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WOODEND-SEFTON COMMUNITY BOARD

AGENDA FOR THE MEETING OF THE WOODEND-SEFTON COMMUNITY BOARD TO BE HELD IN PEGASUS COMMUNITY CENTRE, MAIN STREET, PEGASUS ON MONDAY 13 AUGUST 2018 AT 7PM.

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

BUSINESS PAGES

1 APOLOGIES

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

3 CONFIRMATION MINUTES
   3.1 Minutes of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board – 9 July 2018

   RECOMMENDATION
   THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:
   (a) Confirms the circulated minutes of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting, held 9 July 2018, as a true and accurate record.

4 MATTERS ARISING

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS FROM THE COMMUNITY
   5.1 Greg Byrnes will provide an update on the work of Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust.
   5.2 Craig Sargison (Community and Recreation Manager) will provide an update on Community Facilities Further Investigation.

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS

7 REPORTS
8 CORRESPONDENCE

RECOMMENDATION
THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:
(a) Receives the letter advising of the Council's decisions in relation to the Woodend-Sefton Community Board submission to the Draft Long Term Plan 2018-2028 (Trim 180806088251).

9 CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT

9.1 Chairperson's Report for July 2018

RECOMMENDATION
THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:
(a) Receives report No. 180806088191.

10 MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

10.1 Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting minutes – 5 July 2018 (Trim No. 180628071750).
10.2 Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting minutes – 11 July 2018 (Trim No. 180628071844).
10.3 Kaiapoi Tuahiwi Community Board meeting minutes – 16 July 2018 (Trim No. 180713078003).
10.4 Library Update – Report to Community and Recreation Committee 24 July 2018 (Trim No 180706075217).
10.5 Adoption of Stormwater Drainage and Watercourse Protection Bylaw 2018 – report to Council 1 May 2018 (Trim No 180329034013).

RECOMMENDATION
THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board receives the information in items 10.1-10.5.

Note: Matters for Information were circulated to members separately.

11 MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE

11.1 July Diary for A Allen, J Archer, A Thompson and R Mather (Trim No. 180802087161)
12 CONSULTATION PROJECTS

Flaxton Road
Consultation closes Monday 20 August 2018.
https://www.waimakariri.govt.nz/have-a-say/lets-talk/consultations/flaxton-road

Draft Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan
Consultation closes Monday 3 September 2018.

13 FOSTERING COMMUNITIES

14 BOARD FUNDING UPDATE

14.1 Board Discretionary Grant
Balance as at 8 August 2018: $4000.

14.2 General Landscaping Fund
Balance as at 8 August 2018 $12,160.

15 MEDIA ITEMS

16 QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

17 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

NEXT MEETING
The next meeting of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board is scheduled for 7pm, Monday 10 September 2018 at the Woodend Community Centre.

Workshop
- Members Forum

Briefing
- Rob Hawthorne (Property Manager) will provide an update on the Coastal Forestry project.

A briefing is not open to the Public.
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE WOODEND-SEFTON COMMUNITY BOARD
HELD IN MEETING ROOM A, WOODEND COMMUNITY CENTRE, SCHOOL ROAD,
WOODEND ON MONDAY 9 JULY 2018 AT 7.00PM.

PRESENT
S Powell (Chairperson), A Thompson (Deputy Chair), A Allen, J Archer, A Blackie,
R Mather and J Meyer.

IN ATTENDANCE
S Markham (Strategy and Engagement Manager), S Nichols (Governance Manager),
C Brown (Community Greenspace Manager), J McBride (Roading and Transport
Manager), Mayor D Ayers and E Stubbs (Minutes Secretary).

1 APOLOGIES
Nil.

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
Nil.

3 CONFIRMATION MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board – 11 June 2018
Moved J Meyer seconded J Archer
THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:
(a) Confirms the circulated minutes of the Woodend-Sefton Community
Board meeting, held 11 June 2018, as a true and accurate record.
CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
Nil.

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS FROM THE COMMUNITY
5.1 Julie, Wayne and Tyler Power (Pegasus residents) addressed the Board to
seek the removal of several lake side trees on the north side of Pegasus Lake
(Item 7.1). J Power spoke to a handout (Trim 180718079871) asking the
Community Board if four Griselinia Shrubs, three of which have formed a
hedge, could be removed from the front of their lake side section at 55 The
Esplanade, Pegasus Town as they blocked a good part of their lake view.
J Power advised that they loved shrubs, bushes and trees. They had started
a lifestyle property from a bare block where they planted a large variety of
trees, bushes and shrubs.

J Power advised that after finding their dream section at Pegasus Town with
a beautiful lake view they were disappointed and upset with the Griselinia
shrubs which have grown into large bushes. They impinge on the lake view
and if left will keep on growing. They were happy to pay for the removal of the
bushes and to pay for replacement trees in consultation with the Council, as
to variety. These would be trees that can be seen through as they form a
canopy with a trunk, unlike Griselinia that do not have a single trunk but a
variety of stems from ground level. A quote, from the Oxford dictionary tree
definition "A woody perennial plant typically having a single stem or trunk
growing to a considerable height and bearing branches at some distance from
the ground". J Power noted that the Council had a tree policy and asked if
Griselinia shrubs fell under that policy.
J Power advised that she had spoken to several nurseries and had been told by all that Griselinia were well known, bought and produced for hedging which can be considered as unsuitable to grow in front of a lake side property. The growth rate was medium with one nursery saying that the shrub could grow up to 10 metres tall.

J Power advised that she first contacted Council in January 2017 asking if the Griselinia could be trimmed or removed. She received an email response from Council staff that it is not the intention to remove healthy trees or shrubs. Eventually, the shrubs did get a small height trim. J Power got back in touch with the Council April 2018 and met G Barnard (Parks Community Assets Officer) on site. It was then arranged to meet C Brown (Community Green Space Manager) and Shona Powell (Community Board Chair) on-site at which time options were discussed, however it was agreed that they could not be trimmed further than they had been. J Power believed that a suitable compromise could have been substantial trimming 18 months ago when first requested.

J Power referred to para 4.5 of Report 7.1 in the agenda which was a summary of concerns raised and staff responses. J Power provided replies to those items.

