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**BUSINESS**

1. **APOLOGIES**

2. **CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

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

3. **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

   3.1 **Peter Allen**

   3.2 **John Shivas**

4. **CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**

   4.1 **Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Tuesday 1 August 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 1 August 2017.

   *(minutes to be circulated separately)*

4.2 **Minutes of the public excluded portion of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Tuesday 1 August 2017**

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

5.1. Mark Inglis of Hurunui Trails Trust will discuss the Heartland Cycleway Project.

5.2. Sally Lane of Compass FM will discuss the radio stations future plans.

5.3. Bruce Kearney and Sarah Saunders, representing Kaiapoi High School, will present information in relation to the Schools Indoor Court project.

6. **ADJOURNED BUSINESS**

   Nil.

7. **REGENERATION REPORTS**

   Nil.

8. **REPORTS**

8.1. **2018-21 National Land Transport Programme – support for proposed bids – Ken Stevenson (Roading Manager)**

   **RECOMMENDATION**

   **THAT** the Council:

   (a) **Receives** report No. 170818089218.

   (b) **Endorses** the initial bid submission for the 2018-21 NLTP that was submitted on 31 August 2017 and as detailed in this report.

   (c) **Provides** feedback to enable the firm bid to be submitted on 20 October 2017.

   (d) **Notes** that the final bids are due on 16 December 2017.

   (e) **Notes** that work is still required on assessing the merits of an enhanced programme to upgrade street lights to LED lights in order to reduce power and maintenance costs and that a report will be presented to Council seeking a decision before the final bid is due.

   (f) **Notes** that included in the initial bid is $70,000 for cycle education and that a separate report will be presented to Council on this subject in October to enable the Council to consider the merits of the programme and the amount of funding it is prepared to invest.

   (g) **Notes** that the initial bid is based on the Roading Activity Management Plan (AMP) update work completed to date and that further work is required to refine the programme and the budget levels so further changes may be necessary.

   (h) **Notes** that this initial bid does not commit the Council to a level of funding or to specific projects and changes can be made up until the final bid is due on 16 December 2017.
8.2. **Changes to Kaiapoi (West) Speed Limits – Ken Stevenson (Roading Manager)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No 170822090290

(b) **Approves** the speed limit change on roads within the Kaiapoi (West) area, as outlined below, and as shown on the attached plan (TRIM 170608058547).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Proposed Limit</th>
<th>Existing Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka Road</td>
<td>From the existing 50/70 change point, across Overbridge, to 100m west of Island Road</td>
<td>50km/h</td>
<td>70km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Arterial Road / Butchers Road</td>
<td>From 100m west of Island Road to the end of the houses on Butchers Road</td>
<td>60km/h</td>
<td>N/A / 100km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Arterial Road / Butchers Road / Island Road / Skewbridge Road</td>
<td>From the end of the houses on Butchers Road to west of Skewbridge Road Bridge</td>
<td>80km/h</td>
<td>100km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Road</td>
<td>From 300m south of Ohoka Road to Butchers Road</td>
<td>50km/h</td>
<td>70km/h / 100km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adderley Terrace</td>
<td>From the existing 50/70 change point to Island Road</td>
<td>50km/h</td>
<td>70km/h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(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 Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board for their information.

(f) **Circulates** this report to all Community Boards.

8.3 **Rangiora Town Centre Feature and Street Lighting – Joanne McBride (Development Manager) and Simon Hart (Business and Centres Manager)**

(Also refer to Item 9.1 on this agenda – Matter Referred from Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting of 9 August)

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report no. 170825091852.

(b) **Approves** the feature lighting as detailed in Option Two of this report, consisting of in-ground LED Lighting.

(c) **Approves** the reallocation of $65,000 from the Waikuku to Pegasus Connection budget of $670,000.
(d) **Notes** that staff will report back on options to fund the street lighting of $485,000 through the next LTP process

(e) **Notes** that additional information is provided in relation to report no. 170725078225 referred from the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board.

(f) **Notes** that there is a separate report for Kaiapoi Town Centre feature lighting. Option Two in this report is the same level of service as is being proposed for Kaiapoi Town Centre.

8.4 **Southbrook Recycling Compactor Shelter: Request to Reallocate Budgets – Kitty Waghorn (Solid Waste Asset Manager)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Received** report No. 170823091196.

