terminate or adjourn the debate (see Standing Order 3.12.1); or
(c) Make a point of explanation or request an indulgence of the chairperson (see Standing Order 3.8.13).
### Speeches in English or Maori

#### 3.3.6

A member may address the chairperson in English or Maori. The chairperson may order that a speech be translated and printed in another language. A member must give prior notice, not less than 2 working days before the meeting, to the chairperson if he or she intends to address the chairperson in Maori, when the normal business of the committee is conducted in English, or in English when the normal business of the committee is conducted in Maori.

### Duration of meetings and time limits

#### 3.3.7

Unless pursuant to a resolution to continue, no meeting may continue for more than six hours or beyond 10.30pm, and any business on the agenda not dealt with must be adjourned to the next meeting or extraordinary meeting.

### Reporting of meetings

#### 3.3.8

When a meeting of a local authority is open to the public the following provisions shall apply:

(a) Members of the public including bona fide members of the news media are entitled to attend any meeting or any part of a meeting and to report on the proceedings.

(s. 49(a) LGOIMA)

(b) Any member of the public who is not a bona fide member of the news media shall obtain the consent of the Chair before the commencement of the meeting to the use of visual recording devices.”

(c) Any recording of meetings must be carried out in an unobtrusive manner, and must not be distracting to members.

(d) Any recording of meetings must be notified to the chairperson at the commencement of the meeting.

### Disorderly members to withdraw

#### 3.3.9

Members called to order by the chairperson are to resume their seats and/or stop speaking, as the case may be. Should any member refuse to obey, such member may be directed by the chairperson to withdraw from the meeting. Upon such direction, any such member is to withdraw and must not be permitted to return during the meeting, or any period of that meeting that the chairperson may determine (see Appendix C).

### Members not to be disrespectful

#### 3.3.10

No member of the local authority at any meeting may be disrespectful in speech or use offensive or malicious language, including in reference to the local authority, any other member, or any officer or employee of the local authority. In addition, no member may impute improper motives or make offensive remarks about the private affairs of any other member of the local authority or its staff.

### Retraction of, or apology for, offensive or malicious language

#### 3.3.11

The chairperson may call upon any member or speaker to withdraw any offensive or malicious expression and may require the member to apologise for the expression.
Withdrawal from meeting 3.3.12
Any member who refuses to withdraw the expression or apologise, if required by the chairperson, can be directed to withdraw from the meeting for a time specified by the chairperson.

Disorder in meeting 3.3.13
The chairperson may require any member whose conduct is disorderly or who is creating a disturbance to withdraw immediately from the meeting for a time specified by the chairperson.

Adjournment of meeting following disorder 3.3.14
Should the disorder continue, the chairperson has the right to adjourn the meeting for a time specified by the chairperson. At the end of that period the meeting shall resume and decide without debate the question as to whether the meeting shall proceed or be adjourned. The chairperson may also take such action in relation to disorder from other sources or in the event of an emergency.

Contempt to be recorded in minutes 3.3.15
Where the meeting resolves to find the member in contempt that resolution must be recorded in the minutes.

Removal from meeting 3.3.16
"A member of the police, or an officer or employee of the local authority, may, at the request of the chairperson, remove or exclude a member from a meeting if that member is required to leave the meeting by a ruling made under the standing orders and that member—
(a) refusals or fails to leave the meeting; or
(b) having left the meeting, attempts to re-enter the meeting without the permission of the chairperson."
(cl. 16(2), Schedule 7, LGA)

3.4 QUORUM AT MEETINGS

Requirement for a quorum 3.4.1
"A meeting is duly constituted if a quorum is present, whether or not all of the members are voting or entitled to vote."
(cl. 23(1), Schedule 7, LGA)

Quorum to be present throughout meeting 3.4.2
"Business may not be transacted at any meeting unless at least a quorum of members is present during the whole of the time at which the business is transacted."
(cl. 23(2), Schedule 7, LGA)

Definition of quorum for local authority or joint committee meetings 3.4.3
"The quorum at a meeting of a local authority or a committee or a subcommittee consists of—
(a) half of the members if the number of members (including vacancies) is even; or
(b) a majority of members if the number of members (including vacancies) is odd”.

Definition of quorum for committee meetings

3.4.4 “The quorum at a meeting of a local authority or a committee or a subcommittee consists of —
(a) half of the members if the number of members (including vacancies) is even; or
(b) a majority of members if the number of members (including vacancies) is odd”.
(Cl. 23(3), Schedule 7, LGA)
(See Standing Order 2.4)

3.5 FAILURE OF A QUORUM

Meeting lapses if no quorum

3.5.1 If a meeting is short of a quorum at its commencement, or falls short of a quorum, the business is to stand suspended and, if no quorum is present within 10 minutes, the chairperson is to vacate the chair and the meeting shall lapse.

Lapsed business

3.5.2 The business remaining to be disposed of following the lapsing of a meeting is to stand adjourned until the next meeting unless an earlier meeting is fixed by the chairperson and notified by the chief executive.

Minutes to record failure of quorum

3.5.3 If a meeting lapses by reason of failure of a quorum, the names of the members then in attendance, and the fact of the lapse, are to be recorded in the minutes.

3.6 LEAVE OF ABSENCE AND APOLOGIES

Granting leave of absence

3.6.1 The local authority may grant leave of absence to a member from a meeting or other meetings of the local authority or its committees upon application by the member.

Apologies at meetings

3.6.2 If a member has not obtained leave of absence an apology may be tendered on behalf of the member and the apology may be accepted or declined by the local authority. Acceptance of the apology shall be deemed to be a granting of leave of absence for that meeting.
Recording of apologies

3.6.3
The chairperson of each meeting must invite apologies at the beginning of each meeting, including apologies for lateness and early departure, and these and subsequent apologies during the meeting shall be recorded in the minutes, including whether they were accepted or declined, and the time of arrival and departure of all members.

Absence without leave

3.6.4
An extraordinary vacancy is created where any member is absent without leave of the territorial authority, regional council or community board from 4 consecutive meetings other than extraordinary meetings of the territorial authority, regional council or community board.

(cl. 5, Schedule 7, LGA)

3.7 ORDER OF BUSINESS

Adoption of order of business

3.7.1
“The Order of Business for Council and its Committees (as applicable) shall be:

- Apologies
- Conflict of Interest (to be reported for minuting)
- Notice of Business which is not on the Agenda for the Meeting
- Confirmation of Minutes
- Matters arising from the Minutes

Deputations and Petitions

(People presenting petitions or speaking as a member of a deputation will be given a specific time at which the Council or its committees will hear their submission. These may be heard at any other time during the meeting to suit the Deputation or the Committee.)

Adjourned Business

Notices of Motion

Reports (written)

Committee/Subcommittee/Community Board Reports

Matters referred from Committees/Community Board Reports back on Meetings/Conferences

Mayor/Chairperson’s Report

Correspondence

Questions

Urgent General Business

Matters to be considered with the Public Excluded”

Agenda

3.7.2
The chief executive is to prepare for each meeting an agenda listing and attaching information on the items of business to be brought before the meeting so far as is known. At the meeting the business is to be dealt with in the order in which it stands on the agenda unless the meeting or the chairperson accord precedence to any business set down on the agenda.
Public excluded items

3.7.3
The chief executive must place on a public excluded agenda any matters for which he/she considers the local authority or committee of the local authority is likely in his/her opinion to wish to exclude the public in terms of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, provided that an indication of the subject matter likely to be considered with the public excluded is placed on the agenda available to the public.

Chairperson’s report

3.7.4
The chairperson, by report, has the right to direct the attention of the local authority or the relevant committee as the case may be, to any matter or subject within the role or function of the local authority or committee respectively.

Major items not on the agenda may be dealt with

3.7.5
Where an item is not on the agenda for a meeting, that item may be dealt with at that meeting if —

(a) the local authority, by resolution supported by 75 per cent of members present and voting, so decides, and

(b) the presiding member explains at the meeting at a time when it is open to the public, —

(i) the reason why the item is not on the agenda; and

(ii) the reason why the discussion of the item cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting.

Minor items not on the agenda may be discussed

3.7.6
Where an item is not on the agenda for a meeting, -

(a) That item may be discussed at that meeting if -

(i) That item is a minor matter relating to the general business of the local authority; and

(ii) The presiding member explains at the beginning of the meeting, at a time when it is open to the public, that the item will be discussed at the meeting; but

(b) No resolution, decision, or recommendation may be made in respect of that item except to refer that item to a subsequent meeting of the local authority for further discussion."

(s. 46A(7) & 46A(7A), LGOIMA)

Chairperson’s recommendation

3.7.7
The chairperson of any meeting may include on the agenda for that meeting a chairperson’s recommendation regarding any item brought before the meeting.
### 3.8 RULES OF DEBATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reserving speech</strong> 3.8.1</td>
<td>Reserving speech – A member may second a motion or amendment without speaking to it, and may reserve the right to speak to it later in the debate, provided that such reservation is made before any member, other than the mover, speaks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Irrelevant matter and needless repetition</strong> 3.8.2</td>
<td>In speaking to any motion or amendment, members are to confine their remarks strictly to such motion or amendment, and shall not introduce irrelevant matters or indulge in needless repetition. In this matter, the chairperson’s ruling is final and not open to challenge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Limitation on speakers</strong> 3.8.3</td>
<td>If 3 speakers have spoken consecutively in support of, or in opposition to a motion, the chairperson may call for a speaker to the contrary. If no such speaker is forthcoming and after the mover has had the right of reply, the motion must be put. Members speaking must, if so called upon by the chairperson, announce whether they are speaking in support of, or against the motion or amendment being debated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Taking down words</strong> 3.8.4</td>
<td>When any member objects to words used and desires his/her objection to be recorded in the minutes, the chairperson may order the objection to be recorded, provided such objection be made at the time the words were used and not after any other members have spoken (see Standing Order 3.13.4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading of speeches</strong> 3.8.5</td>
<td>Members shall not read their speeches, except with the permission of the chairperson, but may refresh their memory by reference to notes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Time limits on speakers** 3.8.6 | The following time limits apply to members speaking at local authority meetings, unless extended by a majority vote of members present:  
(a) Movers of motions when speaking to the motion, ten minutes;  
(b) Movers of motions, when exercising their right of reply, five minutes;  
(c) Other members, not more than five minutes.  
(see also Standing Order 3.19.6) |
| **Member speaking more than once** 3.8.7 | A member may not speak more than once to a motion, save that this order does not apply to meetings of committees or subcommittees. |
| **Restating of motion** 3.8.8 | Members may request the chairperson to restate the motion for their information at any time during the debate, but not so as to interrupt. |
Right of reply

3.8.9
The mover of an original motion (not an amendment) has a right of reply. After the mover has commenced such reply, or has intimated the wish to forego this right, or having spoken to an amendment to the motion and the chairperson has intimated his intention to put the motion, no other member of the local authority may speak on the motion. Movers in reply are not to introduce any new matter and must confine themselves strictly to answering previous speakers.

When right of reply may be exercised

3.8.10
The right of reply is governed as follows:

(a) Where no amendment has been moved, the mover may reply at the conclusion of the discussion on the motion;

(b) If there is an amendment, the mover of the original motion may make such reply at the conclusion of the debate on such amendment, and this reply exhausts their rights as mover of the original motion (see Standing Order 3.8.9), provided that the mover may reserve such right of reply. The mover may, however, take part in the discussion upon subsequent amendments.

NOTE – A right of reply can be exercised at either the end of the debate on an original motion or at the end of the debate on an amendment. Only the mover of an original motion has a right of reply and that right can only be used once. In addition to a right of reply, the mover of an original motion may reserve a right of reply and speak once to an original motion and once to each amendment without losing that right of reply.

Speaking only to relevant matters

3.8.11
Members may speak to any matter before the meeting or upon a motion or amendment to be proposed by themselves, or upon a point of order arising out of debate, but not otherwise.

Personal explanation

3.8.12
“Notwithstanding Standing Order 3.8.7, members may make a personal explanation with the permission of the chairperson, provided that the matter is personal to the member, deals with fact and not denigratory in nature. Such matters may not be debated”.

Explanation of previous speech

3.8.13
With the permission of the chairperson, explanation of some material part of a previous speech in the same debate may be given by a member who has already spoken, but new matter may not be introduced.

3.9 MOTIONS AND AMENDMENTS

Requirement for a seconder

3.9.1
All motions and amendments moved in debate (including notices of motion) must be seconded, and thereupon the chairperson shall state the matter raised and propose it for discussion.
3.9.2 Withdrawal of motions and amendments

Once motions or amendments have been seconded and put to the meeting by the chairperson, they cannot be withdrawn without the consent of the majority of the members present and voting. A motion to which an amendment has been moved and seconded, cannot be withdrawn until the amendment is withdrawn or lost.

3.9.3 Substituted motion by amendment

The meeting may allow a motion, which is subject to an amendment, to be withdrawn and replaced by the amendment as the substituted motion, provided the mover and seconder of the original motion agree to the withdrawal of the original motion. In such circumstances, members who have spoken to the original motion may speak again to the substituted motion.

3.9.4 Motions in writing

The chairperson may require movers of motions or amendments to provide them in writing signed by the mover.

3.9.5 Motions expressed in parts

The chairperson or any member may require a motion expressed in parts to be decided part by part.

3.9.6 Amendment once moved

When a motion has been moved and seconded, then proposed by the chairperson for discussion, an amendment may be moved or seconded by any member who has not spoken to the motion, whether an original motion or a substituted motion. The mover or seconder of a motion for the adoption of the report of a committee, who desires to amend any item in the report, may also propose or second an amendment.

3.9.7 Amendments and motions not seconded

Amendments and motions which are proposed but not seconded are not in order and are not entered in the minutes.

3.9.8 Further amendments

No further amendment may be allowed until the first amendment is disposed of, although members may notify the chairperson of their intention to move further amendments and the tenor of their content.

3.9.9 Where amendment lost

Where amendment lost – Where an amendment is lost, another may be moved and seconded by any members who have not spoken to the motion, whether an original motion or substituted motion. Movers of previous amendments which were lost are entitled to speak on the substantive motion and to any new amendment, but are not entitled to move or second such new amendment.

3.9.10 Where amendment carried

Where an amendment is carried, the motion as amended becomes the substantive motion, and any member, other than previous movers or seconders in the debate, may then propose a further amendment.
Amendments relevant

3.9.11
Every proposed amendment must be relevant to the motion under discussion and not be in similar terms to an amendment which has been lost.

Direct negatives not allowed

3.9.12
No amendment which amounts to a direct negative, is to be allowed which, if carried, would have the same effect as negating the motion.

Procedure until resolution

3.9.13
The procedures in Standing Orders 3.9.6 and 3.9.8 must be repeated until a resolution is adopted.

Flow chart of motions and amendments

3.9.14
A flow chart illustrating the process regarding motions and amendments is included in this Standard as Appendix D.

Revocation or alteration of resolutions

3.9.15
A notice of motion for the revocation or alteration of all or part of a previous resolution of the local authority is to be given to the chief executive by the member intending to move such a motion.

(a) Such notice is to set out:

(i) The resolution or part thereof which it is proposed to revoke or alter;

(ii) The meeting date when it was passed; and

(iii) The motion, if any, that is intended to be moved in substitution thereof.

(b) Such notice is to be given to the chief executive at least five clear working days before the meeting at which it is proposed to consider such a motion and is to be signed by not less than one third of the members of the local authority, including vacancies.

(c) The chief executive must then give members at least two clear working days notice in writing of the intended motion and of the meeting at which it is proposed to move such.

Restriction on action to be taken on previous resolution

3.9.16
Where a notice of motion has been given in terms of Standing Order 3.9.15, no action which is irreversible may be taken under the resolution which is proposed for revocation or alteration until the proposed notice of motion has been dealt with by the local authority, provided that if, in the opinion of the chairperson:

(a) The practical effect of the delay would be equivalent to a revocation of the resolution, or if;

(b) By reason of repetitive notices the effect of the notice is an attempt by a minority to frustrate the will of the local authority;

Then, in either case, action may be taken as though no such notice to the chief executive had been given or signed.
Revocation or alteration of resolution at same meeting 3.9.17
If, during the course of a meeting of the local authority, fresh facts or information are received concerning a matter already resolved at the meeting, the previous resolution may be revoked or altered by the consent of 75% of the members then present and voting.

Local authority may revoke or alter any previous resolution 3.9.18
A local authority meeting may, on a recommendation contained in a report by the chairperson or chief executive, or the report of any committee, revoke or alter all or part of resolutions previously passed at meetings. At least two clear working days notice of any meeting to consider such a proposal must be given to members, accompanied by details of the proposal to be considered.

Restating the motion 3.9.19
The chairperson may, immediately prior to any division being taken, request the chief executive to restate the motion upon which the division is to be taken.

No speakers after reply or question has been put 3.9.20
Members may not speak on any motion once the mover has commenced replying or where the chairperson has commenced putting the question.

Reflections on resolutions 3.9.21
In speaking in any debate no member may unduly criticise the validity of any resolution of the local authority except by a notice of motion to amend or revoke the same.

3.10 NOTICES OF MOTION

Notices of motion to be in writing 3.10.1
Notices of motion must be in writing signed by the mover, stating the meeting at which it is proposed that the notice of motion be considered, and must be delivered to the chief executive at least five clear working days before such meeting.
Refusal of notice of motion

3.10.2
The chairperson may direct the chief executive to refuse to accept any notice of motion which:
(a) Is disrespectful or which contains offensive language or statements made with malice; or
(b) Is not related to the role or functions of the local authority; or
(c) Contains an ambiguity or a statement of fact or opinion which cannot properly form part of an effective resolution, and where the mover has declined to comply with such requirements as the chief executive may make; or
(d) Is concerned with matters which are already the subject of reports or recommendations from a committee to the meeting concerned.

Reasons for refusing a notice of motion should be provided to the proposer.

Mover of notice of motion

3.10.3
Notices of motion may not proceed in the absence of the mover, unless moved by another member authorised in writing by the mover to do so.

Alteration of notice of motion

3.10.4
A notice of motion may be altered only by the mover with the consent of the meeting.

When notices of motion lapse

3.10.5
Notices of motion not moved on being called for by the chairperson shall lapse.

Referral of notices of motion to committees

3.10.6
Any notice of motion referring to any matter ordinarily dealt with by a committee of the local authority may be referred to that committee by the chief executive. Where such notices are so referred, the mover of the motion shall, if not a member of that committee, have the right to move that motion, and of reply, as if a committee member.

3.11 REPEAT NOTICES OF MOTION

First repeat where notice of motion rejected

3.11.1
When a motion which is the subject of a notice of motion has been considered and rejected by the local authority, no similar notice of motion which, in the opinion of the chairperson, is substantially the same in purport and effect may be accepted within the next six months unless signed by not less than one third of all members, including vacancies.

Second repeat where notice of motion rejected

3.11.2
If such a repeat notice of motion as provided for in Standing Order 3.11.1 is also rejected by the local authority, any further notice prior to the expiration of the original period of six months must be signed by a majority of all members, including vacancies.
No repeats where notice of motion adopted

3.11.3
Where a notice of motion has been considered and adopted by the local authority, no notice of any other motion which is, in the opinion of the chairperson, to the same effect may be put again whilst such original motion stands.

3.12 PROCEDURAL MOTIONS TO TERMINATE OR ADJOURN DEBATE

Members may move procedural motions to terminate or adjourn debate

3.12.1
Any member who has not spoken on the matter under debate may move any one of the following procedural motions to terminate or adjourn debate, but not so as to interrupt a member speaking:
(a) That the meeting be adjourned to the next meeting, unless an alternative time and place is stated; or
(b) That the item of business being discussed be adjourned to a time and place to be stated; or
(c) That the motion under debate be now put (a “closure motion”); or
(d) That the meeting move directly to the next business, superseding the item under discussion; or
(e) That the item of business being discussed does lie on the table, and not be further discussed at that meeting; or
(f) That the item of business being discussed be referred (or referred back) to the relevant committee of the local authority.