1. Concern is more than the height of the Griselinia. Griselinia form a hedge, which three already have. They grow to three metres in width and five metres plus in height which is a block unlike a tree which one can see through. All benefits for example: vertical relief and breaking up the built form as viewed from Western shores, will still be there with replacement "trees".

2. The bushes require ongoing maintenance as they grow onto the path. That cost would be eliminated, if the shrubs were removed.

3. The other planted shrub beds around the lake, are substantially further from residential properties. Most of them being on Lakeside Drive which has a berm, a footpath, a road, grass frontage then the bushes. J Power’s property had the closest strip of reserve around the lake that has planting next to properties. At 5 Kewai Court there are just two bottle brush trees with a gap in the middle. As they are in tree form they do not block the lake view.

4. There would be no negative effects as listed and perhaps more benefits. A tree creates a canopy for all day shade unlike bushes. Regarding landscape amenity enhancement, it would be superior with a tree as you can see through the trunk area to other plantings. Wind protection is minimal on the inside of the bushes as you need to stand on the path, and on the lake side of the bushes there is no designated picnic area. There is also no lake access or lake edge access because of other plantings.

5. The report says there were no residents at the time of planting to consult with. There are now several residents.

6. An experienced landscape architect would be unlikely to plant hedging in front of a property with a lake view. Consideration needs to be given to how these lake side properties were marketed, sold and priced by the developer. Replacement trees will also benefit the wider Pegasus community.

J Power noted that at no time was it said that they would like the trimming or removal because of the "distant mountains" view. One of the policy objectives 7.2.2 is to plant appropriate trees on Council managed land for the benefit of current and future generations. J Power believed it was unfair to plant an unsuitable bush just because it grew easily in the environment.

J Power thanked the Board for listening, saying that people’s genuine concerns and feelings were more important than bushes, especially bushes
that had a direct negative impact on someone and were able to be remedied. The Power family were hoping for the Board’s approval to remove the bushes. J Power commented that they loved Pegasus and were looking forward to living there.

R Mather noted that she had visited the site and referred to a tabled photo asking if it showed half the width of the section. J Power commented that one fence and the real estate sign on the other side could be seen. R Mather commented that the section had beautiful views and J Power advised that they had bought the section when it had a clear lake view and the bushes had grown up to impinge on that view. The issue was upsetting and getting worse.

J Archer advised that he had visited the site and noted that the Griselinia had been badly affected by trimming. He agreed with removal of some of the Griselinia and saw others as part of the view.

A Allen asked if removal of the three hedge Griselinia would suffice for the Power family. J Power replied she would be happy for the hedge (three shrubs) to be removed. T Power commented that would be a concession to remove three of the four shrubs.

S Powell asked if the section was currently on the market. J Power replied that they owned two lake side sections, both of which were on the market. The sale of one section would determine their building plans on the remaining section. If the bushes were removed there was a good chance that they would build on that section. They had received feedback from potential purchasers regarding the bushes, and how they detracted from the lake view, and potentially purchase of the section.

S Powell asked if it would be possible to leave the decision around bush removal for a potential purchaser in the future. J Power replied they had received a lot of feedback from Pegasus residents and potential purchasers that the hedge was unsuitable for a lakeside view. She did not think they would get a potential buyer if the bushes kept growing.

J Archer asked what they thought of cabbage trees as a suitable replacement and J Power liked that they had a single trunk.

*Item 7.1 was taken at this time. Note that the minutes have been recorded in accordance with the order of the agenda as circulated.*

5.2 J McBride (Roading and Transport Manager) provided an update on roading priorities for 2018-2019 and sought feedback from the Board on the roading programme. J McBride advised that the renewal of kerb and channel and footpaths was driven by the condition rating for which an inspection was carried out every three years. Work was coordinated with the 3Waters and Greenspace teams.

R Mather asked about crossings in Pegasus. J McBride advised that Pegasus rumble strips were being taken out under maintenance. It was not sitting as a specific project in the three year plan. I Kennedy (Road Maintenance Engineer) was in contact with the Pegasus Residents Group and J McBride would follow-up with I Kennedy.

S Powell noted the extension of the footpath in Woodend to the Anglican Church which was in the Board Long Term Plan (LTP) submission. J McBride advised it had been assessed as part of the new footpath programme. Due to the presence of a large drain it was expensive, and from a cost/benefit analysis the project had fallen in priority. J McBride noted there was funding for cycleways and footpaths in a new NZTA category. There was potential to feed the project into that funding stream. Another factor was the NZTA funding set asked for safety improvements in Woodend. There was still a lot of work to do in that space connecting Woodend and North Woodend.
A Allen asked if there was potential for traffic lights as an alternative to the Pegasus Roundabout. J McBride commented in the future traffic movements would increase with Ravenswood and traffic lights may be required at some time in the future. The roundabout was a good interim measure.

A Thompson asked about a Woodend path extension north to Pegasus/Ravenswood on the State Highway and asked if there was an option for path to go through Ravenswood. J McBride was not aware of details but understood there was a path planned; it was a few years away.

A Thompson referred to the drain on the eastern side on the main entrance to Rangiora and asked if there were plans for that drain to be piped. J McBride advised that there were plans to upgrade Flaxton Road and there would be discussions around what the road would look like. The project would likely include kerb and channel on the drain side, and improvements to tidy up the drain, but there were no plans to pipe as that was a costly exercise.

S Powell asked about a compulsory stop at Flaxton Road/Fernside Road intersection. J McBride noted the new route linking West Belt and Townsend Road to Fernside Road.

S Powell asked about the Rangiora Woodend path ends. J McBride advised there was a project underway looking at cycleways in the district and where improvements could be made.

S Powell asked about Gressons Road improvements and J McBride noted that it would look at the bridges, road signs and markings to make sure they were suitable.

S Powell asked about the Rangiora Woodend Road, in particular road safety at the Boys Road intersection and J McBride advised there was funding this financial year for design.

J Archer asked about a Tuahiwi footpath noting the Board’s LTP submission. J McBride advised that project is part of the walking/cycling programme.

5.3 S Markham (Manager Strategy and Engagement) provided an update regarding the District Development Strategy (DDS) and provided a copy of the Waimakariri 2048 DDS. He commented it was the end of a long process to finalise the document. There had been workshops with the Board and members of the community to look ahead, set out and describe the broad direction for development for the next 30 years. It was expected that there would be a continuation of the significant growth in the district.