(b) **Approves** reallocation of unused funding from the following budgets to fund the $26,300 short-fall for the Southbrook Recycling Compactor Shelter (PJ 100844.000.5043):

   i. $13,900 from Gartery’s Pit roads and fencing (PJ 100846.000.5043)

   ii. $6,300 from Recycling bottle bank/container (PJ100991.000.5044)

   iii. $6,100 from RPZ installation (backflow protection) Oxford (PJ 100955.000.5043)

(c) **Notes** that these capital works are all to be loan funded out of the Solid Waste Disposal Account

8.5 **Poyntz Road Source Upgrade – Request to Consult Community Regarding Proposed Pipe to connect to West Eyerton – Colin Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Received** report No. 170816088611.

(b) **Endorsed** the option of connecting the Poyntz’s Road scheme with the West Eyerton scheme as the preferred option to upgrade the Poyntz’s Road water supply source for preliminary consultation with the community.

(c) **Notes** that the options of drilling a new deep source or treating the existing source are not considered to be viable due to the risks associating with both options relative to the joining with West Eyerton option.

(d) **Approves** staff to consult with the residents along both possible routes for the new pipe to determine the level of interest that these residents have to connecting to this new pipe.

(e) **Notes** that, following the identification of the preferred route, staff will undertake a rating assessment and prepare consultation material to present to the existing Poyntz’s Road and West Eyerton communities.
(f) Circulates this report to the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board for their information.

8.6 West Eyreton and Summerhill Backup Source Options – Mark Andrews (Civil Engineer), Jeff Dunn (Engineering Technician) and Colin Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 170627066208.

(b) Notes that staff have considered a number of options to provide a backup source for the West Eyreton and Summerhill water supply schemes and that drilling a new deep well at West Eyreton (Option A) has been identified as the recommended upgrade option.

(c) Approves the drilling of a new deep well at West Eyreton to provide the West Eyreton and Summerhill water supply schemes with a secure backup source.

(d) Notes that there is adequate budget of $190,000 under the capital budget for the West Eyreton scheme and $400,000 under the capital budget for the Summerhill scheme, both for the 2017/18 financial year for this project.

(e) Circulates this report to the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board and the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board for their information.

8.7 Request for Funding to be Brought Forward for Bramleys Road Well Consent to take Water – Colin Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 170811086311.

(b) Approves $25,000 of the Bramleys Road Well Level of Service Component capital works budget currently set for the 2021/22 year to be brought forward to the current 2017/18 financial year.

(c) Notes that this will allow staff to submit an application to take water from the Bramleys Road well to Environment Canterbury with the aim of securing this consent, before other wells are drilled and consented in the area.

(d) Circulates this report to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi and Woodend-Sefton Community Boards for their information, and authorises staff to inform the local Runanga at the next scheduled meeting.

8.8 Appointments to Rural Primary Health Organisation – Sarah Nichols (Governance Manager)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives Report No. 170824091839.
(b) **Approves** the appointment of Councillor Gordon as the Council Community Representative to the Rural Canterbury Primary Health Organisation Board, effective from 5 September 2017.

9. **MATTER REFERRED FROM COMMITTEES, BOARDS AND HEARING PANELS**

9.1 **High Street Feature Lighting - Ken Stevenson (Roading Manager) and Joanne McBride (Development Manager)**

(refer to attached copy of report no. 170725078225 to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting of 9 August 2017)

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Approves** the feature lighting for High Street as detailed on the attached plan (TRIM 170728080053).

(b) **Approves** the reallocation of the remaining $265,000 High Street Upgrade budget in 2017/18 to fund the feature lighting in High Street.

(c) **Notes** that the current allocation of the remaining $265,000 is $205,000 to Good Street upgrade and $60,000 to the feature lighting.

(d) **Notes** the Good Street upgrade cannot now be completed until 2018/19 because of the delay in the new building on the east side of the street and that the likely cost to achieve the required outcome will be more than the $205,000 that is currently allocated.

(e) **Approves** the allocation of $350,000 from the future Town Centre Upgrade budget of $100,000 per year to the Good Street Upgrade project in 2018/19.

(f) **Considers** options to fund the street lighting of $550,000 through the next LTP process.
9.2 **Kaiapoi Town Centre Feature Lighting – Joanne McBride (Development Manager) and Simon Hart (Business and Centres Manager)**

*(refer to attached copy of report no. 170810086146 to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting of 21 August 2017)*

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Approves** the Stage One feature lighting for Kaiapoi Town Centre as detailed in this report.