Chairperson may accept closure motions

3.12.2
The chairperson may accept a closure motion if there have been no less than two speakers for and two speakers against the motion, or, if there are no such speakers, in the chairperson’s opinion, it is reasonable to do so.

Procedural motions to terminate or adjourn debate to take precedence

3.12.3
Procedural motions to terminate or adjourn debate take precedence over other business, other than points of order, and shall, if seconded, be put to the vote immediately without discussion or debate.

Voting on procedural motions to terminate or adjourn debate

3.12.4
All procedural motions to terminate or adjourn debate must be determined by a majority of those members present and voting. If lost, a further procedural motion to terminate or adjourn debate may not be moved by any member within the next 15 minutes.

Closure motion to be put if no further speaker

3.12.5
Notwithstanding Standing Order 3.12.4, a closure motion shall be put if there is no further speaker in the debate.

Closure motion on amendment

3.12.6
When an amendment to a motion is under debate, a closure motion relates to the amendment and not to the motion.
Right of reply following closure

3.12.7 If a closure motion is carried, the mover of the motion then under debate is entitled to the right of reply, and the motion or amendment under debate is then to be put.

Debate on items previously adjourned

3.12.8 The debate on adjourned items of business is to be resumed with the mover of such adjournment being entitled to speak first in the debate. Members who have already spoken in the debate may not speak again.

Adjourned items taken first

3.12.9 Adjourned items of business are to be taken first at the subsequent meeting in the class of business to which they belong.

Other business not superseded

3.12.10 The carrying of any motion to adjourn a meeting shall not supersede other business before the meeting remaining to be disposed of, and such other business is to be considered at the next meeting.

Referral or referred back to committee

3.12.11 Business referred, or referred back, to a specified committee is to be considered at the next meeting of that committee, unless otherwise specified.

Table of procedural motions

3.12.12 A table of procedural motions is included in this Standard as Appendix E.

3.13 POINTS OF ORDER

Members rising to points of order

3.13.1 Any member may rise to speak to a point of order upon any breach of these Standing Orders and the member previously speaking is to be seated and stop speaking.

Stating subject matter of point of order

3.13.2 The member rising is to state without explanation precisely the subject matter of the point of order.

Points of order during division

3.13.3 No point of order may be raised during a division except by the permission of the chairperson.
Types of points of order

3.13.4
The following are recognised as substance for points of order:
(a) Where disorder is drawn to the attention of the chairperson; or
(b) Use of disrespectful, offensive or malicious language; or
(c) Discussion of a question not before the local authority; or
(d) Misrepresentation of any statement made by a member or by an officer or employee of the local authority; or
(e) The breach of any standing order; or
(f) A request that words objected to be recorded in the minutes.

Contradiction not point of order

3.13.5
Rising to express a difference of opinion or to contradict a statement of a previous speaker does not constitute a point of order.

Decision of chairperson final

3.13.6
The chairperson may decide on any point of order immediately after it has been raised by any member, or may first hear further argument before deciding. The ruling of the chairperson upon any point of order is not open to any discussion and is final.
3.14 VOTING

Decisions to be decided by majority votes

3.14.1 "Unless otherwise provided in [the Local Government Act] or in any standing orders, —

(a) the acts of a local authority must be done, and the questions before the local authority must be decided, at a meeting by —

(i) vote; and

(ii) the majority of members that are present and voting."

[s26(7) Local Government Act 2002 Amendment Act 2004]

Chairperson’s voting

3.14.2 Unless the Local Government Act 2002 provides otherwise, for the purposes of Standing Order 3.14.1, the mayor or chairperson or other person presiding at the meeting —

(a) Has a deliberative vote; and

(b) In the case of an equality of votes, does not have a casting vote (and therefore the act or question is defeated and the status quo is preserved).

NOTE – This is based on the legislative default position of there being no casting vote. Where a local authority wishes to have a casting vote it should refer to Appendix H for alternative wording for this section. When adopting, amending or suspending Standing Orders to provide for a casting vote, clause 27, schedule 7 of the Local Government Act applies.

[cl. 24, Schedule 7, LGA]

Open voting

3.14.3 “An act or question coming before the local authority must be done or decided by open voting”.

[cl. 24(3), Schedule 7, LGA]

Members may abstain

3.14.4 Any member may abstain from voting.

Members may have their votes recorded

3.14.5 Any member’s vote or abstention must be recorded in the minutes if so requested by that member.

Method of voting

3.14.6 The method of voting shall be as follows:

(a) The chairperson in putting the motion shall call for an expression of opinion on the voices or take a show of hands, the result of either of which, as announced by the chairperson, shall be conclusive unless such announcement is questioned immediately by any member, in which event the chairperson shall call a division.

(b) The chairperson or any member may call for a division instead of or after receiving opinion on the voices and taking a show of
hands.

(c) Where a suitable electronic voting system is available, that system may be used instead of a show of hands, vote by voices or division, and the result displayed shall be notified to the chairperson who shall declare the result.

Division

3.14.7
When a division is called, the chief executive shall take down the names of the members voting for and against the motion and abstentions and is to hand the list to the chairperson to declare the result. The result of the division shall be entered into the minutes.

Second division

3.14.8
The chairperson may call a second division where there is confusion or error in the original division, unless the same can be otherwise corrected.

Pecuniary interest

3.14.9
No members may vote or take part in the discussion of any matter at any meeting where they, directly or indirectly, have any pecuniary interest as defined in law, other than an interest in common with the public.

[s. 6(1), Local Authorities (Members’ Interests) Act]

Declaration of pecuniary interest

3.14.10
Every member present when any matter is raised in which they directly or indirectly have a pecuniary interest, apart from any interest in common with the public, is under a duty to fully declare any such interest to the meeting. This disclosure and the subsequent abstention of such members from both discussion and voting on the item, is to be recorded in the minutes.

[s. 6(1), Local Authorities (Members’ Interests) Act]

Pecuniary interest a reason for leaving room

3.14.11
“Members who have declared a pecuniary and/or non-pecuniary interest in matters to be discussed shall be required to withdraw from the meeting table and should consider leaving the meeting room for the full duration of the discussion on such matters. However, the member may remain in the area set aside for the public”.

3.15 Qualified Privilege

Qualified privilege relating to agenda and minutes

3.15.1
Where a meeting of any local authority is open to the public during the proceedings or any part thereof, and a member of the public is supplied with a copy of the agenda for the meeting or any part of the minutes of that meeting are provided, the publication of any defamatory matter included in the agenda or in the minutes is privileged unless the publication is proved to have been made with ill will or taking improper advantage of the publication.
[s. 52, LGOIMA]

3.15.2
Any oral statement made at any meeting of a local authority in accordance with the rules that have been adopted by that local authority for the guidance and order of its proceedings, is privileged, unless the statement is proved to have been made with ill will or taking improper advantage of the publication.
[s. 53, LGOIMA]

3.15.3
The privilege conferred by Standing Order 3.15.2 is in addition to, and not in substitution for, or derogation of any other privilege, whether absolute or qualified, that applies, by virtue of any other enactment or rule of law, to the proceedings of any local authority.

3.16 MAINTENANCE OF PUBLIC ORDER AT MEETINGS

Chairperson may require members of the public to leave meeting

3.16.1
The chairperson presiding at any meeting of the local authority may require any member of the public to leave the meeting if it is believed on reasonable grounds that the behaviour of that member of the public is likely to prejudice the orderly conduct of the meeting if that person is permitted to remain.
[s. 50, LGOIMA]

Removal of members of public

3.16.2
If any member of the public who is required in accordance with Standing Order 3.16.1 to leave a meeting, refuses or fails to leave the meeting or, having left the meeting, attempts to re-enter the meeting without the permission of the chairperson, any police officer or employee of the local authority may, at the request of the chairperson, remove or exclude that member of the public from the meeting.

3.17 MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes to be evidence of proceedings

3.17.1
“(1) A local authority must keep minutes of its proceedings.

(2) Minutes of proceedings duly entered and authenticated as prescribed by a local authority are prima facie evidence of those proceedings.”

[cl. 28, Schedule 7, LGA]

Keeping of minutes

3.17.2
The chief executive or his/her designated representative must keep the minutes of meetings. The minutes must record the date, time and venue of the meeting; the names of those members present; identification of the chairperson; apologies tendered and accepted; arrival and departure times of members; any failure of a quorum; a list
of speakers in the public forum and the topics they cover; a list of items considered; resolutions and amendments pertaining to those items; any objections to words used; all divisions taken; names of any members requesting the recording of their abstentions or votes; declarations of pecuniary interest; contempt, censure and removal of any members; resolutions to exclude members of the public; and the time that the meeting concludes or adjourns (see Standing Orders 2.16.3, 3.3.15, 3.5.3, 3.6.3, 3.8.4, 3.14.4, 3.14.5 and 3.14.11).

No discussion on minutes

3.17.3
No discussion may arise on the substance of minutes at any succeeding meeting, except as to their correctness.

3.18 MINUTE BOOKS

Inspection of minute books

3.18.1
The minute books of the local authority must be kept by the chief executive and be open to inspection in accordance with the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the Local Government Act (see Standing Order 2.15.13 and 2.15.14).

[see 51, LGOIMA]

Minutes of last meeting before election

3.18.2
The chairperson and the chief executive shall authenticate the minutes of the last meeting of a local authority prior to the next election of members.

3.19 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

Deputations where heard

3.19.1
Deputations may be received by the local authority or any of its committees provided an application for admission setting forth the subject has been lodged with the chief executive at least two working days before the date of the meeting concerned, and has been subsequently approved by the chairperson. The chairperson may refuse requests for deputations which are repetitious or offensive.

Urgency or major public interest

3.19.2
Notwithstanding Standing Order 3.19.1, where in the opinion of the chairperson the matter which is the subject of a deputation is one of urgency or major public interest, the chairperson may determine that the deputation be received.

Deputations and presentations in English or Maori

3.19.3
A deputation or presentation to a local authority or any of its committees may be made in English or Maori. Prior arrangement with the chairperson should be sought at least two working days before the meeting if the address is not in English. The chairperson may order that any speech or document presented be translated and/or printed in another language.
### Procedures for deputations

**3.19.4**

Except with the approval of the local authority or committee, not more than two members of a deputation may address the meeting. After a presentation is received, members may put to the deputation any question pertinent to the subject heard, but no member may express an opinion upon, or discuss the subject, until the deputation has completed making its submissions and answering questions (see Standing Order 3.15.2 regarding qualified privilege).

### Termination of presentation if disrespectful

**3.19.5**

The chairperson may terminate a presentation in progress which is disrespectful or offensive, or where the chairperson has reason to believe that statements have been made with malice (see Standing Order 3.15.2 regarding qualified privilege).

### Time limit on presentation

**3.19.6**

Unless the meeting determines otherwise in any particular case, a limit of 10 minutes is placed on a speaker making a presentation, or if there are two members of the deputation addressing the meeting, 10 minutes in total for the two speakers.

###Petitions

### Form of petitions

**3.20.1**

Every petition presented to the local authority or to any of its committees must comprise fewer than 50 words (not including signatories) and not be disrespectful, nor use offensive language or include statements made with malice (see Standing Orders 3.15.1 and 3.15.2 regarding qualified privilege).

### Petition where presented by members

**3.20.2**

Any member of the local authority, who presents a petition on behalf of the petitioners, is to confine himself/herself to reading the petition and the statement of the parties from which it comes, and the number of signatures attached to it.

### Petition in English or Maori

**3.20.3**

A petition presented to a local authority or any of its committees may be in English or Maori. Prior arrangement with the chairperson should be sought at least two working days before the meeting if the petition is not in English. The chairperson may order that any petition be translated and/or printed in another language.

### Petition where presented by petitioner

**3.20.4**

Where a petition is presented by a petitioner, unless the local authority determines otherwise, a limit of five minutes is placed on that person (see Standing Orders 3.15.1 and 3.15.2 regarding qualified privilege). If the chairperson has reason to believe that the petitioner is disrespectful or offensive, or has made statements with malice, the chairperson shall terminate presentation of the petition.
3.21 Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions to officers during debate</th>
<th>3.21.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the course of any debate at any local authority meeting, any member may, at the chairperson’s discretion, ask any question of the relevant officer on any matter under debate. Such questions are to be directed through the chair.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions to be in writing</th>
<th>3.21.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questions shall be in writing and handed to the chairperson prior to the commencement of the meeting at which they are to be asked and in time for an appropriate answer to be prepared.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions may be deferred</th>
<th>3.21.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If an answer to the question cannot be given at that meeting it shall, at the discretion of the Chairperson, be placed on the agenda for the next local authority meeting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions to be concise</th>
<th>3.21.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questions and answers shall be submitted as briefly and concisely as possible. No discussion shall be allowed upon any question or upon the answer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

GROUNDS TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC FROM MEETINGS IN TERMS OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT OFFICIAL INFORMATION AND MEETINGS ACT 1987

(Normative)

A local authority may by resolution exclude the public from the whole or any part of the proceedings of any meeting only on one or more of the following grounds:

A1 That the public conduct of the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information where such disclosure would be likely:

(a) To prejudice the maintenance of the law, including the prevention, investigation, and detection of offences, and the right to a fair trial; or

(b) To endanger the safety of any person.

A2 That the public conduct of the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information where the withholding of the information is necessary to:

(a) Protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of deceased natural persons; or

(b) Protect information where the making available of the information:

(i) Would disclose a trade secret or

(ii) Would be likely unreasonably to prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied or who is the subject of the information; or

(c) In the case only of an application for a resource consent, or water conservation order, or a requirement for a designation or heritage order, under the Resource Management Act 1991, to avoid serious offence to tikanga Maori, or to avoid the disclosure of the location of wahi tapu; or

(d) Protect information which is subject to an obligation of confidence or which any person has been or could be compelled to provide under the authority of any enactment, where the making available of the information:

(i) Would be likely to prejudice the supply of similar information, or information from the same source, and it is in the public interest that such information should continue to be supplied or

(ii) Would be likely otherwise to damage the public interest; or

(e) Avoid prejudice to measures protecting the health or safety of members of the public; or

(f) Avoid prejudice to measures that prevent or mitigate material loss to members of the public; or

(g) Maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through the protection of members, officers or employees of any local authority from improper pressure or harassment; or

(h) Maintain legal professional privilege; or

(i) Enable the local authority holding the information to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities; or
(j) Enable the local authority holding the information to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations); or

(k) Prevent the disclosure or use of official information for improper gain or improper advantage.

Provided that where A2 of this Appendix applies the public may be excluded, unless, in the circumstances of the particular case, the exclusion of the public is outweighed by other considerations which render it desirable, in the public interest, that the public not be excluded.

A3 That the public conduct of the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information, the public disclosure of which would:

(a) Be contrary to the provisions of a specified enactment; or

(b) Constitute contempt of Court or of the House of Representatives.

A4 That the purpose of the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting is to consider a recommendation made to the local authority by an Ombudsman under section 30(1) or section 38(3) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (in the case of a local authority named or specified in the First Schedule to this Act).

A5 That the exclusion of the public from the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting is necessary to enable the local authority to deliberate in private on its decision or recommendation in:

(a) Any proceedings before a local authority where:

(i) A right of appeal lies to any Court or Tribunal against the final decision of the local authority in those proceedings or

(ii) The local authority is required, by any enactment, to make a recommendation in respect of the matter that is the subject of those proceedings; and

(b) Any proceedings of a local authority in relation to any application or objection under the Marine Farming Act 1971.
APPENDIX B

SAMPLE RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

(Informative)


I move 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>1.</td>
<td>Report of the Chair of the Finance Committee</td>
<td>Appointment of Directors – District Services Limited</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Minutes of the In Committee portion of the Utilities and Roading meeting of 16 June 2006</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>3.</td>
<td>Report of the Manager Community and Recreation</td>
<td>Building naming rights</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Report of the Council Hearings Panel</td>
<td>Recommendation on Submissions to Variation 100 to Proposed District Plan</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>Protection of privacy of natural persons</th>
<th>Conduct of negotiations</th>
<th>Protection of privacy of natural persons To carry out commercial activities without prejudice</th>
<th>Prevention of improper advantage</th>
<th>Ref NZS 9202:2003 Appendix A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2)(i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A2(a) A2(b)ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2)(k)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE –

Section 48(4) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 provides as follows:

“(4) Every resolution to exclude the public shall be put at a time when the meeting is open to the public, and the text of that resolution (or copies thereof):

(a) Shall be available to any member of the public who is present; and

(b) Shall form part of the minutes of the local authority.”
APPENDIX C
POWERS OF THE CHAIRPERSON

(Normative)

This Appendix is intended to separately set out the chairperson’s powers which are contained in various parts of the Model Standing Orders.

The provisions in the Model Standing Orders shall be authoritative. The relevant Model Standing Orders are referred to in brackets.

C1 Chairperson to decide all questions
The chairperson is to decide all questions where these standing orders make no provision or insufficient provision. The chairperson’s ruling is final and not open to debate.
(See Standing Order 3.3.2)

C2 Chairperson to decide points of order
The chairperson is to decide any point of order and may do so immediately after it has been raised or may first hear further argument before deciding. The ruling of the chairperson upon any point of order is not open to any discussion and is final. No point of order may be raised during a division except by permission of the chairperson.
(See Standing Orders 3.13.3 and 3.13.6)

C3 Items not on the agenda
Major items not on the agenda may be dealt with at that meeting if so resolved by the local authority and the chairperson explains at the meeting at a time when it is open to the public the reason why the item was not listed on the agenda and the reason why discussion of the item cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting.

Minor matters not on the agenda relating to the general business of the local authority may be discussed if the chairperson explains at the beginning of the meeting, at a time when it is open to the public, that the item will be discussed at that meeting, but no resolution, decision or recommendation may be made in respect of that item except to refer it to a subsequent meeting.
(See Standing Order 3.7.5)

C4 Chairperson’s report
The chairperson, by report, has the right to direct the attention of the local authority to any matter or subject within the role or function of the local authority.
(See Standing Order 3.7.4 & 3.7.5.1)

C5 Chairperson’s recommendation
The chairperson of any meeting may include on the agenda for that meeting a chairperson’s recommendation regarding any item brought before the meeting. The purpose of such a recommendation is to focus debate on a suggested motion.
(See Standing Order 3.7.6)

C6 Chairperson’s voting
The chairperson at any meeting has a deliberative vote and, in the case of equality of votes, does not have a casting vote unless expressly provided for in these Standing Orders.

NOTE – Where a local authority wishes to have a casting vote it should refer to Appendix H for alternative wording for this Standing Order. When adopting, amending or suspending Standing Orders to provide for a casting vote clause 27, Schedule 7 of the Local Government Act 2002 applies.
(See Standing Order 2.5.1)
C7  Motion in writing
The chairperson may require the mover of any motion or amendment to submit it in writing signed by the mover.
(See Standing Order 3.9.4)

C8  Motion in parts
The chairperson may require any motion expressed in parts to be decided part by part.
(See Standing Order 3.9.5)

C9  Notice of motion
The chairperson may direct the chief executive to refuse to accept any notice of motion which:

(a)  Is disrespectful or which contains offensive language or statements made with malice; or

(b)  Is not within the scope of the role or functions of the local authority; or

(c)  Contains an ambiguity or statement of fact or opinion which cannot properly form part of an effective resolution, and the mover has declined to comply with such requirements as the chief executive may have made; or

(d)  Is concerned with matters which are already the subject of reports or recommendations from a committee to the meeting concerned.

Reasons for refusing a notice of motion should be provided to the proposer.