S Markham noted the other purpose of the document was to provide context within which to undertake the review of the District Plan. A wider context was the Greater Christchurch Partnership and the opportunities and constraints that it provided to the Council.

S Markham referred to page 43 of the 2048 DDS document which related to transport in the Woodend/Pegasus area. Even if the Council undertook no new zoning the community had an estimated population of 12,000. There had been some discussion at the workshop of what a community of that size needed or wanted. There needed to be thought about movement patterns within towns and connections. The eastern bypass was a live issue and the Council was mindful to engage with government to get certainty around the confirmed alignment and timing.

S Markham referred to page 33 of the document which related to key activity centres in the area. The proposed Ravenswood commercial area provided an element of opportunity. There would be a more intensive workshop discussion with the developer. Also in light of the persistent uncertainty regarding the Woodend Bypass there was a need to manage the existing Woodend Town Centre including safety until the long term situation was resolved. It was not about doing nothing but keeping a push on active management and looking to the long term role of the commercial area in Woodend without a highway designation.
The Board raised a number of corrections around road locations/names in the document.

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS
Nil.

7 REPORTS

7.1 Pegasus Lake Griselinia Removal Request — C Brown (Community Greenspace Manager)

C Brown spoke to the report noting that its purpose was to seek a decision regarding the four Griselinia trees located outside 55 The Esplanade. C Brown acknowledged the thorough deputation from the Power family.

C Brown highlighted para 7.2.1 in the report regarding legislation. The Griselinia were of a significant enough size to be treated as trees and therefore the Councils Street and Reserves Tree Policy applied.

C Brown highlighted the benefits of the four plants for the Pegasus area. It was important to note that the Griselinia were very healthy as many trees planted in Pegasus have struggled to grow in the difficult environment. The Griselinia provided vertical relief, native habitat biota nodes, wind protection, landscape amenity enhancement, creation of more discrete areas for passive recreation activities and breaking up the built form. C Brown commented that the Griselinia were effective in providing those benefits.

C Brown referred to para 4.5 in the report which was a summary of the request of residents for removal and staff comments. There had been no feedback from flyers distributed to three neighbouring residents.

C Brown referred to the criteria in the Council Street and Reserves Tree Policy and advised that currently the Griselinia did not meet the criteria to remove.

J Archer asked about the ongoing maintenance problem keeping the hedge off the path. C Brown replied that the bushes had been hedged and were not able to be ‘lifted’ as they had too many stems. They required maintaining off the path however the cost was not significant. J Archer noted the ongoing maintenance and asked if cabbage trees would provide the vertical relief. C Brown replied they would, however the lake was big and there was a need to plant new trees for vertical relief. He noted that trees were inspected on a three yearly basis and would require more ongoing cost than the bushes.

J Archer asked if the shelter provided would be minimal and C Brown replied that there would be some degree of shelter by tucking up on the other side if you were having a picnic.

A Allen asked C Brown who he perceived the lake edge users to be. C Brown advised that was anyone who used that lake as it was a public space. A Allen commented that no one used that area for picnicking or shelter as it was not possible to approach the water. C Brown commented that they could not monitor all parks and locations which was why the Community Board was important. The Griselinia did break up the space for passive and recreational use and by removing the Griselinia that opportunity was reduced for future users of the space.

J Meyer asked whether the bushes could be shaped into individual trees. It was noted that it was not possible as there were now too many leaders.

J Archer asked about removing a selected few of the plants. C Brown noted that for the reasons identified individual plants were not recommended to be removed as it would still have a negative impact on values. It was the decision of the Community Board, as per their delegation from the Council.
A Thompson commented it was an important issue with a variety of views. He asked if there were other Griselinia around the lake and C Brown replied yes. A Thompson asked if staff had hedged the Griselinia and C Brown replied they had been pruned after requests by the owners and also due to their locality next to the footpath.

A Thompson asked if the area had been planted at the time of the section being sold. C Brown replied yes they were planted as part of the overall development with a lot of thought from the landscape architect to provide a cohesive planting plan including the bottle brush to attract birds.

R Mather asked if there was a precedent for the plants removal elsewhere in the district and what the likelihood was for it setting a precedent in Pegasus. C Brown replied that other residents did have plants in front of the properties in Pegasus. In those instances the trees were generally further away. A precedent could be set anywhere. The Community Board had the delegation to approve the removal of trees from Council Green Space land and there were many situations where trees were removed or retained outside of policy. It was looked at on a case by case basis.

Moved A Allen seconded A Blackie

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180629072319
(b) Notes that removal of the shrubs would not be consistent with Councils Tree Policy.
(c) Notes that three adjacent residents were sent a letter asking for feedback however, no replies were received.
(d) Approves the removal of the three hedged Griselinia and the lone Griselinia and request they are replaced with alternative planting at the cost of the Power family. Replacement options to be determined by Community Greenspace and presented to the Woodend-Sefton Community Board for approval by way of report and sample photography.

CARRIED

J Archer and R Mather Abstained

A Division was called

For: A Allen, A Blackie and J Meyer
Against: S Powell and A Thompson
Abstain: J Archer and R Mather.

Motion carried 3:2

A Allen commented that it was a comprehensive report and there had been a passionate submission from the Power family.

A Blackie referred to previous requests for tree removal for example silver birches near schools and Kaiapoi cherry blossoms. He supported the motion as he believed there were a number of items in favour of the request to remove including, costs would be met by the applicants and not the ratepayers, although the Council had signed off planting it was not a Council arborist who had chosen the trees, he believed the Griselinia were ugly, shelter was limited and it was a solvable issue at no expense to the Council.

A Thompson did not support the motion for a number of reasons including that there were many situations where people liked or disliked public plantings, there was still a substantial view from the property, the plants were present when the property was purchased and the representation was from one
property owner rather than a group of residents. He noted the owners had offered to meet the costs.

R Mather remarked she found the decision difficult. She agreed with A Thompson, believing there was nothing wrong with the view, the photograph shown was a part of the property, and the plants had the advantage of blocking the view of the apartments. As a house was yet to be built on the section, the impact of the view from the future house was yet to be determined. R Mather was concerned approving the tree removal would open it up for more residents to request tree removal in the future. On the other side there was minimal disruption if the trees were replaced.