(b) **Approves** the allocation of $125,000.00 of the Kaiapoi Town Centre budget to fund the Stage One feature lighting in Kaiapoi

9.3 **Kaiapoi East Reserve Roading Access Options Consultation Feedback - Cathy Batchelor, (District Regeneration Communications Advisor), Roxanne Ramsay, (District Regeneration Project Administrator), Duncan Roxborough, Implementation Project Manager**

*(refer to attached copy of report no. 170711071699 to the Regeneration Steering Group meeting of 7 August 2017, and minutes of that meeting)*

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No.170711071699.

(b) **Approves** the adoption of Option 2 as the preferred configuration for the sports and recreation reserve and roading configuration subject to Crown approval.

(c) **Requests** staff to provide alternate configuration of the dog park and BMX facility to achieve a dog park no smaller than was provided on Option 1.

(d) **Notes** that the alternate configuration may include use of the Corcoran Reserve.

(e) **Notes** that the outcomes of the community consultation process and the Steering Group resolution will be made public via media release, and direct response to those who made submissions.
9.4. **Establishment of Targeted Rate for the sealing of Barkers Road, (Loburn)**  
- K Stevenson (Roading Manager)

(refer to attached copy of report no. 170808084823 to the Barkers Road  
Hearing Panel meeting of 22 August 2017 and minutes of that hearing/deliberations meeting.

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Approves** the targeted rate for the sealing of Barkers Road as  
detailed in the Statement of Proposal (Doc 170220015597).

(b) **Notes** that property owners have the option of paying by lump sum  
rather than by a targeted rate.

9.5. **Changes to Cones Road Speed Limit – K Stevenson (Roading Manager),  
B Rice (Senior Transport Engineer), H Davies (Roading Projects Engineer)**

(refer to attached copy of report no. 170713072881 to the Rangiora-Ashley  
Community Board meeting of 9 August 2017 and minutes of that meeting in  
itm 12.2 of this agenda).

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Approves** a speed limit of 40km/h on Cones Road, north of Carrs  
Road, along with the following safety improvements:

- Speed advisory and pedestrian warning signage.
- Improvements to the timber site rails at the beginning of the  
unsealed portion of Cones Road.
- Localised shaping of the vertical curve north of 352 Cones  
Road and minor widening of the road.
- Outdoor convex mirror opposite the driveway at 352 Cones  
Road.
- Clearing of vegetation adjacent to the road and including the  
berm areas in the Council’s maintained mowing list.
- Letter drops to residents, who are the predominant users of  
this road, leading up to the installation of the new walking  
track. These will outline the protocols to enable safe operation  
of this section of road.

(b) **Notes** that the Register of Speed Limits will be updated to include the  
changed speed limit.

(c) **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.
(d) **Requests** that staff continue to investigate the intersection access and area of Carrs and Cones Roads in order to:

- Provide greater safety
- Provide adequate parking

(e) **Requests** that within six months of the vertical curve being reshaped, a speed survey will be carried out in this location, and an assessment made to ensure that the appropriate stopping sight distances are provided.

10. **HEALTH AND SAFETY**

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

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 170825092092

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

11.1. **Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee held on 10 July 2017**

179 - 186

11.2. **Minutes of a meeting of the Community and Recreation Committee held on 18 July 2017**

187 - 193

11.3. **Minutes of a meeting of the Audit and Risk Committee held on 18 July 2017**

194 - 200

11.4. **Minutes of a meeting of the District Planning and Regulation Committee held on 15 August 2017**

201 - 206

11.5. **Minutes of a meeting of the Utilities and Roading Committee held on 15 August 2017**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the information in Items 11.1 – 11.5 be received.
12. COMMUNITY BOARD MINUTES FOR INFORMATION

12.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board held on 3 August 2017

12.2 Minutes of a meeting of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board held on 9 August 2017

12.3 Minutes of a meeting of the Woodend-Setton-Community Board held on 14 August 2017

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the information in Items 12.1 to 12.3 be received.