Where a notice of motion has been considered and agreed by the local authority, no notice of any other motion which is, in the opinion of the chairperson, to the same effect may be put again whilst such original motion stands.
(See Standing Orders 3.10.2 and 3.11.3)

C10  Action on previous resolutions
If in the opinion of the chairperson the practical effect of a delay in taking action on a resolution which is subject to a notice of motion, until the proposed notice of motion has been dealt with by the local authority, would be equivalent to revocation of the resolution, or if repetitive notices of motion are considered by the chairperson to be an attempt by a minority to frustrate the will of the local authority, action may be taken as though no such notice had been given.
(See Standing Order 3.19.16)

C11  Repeat notice of motion
If in the opinion of the chairperson a notice of motion is substantially the same in purport and effect to any previous notice of motion which has been considered and rejected by the local authority, no such notice of motion may be accepted within six months of consideration of the first notice of motion unless signed by not less than one-third of the members of the local authority, including vacancies.
(See Standing Order 3.11.1)

C12  Revocation or alteration of previous resolution
A chairperson may recommend in a report to the local authority the revocation or alteration of all or part of any resolution previously passed, and the local authority meeting may act on such a recommendation.
(See Standing Order 3.9.18)

C13  Chairperson may call a meeting
The chairperson:
(a) May call a meeting to dispose of the business to be transacted following the lapping of a meeting due to failure of a quorum, if such business cannot be delayed until the next meeting;

(b) May requisition an extraordinary meeting to be held at a specified time and place, in order to conduct specified business.

(See Standing Orders 3.5.2, 2.14.1 and 2.14.2)

C14 Irrelevant matter and needless repetition
The chairperson’s ruling preventing members when speaking to any motion or amendment from introducing irrelevant matters or indulging in needless repetition is final and not open to challenge.
(See Standing Order 3.8.2)

C15 Taking down words
The chairperson may order words used and objected to by any member to be recorded in the minutes, provided such objection is made at the time the words are used and not after any other members have spoken.
(See Standing Order 3.8.4)

C16 Reading of speeches
The chairperson may permit members who request permission to do so, to read their speeches.
(See Standing Order 3.8.5)

C17 Explanations
The chairperson may permit members to make a personal explanation in addition to speaking to a motion, and members who have already spoken, to explain some material part of a previous speech in the same debate.
(See Standing Orders 3.8.12 and 3.8.13)

C18 Chairperson rising
Whenever the chairperson rises during a debate any member then speaking or offering to speak is to be seated and members are to be silent so that the chairperson may be heard without interruption.
(See Standing Order 3.3.3)

C19 Members may leave places
The chairperson may permit members to leave their place while speaking.
(See Standing Order 3.3.4)

C20 Priority of speakers
The chairperson shall determine the order in which members may speak when two or more members indicate their wish to speak.
(See Standing Order 3.3.5)

C21 Minutes
The chairperson is to sign the minutes and proceedings of every meeting once confirmed. The chairperson and chief executive are responsible for confirming the correctness of the minutes of the last meeting of a local authority prior to the next election of members.
(See Standing Orders 3.17.1 and 3.18.2)

C22 Questions of speakers
The chairperson may permit members to ask questions of speakers under public forum or tangata whenua participation, for the purpose of obtaining information or clarification on matters raised by the speaker.
(See Appendices F4 and G5.)
C23 Withdrawal of offensive or malicious expressions

(a) The chairperson may call upon any member to withdraw any offensive or malicious expression and may require the member to apologise for the expression.  
(See Standing Order 3.3.11)

(b) Any member who refuses to withdraw the expression or apologise, if required by the chairperson, can be directed to withdraw from the meeting for a time specified by the chairperson.  
(See Standing Order 3.3.12)

C24 Chairperson's rulings

Any member who refuses to accept a ruling of the chairperson may be required by the chairperson to withdraw from the meeting for a specified time.  
(See Standing Orders 3.1.1 and 3.3.2)

C25 Disorderly behaviour

The chairperson may:

(a) Require any member or member of the public whose conduct is disorderly or who is creating a disturbance, to withdraw immediately from the meeting for a time specified by the chairperson.  
(See Standing Orders 3.3.13 and 3.16.1)

(b) Ask the meeting to hold in contempt, any member whose conduct is grossly disorderly and where the meeting resolves to find the member in contempt, that resolution must be recorded in the minutes.  
(See Standing Orders 3.3.14 and 3.3.15)

C26 Failure to leave meeting

If a member or member of the public who is required, in accordance with a chairperson’s ruling, to leave the meeting, refuses or fails to do so, or having left the meeting, attempts to re-enter without the permission of the chairperson, any member of the police or officer or employee of the local authority may, at the chairperson’s request, remove or exclude that person from the meeting.  
(See Standing Orders 3.3.16 and 3.16.2)
# APPENDIX E

## TABLE OF PROCEDURAL MOTIONS

(Standards for Normative)
(See Standing Orders 3.12.1 to 3.12.12 and 3.13.1 to 3.13.6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motion</th>
<th>Has the Chair discretion to refuse this motion?</th>
<th>Is seconder required?</th>
<th>Is discussion in order?</th>
<th>Are amendments in order?</th>
<th>Is mover of procedural motion entitled to reply?</th>
<th>Are previous participants in debate entitled to move this motion?</th>
<th>Can a speaker be interrupted by the mover of this motion?</th>
<th>If lost, can motion be moved after an interval?</th>
<th>Position if an amendment is already before the Chair</th>
<th>Position if a procedural motion is already before the Chair</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) &quot;That the meeting be adjourned to the next meeting, or to a stated time and place.&quot;</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>As to time and date only</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes – 15 minutes</td>
<td>If carried, debate on the original motion and amendment are adjourned</td>
<td>If carried, debate on the original motion and procedural motion are adjourned.</td>
<td>On resumption of debate, the mover of the adjournment speaks first. Members who have already spoken in the debate may not speak again.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) &quot;That the item of business being discussed be adjourned to a stated time and place.&quot;</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>As to time and date only</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes – 15 minutes</td>
<td>If carried, debate on the original motion and amendment are adjourned</td>
<td>If carried, debate on the original motion and procedural motion are adjourned.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) &quot;That the motion under debate be now put (closure motion).&quot;</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes – 15 minutes</td>
<td>If carried, only the amendment is put.</td>
<td>If carried, only the procedural motion is put.</td>
<td>The mover of the motion under debate is entitled to exercise a right of reply before the motion or amendment under debate is put.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion</td>
<td>Has the Chair discretion to refuse this motion?</td>
<td>Is seconder required?</td>
<td>Is discussion in order?</td>
<td>Are amendments in order?</td>
<td>Are mover of procedural motion entitled to reply?</td>
<td>Are previous participants in debate entitled to move this motion?</td>
<td>Can a speaker be interrupted by the mover of this motion?</td>
<td>If lost, can motion be moved after an interval?</td>
<td>Position if an amendment is already before the Chair</td>
<td>Position if a procedural motion is already before the Chair</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) “That the meeting move directly to the next business, superseding the item under discussion.”</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes – 15 minutes</td>
<td>If carried, debate on the original motion and amendment are adjourned.</td>
<td>If carried, debate on the original motion and procedural motion are adjourned.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) “That the item of business being discussed does lie on the table and not be further discussed at this meeting.”</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes – 15 minutes</td>
<td>If carried, the original motion and amendment are both laid on the table.</td>
<td>Motion not in order.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) “That the item of business being discussed be referred to the relevant committee.”</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>As to committee, time for reporting back etc. only.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes – 15 minutes</td>
<td>If carried, the original motion and all amendments are referred to the committee.</td>
<td>If carried, the procedural motion is deemed disposed of.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) “Points of order.”</td>
<td>No – but may rule against.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes – at discretion of Chairperson.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Point of order takes precedence</td>
<td>Point of order takes precedence</td>
<td>See Standing Orders 3.13.1 to 3.13.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX F

### PUBLIC FORUM

(Informative)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>F1</strong></th>
<th><strong>Public forum</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A period of up to 30 minutes, or such other time as the local authority may determine, will be set aside for a public forum at the commencement of meetings of the local authority, committee and subcommittee meetings which are open to the public. Each speaker during the public forum section of a meeting may speak for three minutes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>F2</strong></th>
<th><strong>Time extension</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standing orders may be suspended on a vote of not less than 75% of those present, to extend the period of public participation or the period any speaker is allowed to speak.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>F3</strong></th>
<th><strong>Subjects of public forum</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In respect of local authority, committee and subcommittee meetings, the public forum is to be confined to those items falling within the terms of reference of that meeting, provided the matter is not sub-judice.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

    NOTE – The public forum procedure does not apply in respect of any hearing, including the hearing of submissions where the local authority, committee or subcommittee sits in a quasi-judicial capacity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>F4</strong></th>
<th><strong>Questions of speakers during public forum</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With the permission of the chairperson, members may ask questions of speakers during the period reserved for public forum. If permitted by the chairperson, questions by members are to be confined to obtaining information or clarification on matters raised by the speaker.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G
ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS FOR TANGATA WHENUA

(Informative)

G1  Tangata whenua representation at meetings
Where representatives of the tangata whenua identify any item on the agenda for a meeting of a local authority, committee or subcommittee which the tangata whenua wish to discuss, they may attend the meeting for that purpose. These provisions do not apply to any meeting of a local authority, committee or subcommittee which is sitting in a quasi-judicial capacity in respect of any matter to be heard.

G2  Speaking rights in addition to public forum
The right to speak at meetings of the local authority conferred by these provisions are in addition to and separate from those rights of a public forum available in terms of Appendix F.

G3  Tangata whenua representation at committees and subcommittees
Where representatives of the tangata whenua have, in accordance with clause F1, identified items they wish to discuss at a meeting, they may be represented by such number of representatives as is equal to the number of permanent members of that committee or subcommittee who are present at that meeting.

G4  Tangata whenua speaking time
Representatives of the tangata whenua shall have the right to address any meeting of the local authority, committee or subcommittee for a period of 15 minutes in total on any item or issue which has been identified or initiated by the tangata whenua and listed for consideration at a meeting.

G5  Questions of speakers during tangata whenua participation
With the permission of the chairperson, members may ask questions of representatives of the tangata whenua. If permitted by the chairperson, questions by members are to be confined to obtaining information or clarification on matters raised by the speaker.

NOTE – The term “tangata whenua” is not mentioned in the Local Government Act 2002. The Act refers to “Maori”.


APPENDIX H
PROVISION FOR CASTING VOTE
(Normative)

Where a local authority wishes to have a casting vote replace Standing Order 3.14.2(b) with “in the case of equality of votes the chairperson has a casting vote”.

NOTE – When adopting, amending or suspending Standing Orders to provide for a casting vote clause 27, Schedule 7 of the Local Government Act 2002 applies.
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT

FILE NO and TRIM NO: RGN-02-01/170908097449

REPORT TO: Regeneration Steering Group

DATE OF MEETING: 6 November 2017

FROM: Duncan Roxborough, Implementation Project Manager – District Regeneration

SUBJECT: District Regeneration – Draft Road Stopping Plans for The Pines Beach

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

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to seek approval for the proposed decommissioning of a stopping of two redundant roads and an associated walkway in The Pines Beach Regeneration Area; being Clarke Avenue, Hood Avenue, and Lindsay Lane walkway that are eventually located within the expanded Tīhātara Coastal Park area.

1.2. Council and the Regeneration Steering Group and have already approved and endorses the stopping of Kay Avenue (West of Dunns Avenue) in The Pines Beach Regeneration Area under a previous road stopping proposal report.

1.3. The walkway removal proposal (Lindsay Lane) included within this report is a departure from the land-use maps included within the Recovery Plan.

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Regeneration Steering Group recommends:

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No.170908097449.

(b) Approves the physical removal and legal road stopping of Hood Avenue and Clar Avenue in The Pines Beach Regeneration Area.

(c) Approves the physical removal and revoking of the reserve status of Lindsay Lane walkway (off the end of Clarke Avenue), and the divesting of this land of approximat 250 m² area to the Crown at no cost.

(d) Notes that the road stopping and reserve revocation process for Regeneration Areas proposed to be undertaken through collaboration with Land Information New Zealand (LINZ) utilising the provisions of the Greater Christchurch Regeneration Act 2016 (GCR Act), and the physical removal works are subject to a cost share agreement between Crown and Council.

(e) Notes that under the terms of the existing Cost Share Agreement with the Crown, land arising from the legal stopping of redundant roads, with Waimakariri District Council as the registered proprietor, will be divested to the Crown at nil cost to the Crown.
(f) Approves staff working with the Trust to establish a memorandum of understanding for potential future walkway reinstatement over Coastal Park land.

(g) Circulates a copy of this report to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board.

3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. Background

3.1.1. Staff have been working on strategies for proposed road stopping and physical removal of redundant roads in the five regeneration areas of Kaiapoi West, Kaiapoi South, Kaiapoi East, The Pines Beach, and Kairaki. This has included the participation of the Roading Manager and the Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery Steering Group.

3.1.2. A previous report to the Regeneration Steering Group (Trim: 170823090835[v2]) has outlined the proposals for the 3 Kaiapoi regeneration areas (noting that Kairaki has no proposed road stopping or road removal).

3.1.3. The previous road stopping report also addressed the stopping of the redundant section of Kay Avenue (West of Dunns Avenue) in The Pines Beach Regeneration Area.

3.1.4. The previous report noted that two redundant roads at The Pines Beach Regeneration Area are located within an area of Crown-owned former red-zone land that no longer provides access to private properties. This block of Crown-owned land, encompassing the two roads in question, will be divested directly from the Crown to the Te Kōhaka o Tūhātara Trust, to become part of the expanded Tūhātara Coastal Park. It was noted and agreed at the Regeneration Steering Group meeting when the previous reports were considered, that further engagement with the Te Kōhaka o Tūhātara Trust was required in order to establish the Trust’s intended use of the land, so that Council could consider those plans alongside their own plans for the roads and confirm which (if any) of the affected roads should be legally stopped.

3.1.5. One of the roads considered, Clarke Avenue, was a no-through road, with a continuation via walkway linkage between Reid Memorial Avenue and Chichester Place. This is diagrammatically shown in Figure 1 overleaf which is an extract from Waimap GIS showing property boundaries. The walkway linkage currently sits on land owned by WDC (shown as #9 Clarke Avenue), with reserve status.

3.1.6. More definition around the actual outline boundaries of the blocks of regeneration land that will become part of the Coastal Park is included within the maps in the Recovery Plan.
3.2. Discussion on Lindsay Lane Walkway

3.2.1. Council's previous outline plans for the site in question were to physically remove and legally stop Hood Ave; and physically remove and partially legal stop Clark Ave, whilst retaining the walkway linkage reserve and linking it to the retained partial road reserve (thereby maintaining a protected walkway linkage). The walkway linkage is known as Lindsay Lane and provides a walking/cycling link between Reid Memorial Reserve and the Pines Oval (and the new Pinx Beach community hall). The walkway provides a key linkage between the Kairaki community and The Pines Beach which is generally separate from the road.

3.2.2. Staff and the Regeneration portfolio holder were invited to attend the Te Kōhā o Tūhātara Trust meeting on Wednesday 6 September to discuss the Trust plans for the area of land which will be divested from the Crown to the Trust. The Pines Beach. This area comprises a number of Crown-owned form private properties that were 'red-zoned', along with a small section of WDC land (under the walkway), and redundant roads.

3.2.3. The Trust have advised that their intentions for this particular site is to potentially build an education centre or field research station, and to form a 'gateway' entrance into the coastal park. The Trust have advised that other uses on this site (including any underlying road reserve) would potentially impede the Trust effective use of this site. The Trust preference was for all legal road corridors or other encumbrances on the site to be uplifted or removed.
3.2.4. If Lindsay Lane were to be closed and legally removed; then alternative routes for a walkway linkage between Reid Memorial Avenue and the Pines Oval do still exist. These could possibly use the existing Dunns Avenue road corridor, or the (yet to be formed) recreation and ecological linkage land to the west of Dunns Avenue; although it was noted that these routes are not as direct as Lindsay Lane and do not follow direct desire lines.

3.2.5. Following discussion at the Regeneration Project Control Group (PCG) and consideration of the foregoing information, it was recommended by the PCG that Clarke Avenue, and the Lindsay Lane walkway reserve section, be physically removed and legally stopped/uplifted in its entirety. It was noted that if Lindsay Lane were effectively relinquished, then a separate walkway connection between Kairaki and the Pines Beach will still be required.

3.2.6. Removal of the Lindsay Lane walkway in order to achieve the desired outcomes above would also require the uplifting of the reserve status on the land parcel under the walkway. This would be done under the GCR Act.

3.2.7. There may still be an opportunity for a walkway linkage via the expanded Coastal Park land, which would not be able to be confirmed until the Trust have advanced their design plans further. If a walkway were to be formed across the future Trust land then this could be protected via an easement, subject to future agreement (this type of arrangement in principle was discussed at the meeting with the Trust on Wednesday 6 September 2017).

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. Community views were sought extensively throughout the development of the Waimakariri Residential Red Zone Recovery Plan. During this process the maps consulted on, and ultimately included in the Recovery Plan, showed the retention of the Lindsay Lane walkway. The proposal outlined in this report to close Lindsay Lane walkway is a departure from the maps that were included within the Recovery Plan.

4.2. The views of the Pines Kairaki Residents Association of any proposed changes to the walkway and linkage configuration have not been sought.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. Financial

5.1.1. There is a financial cost associated with the physical removal and legal stopping of redundant roads. A provision for decommissioning of redundant roads in the regeneration areas was made in the Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery Programme budget, which would be intended to include removal of these affected roads at The Pines Beach.

5.1.2. Physical road removal works are covered by a cost share agreement with the Crown, with the Crown contributing 60% to the cost of removing redundant roads. In total – the Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery Programme has a total allowance of $3M for removal of redundant roads in all five of the regeneration areas. This budget provision would cover the removal of the roads at The Pines Beach.

5.1.3. The legal stopping and reserve uplift process will be undertaken by Land Information New Zealand (LINZ) on behalf of the Crown, including any associated survey work.
5.1.4. Provision was made in the 2015 – 2025 LTP budgets for general walkway upgrades in the area of Reid Memorial Reserve, including allowance for an upgrade to Lindsay Lane. This provision would no longer be used on Lindsay Lane, but could possibly be partially reappropriated to the construction of a new walkway.

5.1.5. Establishment of alternative walkway routes may cost more in total than retention and upgrade of Lindsay Lane; due to new walkway routes needing more work to establish from scratch, plus the likelihood of these alternative walkways being of longer total length with additional features needed due to road proximity and crossings.

5.1.6. As per the other roads being stopped in other regeneration areas; when existing legal roads are stopped, a new legal title will need to be created for the underlying land (subject to survey), with WDC as registered proprietor. Terms of the divestment agreement between the Crown and Council, are separately between the Crown and the Trust (as eventual land owners), and outline what happens with these parcels of land in terms of transfer of legal ownership. Any divestment terms will be subject to approval of Council following staff and legal reviews.

5.1.7. In principle, the land arising from the road stopping would be divested (if not automatically acquired under the current Cost Share agreement) from WDC to Crown, at no cost, subject to Council approval.

5.1.8. The land parcel that forms Lindsay Lane is not road reserve, so would not automatically vest to the Crown under the Cost Share Agreement. A Council resolution is required in order to divest this land to the Crown.

5.1.9. The Crown through their agent Land Information New Zealand (LINZ) would the amalgamate the former WDC owned land and road reserves with the surrounding Crown-owned former private properties, before divesting the complete block of amalgamated land (including the former WDC roads) directly to the Trust.

5.1.10. The simplified outline process generally would therefore be:

- Regeneration Steering group consideration and recommendation (th report)
- Consultation – (if required)
- Council decision
- Physical Survey (by LINZ)
- Road stopping process (by LINZ, using GCR Act)
- Reserve revocation
- WDC Land divests to Crown (WDC/LINZ)
- Crown / LINZ amalgamate land into larger block (LINZ)
- Crown divests land to Te Kohaka o Tuhaitara Trust
- WDC make alternative walkway provision (including possible reinstatement over the Coastal Park in a new position, possible protected by an easemen
5.2. **Risk**

5.2.1. The stopping of Hood Avenue, Clarke Avenue, and Kay Avenue (west of Dunns Avenue) were implied in the plans attached to the Recovery Plan; however the removal of the Lindsay Lane walkway between Reid Memorial Avenue and Chichester Place would be an amendment to the Recovery Plan.