J Meyer appreciated the submission from the family. He supported the motion to remove the shrubs as the plants were hedges rather than true trees. He did not believe that it would encourage others to request tree removal. He had been swayed by the photographs of ‘true’ trees provided by the family.

J Archer noted that he had walked around the area and looked at the trees. He believed from parts of the property there were clear views and the trees added to the landscape. He would prefer a selection of the trees to be removed. Any remaining Griselinia would still require maintenance.

S Powell advised that she had been to the section a number of times. The plants did provide wind shelter and broke up the landscape. It was possible to picnic in that area. She was concerned about precedent setting and believed, looking at the big picture, the plants did add value to the community and visitors to the lake.

7.2 Woodend-Sefton Community Board’s Discretionary Grant Fund 2018/2019 and General Landscaping Fund 2018/2019 - E Cordwell (Governance Adviser)

S Nichols spoke briefly to the report and asked the Board to start thinking over the next few months how they would like the landscaping money spent. The funding application criteria remained the same with minor tweaks to the funding form. It was the same form for all Community Boards. It would be uploaded to the website after the Board signed off. S Nichols provided some clarification on the ‘who will benefit’ question on the application.

It was noted there was a CPI increase to the landscaping budget.

Moved A Allen   seconded J Archer

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180627071293.

(b) **Notes** that the Board’s General Landscaping Budget allocated by the Council for 2018/19 is $12,160.

(c) **Notes** that the Board’s Discretionary Grant Funding allocated by the Council for 2018/2019 is $4,000.

(d) **Approves** the Board’s 2018/2019 Discretionary Grant Fund Application Criteria and Application Form (Trim No. 180627071237).

(e) **Approves** the Board’s 2018/2019 Discretionary Grant Accountability Form (Trim No. 180621068888).

(f) **Approves** that Discretionary Grant Fund applications will continue to be considered at each meeting for the 2018/2019 financial year (July 2018 to June 2019).

CARRIED
7.3 **Approval of the updated Woodend-Sefton Community Board Plan 2018/19 – E Cordwell (Governance Adviser)**

S Nichols spoke briefly to the report noting the layout would be improved when it was in a different format.

Moved R Mather seconded J Meyer

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180627071416.

(b) **Approves** the final draft of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board Plan 2018-2019 (Trim 180606062276) subject to any minor edits discussed and approved by the Board Chairperson.

CARRIED

R Mather commented that she had provided feedback and was happy for the Chair to approve minor edits.

A Allen was glad the updated version was less ‘wordy’.

8 **CORRESPONDENCE**

S Powell noted the tabled Waimakariri District Council Stormwater Drainage and Watercourse Protection Bylaw 2018 submission response (Trim 180619067680).

9 **CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT**

9.1 **Chairperson’s Report for June 2018**

S Powell commented that it was good to see Board members at the Rangiora-Woodend Path opening.

Moved S Powell seconded J Archer

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180703073564.

CARRIED

10 **MATTERS FOR INFORMATION**

10.1 **Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting minutes – 7 June 2018** (Trim No. 180530059840).

10.2 **Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting minutes – 13 June 2018** (Trim No: 180606062470).

10.3 **Kaiapoi Tuahiwi Community Board meeting minutes – 21 May 2018** (Trim No.180518054887).

10.4 **Kaiapoi Tuahiwi Community Board meeting minutes – 18 June 2018** (Trim No.180618067116).

10.5 **Youth Council meeting minutes – 29 May 2018**

10.6 **Environment Canterbury Representation Review – report to Council 3 July 2018** (Trim No 180624069683).


10.8 **Final Greenspace Activity Management Plan 2018 – report to Council 3 July 2018** (Trim No 180614066068).

Moved J Archer seconded A Thompson

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board receives the information in items 10.1-10.19.

CARRIED

11 MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE

11.1 March Diary for J Archer, A Thompson and R Mather

(Trim No. 180703073567)

R Mather

- Noted that she was yet to hear back from the meeting regarding the Pegasus Community Centre.
- Commented that the Transport Forum had been interesting and noted the public transport focus of the new government.

J Meyer

- Noted the presence of the new Roading Manager at the meeting and encouraged Board members to review the roading programme.
- Commented that Councillors and staff had been busy with the LTP.
- Noted upcoming meetings regarding water quality and the challenges in that space for the future.
- Consultation for Kaiapoi Town Centre opens on 6 August and closes on 3 September 2018 with hearings in late September. A Blackie, K Barnett and J Meyer were on the hearings panel.

A Blackie

- Advised that S Stewart had provided an update from the Waimakariri Zone Committee and there was planned consultation in July 2018. Nitrate levels were expected to climb for the next 20 years. Silverstream had risen from 6.2 Nitrate-N g/m³ to 11.2 Nitrate-N g/m³ in 12 months, the maximum allowable value was 11.3 Nitrate-N g/m³. It was an intergenerational problem that would take decades to fix. Individuals and Council needed to look at solutions to high nitrate levels in water supplies.
- Advised that the Kaiapoi River scheme was facing difficulties around timing constraints and delays. In mid-February 2019 there was to be the River Carnival opening which could include the Christchurch Boat Show on regeneration land.

A Allen

- Attended North Canterbury Neighbourhood Support (NCNS) planning meeting. Noted NCNS had good support from Hurunui and Kaikoura District Councils but there was some push back from the Waimakariri District Council. Looking to do a presentation to the Community Boards to improve the relationship. The New Zealand Police were happy with NCNS.
- Public Spaces Policy question and answer session at Rossburn Reception 26 July 2018.

A Thompson

- Commented planting at Taranaki Stream was going well.

12 CONSULTATION PROJECTS

Business Zones 1 & 2 Public Spaces Policy
Consultation closes Monday 30 July 2018.

S Powell noted the Kaiapoi Town Centre consultation would occur through August.

13 FOSTERING COMMUNITIES
Nil.

14 BOARD FUNDING UPDATE
14.1 Board Discretionary Grant
Balance as at 9 July 2018: $4000.

14.2 General Landscaping Fund
Balance as at 9 July 2018 $12,160.

15 MEDIA ITEMS
Item in the last issue of the Sefton Community Newsletter regarding funding.

16 QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS
Nil.

17 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS
Nil.