13. CORRESPONDENCE

14. MAYOR’S DIARY

14.1 Mayor’s Diary 26 July - 28 August 2017

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report no. 170828092548

15. COUNCIL PORTFOLIO UPDATES

15.1 Iwi Relationships

15.2 Canterbury Water Management Strategy

15.3 International Relationships

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 N°</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 1 August 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 a meeting of the Audit and Risk Committee 18 July 2017</td>
<td>Receipt of minutes for information</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>Minutes of the public excluded portion of a meeting of the Utilities and Roading Committee meeting of 15 August 2017</td>
<td>Receipt of minutes for information</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>Report of Colin Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager)</td>
<td>Procurement of Water Supply Well Services for Kings Ave, West Eyreton, McPhedrons Road and Smith Street</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>Report of Kelly LaValley (Project Delivery Manager)</td>
<td>Delegated Authority to Accept Tender for Townsend Road Extension and Stormwater Management Area</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 Kelly LaValley (Project Delivery Manager)</td>
<td>Doncaster Land Purchase</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 Craig Sargison (Manager Community and Recreation)</td>
<td>Land Purchase</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 Craig Sargison (Manager Community and Recreation)</td>
<td>Kaliapoi High School Indoor Court Memorandum of Understanding</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18.9 Report of Jeff Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support)  
Shared Service Business Process Review on Procurement and Contract Management  
Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7  
Section 48(1)(a)

PUBLIC EXCLUDED MATTER REFERRED FROM AUDIT AND RISK COMMITTEE  
MEETING OF 18 JULY 2017

18.10 Report of Sarah Nichols (Governance Manager)  
Potential Sale of Civic Assurance House  
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>
</table>
| 18.1 – 18.10 | Protection of privacy of natural persons  
To carry out commercial activities without prejudice | A2(a)  
A2(b)ii |

CLOSED MEETING

See Public Excluded Agenda (blue papers)

OPEN MEETING

19. NEXT MEETING

The next scheduled meeting of the Council is on Tuesday 3 October 2017 commencing at 1.00pm.
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT

FILE NO: 
RDG-29, RDG-11/170818089218

REPORT TO: 
Council

DATE OF MEETING: 
5 September 2017

FROM: 
Ken Stevenson, Roading Manager

SUBJECT: 
2018-21 National Land Transport Programme – support for proposed bids

SIGNED BY: 
Department Manager  pp Chief Executive

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to update the Council on the 2018-21 National Land Transport Programme (NLTP) and to seek Council endorsement of the initial bids submission and feedback before submitting the firm bid.

1.2. NZTA require bid submissions in three stages. Initial bids by 31 August 2017, firm bids by 20 October 2017 and final bids by 16 December 2017.

1.3. Staff have submitted the initial bid and that was based on the information presented to and the feedback from the Utilities and Roading Workshop on 20 June 2017.

1.4. The next stage is for firm bids to be submitted by 20 October 2017. Feedback is being sought from the Council through this report to enable the firm bid to be finalised.

1.5. The initial bid for the NZTA subsidised Maintenance and Renewal Programme is based on a business as usual approach with an additional $180,000 ($91,800 NZTA, $88,200 WDC) per annum being sought over and above what is already allowed for in the current LTP. The details of the additional items are in Clause 3.23 below.

1.6. One outstanding issue is that of upgrading street lights to LED lights to achieve lower power and maintenance costs. No additional funding has been sought at this stage over what is already included for street light renewal as further work is required to consider the merits of an increased programme. A separate report will be submitted to Council on street lighting before the NLTP final bid is due.

1.7. The initial bid for the Road Safety Programme includes an additional $70,000 ($35,700 NZTA, $34,300 WDC) per annum for Cycle Education Activities. ACC may also fund part of this programme and so the WDC contribution may be less. A report is being prepared to Council on this subject and that report will enable the Council to consider the merits of the programme and the amount of funding it is prepared to invest. This will then be included in the firm bid in October.

1.8. Key improvement projects included in the initial bid for the 2018-21 period are as follows:

- Townsend Road/Fernside Road/Flaxton Road/Skebridge Road/Island Road route improvements and in particular the realignment of the bridge on Skebridge Road.
• Rangiora Woodend Road improvements, including the Boys Road intersection, and Woodend access improvements to State Highway 1.
• Main North Road (Old Waimakariri Bridge to Kaiapoi urban boundary) improvements including the new cycleway connection.
• Targeted intersection improvements and clear zone improvements on rural roads.
• Condition driven improvement projects on arterial roads, eg Williams Street (Ohoka to Vickery), Ivory Street (Bucham to Alfred), Flaxton Road (Lineside to Kingsford Smith Drive).
• Cycleway projects

1.9. It is noted that this initial bid is based on the Roading Activity Management Plan (AMP) update work completed to date. The AMP is still being updated and further work is required to refine the programme and the budget levels. The Council will also want to consider the roading programme and budget in the context of the overall Council priorities in the 2018-28 LTP and so further changes may be necessary.