5.2.2. Any change or refinement to the Recovery Plan would require agreement from the Minister supporting Greater Christchurch Regeneration. As part of the process, Council may need to demonstrate the degree of community consultation undertaken on the proposed change. There is also now a new appointment to the Minister supporting Greater Christchurch Regeneration.

5.2.3. Removing the legal status of Lynsday Lane and Clarke Avenue may place a limitation on future options (or feasibility) for a walkway establishment via the future Trust land. It may be prudent to seek a Memorandum of Understanding from the Trust seeking a safeguarding of a route in future across the Trust lands for a public walkway. It is noted however that alternative routes, using WDC owned land (post-Crown divestment) or road corridors do exist for establishment of an alternative route walkway linking The Pines Beach and Kairaki via Featherstone Reserve.

6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. **Policy**

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

6.2. **Legislation**

- Greater Christchurch Regeneration Act 2016
- Reserves Act 1977
- Local Government Act 2002

6.3. **Community Outcomes**

- There is a safe environment for all.
- Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality
- Core utility services are provided in a timely, sustainable and affordable manner
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT

FILE NO and TRIM NO: RGN-05-04-01 / 171018112971

REPORT TO: Regeneration Steering Group

DATE OF MEETING: 6 November 2017

FROM Kevin Dwyer, Landscape Architect – District Regeneration

SUBJECT: Kaiapoi Wharf and Marine Precinct
Riverview Terraces and Boardwalk – Progress Update and Design Options

SIGNED BY:
Department Manager
Chief Executive

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to update the Regeneration Steering Group on progress, the design of the Riverview Terraces and Boardwalk, including presentation of preliminary design options for the overall design, and wording options to be integrated with the terraces design.

Attachments:
   i. Riverview Terraces and Boardwalk Options Plans - TRIM No. 171026115714
      • Option A: Terraces with accessible ramps
      • Option B: Terraces without accessible ramps
      • Perspective Drawings of Option A

2. RECOMMENDATION

   THAT the Regeneration Steering Group recommends that the Council:
   (a) Receives report No. 171018112971
   (b) Approves Option A, with accessible ramps to the lower deck level, as the preferred design option to progress through to detailed design and procurement of a contractor for construction Options Plans - TRIM No. 171026115714
   (c) Approves Poem Option 1 as the preferred poem to be integrated with the terraces design

3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. Riverview Terraces and Boardwalk design progress

3.1.1. Preliminary Civil and Structural Design has been completed by Kirk Robe Consulting Engineers.

3.1.2. Detailed Civil and Structural design can proceed once the preferred terrace design option is confirmed.

3.1.3. Matapopore will be engaged for integration of cultural values in the design. Initial design meeting has already taken place.
3.2. **Design Options**

Two architectural options are being presented for consideration by the RSG (refer to attachments):

- Option A - With accessible ramps to the lower deck level
- Option B - Generally as presented at the RSG meeting (3 July 2017)

Comparison of options for the Riverview Terraces and Boardwalk:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Overall Length</th>
<th>Terraces Length</th>
<th>River Edge - Lower Deck Length</th>
<th>Total Terrace Seating Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (with ramps)</td>
<td>45m</td>
<td>27m</td>
<td>36m</td>
<td>102m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (no ramps)</td>
<td>36m</td>
<td>33m</td>
<td>33m</td>
<td>129m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3. Option A with accessible ramps, includes the following key differences to Option B:

- The length of the overall structure increases by 9m
- The length of structure occupied by terracing decreases by 6m
- The length of the lower level deck increases by 3m
- The total length of terrace seating decreases by 27m from 129m to 102m
- Ramped access to the lower deck

3.4. Benefits of Option A with accessible ramps includes:

- Accessible access to the lower deck level / river edge
- Easier access for disabled, elderly, prams, bikes
- Easier access for loading/unloading people and equipment from the future pontoons
- The overall terrace/ramp structure extends the full length of the adjacent boardwalk
- The proposed ramps would be the only accessible pedestrian/wheelchair access to the river edge within the Kaiapoi Marine Precinct

3.5. Benefits of Option B without accessible ramps include:

- Less cost to build
- Simpler construction

3.6. There is no change to the amount of boardwalk/upper deck area or boardwalk seating between the two options

3.7. The accessible ramp access from Williams Street has changed from that presented to the RSG at the last terraces update. The current design has a shorter ramp with the ramp threshold nearer to the Williams Street Bridge and connection with the riverbanks walkway to the west. This applies to both Option A and Option B.
3.8. There is potential for wording to be incorporated in the terrace design, onto the terraces vertical faces. Two poems that were shortlisted from a ‘You, Me, We Us’ competition initially intended for use on with the Kalapoi Town Centre seats, could now be used for the terraces. These are as follows:

3.8.1. Poem Option 1

Let the river run forever
Through floods and quakes
We stand together

3.8.2. Poem Option 2

Lest we forget
The white marble soldier surviving
The war of endless aftershocks

3.8.3. The staff’s recommendation is to use Poem Option 1

3.8.4. The wording would be sandblasted onto the face of the terraces, and therefore could be done after completion of the terraces if required.

3.8.5. Staff are seeking confirmation of the Regeneration Steering Group’s preferred wording option. It is noted that if neither option is preferred, then a new process for obtaining wording options could be considered.

3.9. Design input integrating cultural values is to be provided by the Matapopore Trust. At an initial meeting between WDC staff and Matapopore designers, the following elements were identified that could be included in the design:

- Pattern or motif cast or sandblasted onto concrete terrace or wall faces
- Paving patterns using unit pavers on ramps
- Planting
- Etching on timber or concrete surfaces
- Placement of boulders at strategic locations

3.10. Proposed incorporation of cultural artistic/design elements will be presented to the Regeneration Steering Group for consideration.

3.11. The proposed pontoons are intended to run parallel with the lower level deck where they are adjacent to the deck. At the eastern (downstream) end of the deck, the pontoon layout is intended to change alignment to run parallel with the river wall. The transition between alignments would need to be considered in the pontoons detailed design.

3.12. An application for exemption from Building Consent has yet to be lodged. The terraces design and construction will be required to comply with NZ Building Code regulations.
3.13. The Management Team/CE has reviewed this report and supports the recommendations.

4. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

4.1. Feedback from the staff presentation of the terrace design at the Waimakariri Access Group meeting 13 June 2017 was generally that accessible access should be provided to the lower level of the terraces by the river wall. Jill Waldron advised on the 26th October that the group’s preference would be to include ramps if budget allows and it is spatially achievable.

4.2. Carina Duke (representing the Blind Foundation) recommended that an accessible ramp to the lower level should be included.

4.3. Staff have received feedback from members of the public that access to the lower level should be provided if possible.

4.4. Some negative public comment has been received about the lack of accessibility of the library decks and steps on the south bank opposite.

4.5. The draft Waimakariri Accessibility Strategy August 2017 supports public spaces being made accessible. The lower level of the terraces will be a public space that is unique in Kaiapoi and following recommendations of the Strategy, is desirable to be made accessible.

4.6. PLC Developments, represented by Jedd Pearce, have been included in the terraces design development to date, and is in general agreement with the options proposed.

5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

5.1. **Stopbank Rebuild**

Construction of the terraces will follow the rebuild of the existing stopbank by ECan. The proposed new river wall also requires the removal of the stopbank to approximately one metre below the top of the existing wall to enable the installation of tie-back anchors.

ECan will be carrying out the stopbank work to repair earthquake damage.

The stopbank rebuild to accommodate the terraces requires a specific engineered construction methodology, over and above what would normally be done by ECan. This includes higher compaction rates and use of imported aggregate material.

An agreement will need to be made between ECan and WDC for the proportioning of costs for the stopbank work and responsibility for phases of the construction.

As the proportioning of costs has not yet been established, the cost of the bulk stopbank rebuild has been excluded from the Terraces and Boardwalk cost estimates.
5.2. Terraces and Boardwalk Cost Estimates

Estimates for the total project costs have been provided by WT Partnership quantity surveyors using WDC drawings and engineer's preliminary detailed design information for both options as per Point 3.2.

5.2.1. Option A: with accessible ramps to the lower level: $1,615,788

5.2.2. Option B: without accessible ramps: $1,437,457

5.2.3. Estimates are for the total project costs including consents, professional fees, WDC direct costs and a contingency of 20%.

5.2.4. Estimates exclude the stopbank rebuild bulk earthworks by ECAN which will need to be confirmed as per Point 5.1

5.3. The current budget available for the terraces and boardwalk project and landscape works at the Williams Street interface is $1.62m

6. CONTEXT

6.1. Policy

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

6.2. Legislation

RMA 1991
Reserves Act 1977
Building Act 2004

6.3. Community Outcomes

There is a wide variety of public places and spaces to meet people's needs.

There are wide ranging opportunities for people to enjoy the outdoors.

The range and accessibility of community and recreation facilities meets the changing needs of our community.
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT

FILE NO and TRIM NO: RAT-03-01/ 170908097382

REPORT TO: Audit & Risk Committee

DATE OF MEETING: 28 November 2017

FROM: Maree Harris, Customer Services Manager

SUBJECT: Review of Rating Policies (other than the Revenue & Financing Policy)

SIGNED BY: (for Reports to Council or Committees)

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to:

(a) Review the existing rates remission and postponement policies.

(b) Request that the Committee approves a new policy for the Early Payment of Rates in the Current Year for adoption by the Council.

(c) Request that the Committee approves a new policy for Remission of Rates in Miscellaneous Circumstances for adoption by the Council.

1.2. The process for the review is to update the current policies incorporating any changes requested by the Committee at this meeting for inclusion in the 2018-2028 Draft Long Term Plan.

1.3. The policies for consideration are attached.

Attachments:

i. Draft new policy – Discount for the Early Payment of Rates (1711211126330)

ii. Draft new policy – Remission of Rates in Miscellaneous Circumstances (1711211126338)

iii. Existing Rates Remission (1711211126331) and Postponement (1711211126333) Policies

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Audit & Risk Committee:

(a) Receives report No.170908097382

and recommends that the Council:

(b) Approves the adoption of a policy for the early payment of rates in the current financial year (Trim 1711211126330) for consultation in the 2018/28 Draft Long Term Plan to take effect from 1 July 2018.

(c) Approves the adoption of a policy for Remission of Rates in Miscellaneous Circumstances (Trim 1711211126338) for consultation in the 2018/28 Draft Long Term Plan to take effect from 1 July 2018.
(d) **Resolves** to revoke the “Remission of Community Services Charge and Canterbury Museum Levies” policy from 1 July 2018.

(e) **Approves** the continuation of the current Rates Remission and Rates Postponement policies as outlined in this report, with the minor edits noted, for consultation in the 2018/28 Draft Long Term Plan. (Trim 171121126331 Rates Remissions; 171121126333 Rates Postponements).

(f) **Agrees** that the Policy for Remission of Rates on Maori Freehold Land is amended to include remission for conservation purposes.

(g) **Agrees** that the Policy for Remission of Rates on Properties Damaged by the 2010/11 Earthquakes be extended to cover all natural disaster events that renders the property uninhabitable.

(h) **Agrees/Disagrees** that the Policy for Rates Postponement on land used for Primary Production In Residential and Business Zones be extended to include non-farmland moving from the rural zone to a residential or business zone.

(i) **Agrees/Disagrees** that a new rates remission policy be introduced for land that meets paragraph (b) of Section 20 of the Local Government Rating Act, and either paragraph (a) or (c).

3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

3.1. A rates remission is the waiver of all or part of the obligation to pay rates or rates penalties. Rates postponement is an arrangement for the deferral of the payment of rates. The Council may only grant a rates remission or rates postponement if it has adopted a policy to do so and the conditions of the policy are met.

3.2. The Council has a number of rating policies that govern how remissions or postponements are dealt with in the District. These policies are in addition to the Revenue & Financing Policy which outlines the Council’s funding and rating decisions.

3.3. The Local Government Act 2002 requires that Rates Remission and Rates Postponement Policies must be reviewed at least once every 6 years and most are due for review in the 2018 Long Term Plan. The current rating policies were recently reviewed by the Manager, Finance & Business Support, Customer Services Manager and Rates Supervisor and have been re-drafted in the format of the standard policy template. Minor edits have been made to the wording to fit the new template, these are noted below and do not change the meaning or the practical application of the policies.

**Discount Policy**

3.4. The Council’s current practice is to allow a discount for the early payment of rates. The discount applies when the total years rates and any arrears (including rates collected on behalf of Environment Canterbury) are paid in full by the penalty date of the first instalment.

Historically the provision for discount has been included in the rates resolution, however Section 55 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 provides that the Council should also have adopted a policy for the early payment of rates in the current financial year.

The 4% discount on District wide rates is considered to be a reasonable incentive for early payment.

A draft policy is attached.
For the information of the Committee, $138,326.11 of discount was claimed on 1944 properties in the current year. The amount of rates collected early on these properties was $4,534,552.23. The average discount was $71.15 and the median amount $59.41.

**Suggested Changes to Current Policies**

### 3.5 Remission of Community Services Charge and Canterbury Museum Levies

This policy was introduced when the Council had a single Community Services Charge that covered Parks & Reserves, Libraries and Swimming Pools. At that time Community Services rates were remitted on land where a building consent for a dwelling would not be issued, and on land used for community purposes. When the Community Services Charge was split into three separate rates and targeted to residential and business properties the policy was no longer relevant and revocation is recommended.

### 3.6 Remission and Postponement of Rates On Maori Freehold Land

A minor change has been made to the wording to reflect current terminology. “strike” rates is changed to “set and assess”.

This policy may need to be further amended if the Te Ture Whenua Maori Bill becomes law. It got as far as the Committee of the House stage with the previous Government and its future is uncertain.

It has been suggested by an owner of Maori Freehold Land that a remission should be granted where land is used for conservation purposes. This situation involved a mudfish habitat at Oxford.

Environment Canterbury do recognise conservation purposes in their remission policy on Maori Freehold Land. An extract from the Ecan policy states its objectives as:

- to set aside land that is better set aside for non-use because of its natural features (whenua rahui)
- to recognise and take into account the importance of the land for community goals relating to: “the preservation of the natural character of coastal environment”

  “the protection of outstanding natural features”

  “the protection of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitat of indigenous fauna”

There are other remedies available for land that is used for conservation purposes. These remedies also apply to general land. Areas set aside for conservation get relief through lower rating valuations that reflect the limitations on use. Application can also be made to the QEII National Trust to protect special natural and cultural features on land with open space covenants. The Council also makes an annual grant of $100 towards the rates on properties that have designated indigenous vegetation sites listed in the District Plan.

### 3.7 Remission of Penalty Charges

The current practice is to remit an instalment penalty if there have been no penalty remissions in the last four years for that ratepayer on that property. Less emphasis is put on the reason for the late payment,
Clause 6(a) has been updated to make allowance for approved payment plans going beyond the current financial year.

Clause 7, referred to arrears penalty charges applied after 1 July 2014 which is the date this clause took effect. It is no longer relevant and has been removed.

3.9 Remission of Sewer Pan Charges for Schools, Churches and Non-profit Organisations

The calculation of the remission was not clear and has been clarified:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Pans</th>
<th>Amount of Remission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.33% of the annual charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>50% of the annual charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>40% of the annual charge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The requirement for organisations that hold a club or liquor licence to apply annually is removed.

Note: Residential dwellings are limited to one charge, regardless of the number of pans. This applies to the Eastern Districts Sewer rates only.

3.10 Partial Remission on Dwellings in Commercial Zones

This policy is less relevant since the Council moved to capital value rating for value based rates other than Drainage Rates.

Clause 5, “struck” has been changed to “set and assessed” to reflect the current terminology. References to “rateable land value” are changed to “rateable value” as the policy now also relates to rates on capital value.

3.11 Remission of Fixed Charges on Subdivided Sections

This policy has only ever applied to rates for water and sewer so the title has been changed to reflect this. There are a number of fixed charges that are not covered by this policy, eg. Earthquake Recovery Rate and Community Board Rates. Policy section 1. Change “fixed charges for water and sewer” to “rates for water and sewer”. This takes into account that not all water rates are fixed charges.

3.12 Remission on Land Affected by Natural Calamity

The purpose of this policy is to enable the Council to remit rates should a natural disaster occur. In the event of such a disaster, the detail will be added by resolution of Council. No changes are recommended.

3.13 Remission on Properties Damaged by the 2010/11 Canterbury Earthquakes

Clause 8 has been removed as it is no longer relevant. This provided that no new applications would be accepted under previous versions of this policy after 1 July 2014. The Earthquake Recovery Rate has been added to the list of rates that are not subject to a remission under this policy.
The Rates Supervisor recently received an enquiry about rates on a house that was to be demolished following damage from the Kaikoura Earthquake of 2016. As the existing policy specifically refers to the 2010 and 2011 Canterbury Earthquakes, damage from the later earthquake is not covered. (The customer in this case was asked to provide more information and to date nothing has been received.)

The Council could change this policy to apply to all earthquakes by removing the specific reference to the 2010/11 Canterbury Earthquakes.

3.14 Remission on Unclaimed or Abandoned Land Parcels

Minor change to wording to reflect current terminology. “strike” rates is changed to “set and assess”.

Section 4, Paragraph 2 remove the date as it was only relevant when the policy was first introduced.

In the delegations, remove Rates Officer.

3.15 Rates Postponement in Cases of Financial Hardship

Section 4, change “remission” to “postponement” to correct an error.

3.16 Rates Postponement on Land Affected by Natural Calamity

The purpose of this policy is to enable the Council to postpone rates should a natural disaster occur. In the event of such a disaster, the detail will be added by resolution of Council. No changes are recommended.

3.17 Rates Postponement on Land Used for Primary Production in Residential and Business Zones

This policy is limited to land that is used as a farm. It does not include lifestyle or residential properties that are caught in a change of zoning that can result in a significant increase in a rating valuation and rates paid.

Enquiries have been received recently regarding the possibility for rates relief where an industrial zone boundary has been extended to include previously rural zoned land that is not used for primary production.

The difficulty in extending the policy too far is knowing where the fairness and equity sit. Property valuation increases as the result of a change in zoning also provides benefit to the property owner by increasing their potential for capital gain, however this is not always immediate. It can often take years for services to be extended into these areas before development becomes an economic proposition.

The Council could extend the policy to include other than farm land. Alternatively, requests for postponement for other than farm land could be dealt with under a “Catch all” postponement policy. This option would give the Council more discretion in dealing with individual cases.

New Policy Suggestons

3.18 “Catch All” Remission Policy
The Council may only remit rates where it has adopted a relevant remission policy. Occasionally a circumstance arises where a rates remission could be considered, but the Council does not have a remission policy that covers the situation. Recent examples of this have been the Waimakariri Irrigation utility rates, the request for refund of Oxford rural water rates and applications for rates relief where a house has been damaged by fire.

Both of these issues would have been more straightforward for the customer and the Council if a remission policy had been in place. It is also more transparent because the transaction is processed as a rates remission rather than a refund.

Some Councils have a “catch-all” policy that provides for rates remissions in situations where the request does not fit into any of the current remission policies and the Council considers that a rates remission would be fair and equitable.

It is suggested that this Council adopts such a policy and that remissions granted under this policy are approved by the Audit & Risk Committee.

3.19 Remission in Lieu of Section 20 of the Local Government (Rating) Act

Some Councils remit rates in circumstances where Section 20 of the Local Government (Rating) Act does not apply because one of the three criteria is not met.

Section 20 provides that two or more rating units that are in common ownership, are contiguous and used jointly as a single unit should be treated as one rating unit for setting rates. The effect of this is that only one set of fixed charges apply.

Requests are often received from ratepayers of multiple rating units where the ownership may not be exactly the same (eg one property is under a family trust), but the land is contiguous and used as a single property. Alternatively, there are cases where the land is in common ownership and used as a single property, but the blocks of land are not contiguous.

If the Council did decide to allow a remission, there should be a requirement that the criteria that the separate properties are used jointly as a single unit be met.