NEXT MEETING
The next meeting of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board is scheduled for 7pm, Monday 13 August 2018 at the Pegasus Community Centre.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 8.45pm
CONFIRMED

__________________________
Chairperson

__________________________
Date
03 August 2018

Dear Ms Cordwell,

DRAFT LONG TERM PLAN 2018-2028 COUNCIL DELIBERATIONS

Thank you for taking the time to prepare your submission on the Draft Long Term Plan 2018-2028. The Council appreciates your contribution to the 10 year planning decision-making process and values the opportunity it had to hear submissions from those who attended the Hearings.

This letter is to advise you of the Council’s decisions in relation to the submission points raised.

Submission Point: Kerbside Collection Services

Summary of Submission: The Board supports the Council in offering choice and consultation through the LTP process. The Board queries the arrangements for businesses especially new businesses and how this ‘commercial’ waste can be minimised. The Board also urges strong action and enforcement of developer activities and associated waste – for example polystyrene and wall board. There are numerous instances of polystyrene pollution of green spaces, waterways and drainage channels situated near to both large and small building sites and developments. The Board suggests that penalty clauses be considered as a part of the consenting processes which are then strictly enforced.

Council Decision: Residents within the kerbside collection service areas will be able to choose the kerbside collection service they would like. Council staff will make preparations to get the service ready for introduction from July 2019. This includes asking all ratepayers in the kerbside collection area which bins they would like for their property, tendering for the physical bins and selecting a contractor to run the service.

There are 14 different service options ranging from the compulsory recycling bin through to three bins for recycling, refuse and organics (green waste). The cost will vary depending on the service and size of bins selected, and in light of recent international recycling market developments, rates may vary from $103 up to $388 per year. For a household selecting the standard three bin service, the cost of $338 will be charged to your rates bill from 1 July 2019.

Submission Point: Multi-use Sports Facility

Summary of Submission: The Board strongly supports the principle of such a facility and the benefits that it would bring to the district. However, the Board urges the Council to consider more innovative funding options other than to be fully funded by ratepayers.

Members regard the $23 million as too high to fall solely on rate payers and also query whether a more realistic design should be considered. One which achieves full sporting functionality but with minimal design aesthetics.

Members noted a number of potential and realistic scenarios that could be pursued including seeking partners for its construction in whole or in part. Members noted ‘big box’ companies moving into the district together with successful community focused existing businesses such as those offering Retirement complexes, Mainpower or similar as potential contributors. Many such community facilities receive large donations that are then recognised in some way within the building. Naming of a room or acknowledged on the ‘opening plaque’.
It is not clear whether any other options have been explored and the outcome of these.

The Board urges strong engagement with Environment Canterbury as regards the critical need for public transport – now and even more so in the future – if the facility is built. The board has consistently lobbied ECAn for a Bus service connecting Woodend/Pegasus/Waikuku with the wider area including Rangiora. If ECAn are either unwilling or unable to recognise the critical need for public transport within the District and these critical interconnections, perhaps the Council itself should consider a local arrangement and contract to stimulate usage and offer the services that are clearly needed and currently lacking.

The Board also notes that further complementary sports and recreation facilities remain a high priority and necessity for other local areas such as Pegasus and Oxford.

**Council Decision:** The Council agreed to proceed with the development of the Multi-Use Sports Facility at Coldstream Road for a total project cost of $27.85 million. It is anticipated design of the facility will start in 2018 and is expected that the building will be available for community use during 2020. The cost for this will be $91 per ratepayer per year.

The North Canterbury Sport and Recreation Trust will operate the Multi-Use Sports Facility under a formal operating agreement to be negotiated. Under this agreement it is anticipated that the Trust will lease space required for its commercial activities at market rates. It is intended that the Trust generate sufficient income for operating the four court facility to meet all operating costs of the facility from 2022, so that a return is provided to the Council each year.

**Submission Point:** District Regeneration

**Summary of Submission:** The Board is supportive but notes that there is little information on the substance of what is proposed within the Draft LTP Consultation document to identify how such a significant allocation of funds will be used.

**Council Decision:** The Council will spend $18.6 million to deliver the post-earthquake work programme in the Kaiapoi area over the next 10 years. This includes projects like a BMX track, dog park, recreational and ecological links and sports fields and changing facilities.

The District Regeneration work programme will see the deferral of $1.4 million for the development of the ashes cemetery to an outer year of the Long Term Plan (beyond 2027/28). In addition, the balance of the Regeneration budget will be re-spread for the implementation of recreation and ecological linkages to:

- 2018/19 - $200,000
- 2019/20 - $520,000
- 2020/21 - $400,000.

The re-spread of funding over the three years does not affect the overall budget provision for District Regeneration.

**Submission Point:** Community Facilities

**Summary of Submission:** Pegasus, Woodend and Ravenswood The Board urges immediate action to enable a larger permanent community centre to be established at Pegasus and notes that the ‘trigger threshold’ has been reached already. The Board supports the retention of the current Woodend Community Centre but does NOT support the proposal for a Library and Community centre
to be located at Woodend/Pegasus and urges that this be placed at Ravenswood and that a suitable site is earmarked even at this early stage in readiness for the expansion of the development and population ‘trigger’ for release of the LTP funding. The Board requests that this Ravenswood Hub should also take the form of a ‘mini service centre’ as in Oxford and the Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre.

Rangiora Library Extension The Board notes that there are currently significant issues with the heating and ventilation systems and that these need urgent attention for the comfort of all users and staff.

**Council Decision:** In response to district growth Council staff will investigate a location for a community facility based in Woodend/Pegasus with construction proposed for 10 years’ time.

Budget has been approved for 2021/22 to 2023/24 for the planning, design and construction of expansion to the Rangiora Library. Provision has also been made for the development of car-parking for community group buildings in the Kaiapoi Regeneration Areas. It is anticipated this will take place from 2024/25 onwards.

**Submission Point:** Corporate Accommodation

**Summary of Submission:** The Board supports changes to improve the heating and general environment of the building and the cramped conditions for staff at present. The Board notes the report to Council – TRIM 180119004578 in this regard.