1.10. It is also noted that this initial bid does not commit the Council to a level of funding or to specific projects. Changes can be made up until the final bid is due on 16 December 2017.

Attachments
i  Draft 10 year Improvements Programme (Doc 170823090928)

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 170818089218.
(b) **Endorses** the initial bid submission for the 2018-21 NLTP that was submitted on 31 August 2017 and as detailed in this report.
(c) **Provides** feedback to enable the firm bid to be submitted on 20 October 2017.
(d) **Notes** that the final bids are due on 16 December 2017.
(e) **Notes** that work is still required on assessing the merits of an enhanced programme to upgrade street lights to LED lights in order to reduce power and maintenance costs and that a report will be presented to Council seeking a decision before the final bid is due.
(f) **Notes** that included in the initial bid is $70,000 for cycle education and that a separate report will be presented to Council on this subject in October to enable the Council to consider the merits of the programme and the amount of funding it is prepared to invest.
(g) **Notes** that the initial bid is based on the Roading Activity Management Plan (AMP) update work completed to date and that further work is required to refine the programme and the budget levels so further changes may be necessary.
(h) **Notes** that this initial bid does not commit the Council to a level of funding or to specific projects and changes can be made up until the final bid is due on 16 December 2017.

3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

3.1. **Background**

3.2. Council will be aware of the changes that have occurred in the roading and transport space nationally. The key developments are the implementation of the One Network Road Classification (ONRC) and the requirement to use the business case approach in developing programmes. The ONRC has been put in place to ensure there is a focus on
the road and transport network being one connected network across the country with consistent levels of service.

3.3. The application of the business case approach ensures the right issues and opportunities are identified, and the planned responses are appropriately scoped and timed.

3.4. As part of the business case approach the Council conducted a series of workshops with key stakeholders late last year to identify the district’s strategic transport problems and benefits. Population growth, land use change, and business development was seen as putting pressure on the transport network. The problems this pressure has created is seen through:
   - The State Highway and connecting local roads not coping with the demand at peak time;
   - Increased volumes of traffic leading to increased risk of crashes;
   - Increased rate of land use change putting pressure on maintaining the network.

3.5. The benefits in resolving the identified problems include providing users with consistent and reasonable travel times, decreased numbers and severity of crashes, and the network maintained at appropriate levels of service to meet changing land use.

3.6. The strategic response to managing these problems was identified as follows:
   - Maintaining and using the existing transport infrastructure efficiently and effectively through demand management and network optimisation measures. For example, improving existing routes from Rangiora to SH1 to utilise their existing capacity rather than increasing the capacity of the Southbrook Road/Lineside Road route, and promoting ride share and public transport use to reduce the number of single occupancy vehicles at peak times.
   - Targeted investment in infrastructure improvements for both capacity and safety outcomes.
   - Increased emphasis on walking, cycling and public transport to provide greater transport choice, integration, and flexibility, and promotion of good public health outcomes.
   - Ensuring growth areas and development support modal choice and provide opportunities for people to travel less, especially by private motor vehicle.

3.7. This response is consistent with the current approach as outlined in the Roading Activity Management Plan and as demonstrated by the Council’s investment in the West Kairaki New Arterial Road, the West Belt extension to Townsend Road and in the major cycleways. The Council is also currently working with the greater Christchurch partners on promoting ride share and passenger transport use.

3.8. The Waimakariri transport network is integral with the greater Christchurch transport network and the transport problems identified in Waimakariri reflect the problems across the greater Christchurch transport network. The Waimakariri response to the problems within the district need to align with and is dependent on other business cases. These are detailed as follows:
   - State Highway 1/71; Ashley River to Belfast; Greater Christchurch North Programme Business Case.
   - Greater Christchurch Future PT Business Case
   - Greater Christchurch TDM Business Case
3.9. Both Council staff and elected members have been or will be involved in the stakeholder workshops for these business cases. When completed they will be reported to Council for information and appropriate action.

3.10. The State Highway 1/71; Ashley River to Belfast; Greater Christchurch North Programme Business Case has been completed while the Greater Christchurch Future PT Business Case is only just starting and the Greater Christchurch TDM Business Case is underway.

3.11. 2018-21 NLTP

3.12. The NLTP has three components that apply to our programme. These are:

- Road Maintenance and Renewal Programme
- Improvements Programme.
- Road Safety Programme (includes Cycle Education)


3.14. Staff have submitted the initial bid and that was based on the information and feedback from the Utilities and Roading Workshop on 20 June 2017.