It is uncertain at the moment how many rating units would be involved because it is difficult to identify connections between rating units that are in different ownership. It is thought the number would be less than 100. Rating units that did qualify would generally be bare land so the rates impacted would be the Uniform Annual General Charge, the Roading Fixed Charge and the Earthquake Recovery Charge. Drainage Fixed Rates and Community Board Fixed Rates, in the current year this would be a total of around $300 per rating unit.

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

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1 Community views have not been sought at this stage. The Rating Policies will be included in the Long Term Plan for public consultation.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1 Rates remissions are essentially funded by other ratepayers paying more. The risk of extending rates remission policies is that there is an additional cost that other rating units need to absorb.
5.2. The value of rates remissions granted in the current year total $207,055.50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unclaimed or Abandoned Land</td>
<td>7,165.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services and Canterbury Museum levies</td>
<td>25,937.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Charges on Subdivided Sections</td>
<td>68,064.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthquakes</td>
<td>3,855.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maori Freehold Land</td>
<td>10,648.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Use in Commercial Zones</td>
<td>3,369.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Remission on Schools/Community Groups</td>
<td>88,014.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. **Policy**

This matter is not a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance Policy although the nature of change can have a varying affect to individuals, businesses and other organisations.

6.2. **Legislation**

Local Government Act 2002
- Section 102(3)(a) – Council may adopt a Rates Remission Policy
- Section 108 – Policy on remission and postponement of rates on Maori Freehold Land
- Section 109 – Rates remission policy – states what the remission policy should contain
- Section 109(2A) – Any remission policy must be reviewed at least once every 6 years
- Section 110 – Rates postponement policy

Local Government (Rating) Act 2002
- Section 55 Policy for early payment of rates in the current financial year
- Sections 85-86 Remissions of rates – allows Council to remit rates if it has a policy to do so and the conditions of the policy are met
- Sections 87-90 Postponement of rates – allows the Council to postpone rates if it has a policy to do so and the conditions of the policy are met.

6.3. **Community Outcomes**

That revenue gathering is fair and equitable.

Maree Harris
Customer Services Manager
Discount for the Early Payment of Rates

1 Introduction

Section 55 of the Local Government Act 2002 requires the Council to have a policy for “the early payment of rates in the current year” if it wishes to offer a discount for early payment.

2 Policy Context

The Waimakariri District Council has historically offered a discount of 4% of certain rates (listed in the Policy Statement below) if the total current years rates and any outstanding prior years rates and penalties are paid in full by the penalty date of the first instalment in the current year.

The discount provides an incentive to ratepayers to pay the total rates up front, rather than by quarterly instalments throughout the year.

Benefits to the Council include a reduction in processing and postal costs for the remaining instalments and an increased cash flow at the start of the financial year.

If the Council wishes to continue to offer a discount, it must have a current policy in place.

3 Policy Objective

Meet the objectives of fairness and equity by providing a financial incentive to ratepayers who pay their rates in full early.

Avoid the printing, delivery and receipting costs associated with subsequent instalment processing, contributing to a more efficient use of Council resources.

4 Policy Statement

1. The Council will allow a discount of 4% of certain rates if the total current rates and any rates arrears from previous years are paid by the penalty date of the first instalment in the current year.

2. For the purposes of this policy “total current rates and any rates arrears from previous years” includes rates collected by Waimakariri District Council on behalf of Environment Canterbury.

3. The rates that are subject to the discount are the General Rate, Uniform Annual General Charge, Roading Rates, Community Parks and Reserves, Buildings and Grants Rates, Pegasus Services Rate, Community Library and Museums Rate, Community Swimming Pools Rate, Canterbury Museum Operational Levy Rate and Canterbury Museum Development Levy Rate.

5 Links to legislation, other policies and community outcomes

Local Government (Rating) Act 2002
Revenue & Financing Policy
Discount for the Early Payment of Rates

6 Adopted by and date

Adopted by Council on 19 June 2018 through the 2018-28 Long Term Plan.

The following Delegations apply:

Rates Supervisor or Customer Services Manager – to apply discounts that meet the requirements of this Policy.

Manager, Finance & Business Support – to hear and make a final decision on any appeal on an application for discount that has been declined.

7 Review

Next review at 2024 Long Term Plan.
DRAFT NEW POLICY

RATES

Remission of Rates in Miscellaneous Circumstances

1 Introduction

Council may waive the requirement to pay rates only where it has a rates remission policy in place that authorises the waiver.

Section 102(3)(a) of the Local Government Act 2002 provides that the Council may adopt a Rates Remission Policy. Section 109 outlines what a remission policy should contain and section 109(2A) requires that any remission policy must be reviewed at least once every 6 years.

Sections 85-86 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 allows the Council to remit rates if it has a policy to do so, and the conditions of the policy are met.

2 Policy Context

The Council has a series of rates remission policies to cover situations where a need to remit rates is deemed fair and equitable.

It is recognised that not all situations in which the Council may wish to remit rates will be provided for in specific policies or foreseen at the start of a financial year. The situations could arise as an unintended consequence of the application of the Council’s rating policies.

3 Policy Objective

Give the Council flexibility to grant a rates remission should an extraordinary situation arise during a rating year where the Council considers that rates remission is an appropriate solution, but where authority is not provided in the more specific remission policies.

4 Policy Statement

1. Applications for remission must be made in writing and outline the reasons why rates relief might be justified.

2. Each circumstance will be considered by Council on a case by case basis.

3. A decision on whether to grant a remission, the amount of remission and any terms or conditions will be decided by the Council.

5 Links to legislation, other policies and community outcomes

The Local Government Act 2002
The Local Government (Rating) Act 2002
Waimakariri District Council Rating Policies

171121126338
6 Adopted by and date

Adopted by Council on 19th June 2018 through the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.

The following delegations apply:

Audit and Risk Committee – to approve remissions where it considers it fair and equitable to do.

7 Review

Next review at 2024 Long Term Plan.
Rates Postponement Policy

Introduction

Council may postpone the requirement to pay rates only where it has a rates postponement policy in place that authorises the postponement.

Section 102(3)(b) of the Local Government Act 2002 provides that the Council may adopt a Rates Postponement Policy. Section 110 outlines what a postponement policy should contain and section 110(2A) requires that any postponement policy must be reviewed at least once every 6 years.

Sections 87 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 provides that the Council must postpone the requirement to pay all or part of the rates on a rating unit if it has adopted a rates postponement policy, the ratepayer has applied in writing for a postponement, and the Council is satisfied that the conditions and criteria in the policy are met.

Sections 88-90 contain further provisions regarding rates postponement including the ability to add a fee to postponed rates, how postponed rates must be recorded and that postponed rates may be registered as a charge on property.

Rates Postponement in Cases of Financial Hardship

1 Policy Context

Occasionally circumstances arise where a ratepayer experiences serious financial hardship and is unable to pay their rates.

The priority for Council Credit Control staff is to work with ratepayers in this situation and agree on a payment plan to bring the rates up to date over an acceptable period,

If the hardship is temporary, rates postponement is a useful option in some circumstances to remove the immediate financial stress.

As rates postponement delays rather than extinguishes the obligation to pay, and over time reduces the owner’s equity in the property, it is an option that is used sparingly.

2 Policy Objective

To provide Council the ability to postpone the payment of rates as a method of providing relief to ratepayers who are experiencing extreme financial hardship.

3 Policy Statement

1. The Manager, Finance and Business Support has delegated authority to postpone rates on the grounds of extreme financial hardship on being satisfied after full inquiry that extreme financial hardship exists or would be caused by non-postponement of the whole or part of the rates.
Rates Postponement Policy

2. When considering whether rates postponement will be granted, all of the ratepayer’s personal circumstances will be relevant including the following factors:

- Background to the ratepayer’s situation, including illness and family circumstances;
- The likely period before the ratepayer’s position could be expected to improve;
- The potential for the ratepayer’s situation to deteriorate further.

A report from a budget advisor may be requested.

3. Application must be made in writing using the prescribed form.

4. Prior to approving an application for remission of rates under this policy, the Council will require evidence that:

- The applicant has had access to independent financial advice and understands the effects of rates postponement on their equity in the property,
- All joint property owners agree to rates postponement,
- Where there is a mortgage on the property, the mortgagee agrees to rates postponement.

5. Wherever possible, rates shall be postponed for a finite period, and a payment plan shall be set up to clear the debt within this time.

6. Other than in exceptional circumstances, rates postponement will only be considered for rating units that are used as the residence of the applicant.

7. If the postponement is for other than a residential rating unit, rates will be postponed for a finite period not exceeding 5 years.

8. Postponed rates will become payable on the earliest of the following dates:

   a. When the ratepayer ceases to be the owner/occupier of the rating unit
   b. When the ratepayer ceases to use the rating unit as his/her residence
   c. At a date specified by the Council at the time the application is approved
   d. In the event of a change in the ratepayer’s circumstances, on written notice by the Council.

9. Where rates are postponed, the ratepayer will still be required to pay a minimum of $500 towards the annual rates, in addition to any government rebate which may be available in respect of the property.

10. Rates postponement will apply from the beginning of the rating year in which the application is made although the Council may consider extending the postponement to include arrears from previous years.

11. At the start of any rating year, where a rates postponement arrangement is in place, the Council will send an annual statement showing:

- The total amount of postponed rates outstanding
- The interest rate charged for the year
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- Accrued interest
- Any fees charged during the year

12. Where rates are postponed the Council will require annual confirmation that the dwelling on the property has appropriate insurance cover.

13. Penalty charges (pursuant to s.57 & 58 of the Local Government (Rating) Act will not be added to postponed rates.

14. The amount of any rates postponed including postponement fees where applicable will be secured by a Statutory Land Charge on the Certificate of Title of the Rating Unit.

15. Pursuant to Section 88 of the Local Government (Rating) Act, a postponement fee will be charged on the amount of rates postponed. The amount of the fee will be calculated on the outstanding daily balance applying between the date each instalment is due and the date that the rates are paid using a rate equal to the overdraft interest rate charged by the Council’s bankers at the commencement of each financial year.

16. The administrative cost of setting up the postponement including any costs of registering and releasing the charge on the Certificate of Title will be met by the applicant at the time the application is approved or added to the amount postponed.

17. The amount of rates postponed will be reported annually to the Audit & Risk Committee.

The following delegations apply:

Customer Services Manager – authority to approve remissions that meet the requirements of this policy.

Manager, Finance and Business Support – authority to hear and make a final decision on any appeal on an application for remission that has been declined.

Rates Postponement on Land Affected by Natural Calamity

1 Policy Context

Occasionally events occur, such as a natural disaster outside human control, where damage occurs to property that was unforeseen at the start of the rating year.

In a significant event, such as the Canterbury Earthquakes of 2010 and 2011, the Government may step in and pass new legislation that enables the Council to provide rates relief. In other circumstances, having a generic rates postponement policy in place where specific detail may be added by Council resolution will ensure that the Council is able to respond quickly to offer rates postponement should it wish to do so.
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2 Policy Objective

To give the Council discretion to postpone rates where a rating unit has been detrimentally affected by a natural calamity where the Council believes that hardship exists for would be caused by non-postponement of the whole or part of the rates.

3 Policy Statement

1. Applications must be made in writing and signed by the owner(s) of the rating unit.

2. Full details must be provided of the nature of the event that caused the damage and the degree of damage to the land. If the damage is temporary and the land is expected to return to its former use in the future, an estimate of the time it will take the land to return to its former use in the future, an estimate of the time it will take the land to recover to a useable state and the steps that the owner will take to achieve this should be provided. The Council may ask for a report from a Registered Engineer or other similarly qualified expert.

3. When considering whether to approve postponement of rates the Council will have regard to the severity of the event, the degree of damage to the subject land and other land in the district and other financial assistance available. Consideration will also be given to the financial circumstances of the applicant and the effect of postponement on the remaining rating base.

4. Wherever possible, rates shall be postponed for a finite period, and a payment plan shall be set up to clear the debt within a nominated time.

5. Postponed rates will become payable on the earliest of the following dates:
   a) When in the opinion of the Council the land is restored to a useable state, or
   b) When the applicant ceases to be the owner/occupier of the rating unit, or
   c) When the applicant ceases to use the rating unit as his/her residence, or
   d) At a date specified by the Council at the time the application is approved, or
   e) In the event of a change in the ratepayer’s circumstances, on written notice by the Council.

6. The Council may require a minimum payment towards the annual rates.

7. Rates postponement will apply from the beginning of the rating year in which the application is made.

8. Penalty charges will not be added to postponed rates during the period of postponement.

9. The amount of any rates postponed including postponement fees where applicable will be secured by a Statutory Land Charge on the Certificate of Title of the Rating Unit.

10. Pursuant to Section 88 of the Local Government (Rating) Act, a postponement fee may be charged on the amount of rates postponed between the date that the rates instalments were due for payment and the date that the postponed rates are paid. Any fee will be at a rate to be fixed by the Council at the commencement of each financial year.
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11. The administrative cost of setting up the postponement including any costs of registering the postponement on the title will be met by the applicant or added to the amount postponed.

12. The amount of rates postponed will be reported annually to the Audit & Risk Committee.

Rates Postponement on Land Used for Primary Production in Residential and Business Zones

1. Policy Context

Where business areas expand and develop into previously rural land, the value of farm land can increase at a rate greater than other surrounding rural land due to its potential residential or business use.

Part X of the Rating Powers Act 1988 had provision for the postponement of rates on farmland. This provision was not transferred into the Local Government (Rating) Act, however Councils may still achieve a similar result through a rates postponement policy.

2. Policy Objective

To provide temporary rates relief to land used for primary production where the Council is satisfied that the rating valuation of the land is in some measure attributable to the potential use to which the land may be put for residential or business purposes.

To preserve uniformity and equitable relativity with a comparable rating unit elsewhere in a rural zone in that part of the District where the rating valuations do not contain any "potential value".

3. Policy Statement

1. The Council will allow postponement of rates on land used for primary production in the residential and business zones where it is satisfied that the rating valuation of the land is in some measure attributable to the potential use to which the land may be put for residential, commercial or industrial development.

2. For the purposes of this policy, "land used for primary production" means land that is classified by the Office of the Valuer General as being used for primary production, is used exclusively or principally for agricultural, horticultural, or other pastoral purposes or for the keeping of bees or poultry or other livestock, and “farming purposes” as a corresponding meaning. This may include land used for dairy farming, stock fattening, arable farming, storage of livestock, market gardens and orchards, specialist livestock, forestry, mineral extraction and vacant/idle land.

3. Rating units for which a subdivision consent has been approved or lodged and under consideration by the Council shall not be eligible for rates postponement under this policy.

4. On written application from the ratepayer of any rating unit that is:
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a) located in a zone in the District Plan other than a rural zone and

b) land used for primary production,

the Council will request its Valuation Service Provider to issue a special “rates postponement value” for that rating unit.

5. The rates postponement value will be determined so as to:

a) Exclude any potential value that, at the date of the valuation, the land may have for residential purposes, or for commercial or industrial use; and

b) Preserve uniformity and equitable relativity with comparable parcels of land used for primary production, the valuations of which do not contain any such potential value.

6. Rates postponement values allocated under this policy are final and there is no right of objection against the level of valuation. (The owner still has the right to object to the rating valuation of the property in terms of the Rating Valuations Act 1988).

7. Where a rates postponement value has been determined, the payment of rates will be deemed to have been postponed to the extent specified in clause (8) of this policy.

8. The amount of rates postponed in any year shall be an amount equal to the difference between the amount of the rates for that period calculated according to the rateable value of the property and the amount of the rates that would be payable for that period if the rates postponement value of the property were its rateable value.

9. Notice of the amount of rates postponed shall be entered in the rating records and will be notified with the rates assessment issued in respect of that rating unit.

10. Subject to the rates postponement value remaining in force, postponed rates will be written off at the expiration of 5 years from the commencement of the rating period in respect of which they were made and levied, unless the postponed rates become payable in accordance with clause 11 of this policy.

11. All rates that have been postponed under this policy and have not been written off under this policy become due and payable immediately on:

a) The rating unit ceasing to be classified by the Office of the Valuer General as being used for primary production; or

b) The rateable value of the rating unit ceasing to be to some extent attributable to the potential use to which the land may be put for residential, commercial or industrial development; or

c) A subdivision consent being granted or an application being lodged for a subdivision consent; or

171121126333
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d) The interest of the person who was the ratepayer at the date on which the rates postponement value was entered on the rating roll becoming vested in some person other than –

i) The ratepayer’s spouse or de facto partner or former spouse or de facto partner; or

ii) The executor or administrator of the ratepayer’s estate; or

iii) Where the ratepayer was the proprietor of the interest as a trustee, a new trustee under the trust.

12. Where part of the land ceases to qualify for rates postponement, and the balance of the rating unit still meets the criteria of this policy, the Council will require that a part only of the postponed rates will be required to be paid. The part of the postponed rates to be paid will be in proportion to the value of the land that no longer qualifies for rates postponement.

13. Rates postponement will apply from the beginning of the rating year following the period in which the rates postponement application is approved and will not be backdated to prior years. However, in the event that an application is approved prior to 20 August, rates postponement may apply from the beginning of the financial year in which the application is approved.

14. Penalty charges will not apply to the amount of rates that has been postponed during the period of postponement.

15. Postponed rates will be registered as a statutory land charge on the title of the rating unit.

16. The administrative cost of setting up the postponement including any costs of registering the postponement on the title will be met by the applicant.

The following Delegations apply:
Customer Services Manager – to approve postponements which meet the requirements of this policy.
Manager, Finance and Business Support – to hear and make a final decision on any appeal on an application for postponement that has been declined.

Links to legislation, other policies and community outcomes

The Local Government Act 2002
The Local Government (Rating) Act 2002
Waimakariri District Council Rating Policies

Adopted by and date

Adopted by Council on 19th June 2018 through the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.

Review

Next review at 2024 Long Term Plan.
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT

FILE NO and TRIM NO: EXC-34-20 / 171124127991

REPORT TO: Council

DATE OF MEETING: 5 December 2017

FROM: Jim Palmer, Chief Executive

SUBJECT: Health and Safety Report – November

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to update the Council on Health and Safety matters for the month of November.

Attachment

1 Discharging Officer Health and Safety Duties
2 November 2017 Health and Safety Dashboard Report

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No 171124127991.

3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. There were four work-related accidents recorded this month. There was also one medical incident, an occurrence of property damage and one near miss.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Occurrence</th>
<th>Event description</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 October</td>
<td>Medical Incident</td>
<td>Medical incident. Staff member had chest pain/felt dizzy and had some other issues. Was attended by a First Aider (x2) and was transported to GP.</td>
<td>Not applicable - incident was handled appropriately by First Aid staff. CLOSED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 October</td>
<td>Property Damage</td>
<td>Driver backed into another vehicle at the Water Unit Depot. Damage to vehicle.</td>
<td>Backing camera is in a poor location at the back of the vehicle and on the dash. The reversing cameras are small and they're not is a practical position. OPEN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 October</td>
<td>Accident</td>
<td>Cut hand on copper pipe</td>
<td>Investigation pending. OPEN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 November</td>
<td>Accident</td>
<td>Slipped on floor and grazed knee and foot</td>
<td>Wet floor/ wet feet caused the accident. These types of accidents happen in an aquatic facility. Staff to be vigilant in policing rules such as no running. CLOSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 November</td>
<td>Near Miss</td>
<td>Library sign fell off beam it was attached to. It was a blade type sign recently put up. There were people in the library including someone looking at books not very far away, but did not hit them.</td>
<td>There were 2 signs indicating CAB and The Chamber Art Gallery. We removed the other sign as a precaution, and I have contacted Hortons to come and have a look. These signs have not been up very long. OPEN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 November</td>
<td>Accident</td>
<td>Invisible wood shard pushed up under finger nail while moving hands near wooden inbox. Small amount of bruising &amp; bleeding underneath the fingernail. Stopped bleeding &amp; covered with plasters.</td>
<td>Wooden Inbox on Records Counter had a shard of loose wood that was not visible to the naked eye. It has been covered with tape. CLOSED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 November</td>
<td>Accident</td>
<td>Wasn't using aqua frame. Did demonstration and landed on left ankle. Sore/sprained left ankle.</td>
<td>Iced and elevated when got home. Investigation pending. OPEN.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2. The dashboard review shows:

3.2.1. The recent staff Climate Survey (our voice) has reflected a positive result for Health and Safety as a function within the Council, and that the one area for further work is Workplace Wellbeing.