**Council Decision:** The refurbishment includes significant expenditure on compliance issues and aging building services that are both due for renewal and suffering from functional obsolescence. Careful analysis has also been given to reasonable foreseeable staffing requirements consistent with a growing district. There are no current or foreseeable prospects for amalgamation that would in itself eliminate the need to provide for future growth. Instead of leasing additional space consideration has been given to better utilisation of the existing space within the building and the proposed project enables this to happen within the existing building footprint.

**Submission Point:** Community Grants

**Summary of Submission:** The Board fully supports the proposed LTP funding of $150,000 and acknowledges the excellent work that the Te Kohaka o Tuhaitara Trust achieves.

**Council Response:** The Council thanks you for your support and looks forward to working with the Te Kohaka o Tuhaitara Trust over the next year.

**Submission Point:** Are we doing enough to manage drinking water quality?

**Summary of Submission:** The Board supports the Council’s plans and options to achieve drinking water standards.

**Council Response:** Thank you for your submission and support.

**Submission Point:** Are we doing enough to manage flooding?

**Summary of Submission:** Concern is expressed at the continual flooding at Waikuku and Woodend Beach townships and requests funding be provided for an investigation into drainage and options to resolve the situation.

**Council Decision:** Service Council staff agree with the need to check and clear drainage...
infrastructure prior to a predicted storm event.

Public education is recognised by Council as key to getting public support in managing the public and private drainage systems. Staff will undertake a series of initiatives aimed at public education, in 2018. The Council supports clearing of excessive exotic vegetation from braided rivers. It is noted that the management of the main rivers within the district is an Environment Canterbury function.

Drainage issues at Waikuku Beach are being investigated by staff and a report will be taken to the Council’s Utilities and Roading Committee. Staff have requested flood works budgets at Mandeville be bought forward, at the request of the Mandeville Residents Association. River bank protection works in Ashley River/Rakahuri are the responsibility of Environment Canterbury.

Submission Point: Community Facility Fees & Charges

Summary of Submission: There is general concern at the proposed increase in hire charges for community facilities and that the basis for these is unclear. Merely a statement that the criteria have altered and that no comparison with the 2017 charge can be made. However, in reality this is a forced increase for those groups using the facilities and who are likely to be deterred as a consequence. Some will be aware that it is a change to the definition of Casual and Tutor rates but this is not visible or easy to work out the consequences for groups and individuals. Nor is any reason for the change given. There is little if any information provided to enable a coherent submission to be made in this most important area. This contrasts with the remainder of the Draft LTP which is clear and unambiguous.

Council Decision: The Council thanks for your submission on fees and charges. After considering all of the submissions Council appreciated the impact that increases can have on the operation of community groups and agreed to stagger the proposed increases over two financial years. If any group would like to discuss something in particular regarding fees, the Community & Recreation Committee would be pleased to assist. In the first instance, enquiries can be directed to Council’s Community & Recreation Manager. The majority of community facilities have a $10 per hour hire fee with this cost graduated to $15 per hour in 2019/2020. A full list of community facilities for hire and their associated costs can be requested from Council’s Customer Services team.

Submission Point: Waikuku Hall

Summary of Submission: The Board supports the funding to install acoustic paneling.

Council Decision: The Council thanks you for your support.

Submission Point: Sefton Community Facilities

Summary of Submission: The Board requests that an amount should be included in the budget for hall improvements as the Board is aware that the Sefton Public Hall, which although not a Council facility, is an important community focal point, and as such will require some commitment from the Council to assist in earthquake repairs.

Council Decision: The Council have received correspondence from the Sefton Public Hall Society saying that they are happy with the current amount of grant money being provided by the Council and thanked Council for the opportunity to make a submission.

Submission Point: Youth Facilities - Pegasus

Summary of Submission: There is a clear need for facilities for ‘older youth’ – whether that be BMX trails, fitness trails, skate
or scooter parks. The Board reaffirms its statement to the 2017/18 Annual Plan TRIM 170405033262 as follows:

With the changes in Developers at Pegasus, youth facilities that were originally planned have not proceeded. There are playgrounds etc. for young and primary school aged children but little recreational activities available to teenagers. The Board requests the Council consider the provision, in partnership with the community, for the development in suitable areas around the Woodend-Pegasus-Ravenswood area of facilities such as basketball courts, a skate park, youth centre etc.

Whilst Gladstone Park has been suggested as one possible location for such facilities, the Board feel it is not central enough to permit easy youth access and constant passive surveillance. The Board has identified that the Pegasus Lake reserve by the pedestrian bridge could be a potential location for youth facilities.

**Council Decision:** Staff have undertaken a play space strategy. Within this strategy a new levels of service for skate facilities has been developed that sets criteria for the location and scale.

Applying this level of service the Council should be providing additional facilities in the Woodend Pegasus area. For this reason $150,000 has been identified in the Long Term Plan for a skate facility for the Pegasus Woodend area. The exact location and design is to be determined in conjunction with the community. The money identified will become available in the 2020/2021 financial year.

**Submission Point:** Reserves and Recreation - Woodend-Sefton

**Summary of Submission:** The Board requests a complete audit and review of plans for reserves in their community area to identify areas not being utilised optimally, and those that could undergo development to meet future community needs. This review needs to include the layout of Owen Stalker Park in Woodend (not just looking at playground replacement) and the reserve by Pegasus Lake. Some residents have signaled they would prefer Maunga Tere reserve to be developed rather than Hurunui reserve in Pegasus, and there needs to some consultation with the community around this to determine which is the best option.

**Council Decision:** Staff will work with the Board on priorities for reserve development within Pegasus. Funding is available for the development of some reserves. Funding is currently available for the development of Owen Stalker Park and staff will be working with the Board and community on a concept plan which looks at the whole reserve.

**Submission Point:** Roading and Footpaths - Woodend-Sefton

**Summary of Submission:** The footpath at the north end of Woodend on SH1 was extended in the last year on the eastern side which was well received by the community. However, it still does not reach to the north end of Woodend which is important to the community for safety reasons given that SH1 is so busy. The St. Barnabas Anglican Church is used for many community events and with the development of the commercial area at Ravenswood the Board would like to see the footpath extended to reach the Church at the outskirts of Woodend. This would mean that eventually when a path is created from the Ravenswood Commercial area to the outskirts of Woodend there would be safe access right through. The path from Ravenswood Commercial area to Woodend is under the control of the developer and Council should be encouraging them to complete it as soon as possible.