3.15. The next stage is for firm bids to be submitted by 20 October 2017. Feedback is being sought from Council through this report to enable the firm bid to be finalised.

3.16. All programmes and projects are required to be supported by a business case. A Strategic Business Case has been developed based on the stakeholder engagement referred to above. The Programme Business Case is currently being documented and this is based on the information presented to the Utilities and Roading Committee on 20 June. Both of these documents will be incorporated into the Activity Management Plan (AMP) and the AMP will be the supporting document for the NLTP bids.

3.17. The following provides more detail on the NLTP bids.

3.18. Maintenance and Renewal Programme

3.19. The initial bid that has been submitted is based on the information provided at the Utilities and Roading Workshop on 20 June 2017.

3.20. As presented to the workshop the proposed programme is based on a business as usual approach. The following indicators support this approach.

- Condition rating surveys and trends show network condition is good and not deteriorating.
- Benchmarking shows we are performing well on condition, safety and efficiency compared with our peers.
- The customer satisfaction survey shows high levels of satisfaction for roading.

3.21. Generally our levels of service align well with the ONRC levels of service.

3.22. It is noted that the business as usual approach means budgets are increased to allow for growth and inflation and this is already included in the LTP projections.

3.23. As discussed at the workshop there are some one off issues that need to be addressed and these will incur some additional costs. There are also some adjustments within the programme to align with actual costs. These are summarised below.

- Bridge maintenance – the current budget is $190,000 for 270 bridges. This is not adequate based on the detailed Bridge Inspection Reports and another $50,000 per annum is being requested.
• Cycle path maintenance – the operational costs for the new major cycleways were not included in the LTP and so additional funding is required to maintain the new major cycleways. An additional $12,000 per annum is being requested. The current budget is $8,900 per annum.

• Environmental maintenance (crash debris and detritus) – increased traffic is increasing the amount of crash debris and detritus to be cleaned up at a greater rate than what has been allowed. The current budget is $64,000 and an additional $15,000 per annum is being requested.

• A recent independent report on the condition of our road pavements recommended more and better information on road pavement strength and condition is required in order to better predict future performance. An additional $50,000 per annum is being requested for high speed data surveys.

• There are additional management demands in managing the network and meeting NZTA reporting requirements through the ONRC and preparing business cases and so an additional $50,000 per annum is being requested to meet these demands.

• As noted below in the improvements programme there is a project for travel demand management measures to align with the greater Christchurch TDM Business Case. An additional $50,000 is being requested for this work.

• Offsetting these additional costs is a reduction in the street light power budget of $50,000 per annum to align with the current actual power costs. It appears the growth factor that has been applied to past budgets has been higher than necessary.

3.24. Overall this is an increase of $177,000 per annum in the subsidised road maintenance and renewal budget of $10m. 51% of this cost will be met by NZTA.

3.25. Further work is required to assess the benefits of accelerating the replacement of street lights with LED lights. LED lighting provides much lower power cost and reduced maintenance costs. Once further work is carried out this will be reported to Council for consideration.

3.26. There are a number of risks that need to be noted as these may impact on the programme.

• Treatment of stormwater from existing roads. No allowance has been made for the treatment of stormwater from existing roads. While there are no requirements to treat stormwater from existing roads this may become an issue within the next few years. Note that the treatment of stormwater from vested assets and from new projects is included in those projects.

• Emergency events. The submitted programme allows for ‘normal’ snow and other weather events only. No allowance is made for more extreme events. NZTA have funding for what they describe as ‘Minor Events’ and ‘Emergency Works’ and this can be applied for and claimed if an event occurs. On average the Council would make a claim under these activities every three years. In recent times there were flood events in 2014 and the recent rain events in 2017 that required a claim from NZTA. The ‘local share’ of these events was not allowed for in the budget. In the context of the overall Council budget these costs were not significant.

• Old Waimakariri bridge maintenance and repairs. This bridge is 50% owned by the Waimakariri District Council and managed by Christchurch City Council. If this bridge requires anything more than very minor maintenance then additional budget will be required. It is likely some major repairs will be required over the next few years. Information has been requested from Christchurch City Council.

• Pegasus Street lights. Last year a problem was identified with the design of the street lights in Pegasus. A report is currently being prepared on this issue and it is highly
likely mitigation work will be required. At this stage no allowance has been made for these costs as the amount and extent is not known.