The creation of a wellbeing strategy that aligns with the survey results and with the Mental Health Foundation’s Five Ways to Wellbeing has been approved by Management Team, including an investigation into the top two ideas from each of the current, proposed and suggested activities under each of the Five Ways to Wellbeing.

![Wellbeing Survey](image)

Total sample: 202

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. N/A.
5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

5.1 N/A

6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. **Policy**

   N/A

6.2. **Legislation**

   Key extracts from the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015, especially as it relates to Officers, were provided to the first meeting of this term of Council on 25 October 2016.

---

Jim Palmer  
Chief Executive
## Discharging Officer Health and Safety Duties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OFFICER DUTIES</th>
<th>EXAMPLES OF ACTIVITIES TO SUPPORT DISCHARGE OF DUTIES</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>KNOW</strong></td>
<td>• Updates on new activities/major contracts</td>
<td>Various Committee reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(To acquire, and keep up to date, knowledge of work health and safety matters)</td>
<td>• Council reports to include Health and Safety advice as relevant</td>
<td>Monthly, as required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Audit Committee to receive minutes of Health and Safety Committee meetings</td>
<td>Two-monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Update on legislation and best practice changes to Audit Committee</td>
<td>As required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNDERSTAND</strong></td>
<td>• Induction of new Council through tour of District and ongoing site visits.</td>
<td>Start of each new term and as required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(To gain an understanding of the nature of the operations of the business or undertaking of the PCBU and generally of the hazards and risks associated with those operations)</td>
<td>• H&amp;S Risk register to Audit Committee</td>
<td>Six monthly, or where major change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Training on H&amp;S legislation and best practices updates</td>
<td>At least annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CCO activities reported to the Audit Committee</td>
<td>At least annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESOURCES</strong></td>
<td>• LTP or Annual Plan to have a specific report on H&amp;S resources</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(To ensure that the PCBU has available for use, and uses, appropriate resources and processes to eliminate or minimise risks to health and safety from work carried out as part of the conduct of the business or undertaking)</td>
<td>• Reports to Committees will outline H&amp;S issues and resourcing, as appropriate</td>
<td>As required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MONITOR</strong></td>
<td>• Report to every Council meeting – standing agenda item to include Dashboard Update and any major developments</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(To ensure that the PCBU has appropriate processes for receiving and considering information regarding incidents, hazards, and risks and for responding in a timely way to that information)</td>
<td>• Risk register review by Audit Committee</td>
<td>Six monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMPLY</strong></td>
<td>• Programme of H&amp;S internal work received by Audit Committee</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(To ensure that the PCBU has, and implements, processes for complying with any duty or obligation of the PCBU under this Act)</td>
<td>• Internal Audit reports to Audit Committee</td>
<td>As completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Incident Investigations reported Audit Committee</td>
<td>As required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Worksafe review of incidents/accidents reported to Audit Committee</td>
<td>As required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VERIFY</strong></td>
<td>• Receive ACC WSMP audit results and remedial actions (if any) reported to Audit Committee</td>
<td>Two yearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(To verify the provision and use of the resources and processes)</td>
<td>• Worksafe audits, if undertaken</td>
<td>As completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Self-assessment against Canterbury Safety Charter reported to the Audit Committee</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Progress against 2017/18 Workplan - November 2017 (**as at Wednesday 22 November 2017**)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Projects</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective 1: Improve Health and Safety data management, and encourage all staff to report incidents and hazards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action 1: Safety Management System investigation and procurement project (includes carry-over of 'Reporting Improvement' project from 2016/17).</td>
<td>Informal investigation has commenced, with 6 options being reviewed. Requirements for system have been developed. Formal initiation of project has commenced in August 2017, and first Project Advisory Group meeting held on 7 September 2017. Meeting was held with 4 other Councils in the region during to investigate the potential to embark on a shared services' procurement project, as each of those Councils are in varying stages either procuring, reviewing or replacing their Safety Management System software. First meeting has identified that one Council in particular (CCC) has recently completed a very thorough procurement process and that many of their learnings can be shared with all of the other participants once their final choice has been announced and they are able to share procurement information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action 2: Implementation of Tech/Mobile Hazard, Incident and Take-5 systems (carry-over project).</td>
<td>Hazards and Incidents: Both hazard forms and incident forms have ‘gone live’ online. All staff can lodge hazards or incidents via intranet link or mobile device. Link has been established to Technology 1, which is now the database for hazard and incident data. IT staff are developing workflows for any actions to be assigned to relevant staff. Completion of the workflows in Technology 1 is imminent, with it currently working to finalise. Take-5 Forms: Take-5 forms have been developed for mobile devices, and are in use in the Water Unit. The forms have been demonstrated to Audit &amp; Risk Committee, Health and Safety Committee, and key users throughout the organisation. Trial for Utilities and Roading team has been completed, and feedback will be incorporated into Take-5 prior to roll out to remainder of organisation (early 2018).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action 4: Improvement of Due Diligence Health and Safety reporting.</td>
<td>Linked with Action 2, the finalisation of the Technology 1 hazard and incident database will allow for improved due diligence reporting reporting of both hazards and incidents. In addition, the information Services team are developing bespoke reporting program to be able to draw the required information from Technology 1. Goal is to have this completed by early 2018.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 2: Maintain a fit-for-purpose internal health and safety auditing system to ensure that WDC is compliant with health and safety policies, procedures and legal requirements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action 5: Review and re-develop internal health and safety auditing system, aligned with best practice.</td>
<td>Initial investigation has lead to reviewing WorkSafe’s proposed “SafePlus” as a model. SafePlus has not been designed to replace WISP. It has a different approach from a purely compliance audit. SafePlus is a business improvement tool that uses a behaviour-based assessment approach, and also offers independent guidance and advice on how to improve health and safety performance in a business. The toolkit will be available as three separate products: - Resources and guidance from WorkSafe website (available September 2017). - An independent onsite assessment (available September 2017). A free online self-assessment. (available mid 2018) Report to Management Team has been submitted to seek approval to align WDC H&amp;S systems with SafePlus, and in turn, create an internal auditing programme to suit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 3: Ensure that all contractors are managed according to health and safety procedural requirements, and improve staff knowledge of those requirements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action 6: Contractor management process improvement project.</td>
<td>Project is now in implementation phase. Stage 1: Current state analysis complete. Meetings were held with all key contract managers to determine current gaps, to ensure that any solutions that are developed are fit-for-purpose. Report to Management Team was submitted at end of August and proposed next steps were approved. Phase 2: - Creation of interim contract register - Process mapping of Contract Management processes - Implementation of a Contract Management software system (e.g. TechnologyOne Contract Management module) Interim contract register has been created, and will be rolled out to the organisation during October/November. Process mapping has commenced, and the Contractor Management Process Improvement project has been identified as one of the ‘pilot’ projects that will utilise Promapp to map processes (early 2018 - completion by March/April 2018).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 4: Improve the Health and Wellbeing of staff, and create measures to ensure success.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action 7: Wellbeing strategy development and implementation project.</td>
<td>Proposal for Wellbeing Strategy Development has been created, and shared with key groups (Community Team, M&amp;O Committee and Social Club). A Wellbeing Survey was distributed in mid-September. Report to Management Team to present the findings of the Survey has been submitted in November. Strategy development will occur Dec 2017/early 2018.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 5: Improve traceability of staff working alone outside of hours, and appropriate response in the event of an Incident.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action 8: Lone working equipment procurement project.</td>
<td>COMPLETE Work is complete on this project. SmaTrak devices have been procured for the Water Unit on-call team, which are satellite capable and externally monitored by ADT. They act as panic alarms and communication devices, even when the staff are out of cell phone coverage range. A panic alarm has been assessed in the Environmental Services Unit, and the trial was successful, therefore they will be going ahead with purchase.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEGEND
- On track
- Slightly behind schedule (less than one month)
- Behind schedule (greater than one month)
Incidents/Accidents - November 2017 (**as at Wednesday 22 November 2017)

Nov 2016 to Current: Worker Incident Reporting
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Description</th>
<th>Rating (out of 25)</th>
<th>Current actions</th>
<th>Action Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contractor Health and Safety Management</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>*Train all contract managers in H&amp;S processes/requirements at time of induction.</td>
<td>Charlotte Browne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Develop comprehensive contract administration/contract management training package to deliver to all staff managing contractors.</td>
<td>Gerard Cleary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Identify volunteer groups and leaseholders that engage contractors on behalf of WDC and train in contract H&amp;S management processes.</td>
<td>Charlotte Browne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Complete development of Safety in Design procedures and embed in design processes.</td>
<td>Gerard Cleary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Use &amp; Driver Safety</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>*Deliver driver training as per training strategy (Driver Safety / 4WD)</td>
<td>Charlotte Browne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Identify any drivers that require further progressive driver training on an as-needs basis and provide relevant training.</td>
<td>Managers &amp; Team Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Provide information and training regarding use of safety equipment such as fire extinguishers in staff pool vehicles to all drivers.</td>
<td>Charlotte Browne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>*Undertake a review of operations to ensure that all activity and training is being carried out as per internal H&amp;S processes.</td>
<td>Liz Ashton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Conducting hazardous activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Injury/death</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverse Weather</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>*Develop protocols for response to adverse weather events (especially at night), and include in Safe Working in the Field Manual</td>
<td>Charlotte Browne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Include in Emergency Management Plan out-of-hours deployment in adverse weather.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airfield Operations</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>*Develop of Airfield Safety Committee and appointment of Airfield Safety Coordinator to administer all actions from safety review.</td>
<td>Craig Sargison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Develop of Airfield Operations Manual, and adoption of the manual by Council as the key safety document for the Airfield operations.</td>
<td>Craig Sargison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Provide regular Airfield Operations report to Council</td>
<td>Craig Sargison</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE REGENERATION STEERING GROUP HELD IN THE RUATANIWHA KAIAPOI CIVIC CENTRE ON MONDAY 6 NOVEMBER 2017 AT 4.00PM.

PRESENT:
A Blackie (Chair), J Watson, P Redmond, S Stewart, C Greengrass, R Blair, M Pinkham.

Te Kōhaka o Tūhāaitara Trust (Chair) representative C McMillian; Environment Canterbury representative C McKay; D Ayers (Mayor); J Palmer (Chief Executive); C Sargison (Manager Community and Recreation); D Roxborough (Implementation Project Manager - District Regeneration).

IN ATTENDANCE:
H Crombie, LINZ
J Barr, LINZ
K Dwyer, WDC

1. APOLOGIES
An apology was received and sustained from N Atkinson and J Meyer for absence.

An apology was received and sustained from M Pinkham for lateness.

CARRIED

2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
Moved: A Blackie
Seconded: C Greengrass

THAT the Regeneration Steering Group:

Confirms as a true and correct record the minutes of a meeting held on Monday 2 October 2017.

Craig to prepare a memo regarding the status of the Pegasus Bay Walkway.

Clause 6.1 Honda Trees Application – S Stewart stated to amend to abstained.

CARRIED

3. MATTERS ARISING
Nil.

4. DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS
Nil.

5. LINZ UPDATE

H Crombie advised they are in the process of working with the new Minister to ensure that she is aware of the history and where they are at in the process, and secondly to ensure that the change in government hasn’t changed any expectations around either the outcomes or timelines. LINZ are working with the Minister’s office in respect to the project with both the Council and the Trust and the draft agreements that will need to be reviewed together with the view to having principle agreements that can go to Cabinet for final approval for the divestment of the land. LINZ are also aware that the Council are close to being able to confirm road stopping and parcels of land. This will allow LINZ to put together the final survey plans so that they can start the process of physically surveying the areas of land that will require change.

J Barr noted that things are progressing well.
6. **REPORTS**

6.1 **KAIPOI EAST SPORT FIELD CONFIGURATION**

D Roxborough clarified that this is the plan of the Kaiapoi East Sport and Recreation Reserve area. The purpose of this report is formally put through the Regeneration Steering Group to seek approval for staff to progress to the next stage of design based on the conceptual layout. There has been a question asked in regard to the nature of the paths as to whether they were cycling paths. At this stage, conceptually we assumed that the one path running north to south through the sports fields’ area is a shared path. In time, the actual status of the paths will be developed as we work through the Reserves Master Plan.

D Roxborough advised that there is a meeting set up with Kaiapoi Rugby League to advance discussions around their plans.

Moved: A Blackie  
Seconded: S Stewart

**THAT** the Regeneration Steering Group recommends:

(a) **Receives** report No. 1710261155774.

(b) **Approves** the proposed concept design for the Kaiapoi East Sport Field configuration.

(c) **Approves** staff progressing with the design of the Kaiapoi East reserves.

**CARRIED**

6.2 **DISTRICT REGENERATION – DRAFT ROAD STOPPING PLANS FOR THE PINES BEACH**

D Roxborough advised that in the previous report on road stopping it referred to the other regeneration areas with the exception of the Pines Beach area so that discussions could be held with the Trust to identify their plans for the area at The Pines Beach that is to be divested to the Trust. A meeting has now been held with the Trust recommending that the two roads be legally stopped within the Pines Beach area, being Clarke Avenue and Hood Avenue. There is a narrow strip of land referred to as Lindsay Lane Walkway, which is proposed to be stopped and have the reserve status uplifted.

D Roxborough referred to Clause 5.2.3 and advised that there is potential for a walkway to be retained through the new block of the coastal park and that the Council seek a Memorandum of Understanding from the Trust seeking a safeguarding of a route in future across the Trust land for a public walkway.

C McMillan advised that the Trust’s intention are not to make it difficult for people to get around. It was noted that this is one block where the University have expressed very strong interest in having a research centre and the Trust are still looking at what this research centre might look like. They are looking at putting a parking area within one of these blocks as well.

S Stewart asked if there would be a presentation at some point to the Regeneration Steering Group around what the Trust is planning for the area.

C McMillan replied that they have prepared a very early draft policy around what might happen which has been put out to some of the residents to have a look at over the summer and are planning in February to go back out for consultation discussion and at that point we would be able to prepare some presentations.

A Blackie suggested that this should also go to the Kaiapoi Community Board.

Moved: J Watson  
Seconded: P Redmond
THAT the Regeneration Steering Group recommends:

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No.170908097449.

(b) Approves the physical removal and legal road stopping of Hood Avenue and Clarke Avenue in The Pines Beach Regeneration Area.

(c) Approves the physical removal and revoking of the reserve status of Lindsay Lane walkway (off the end of Clarke Avenue), and the divesting of this land of approximately 250 m² area to the Crown at no cost.

(d) Notes that the road stopping and reserve revocation process for Regeneration Areas is proposed to be undertaken through collaboration with Land Information New Zealand (LINZ) utilising the provisions of the Greater Christchurch Regeneration Act 2016 (GCR Act), and the physical removal works are subject to a cost share agreement between the Crown and Council.

(e) Notes that under the terms of the existing Cost Share Agreement with the Crown, the land arising from the legal stopping of redundant roads, with Waimakariri District Council as the registered proprietor, will be divested to the Crown at nil cost to the Crown.

(f) Approves staff working with the Trust to establish a memorandum of understanding for potential future walkway reinstatement over Coastal Park land.

(g) Circulates a copy of this report to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board.

CARRIED

6.3 KIAPOI WHarf AND MARINE Precinct – RIVERVIEW TERRACES AND BOARDWALK – PROGRESS UPDATE AND DESIGN OPTIONS

K Dwyer presented this report to seek approval of the options for the ramp and the option for the preferred poem that is to be integrated with the terraces design.

It was agreed that both of the poems were to be used. The Option A poem to be integrated with the terraces design and Option B poem to be used at the war memorial site.

A Blackie noted that for the terraces he favours Option B, and felt that the ramp is a ramp to nowhere and that there are plenty of other areas for accessibility to the river areas. He noted that the Access Committee debated this and asked for this to be included but they were not very strong on whether this should go ahead or not and they commented that if it does not fit the budget they are not concerned if it does not go in. He noted that he could not see a cost benefit from an access/disability perspective to putting this in. A Blackie suggested that if this was taken out and to go with Option B there would be a further $178K to put towards the pontoon.

S Stewart supports Option A.

D Ayers supports Option A and noted we do have a commitment to access that the Council is about to sign off on an Access Charter.

C McKay supports Option A.

R Blair supports Option A.

Moved: M Pinkham Seconded: P Redmond
THAT the Regeneration Steering Group recommends:

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 171018112971

(b) Approves Option A, with accessible ramps to the lower deck level, as the preferred design option to progress through to detailed design and procurement of a contractor for construction Options Plans - TRIM No. 171026115714

(c) Approves Poem Option 1 as the preferred poem to be integrated with the terraces design

CARRIED

6.4 KAIAPOI RIVER WHARF AND MARINE PRECINCT PROGRAMME – RIVERVIEW TERRACES AND BOARDWALK, AND RIVER WALL UPGRADE – PROJECT TIMEFRAMES

D Roxborough outlined that the purpose of the report is to inform the group of the current anticipated timeframes for the terraces and other allied projects.

M Pinkham asked if the sale of the Hansen’s Mall site now been completed and can the resource consent process be outlined.

C Sargison replied that the sale is about to be completed.

D Roxborough advised that the WDC consent is being processed at present and he is working with Ecan on their consent.

A Blackie requested that the finish of the pontoons be pulled forward as some of us are very keen to get a river carnival together for the end of the summer for 2018. Could this be pulled forward March to November.

Moved: A Blackie Seconded: C Greengrass

THAT the Regeneration Steering Group recommends that the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 171026116121.

(b) Notes the proposed staging and timeframes for the next tranche of projects within the Kaiapoi River Marine Precinct Programme.

CARRIED

7. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

7.1 DISTRICT REGENERATION COMMUNICATIONS REPORT – OCTOBER 2017

D Roxborough advised that the purpose of the report is to provide an update on the Comm’s and Engagement activities, and noted some of the key upcoming communications are on hold until we have a decision on the options for the terraces.

Moved: A Blackie Seconded: J Palmer

THAT the Regeneration Steering Group:

(a) Receives report No. 171018112911.

CARRIED
8. **MATTERS REFERRED FROM COUNCIL**

Nil.

9. **GENERAL**

Croquet Club

C Sargison gave an update on the correspondence that has been received to date from the Croquet Club and clarified some of the questions raised by the Croquet Club. It was agreed that C Sargison prepare a report to go to the December Council meeting with a recommendation to Council.

C Sargison and A Blackie to send a holding response back to the Croquet Club.

Moved: D Ayers  
Seconded: J Watson

**10. MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED**

*Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987*

Moved: A Blackie  
Seconded: J Watson

**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>10.1</td>
<td>Report by Duncan Roxborough (Implementation Project Manager – District Regeneration) &amp; Lucy Eng (Project Manager – AECOM Consultant)</td>
<td>Kaiapoi Marine Precinct River Wall (North Bank) Upgrade Engineering Consultant Proposal Evaluation Report</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section</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>10.1</td>
<td>Protection of privacy of natural persons</td>
<td>A2(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CARRIED**

**CLOSED MEETING**

The public were excluded from the meeting from 5.10pm.
11. **NEXT MEETING**

The next scheduled meeting of the Regeneration Steering Group commences at 4.00pm on Monday 4 December 2017 at the Ruataniwha Centre, Kaiapoi.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS THE MEETING CLOSED AT 5.15PM.
MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF THE OXFORD-OHOKA COMMUNITY BOARD
HELD IN THE A&P MEETING ROOM, OXFORD TOWN HALL, MAIN STREET,
OXFORD ON THURSDAY 9 NOVEMBER 2017 AT 7.00PM.