**Council Decision:** The removal of the rumble strips in Pegasus is currently being managed within existing budgets and it is prioritised against other road maintenance work. Communication is ongoing with the Pegasus Residents Group on this programme. This approach is considered the most cost
effective way of managing this issue as it is managed within the NZTA subsidised programme.

If the Council wants to speed up the programme then additional funding would be required and this would not receive NZTA funding as the NZTA programme for the next three years has already been submitted and can't be changed. Speeding up the programme is not recommended.

Included in the LTP is $100,000 per year over the next five years for new footpaths in the main towns including Woodend. The north end of Woodend now qualifies for this programme as NZTA recently shifted the 50km/h limit and hence the urban boundary further north. A report is being prepared to Council to approve the next three year programme for the new footpaths and Main North Road will be considered for that programme. Due to the high cost of a footpath on the west side due to the location of the drain it is unlikely this path will be in the next three years programme. Council staff will work with the developer to ensure the footpath connections between Woodend and Ravenswood are managed and coordinated in a timely way.

Submission Point: Public Transport

Summary of Submission: It is now becoming critical to connect large townships and communities both with cycle paths and bus services. The Council should be innovative in its approach and trial new transport offers including the potential for a mini-shuttle Orbiter style service taking in the main townships and new subdivisions. ECAn timeframes and assessments do NOT mesh with the actual practical needs of the community and the council is urged to act with smaller private operators to address this urgently. It is noted that Queenstown Lakes have undertaken significant and innovative work with bus services that meet the customer needs, are well priced and link to the places that customers need to go. This has stimulated an increase in the use of public transport, generated income and has reduced traffic volumes and the demand for parking. There have been many years of discussion and no action. There is a real desire for change and we see this as an opportunity that only the Council can initiate and put in place.

Council Decision: Public transport (PT) in the Greater Christchurch area is managed by a Joint PT Committee and the Council is a member of that committee. So it is no longer Environment Canterbury's sole responsibility to manage public transport in the Greater Christchurch area. The Waimakariri

District Council is 'in the tent' and is part of the decision making process. The Committee is currently reviewing the Public Transport Plan and this is a statutory document that must be reviewed every three years. The Committee is also working on a PT Futures Business Case. Both of these pieces of work will provide some direction on the future of PT in the Greater Christchurch area. It is also noted that the Government has announced increased funding for public transport so this might provide opportunities.

Once the Public Transport Plan is completed a review of services will get underway. That will be the time the Board can have some meaningful input. It is intended there will be more engagement with the Boards and community as part of this process and this will be managed by Council staff. In the past Environment Canterbury managed the reviews and they essentially put out a proposal for submissions.

Early engagement will give the opportunity for input before a proposal is developed. In saying that the district has to be realistic as well and any feedback will need to be backed up with evidence. In the past services have been provided in the district and they have been poorly used. Some of the ideas in the submissions are good ideas but is there evidence to support them?

When the reviews happen the ball will be in the Council's court to provide good evidence and a strong case for whatever options it considers necessary. Regarding the Queenstown situation
they had a major traffic congestion problem and the bus services referred to in the submission was the response to deal with that problem. The Regional Council provides the services and the solution was jointly developed by the Regional Council, the District Council and NZTA. The Waimakariri District does not have the same urgent need for action. Also a lesson from the Queenstown case is that a good outcome was achieved by all parties working together to understand the problem and to come up with a solution. A lot of money was spent in that process. With the Greater Christchurch Joint PT Committee a similar approach should be used here. There needs to be a good understanding of the problem before solutions are put on the table.

Submission Point: Enterprise North Canterbury

Summary of Submission: The board notes the work that has been done historically by the ENC and acknowledges the commitment of the staff. The Board does express concern that the main activities of the ENC appear to be related to training and mentoring of new businesses and would urge a re-focussing on attracting new businesses and for ENC to be engaged much more strategically in identifying the barriers to new businesses and overcoming these. There is a perception that those townships without a dedicated Promotions Associations are missing out.

For example, the Board would suggest that a re-focused ENC could consider strategically the ways in which new businesses could be attracted to the District as a whole and not predominantly in Kaiapoi and Rangiora. There should be consideration and analysis of what businesses the community and council would like to see and a much stronger engagement and push to secure these and to establish them into the relevant towns and communities. ENC support for the growing potential in Oxford, Woodend, Pegasus and Ravenswood for new business and economic opportunity and seeking to attract the ‘right’ players to these areas is crucial. The barriers are highly likely to include workforce mobility and lack of public transport and ENC could be a very strong advocate for change in this area.

The Board would wish to work pro-actively with ENC particularly with regard to the ‘Visit Waimakariri’ web site to ensure that the site is both up to date and also reflects the true extent of activities, events and other attractions in the Board’s community area. The Board is not supportive of the apparent retention of status quo and only support the funding allocation if there is real commitment and action from ENC to move beyond training and networking for businesses and look at innovative ways to encourage and support new businesses and promote Waimakariri.

Council Decision: ENC does have a business attraction mandate and programme irrespective of location or presence. It looks to match businesses with location opportunities that are available and which match the locational preferences and needs of the business concerned. Council’s recommendation is that ENC be requested to provide a briefing to the Board on their business attraction activities.

Copies of the Long Term Plan 2018-2028 for public inspection are available at the Rangiora, Kaiapoi and Oxford service centres and libraries and on our website waimakariri.govt.nz. Once again, thank you for your interest and contribution to finalising our budgets and work programme for the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.
Yours sincerely

David Ayers
Mayor
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT

FILE NO and TRIM NO: GOV-26-09-06/180806088191

REPORT TO: Woodend-Sefton Community Board

DATE OF MEETING: 13 August 2018

FROM: Shona Powell, Chair, Woodend-Sefton Community Board

SUBJECT: Chair’s Report for July 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 July</td>
<td>Forestry Harvest Project Group meeting</td>
<td>Regular meeting to discuss the harvest and any issues arising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 July</td>
<td>Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting</td>
<td>Monthly meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 July</td>
<td>Waimakariri Access Group meeting</td>
<td>Regular monthly meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 July</td>
<td>Kaiapoi Art Expo opening</td>
<td>Good to see the wide range of art on show</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 July</td>
<td>Forestry Harvest Project Group meeting</td>
<td>Regular meeting to discuss the harvest and any issues arising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 July</td>
<td>Waimakariri Water Zone Committee Nitrate Consultation - Kaiapoi</td>
<td>Informative to break into groups and hear experiences and thoughts from both the urban and rural environments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 July</td>
<td>Youth Development Grant meeting</td>
<td>Finalised application process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 July</td>
<td>Civil Defence Exercise, Woodend</td>
<td>Volunteered to be an evacuated resident in the exercise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180806088191.