3.27. Improvements Programme

3.28. As noted above the stakeholder workshops identified the following problems:

- The State Highway and connecting local roads not coping with the demand at peak time;
- Increased volumes of traffic leading to increased risk of crashes;
- Increased rate of land use change putting pressure on maintaining the network.

3.29. The key improvement projects included in the initial bid to address the problem areas in the short term are as follows. The attached draft programme gives the full details of the projects including the proposed timing and budget amounts.

- Townsend Road/Fernside Road/Flaxton Road/Skewbridge Road/Island Road route improvements and in particular the realignment of the bridge on Skewbridge Road. Aligns with NZTA business case. Timeframe 2018-21.
- Rangiora Woodend Road improvements, including the Boys Road intersection, and Woodend access improvements to State Highway 1. Aligns with NZTA business case. Timeframe 2018-21.
- Main North Road (Old Waimakariri Bridge to Kaiapoi urban boundary) improvements including the new cycleway connection. Aligns with NZTA business case. Timeframe 2018-21.
- Targeted intersection improvements and clear zone improvements on rural roads. Timeframe 2018-21 and beyond.
- Condition driven improvement projects on arterial roads, eg Williams Street (Ohoka to Vickery), Ivory Street (Bucham to Alfred), Flaxton Road (Lineside to Kingsford Smith Drive). Timeframe 2018-21.
- Passenger transport infrastructure programmes to align to Greater Christchurch PT Business Case. Timeframe likely to be beyond 2021
- Travel Demand Management (TDM) programmes to align to Greater Christchurch TDM Business case. Timeframe 2018-21 and beyond. The funding for this is included in the Maintenance and Renewal Programme as noted above.
- Road Safety (education and promotion) programmes with our road safety partners. Timeframe 2018-21 and beyond. The funding for this is included in the Road Safety Programme as detailed below.
- Walking and cycling improvement and education programmes to encourage more walking and cycling. Timeframe 2018-21 and beyond. The funding for the construction work is included in the improvements programme. The funding for the cycle education programme is included in the Road Safety Programme as detailed below.

3.30. The proposed full 2018 – 28 capital improvements programme is attached to this report.

3.31. This programme is similar to that presented to the Utilities and Roading Workshop on 20 June 2017. It is noted that further work is being done to refine the programme and it may change.

3.32. The process for implementing these projects also follows the business case approach and it is called the detailed business case. This is where specific options are considered and assessed and a key part of the process is engaging with and involving stakeholders. A
series of workshops will be held to work with the stakeholders on each project. These workshops will include Councillors and Community Board Members.

3.33. The programme over the full ten year period is approximately $10m more than that in the current LTP. Key changes are as follows.

- Flaxton Road upgrade - +$500k
- Fernside/Flaxton/Skewbridge route - +$1m
- Rangiora Woodend Road Incl Boys Rd - +$600k
- Woodend Improvements with NZTA - +$1.5m
- Tram Road safety improvements - +$2.3m
- Southbrook Road improvements - +$500k
- Coldstream Road Improvements - +$500k
- Main North Road improvements - +$250k
- Lehmans Rd to River Rd new road - +1m
- Walking and cycling projects - +3.5m

3.34. Road Safety Programme

3.35. The road safety programme is for road safety education and promotion activities. This involves working with our road safety partners and is managed through the Road Safety Coordinating Committee and the Road Safety Action Plan.

3.36. It is proposed that this part of the programme continue as business as usual with no additional funding from that already included in the LTP.

3.37. This activity also includes Cycle Education Activities and NZTA has recently announced support for these programmes. This is to support and encourage cycling and to make it safer and is aligned to the Urban Cycle Programme for with the Council has received funding for the major cycleways. ACC is also supporting the programme and it is likely the funding will be shared between the Council, NZTA and ACC.

3.38. At this stage $70,000 has been included in the initial bid to NZTA for Cycle Education Activities. A report is being prepared to Council on this subject and that report will enable the Council to consider the merits of the programme and the amount of funding it is prepared to invest. This will then be included in the firm bid in October.

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

4. Community Views

4.1. In developing and updating the AMP community views are an important part of the process. They are considered in a number of ways ranging from stakeholder workshops to service request trends, annual plan submission and through the customer satisfaction surveys. The community views from these processes have been considered when preparing the AMP and the initial bid.