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

IN ATTENDANCE
S Markham (Manager, Strategy and Engagement), S Nichols (Governance Manager), B Rice (Senior Transport Engineer), S Hart (Business and Centres Manager), T Ellis (Development Planning Manager), Mayor D Ayers and E Stubbs (Minute Secretary).

The meeting adjourned for a workshop from 8.04pm to 8.41pm and a break from 8.41pm to 8.45pm.

1 APOLOGIES
Nil.

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
There was some discussion over minutes from a Mandeville Residents Association (MRA) meeting that D Nicholl, J Ensor, M Brown and S Farrell attended. The meeting discussed the Tram Road Speed Limit Review and there was a query whether the Mandeville Residents meeting had been recorded correctly in the minutes.

S Markham suggested a test for predetermination was if members had a view in their mind that believed would not be changed, then they were conflicted as they would not have open and objective consideration of matters before them. If they retained an open mind and did not have a full and final view, then they did not have predetermination. It was difficult for elected members as they were invited to community meetings and their presence/silence could be interpreted as support.

K Felstead noted that the recommendation for Item 6.1 was to approve consultation rather than a decision on speed limits.

J Ensor provided an explanation of the discussion at the MRA meeting, advising he would look at those minutes as a public record, referring back to back to their legal team.

There was agreement that all board members remained interested in hearing community views through consultation, therefore no conflict of interest at the point in time.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

3.1 Minutes of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board – 5 October 2017
Moved S Farrell seconded J Ensor

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Amends the minutes of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting held on 5 October 2017, item 7.7 should read as follows:
Moved S Farrell seconded W Doody

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:
(a) Receives report No. 170922102675.
(b) Approves the appointment of Board Member J Ensor as a Board representative and liaison person, to the Swannanoa Cricket Club Domain Development Group.

On being put to the meeting this motion was CARRIED.

However, the Chairperson then advised the Board that M Brown, who had given his apologies for the meeting, had also expressed his interest in the appointment to the Chair via email.

On receipt of this new information and under Standing Orders 3.9.17 Revocation or alteration of resolution at same meeting a further motion was moved and seconded.

Moved D Nicholl seconded J Lynn

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:
(c) Receives report No. 170922102675.
(d) Approves the appointment of Board Member M Brown as a Board representative and liaison person, to the Swannanoa Cricket Club Domain Development Group.

The Board noted that Member Brown was not present and therefore unable to address the Board regarding his interest in the appointment.

Staff advice was sought and an Amendment was moved and seconded as follows:

Amendment:
Moved W Doody seconded J Lynn

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:
(e) Receives report No. 170922102675.
(f) Approves the amendment to the report on the table due to absentee members.

CARRIED

Moved W Doody seconded J Lynn

(b) Approves the minutes of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting, held 5 October 2017, as a true and accurate record with the amendment.

CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING

J Lynn advised he was awaiting feedback from staff on two previously raised issues relating to the Ohoka Domain Draft Master Plan and the Ohoka Pavilion repairs. Staff advised they would follow the matter up.

T Robson advised that there had been a miscommunication around the Young Elected Members Retreat. He hoped to be able to attend other events in the future.
M Brown advised he was awaiting feedback from staff relating to West Eyreton tennis club maintenance. Staff advised they would follow the matter up.

W Doody queried who was assisting with the Ecan submission re Canterbury Landscape Supplies Ltd. S Nichols advised she was co-ordinating matters with the planner that the Board had engaged.

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS
Nil.

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS
6.1 Tram Road Speed Limit Review – B Rice (Senior Transport Engineer) and C Sexton (Intern Engineer)

B Rice reflected on a Board briefing held on 26 October and tabled a copy of the proposed consultation document and a copy of the zone map for the letter drop. He outlined changes since the report was considered at the 5 October meeting, which primarily involved timing. It was advised the developers had not submitted a change in resource consent.

S Farrell questioned the response of the Council if more people submitted in support of a different speed limit. B Rice advised that he could not speak for Council. The report to Council would capture facts as consultation was not a vote or based solely on volume of numbers; elected members would consider the reasons why people supported or opposed a proposal. Appropriate weight would also be given to the response from NZTA and the Police. S Markham added that the validity of arguments would be considered and weighed up before a staff recommendation was made to the Council.

J Lynn asked, given the feedback so far received from Mandeville Residents Association (MRA), where 70km/hr appeared to be their preference, (yet 80km/hr was the proposed recommended speed limit), what consideration could Council give to a 70km/hr limit. K Felstead commented that was unfair to ask staff such a question, he was not a decision maker. K Felstead explained that the Council seldom made a decision on numbers alone as they considered the accompanying arguments. W Doody concurred that all submissions were read in order to make a well informed decision.

B Rice provided an explanation of the process. If the staff resolution was passed tonight then consultation would start tomorrow (10 November) and run for two weeks. At the conclusion a report would be prepared for the Council to consider the matter at their 5 December meeting and a memo would be prepared for the Board that summarised results of consultation.

There was some discussion over the process. It was noted that there were timing implications, if the Council did not consider the report until February 2018 there were operational consequences for the Mandeville development. There was not time for the Board to make a recommendation unless they held an extraordinary meeting prior to the December Council meeting.

Staff advised the proposed consultation finished on 24 November. The Board could potentially hold an extraordinary meeting on 30 November to consider consultation feedback and make a recommendation to the Council for their meeting on 5 December. It was an extremely tight timeframe. B Rice had outlined the implications for the business facility resource consent if it did not open as currently proposed in late January/ early February 2018.

K Felstead summarised that the Board could either trust the Council to make the decision in the best interests of all who use Tram Road or hold an
extraordinary meeting if the Board would like to make a recommendation to the Council.

S Farrell raised potential changes to the developer’s plans with two right hand turns, how the plan was contentious and was already in the public domain, and whether the community should be consulted on the basis that the change could be made in the future. B Rice advised that decisions had to be made on the resource consent as it currently stood. S Nichols advised the Board of staff information at the recent briefing, where it was explained at what point a consent change application could be applied for. B Rice commented that the developer’s had not currently applied for the resource consent change.

K Felstead asked if it would be reasonable to review speed limits if there was a change in the development. B Rice confirmed that if any change in resource consent for the development occurred the Board and/or the Council could review the speed limit situation.

Movd J Lynn seconded T Robson

**THAT** the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) **Receives** Memo No. 171027116188.

(b) **Approves** consultation being carried out on the proposal to change the speed limit on Tram Road to 80km/h, as outlined in the plan (TRIM 170914099898) attached to the main report (TRIM 170913099302).

(c) **Notes** that consultation on this proposal will be carried out between 10 November and 24 November 2017.

(d) **Notes** that the Board will be updated at the end of the consultation process through a memo process.

(e) **Notes** that any submissions on the proposal will be taken into account before the change is presented to the Council on 5 December 2017 for consideration.

J Lynn commented that putting aside future issues, what the Board was being asked to approve today was to receive feedback on the current speed limit proposal applicable to the current resource consent. J Lynn accepted a memo update on results of consultation.

D Nicholl commented that if the Board did not have an extraordinary meeting on the 30 November the decision would be solely left to the Council.

**Amendment**

Movd J Ensor seconded S Farrell

**THAT** the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) **Receives** Memo No. 171027116188.

(b) **Approves** consultation being carried out on the proposal to change the speed limit on Tram Road to 80km/h, as outlined in the plan (TRIM 170914099898) attached to the main report (TRIM 170913099302).

(c) **Notes** that consultation on this proposal will be carried out between 10 November and 24 November 2017.

(d) **Approve** an extraordinary meeting be held on 30 November 2018 in order to consider submissions and make a recommendation to the Council following the consultation.

**LOST**
J Ensr had a number of suggestions that had been provided to the engineer who believed they were good suggestions to mitigate effects. He did not believe they could make a judgement until they saw all the evidence.

S Farrell commented that unless there was an extraordinary meeting they would not receive feedback on the submissions. B Rice reiterated that all submissions would be made available to Board members, however the decision would be that of the Council and without an extraordinary Board meeting the Board would not be able to make a recommendation to the Council.

Substantive Motion

Moved J Lynn seconded T Robson

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives Memo No. 171027116188.

(b) Approves consultation being carried out on the proposal to change the speed limit on Tram Road to 80km/h, as outlined in the plan (TRIM 170914099898) attached to the main report (TRIM 1709130999302).

(c) Notes that consultation on this proposal will be carried out between 10 November and 24 November 2017.

(d) Notes that the Board will be updated at the end of the consultation process through a memo process.

(e) Notes that any submissions on the proposal will be taken into account before the change is presented to the Council on 5 December 2017 for consideration.

CARRIED

J Lynn commented that the consultation was on the proposal as it currently stood. He was comfortable with the Council considering the advice of the support agencies, along with all submissions before deciding the speed limit.

T Robson was happy to receive feedback from the consultation and had faith that the Council would take all feedback into consideration when making a decision.

M Brown supported the view of J Lynn.

6.2 Appointee request from Swannanoa Cricket Club Domain Development Group – K Ward (Community Board Advocate)

S Nichols acknowledged that at the last meeting the recommendation and meeting process had not flowed as it should have. It was advised that since the last meeting Peter Fulton of the Swannanoa Cricket Club Domain Development Group had verbally advised staff that their preference for a Board representative and liaison person was Mark Brown. That did not preclude other Board members involvement from time to time who had knowledge of specialty areas such as irrigation.

S Farrell asked the reason for preference and why that had been raised after the meeting and not before. S Nichols advised the view had been expressed after the Board had laid the report on the table when staff advised the group the outcome of the October meeting. The club representative stated they already had a relationship with M Brown.
K Felstead asked if they had discussed two representatives to the committee and S Nichols replied that had not been discussed.

J Enser asked if it was the preference of the Swannanoa Cricket Club Domain Development Group or of P Fulton. S Nichols advised that P Fulton, who was the club secretary was speaking on behalf of the Club.

S Farrell commented that M Brown was often away. M Brown expressed concern that that was an unfair comment. The Chair permitted M Brown to respond in a personal statement. M Brown had arranged personal employment travel around his other commitments which included community and community board commitments, attending a high percentage of meetings.

M Brown explained that as a previous advisory board member he was an enabler for the Cricket Club bringing many groups to work together turning what was a hay paddock at the West Eyreton Domain into a native bush reserve. While the Cricket Club had a vision, it was not their domain and they needed to understand the co-dependency with the school and wider community. M Brown believed he had those skills to look at the big picture and bring the groups together. Swannanoa was on his doorstep.

Moved W Doody seconded J Lynn

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 170922102675.

(b) Approves the appointment of Board Member M Brown as a Board representative and liaison person, to the Swannanoa Cricket Club Domain Development Group. Furthermore in regard to areas involving J Enser’s speciality knowledge that the club liaise with J Enser also.

CARRIED

J Enser believed the arrangement would work well and was happy to provide advice.

M Brown was happy to seek out expert advice and was looking forward to bringing groups together.

The meeting adjourned for a workshop from 8.04pm to 8.41pm and a break from 8.41pm to 8.45pm.

7 REPORTS

7.1 The Oaks Reserve Draft Concept Plan – G Stephens (Green Space Community Engagement Officer)

S Markham advised that the concept plan had been developed and consulted with the previous Oxford-Eyre Advisory Board. This Community Board was being asked to accept the overall concept and recommend the plan go to the Council for funding consideration in the Long Term Plan (10 year budget). If funding was approved the plan would be subject to detailed planning and come back to the Board for further consideration. The key objective was to include the plan into the Long Term Plan (LTP) process to make sure there was a budget going forward.

S Farrell noted items that needed changing in the plan such as not being able to get to the woodland walk from the carpark without going through the dog park. S Markham advised that if funding was made available under the LTP then detailed planning would follow.
Moved J Lynn  seconded M Brown

**THAT** the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No 16106111868.

(b) **Notes** that staff have undertaken initial consultation with the community through a feedback flyer and at the request of the Oxford Eyre Ward Advisory Board used the results of this feedback to guide the design of the Draft Concept Plan for The Oaks Reserve.

(c) **Supports** staff submitting The Oaks Draft Concept Plan to Council for funding consideration from the 2018 2028 Long Term Plan. (Trim No. 71016111793).

(d) **Notes** that if funding is approved, the plan would be subject to a process of further public consultation before a more detailed concept plan was prepared. This would then be presented back to the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board for approval prior to being implemented.

(e) **Notes** that if the Board wishes to redevelop the area it will be necessary to change its classification under the Reserves Act from a Gravel Pit Reserve.

**CARRIED**

J Lynn noted recommendation (d), that it was a concept draft plan and would be subject to a process of further public consultation.

M Brown commented that it was important to progress the report so that it could get into the LTP. It would definitely still undergo detailed, robust public consultation.

K Felstead queried recommendation (e), changing the classification under the Reserves Act from a Gravel Pit Reserve and enquired if it was a long process that could hold up development in the future and should it be worked on now? Staff acknowledged the question.

An additional motion was proposed:

Moved K Felstead, seconded M Brown

(f) **Requests** that changing the area’s classification under the Reserves Act from a Gravel Pit Reserve be commenced in February 2018 once the general plan is accepted into the Councils 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.

**CARRIED**

### 7.2 Meeting venues and dates until end of 2018 – S Nichols (Governance Manager)

S Nichols advised that the meetings proposed had the same date and time pattern as the past year; that is, commencing 7pm on the first Thursday following the Council meeting. There had been no negative feedback on the arrangement from Board members or the public.

S Nichols advised the another aspect of the report was venues and reflected on a comprehensive report the Board considered last April of venue pros and cons. Rather than multiple venues there was a preference for two or three venues that covered the area to be used consistently.

S Nichols advised for the Ohoka area, an exact venue had not been specified as the Ohoka Domain Pavilion was scheduled in the coming months for renovation. A possibility was also the Ohoka Community Hall which had been
used before and was proven a suitable venue with good heating, size and accessibility. All other venues were secured on the dates in the recommendation.

S Nichols provided comment on Mandeville Sports Centre (MSC) as a venue advising that there had been issues with the arrangement for the September 2017 meeting. The venue had been promised exclusive use with no bar operational, however this was not the case on the meeting night. Due to safety concerns it was not deemed an appropriate venue to hold future Board meetings.

W Doody advised that as the Council representative on the MSC Board she would provide feedback to the Mandeville Sports Club.

There was some discussion around the Mandeville Sports Centre as a future venue. A letter was tabled from the Mandeville Sports Club, via J Ensor for potential 2018 meetings, advising the Board could be given a designated area, however that was not exclusive use. The letter was received.

K Felstead supported follow up on the possibility of future use. S Nichols advised she would work with the club and W Doody to see if an appropriate agreement could enable the Board to utilise the venue at some point in 2018. It was also noted any meeting would work around seasonal sport usage.

Moved M Brown  seconded J Lynn

**THAT** the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No. 171026116094

(b) **Resolves** to hold Board meetings at the following venues, commencing at 7.00pm on the following dates:
- Thursday 7 December 2017 – West Eryeton Hall
- Thursday 8 February 2018 – Oxford Town Hall (auditorium)
- Thursday 8 March – Ohoka
- Thursday 5 April – West Eryeton Hall
- Thursday 3 May – Oxford Town Hall (A&P Room)
- Thursday 7 June – Ohoka
- Thursday 5 July – West Eryeton Hall
- Thursday 9 August – Ohoka
- Thursday 6 September – Oxford Town Hall (A&P Room)
- Thursday 4 October – West Eryeton Hall
- Thursday 8 November – Ohoka
- Thursday 6 December – Oxford Town Hall (A&P Room)

(c) **Request** staff report in April 2018 on the possibility of using Mandeville Sports Centre under conditions acceptable to the Board and Governance staff.

**CARRIED**

W Doody advised that C Brown had a monthly meeting with Mandeville Sports Centre. She suggested that S Nichols could raise concerns at that meeting.

M Brown, as a private member of the Mandeville Sports Centre Board, advised that the Board was aware of concerns with exclusive use and were looking at ways that could be addressed. The centre did not want to lose bookings.

J Lynn commented even if the building could be split, there was still the issue of the bar.
It was agreed that S Nichols would work with W Doody and M Brown to find an appropriate solution.

7.3 **Retrospective ratification of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board’s Submission to Environment Canterbury regarding RC175184 Canterbury Landscape Supplies Ltd 949 South Eyre Road & 33 Diversion Road Eyreton – K Ward (Community Board Advocate)**

S Nichols provided an update on the process. The engaged planner was currently working on the information required for the hearing. The hearing had been set for the week of 4 December 2017. N Harrison advised that the WDC consent process was not yet ready for any notification stage.

It was proposed that on the week of 27 November, D Nicholl and the other member presenting to ECAn would meet with planner in order to go over the submission material to be presented at the hearing.

There was some discussion over who was going to present to ECAn. There had been discussion but no formal board resolution. S Nichols advised that the Board Chair was always the spokesperson with another member as support. It was suggested that J Lynn would accompany the Chair at the hearing, and if one of those members should become unavailable then M Brown would represent the Board at the hearing.

S Nichols advised the presentation would be no more than half an hour at a venue in Christchurch.

K Felstead asked why there was not a joint hearing with WDC and ECAn, which he believed that was compulsory under the RMA. S Markham suggested that it was only where practicable.

Moved W Doody  seconded M Brown

**THAT** the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No. 171027116328.

(b) **Ratifies** the Board’s Submission to Environment Canterbury (EcAn) regarding RC175184 Canterbury Landscape Supplies Ltd 949 South Eyre Road & 33 Diversion Road Eyreton. (Trim 171024114418).

**CARRIED**

7.4 **Ratification of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board’s Submission regarding the District Plan Review ‘Comments and Issues’ Phase – E Cordwell (Governance Adviser)**

S Markham advised that mid-late next year there would be a further round of District Plan follow-up with the Board.

Moved J Ensor  seconded M Brown

**THAT** the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No. 171009109016.

(b) **Ratifies** the Board’s Submission regarding the Waimakariri District Council’s District Plan Review ‘Comments and Issues’ Phase (Trim 171009108984).

**CARRIED**
J Ensor believed it was a very good submission and congratulated the Board.

8 CORRESPONDENCE

S Nichols advised the waste management matters would feed into the LTP, which would be consulted through the LTP in March 2018.

S Nichols advised that the letter from the Mandeville Residents’ Association regarding speed limits would be treated as a submission to the consultation approved in Item 6.1.

In December there would be a report to the Board regarding appointment of a representative to the Waimakariri Access Group. There had been an invitation to attend an event on the 21 November which was open to all members.

Moved J Lynn seconded S Farrell

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives the letter regarding Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan and Kerbside Options (Trim 171030116729).

(b) Receives both the letter from the Mandeville Residents’ Association regarding Speed Limits at Commercial Development at the Mandeville Village (Trim 171102118664) and the letter of acknowledgement (Trim 171101118551).

(c) Receives the request from the Waimakariri Access Group to appoint a representative to the group from the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board. (Trim 171033117662).

CARRIED

9 CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT

9.1 Chairperson’s Report for October 2017

Moved W Doody seconded M Brown

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No 17103117684.

CARRIED

10 MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

10.1 Woodend Sefton Community Board meeting minutes – 11 September 2017 (Trim No. 171003106542)

10.2 Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting minutes – 13 September 2017 (Trim No. 170919101095).

10.3 Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting minutes – 18 September 2017 (Trim No. 170918100755)


10.5 Battle of Passchendaele Commemoration 2017 – Report to Council 3 October 2017 (Trim No. 170922102546).


S Farrell sought clarification on some of the items relating to the Stormwater Drainage Bylaw Review. There was some discussion on the issues raised. S Markham advised that staff would arrange a briefing with the Board later in November. It was clearly a significant issue in the Mandeville area.

Moved W Doody seconded M Brown

*THAT* the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board receives the information in items 10.1-10.8.