Shona Powell
Chair
Woodend-Sefton Community Board

August 2018
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEMO

FILE NO AND TRIM NO: GOV-26-09-06 / 180802087161

DATE: 13 August 2018

MEMO TO: Woodend-Sefton Community Board

FROM: Board members Andrea Allen, John Archer, Rhonda Mather, Andrew Thompson.

SUBJECT: Members’ Information Exchange – July 2018

Andrea Allen

16th July 2018
North Canterbury Neighbourhood Support Meeting
Discussion: Relationship building and strengthening with Internal and External Stakeholders - Confidential content

27th July 2018
Civil Defence Scenario
North Canterbury Neighbourhood Support representative
I had the pleasure of participating in the capacity as a Woodend Sefton Community Member but primarily as a North Canterbury Support Board Member.
The passion and will of the members of Civil Defence was heart-warming and certainly endorsed my love of our area and the residents who support and nourish.
I was privileged to be a part of the debrief at the end of the mock event. The area of administration certainly requires attention and this was communicated. As a board member I will certainly advocate the need for strong administration skills to process the public effectively and efficiently. As a board we have an absolute obligation to ensure that our ward is supported and able to manage and facilitate effectively in the unfortunate fall of an event.

7th August 2018
Waimakariri Health Advisory Group
TBA - Report completed pre-meeting.

John Archer

Due to ill health missed a number of meetings that I was due to attend.

Attended the ECAn Water Zone public meeting in the Rossburn Centre regarding Nitrate Levels. Received draft report from the Waimakariri Land and Water Solutions program. Some serious issues being addressed.

Attended Civil Defence exercise in Woodend. Was a bit of praying going on and Alpacas stranded along with some stressed out farmers. Some really good acting almost believable.

Attended Woodend Community Association meeting 6 August.
Andrew Thompson

I attended the Kaiapoi Arts Expo that the Community Board supported with funding. There were good numbers there and a great selection of artwork.

I was the sole Community Board representative at the annual Waikuku Beach Surf Club mid-winter swim. There were good numbers in attendance, the water wasn’t too cold but the day was! I would appreciate feedback on my suggestion reported in The North Canterbury News that the swim be compulsory for all in the neighbourhood.

I’ve spent time at Taranaki Reserve planting a few plants gifted to us, and maintaining others.

I am looking forward to the Northern Pegasus Bay Advisory Group meeting that is approaching.

Rhonda Mather

Pegasus Residents Group Inc.

- Attended committee meeting 10 July.
- Given the continued population growth in the Pegasus, Woodend and Ravenswood areas a WDC review of community facilities is being undertaken by an external consultant – Sue Sutherland. Sue will meet with various groups in the area to gain feedback. The PRGI is clear that there is a need for additional facilities in the short term if it is to make progress with community growth and connections. The PRGI believes that the former Ray White premises would still seem to be the best short term option and is looking forward to working with Sue and the Council towards a positive outcome for the Pegasus community.

The PRG PCC met with Sue on 6 August to make its own recommendations and had a two hour meeting which included showing her through the current PCC premises, the old General Store and the former Ray White premises. A good exchange of information took place and the PCC will send additional info to Sue. A decision has yet to be made with regard to surveying Pegasus residents, but the PRG PCC subcommittee will continue to work with Sue on this over the next couple of weeks before a final decision is made. Sue's project is expected to be ready for Council around year end. Sue is also speaking with the Pegasus Bay School Principal, Andrea from the Woodend Community Association and Shona Powell.

- The PRG PCC subcommittee met with the WDC Community Facilities Co-ordinator - Simon Kong to discuss a number of matters relating to the community centre. Some areas of concern included ongoing issues with the front door being an automatic one and the amount of draught it lets in, lack of toilet facilities, boxes that the PRGI understand belong to Todd Property stacked high in the storage area creating a H & S issue and test tagging of electrical equipment (is due). The subcommittee also undertook a review of the management agreement, as some things have changed since it was first created over 12 months ago. As always, Simon was a pleasure to deal with and the PCC will continue to follow up with him over the coming weeks to ensure all items discussed are actioned. Already he has delivered a baby change table to the PCC.

- Compiled ‘Pegasus Page’ for August Woodpecker
- 7 August – PRGI Christmas event meeting
Other

• 11 July – Ronel’s Community Cuppa was extra special with the Mayor joining us and The Good Home Pegasus providing free delicious food for all. Ronel had to limit numbers for practical reasons and it is estimated that 50 people were in attendance.

• 13 July – Kaiapoi Art Expo opening – another excellent event. The crowd at the opening seemed bigger than ever. I visited the expo again over the weekend with my mother and sister to get a better look, as things seemed a bit cramped at the opening.

• 19 July – popped along to one of the sessions about the e-plan. Very interesting and well worth attending to get an overview of the new system and how to use it

• 23 July – Met with the Chair of the Woodend- Sefton Community Board (Shona Powell) to discuss PCC and other local topics

• 27 July – offered to participate in a ‘stay at home’ capacity with Civil Defence exercise, but apart from a couple of emails received, nothing happened

• Had a visit from a resident who was concerned that the Council had not yet replaced his street tree (which was removed due to it being diseased). Spoke to WDC Parks and Community Assets Officer - Greg Barnard who said the contractor has not yet finished planting and he would follow up.

• I have expressed my interest (to the WDC Community Development Advisor - Madeleine Burdon) in being involved with the age-friendly community steering group. The final make-up of that group has not yet been decided (at time of writing my report).

Coming Up

• 6 August – PRGI PCC subcommittee meet with Sue Sutherland
• 7 August – PRGI Christmas subcommittee meeting
• 13 August – LinC Programme
• 14 August – PRGI committee meeting
• 15 August – Ronel’s Community Cuppa
• 27 August – Social isolation forum at Woodend