**CARRIED**

11 **MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE**

11.1 **J Enser**

- Attended WHAG meeting. D Gordon was the Councillor representative. Tessa Sturley had taken over from Madeline Burdon as staff representative.
- The Motor Neuron Disease Mountain Bike fundraiser in memory of Councillor P Allen to held on 9.30am Sunday 12 November.
- Attended opening on Western Belfast Bypass.
- Attended Mandeville Residents Association meeting where developer’s outlined new development.
- Attended District Plan submission workshop.
- Attended Mandeville Sports Centre meeting.
- Commented on upcoming Cust School 150th anniversary celebrations.

11.2 **T Robson**

- Attended Pearson Park Advisory Group meeting
  - finalised design and placement of sign that was funded out of the Boards landscape budget.
  - discussed half basketball court investigation.
- Attended OPAC meeting.
- Attended Youth Council meeting where ideas for the Kaitapoi Town Centre plan were discussed.

11.3 **S Farrell**

- Attended Pearson Park Advisory Group meeting with on-site visit to park; discussed limb up trees for natural shade in the future.
- Concerns raised by residents regarding people walking through the pensioner flat complex.
- Received two complaints regarding speed and dangerous exit, referred to Council.
- Received queries on right hand turns.
- Sent ‘snap, send, solve’ requests to Council with great response.
- Attended Mandeville Residents Association meeting.
- Canterbury Landscape Supplies – advised a hold had been placed on some of the types of materials that could be delivered there.

11.4 **J Lynn**

- Was newly appointed as Deputy Chair of North Canterbury Neighbourhood Support.
- Attended Ohoka Domain meetings, currently receiving submissions.
- Attended Parks and Reserves Management meeting.
- Attended governance training sessions.
- Ohoka School 150th year celebration in October 2018 and was Chair of organising committee.
• The Ohoka School speed sign had been finalised.

11.5 **M Brown**
• Requested update on design of railing outside liquor store on Meyer Place.

11.6 **W Doody**
• Tabled Councillors report.

11.7 **K Felstead**
Commented on the 7 November Council meeting:
• Adopted accessibility strategy
• National Land Transport supported cycle education funding to $70-80,000.
• North Canterbury Riding for the Disabled – Council had agreed to defer payments on loan.
• Reclassified South Eyre Road Reserve.
• Agreed to secure new land for Lehman’s Road / River Road bypass.
• Agreed to fund share of Petries Road water main.
• Agreed to fund Tuahiwi sewage extension.

S Nichols provided an update on an unsealed section of North Eyre Road which was proposed to be sealed, following the Boards action. K Stevenson had advised that the project was out for tender closing mid-November, anticipating to be awarded prior to Christmas, which sealing occurring in the New Year.

12 **CONSULTATION PROJECTS**
12.1 **Dudley Park Shelter Belt Removal**
Consultation closes 5pm, 16 November 2017.

12.2 **Stormwater Drainage Bylaw**
http://www.waimakariri.govt.nz/have-a-say/letstalk/consultations/stormwater-drainage-bylaw
It was noted a staff briefing relating to the bylaw had been requested. Submissions close on 15 December 2017. It was proposed the Board could workshop their submission at the conclusion of their 7 December meeting to convey to staff the Board submission. A draft submission would then be circulated via email for comment and approval before the closing date.

12.3 **Williams Street Beach Road Intersection**
Consultation closes 5pm, 13 November 2017.
The Board noted the current consultations.

13 **REGENERATION PROJECTS**
13.1 **Town Centre, Oxford**
Updates on the Oxford Town Centre projects are emailed regularly to Board members. These updates can be located using the link below:

13.2 **New Arterial Road, Kaiapoi**

Regular updates on the progress of the new Arterial Road will be posted on the Council’s website. There are also links to intersection layout plans for each of the new intersections. The updates can be located using the link below:

The Board noted the regeneration updates.

14 **BOARD FUNDING UPDATE**

14.1 **Board Discretionary Grant**

Balance as at 9 November 2017: $3,660.95

S Nichols encouraged members to link with their community groups advising of the discretionary fund for consideration in the upcoming months.

M Brown noted the Swannanoa Cricket Club were wanting to move their club rooms and that Mandeville Sports Centre were looking for funding to plant trees. He would suggest both groups make an applications to the Board.

15 **MEDIA ITEMS**

S Farrell commented that the Board did not have a face in the community and suggested that the Board put out some information on what they were doing. S Nichols advised that a member of the communications team had been assigned to the Board. They would attend a meeting in the new to discuss initiatives. It was advised what other Community Boards are doing to connect with the community such as attending community events by setting up a location at the event with their banner flag and inviting conversation with members of the community. A member also wrote an article for the Woodpecker discussing what happened at the Board meeting. S Farrell noted it was difficult to get an article into the Observer. S Nichols commented there was very little budget for advertising. The Board advised of their strong desire to have presence (and tent) at the Oxford A&P show being held 31 March 2018.

16 **QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**

Nil.

17 **URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**

Nil.

**NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board is scheduled for Thursday 7 December 2017 commencing at 7.00pm, at West Eyreton.
THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 10.16pm.

CONFIRMED

__________________________
Chairperson

__________________________
Date

**Workshop** *(8.04pm to 8.41pm)*

Staff presented a workshop updating members of the Oxford Town Centre Strategy.
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE WOODEND-SEFTON COMMUNITY BOARD
HELD IN THE WOODEND COMMUNITY CENTRE, SCHOOL ROAD, WOODEND ON
MONDAY 13 NOVEMBER 2017 AT 7PM.

PRESENT
S Powell (Chairperson), A Thompson (Deputy Chair), A Allen, J Archer, and R Mather.

IN ATTENDANCE
C Sargison (Community and Recreation Manager), Mayor Ayers and E Stubbs (Minutes Secretary).

1 APOLOGIES
Moved A Thompson    seconded A Allen
Apologies were received and sustained from A Blackie and J Meyer for absence.   CARRIED

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
Nil.

3 CONFIRMATION MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board – 9 October 2017
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 9 October 2017, as a true and accurate record.
CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
Nil.

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS FROM THE COMMUNITY
Nil.

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS
Nil.

7 REPORTS
7.1 Park-run Route Markers – Pegasus Lake, Pegasus Town – M Kwant (Community Projects Officer) and C Brown (Community and Greenspace Manager)

C Sargison advised the report came as a result of a member of the community who spoke to staff. Board members had not been advised of the initiative earlier as the request came between Board meetings. In the future, the Board would be asked for approval to report on items regarding the General Landscaping Budget prior to a report presentation.

C Sargison advised that parkrun had a national standard of signage for each 1km marker. There would be six markers, each 1km apart. They were requested at Pegasus for the parkrun events, and as a large number of people used Pegasus for training it would be a good asset. It would be good to be able to install the signage before the summer season.
The standard design was powder coated aluminum panel 100mm x 100mm; they were installed to 500mm deep. Above ground, the markers stood to chest height, which meant they were easily visible. The markers would be placed on the asset register and receive regular maintenance and staining. The total cost was up to $2,395. If the funding was approved staff would look for other prices.

A Allen asked if they were aesthetically pleasing. C Sargison replied they were a standardized design, customized to Pegasus.

The cost was questioned by several Board members and C Sargison advised that staff would review the production and installation which may reduce the cost.

Moved A Allen seconded R Mather

THAT the Woodend-Seton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 171101118288

(b) Notes that there is currently $18,198.70 available within the Woodend Seton General Landscaping Budget to be spent on landscaping projects within the Woodend Seton ward.

(c) Approves the allocation of up to $2,395 to be funded from the Woodend Seton General Landscaping Budget, to implement the installation of permanent track markers on Pegasus Lake, Pegasus Town Park Run Route.

CARRIED

A Allen noted she had already seen the number of people using the track increasing for summer.

R Mather believed the markers were expensive, but was reassured by staff they would investigate a more cost effective solution. She believed it was a good idea as the parkrun concept was highly utilized.

7.2 Board Meeting Dates and Venues for 2018 – S Nichols (Governance Manager)

C Sargison advised that the meeting dates were the same intervals as the past year with alternating venues of Pegasus and Woodend. It could change during the year if there was a particular item of interest to the community. The lead-time to advertise the location was approximately one month. He noted that acoustically Waikuku Hall was not ideal for a meeting venue.

Moved S Powell seconded A Allen

THAT the Woodend-Seton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 171103119323.

(b) Resolves to hold Board meetings on the second Monday of the month, commencing at 7.00pm, and alternating venues between the Pegasus Community Centre and the Woodend Community Centre on the following dates:

- Monday 12 February 2018 - Pegasus
- Monday 12 March 2018 - Woodend
- Monday 9 April 2018 - Pegasus
- Monday 14 May 2018 - Woodend
- Monday 11 June 2018 - Pegasus
Monday 9 July 2018 - Woodend
Monday 13 August 2018 - Pegasus
Monday 10 September 2018 - Woodend
Monday 8 October 2018 - Pegasus
Monday 12 November 2018 - Woodend
Monday 10 December 2018 – Pegasus

CARRIED

7.3 **Ratification of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board’s Submission regarding the District Plan Review ‘Comments and Issues’ Phase – E Cordwell (Governance Adviser).**

Moved S Powell  seconded J Archer

**THAT** the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No. 171009108812.

(b) **Ratifies** the Board’s Submission regarding the Waimakariri District Council’s District Plan Review ‘Comments and Issues’ Phase (Trim 171003106646).

CARRIED

8 **CORRESPONDENCE**

C Sargison noted that the Waimakariri Access Group had requested a representative from the Board and a report would be presented for the December meeting. S Powell noted the accessibility training on 21 November 2017.

A Thompson enquired on progress on the Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan. C Sargison replied that there would be a recommendation from the hearing panel to the Council for the draft Long Term Plan. There would be an opportunity for the Board to make a further submission in the new year.

Moved R Mather  seconded A Thompson

**THAT** the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) **Receives** the letter regarding Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan and Kerbside Options (Trim 171030116729).

(b) **Receives** the request from the Waimakariri Access Group to appoint a representative to the group from the Woodend-Sefton Community Board. (Trim 171107120715).

CARRIED

9 **CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT**

9.1 **Chairperson’s Report for October-November 2017**

S Powell tabled information regarding an NZTA drop in session on 27 November 2017 between 2pm and 7pm at the Woodend Community Centre regarding the road safety project on SH1 between Saltwater Creek and Tram Road. Some of the safety improvements included widening the shoulders, putting in flexible roadside barriers, widening the centre line, improving risky intersections, landscaping and reviewing the speed. Public consultation would begin early next year. S Powell noted the Board had a particular interest in the project as it affected residents every day. She suggested that the arranged Board training be moved until a week later so Board members could attend the drop-in session. There was agreement to change the training session to 5.30pm 4 December 2017 at Rangiora.
The Board role at the NZTA drop-in session was raised and S Powell suggested members attend as they could. Feedback closed 4 December 2017. S Powell suggested members encourage groups to attend the drop-in session as it was not currently well publicised. S Powell suggested the Board send a formal letter to NZTA following the session.

Moved S Powell seconded A Allen

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:
(a) Receives report No. 171106119920.

CARRIED

10 MATTERS FOR INFORMATION
10.1 Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting minutes – 5 October 2017
(Trim No. 171018112694)
10.2 Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting minutes – 11 October 2017
(Trim No. 171018112700).
10.3 Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting minutes – 16 October 2017
(Trim No. 171016111634)
10.4 Draft Submission to the Productivity Commission’s issues paper on a
Low-emissions Economy – Report to Council 3 October 2017
(Trim No. 170920101559).
10.5 Battle of Passchendaele Commemoration 2017 – Report to Council
3 October 2017 (Trim No. 170922102354).
10.6 Road Safety Action Plan – Report to Council 24 October
(Trim No. 171004107285)
10.7 Stormwater Drainage Bylaw Review 2017/18 – Report to Council
24 October 2017 (Trim No. 170907097266)
10.8 CAREX Report on Glyphosate - Report to Council 24 October 2017
(Trim No. 171012110892)
10.9 Cam River Enhancement Allocation of Funding – Report to Council
24 October 2017 (Trim No. 170925103162)
C Sargison advised that consultation on the Stormwater Drainage Bylaw
review closed 15 December 2017. Oxford-Ohoka Community Board had
requested a briefing on the matter which was to be held 30 November at
5.30pm. It was open to all community board members. Due to time
constraints, if the Board wanted to make a submission, the key points could
be captured before their December meeting and the submission ratified
afterwards.

Moved A Thompson seconded J Archer

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board receives the information in
items 10.1-10.9.

CARRIED
11 MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE

11.1 October-November Diary for R Mather, A Allen and J Archer (Trim No. 171106119946)

11.2 A Thompson

- Assisted with Taranaki Stream projects.
- Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw.
  - The bylaw had been signed off by the Council prior to this meeting.
  - It was very important for this area, noting it was great to have a submission from the Community Board.
  - It would be called the Northern Pegasus Bay Coastal Strip to avoid confusion with the park.
  - Decisions had been in line with the Board submission including education, better signage and enforcement with tangible actions on all three points.

J Archer asked if the horse training issues had been raised. A Thompson advised that there had been no submission from horse trainers. C Sargison advised that staff had spent a lot of time working with the horse trainers group. In terms of complaints, a service request should be lodged. J Archer expressed concern at the lack of pipis on the beach and suggested it was a result of the horses training in the intertidal area, as he believed pipis were vulnerable to hooves.

11.3 R Mather

- In addition to submitted information, added that the seat for outside the Pegasus Community Centre had been purchased and would be fixed in place shortly.
- Congratulated the Woodend Community Association on the fantastic job with the Jill Creamer Trail and well organised opening.
- Expressed concern regarding the 100km/hr speed limit still in place alongside the construction area of the Woodend-Rangiora Cycleway. She had spoken to staff who had advised that 100km/hr was acceptable. C Sargison advised that as construction proceeded there would be temporary speed restrictions in place.

S Powell advised that at the following meeting B Rice would hold a workshop regarding the speed limit of Rangiora-Woodend Road/Chinnerys Road whole area including what the Community Board would like to see.

A number of items were raised by members.

A Thompson suggested a workshop at the following meeting regarding naming the Rangiora-Woodend cycle trail. It was noted that most of the cycleway was in the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi ward and the conversation would involve the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board as well as the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board.

S Powell noted there was no cutaway in the kerb on the walkway at Sandhill Road.

A Allen raised correspondence from L and J Smart regarding problem trees.

A Thompson asked if the Pegasus Toilets were up and running. C Sargison advised that they were still some signage to be installed. R Mather asked if there would be a change table and C Sargison replied that staff were investigating vandal proof options.

J Archer requested follow up on a previous letter written to the Council regarding problem trees at the boys brigade club where guttering had had to be replaced three times.
A Allen raised the unmown grass alongside the Pegasus Golf Club and asked if there was a process. C Sargison advised that staff had been speaking to the club advising of their responsibility for berms. It was the prime entrance to Pegasus and needed ongoing maintenance.

12 CONSULTATION PROJECTS

12.1 Dudley Park Shelter Belt Removal
Consultation closes 5pm, 16 November 2017.

12.2 Stormwater Drainage Bylaw
http://www.waimakariri.govt.nz/have-a-say/letstalk/consultations/stormwater-drainage-bylaw

12.3 Williams Street Beach Road Intersection
Consultation closes 5pm, 13 November 2017.

12.4 Ohoka Domain
Consultation closes 5pm, 21 November 2017.
http://www.waimakariri.govt.nz/have-a-say/lets-talk/consultations/ohoka-domain

The Board noted the consultation.

13 FOSTERING COMMUNITIES

C Sargison advised that at the December meeting he would provide a briefing on community facilities. There would be formal consultation through the draft Long Term Plan in March.

14 REGENERATION PROJECTS

14.1 Town Centres, Woodend-Pegasus
Updates on the Woodend-Pegasus area projects are emailed regularly to Board members. These updates can be located using the link below:

14.2 New Arterial Road, Kaiapoi
Regular updates on the progress of the new Arterial Road will be posted on the Council’s website. There are also links to intersection layout plans for each of the new intersections. The updates can be located using the link below:

The Board noted the projects.
15 **BOARD FUNDING UPDATE**

15.1 **Board Discretionary Grant**

Balance as at 9 October 2017: $1,935.97.

C Sargison noted that the landscape budget required some work. He advised that G Stephens would be speaking to the Board early in 2018 regarding suggestions for the General Landscaping budget. It would be ideal to have projects completed prior to winter.

16 **MEDIA ITEMS**

The discussion on the Facebook page regarding the opening of the Waikuku paddling pool was noted.

S Powell thanked R Mather for organizing the media regarding the Karen Eastwood memorial table and ‘give-a-little’ page for that.

17 **QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**

Nil.

18 **URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**

Nil.

**NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board is scheduled for 7pm, Monday 11 December 2017 at the Pegasus Community Centre.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 7.57pm.

CONFIRMED

__________________________________
Chairperson

__________________________________
Date
**WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**REPORT**

**FILE NO:** GOV-18 / 171128129050  
**REPORT TO:** Council  
**DATE OF MEETING:** 5 December 2017  
**FROM:** David Ayers, Mayor  
**SUBJECT:** Mayor’s Diary 31 October to 26 November 2017

1. **SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friday 3 November</td>
<td>Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attended launch of Canterbury Accessibility Charter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 4 November</td>
<td>Attended the Pines Beach Hall Opening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 6 November</td>
<td>Interview with David Hill (North Canterbury News)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regeneration Steering Group Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 7 November</td>
<td>Interview with Compass FM Radio Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 8 November</td>
<td>Attended Oxford Area School Y11-13 Prizegiving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 9 November</td>
<td>Achieving Smokefree Aotearoa by 2025 – workshop, Halswell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion with John Forrest regarding Picton-Christchurch Cycleway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oxford -Ohoka Community Board meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 10 November</td>
<td>With Mayor Winton Dalley, interviews or potential ENC Board members, Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 11 November</td>
<td>Wreath Laying for Armistice Day, Kaiapoi. Deputy Mayor Kevin Felstead attended on my behalf, the wreath-laying at Rangiora.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visited Kaiapoi Borough School Fair and Kaiapoi Community Garden Open Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 12 November</td>
<td>Participated in Jill Creamer Walkway Opening, Woodend and Woodend Beach, and Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust Open Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Briefly attended the start of the Walk 2 D’Feet MND, Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attended Kaiapoi Community Watch 25th Anniversary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 13 November</td>
<td>Interview with David Hill (North Canterbury News)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury Museum Trust Board meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waimakariri Water Zone Committee meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 14 November</td>
<td>Interview with Compass FM Radio Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 15 November</td>
<td>Friends of the Town Hall Meeting with Carol Waugh - Deputy Chair for the Friends of the Rangiora Town Hall Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Talk to St John Cadets, Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday-Friday 16-17</td>
<td>Attended and presented at LGNZ Rural-Provincial Meeting, Wellington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 20 November</td>
<td>Interview with David Hill (North Canterbury News)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White Ribbon event at Rangiora New Life School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kaiapoi-Tuahiw Community Board meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 21 November</td>
<td>Interview with Compass FM Radio Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White Ribbon event at Kaiapoi High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chamber of Commerce Farewell to Peter Townsend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 22 November</td>
<td>Tram Road, Mandeville: speed review meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Growing First Nation Economics – presentation in Christchurch by Canadian First Nations visitors to Hui a Iwi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 23 November</td>
<td>Inspection of WDC Kaiapoi Pensioner Housing Units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Canterbury Apprentices Graduation Ceremony, Christchurch, with Mayors Lianne Dalziel and Winton Dalley and Deputy Mayor Malcolm Lyall.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friday 24 November</td>
<td>Interview with David Hill (North Canterbury News)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Powhiri for Hui a Iwi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 25 November</td>
<td>White Ribbon Day Ride, Kaiapoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Canterbury Academy of Music Showcase Concert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 26 November</td>
<td>Hui A Iwi Gifts Giving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attended Rangiora Museum commemoration of 50 years at their Good Street site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 27 November</td>
<td>Met Tihou Messenger-Weepu re Tuia Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Met developers Jeff Taylor and Alan Fowler re west Rangiora</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No 171128129050

David Ayers
MAYOR