4.2. Ultimately the community has the opportunity to provide their views through the consultation on the LTP.

5. Financial Implications and Risks

5.1. The value of the submitted maintenance and renewal programme is in the order of $10m per annum with $5.1m (51%) funded from the NLTP and $4.9m (49%) from the Council through rates.
5.2. The submitted capital improvements programme is in the order of $13.6m over the three years.

5.3. Other financial implications and risk is covered in Section 3 above.

6. CONTEXT

6.1. Community Outcomes

There is a safe environment for all:

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

Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable, affordable and sustainable

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

Ken Stevenson
Roading Manager
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROAD IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20</th>
<th>20/21</th>
<th>21/22</th>
<th>22/23</th>
<th>23/24</th>
<th>24/25</th>
<th>25/26</th>
<th>26/27</th>
<th>27/28</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ivory Street Widening at Queen St</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 420,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 420,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fletton Road (Lincoln to Transfer Station) - Southbrook OD</td>
<td>$ 830,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 830,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Kalapoli Mill Rd - Skewbridge Rd</td>
<td>$ 500,000</td>
<td>$ 2,000,000</td>
<td>$ 2,500,000</td>
<td>$ 500,000</td>
<td>$ 500,000</td>
<td>$ 500,000</td>
<td>$ 500,000</td>
<td>$ 500,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 7,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Kalapoli, Silverstream, new collector road</td>
<td>$ 2,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Woodend Road including Boys Road Intersection</td>
<td>$ 300,000</td>
<td>$ 300,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend Improvements in conjunction with NZTA Business case Incl Woodend Bypass</td>
<td>$ 250,000</td>
<td>$ 250,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 500,000</td>
<td>$ 1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tram Road safety improvements including McHughs Road</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>$ 2,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbrook Road Improvements</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coldestream Road Improvements at sports hub</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaipori Park and Ride</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Park and Ride</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coldestream Rd/Golf Links Rd Improvements</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>$ 500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaipori to Belfast cycleway (WDC section)</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>$ 250,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Passenger transport Infrastructure</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>$ 500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns Rd/Plasketts Rd/Fernside Rd Improvements</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Rangiora Road Improvements - Lehmans to River Rd</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Rangiora Road Improvements - Existing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>420,000</td>
<td>420,000</td>
<td>420,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 1,260,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking and Cycling Projects</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>$ 4,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Improvements</td>
<td>550,000</td>
<td>550,000</td>
<td>550,000</td>
<td>550,000</td>
<td>550,000</td>
<td>550,000</td>
<td>550,000</td>
<td>550,000</td>
<td>550,000</td>
<td>550,000</td>
<td>$ 5,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>$ 5,730,000</td>
<td>$ 5,740,000</td>
<td>$ 4,120,000</td>
<td>$ 4,020,000</td>
<td>$ 5,100,000</td>
<td>$ 3,600,000</td>
<td>$ 1,600,000</td>
<td>$ 1,600,000</td>
<td>$ 2,850,000</td>
<td>$ 1,850,000</td>
<td>$ 36,410,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Chief Executive

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to seek Council approval to change the speed limits on roads within the Kaiapoi (West) area.

1.2. A speed limit of 60km/h is proposed on the New Arterial Road to the end of the houses on Butchers Road, and an 80km/h speed limit through to the west side of the Skewbridge Road bridge.

1.3. A speed limit of 50km/h is proposed on Island Road, Adderley Terrace and the Ohoka Road overpass in the areas shown on the attached plan (TRIM 170608058547).

1.4. In June 2017 the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board approved consultation being carried out on the proposed changes and consultation was carried out between 17 July and 11 August 2017.

1.5. A total of 44 submissions were received on the proposal, as summarised in Table 1 below.

Table 1 Summary of Submissions Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Speed Limit</th>
<th>Support in Full</th>
<th>Conditional Support</th>
<th>Opposed in Full</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50km/h Speed Limit on Ohoka Road across Overbridge</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60km/h Speed Limit on New Arterial Road</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80km/h Speed Limit on New Arterial Road</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50km/h Speed Limit on Island Road &amp; Adderley Terrace</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.6. NZTA supports the proposal in full. There have been no formal responses from the NZ Automobile Association, the Police or from the Road Transport Forum NZ to this proposal.

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

1.8. Based on this feedback it is recommended the speed limits change as was proposed.

Attachments:

i. Plan showing proposed speed limits (TRIM 170608058547)
ii. Submission Details (TRIM 170810085964)
iii. Memo to Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board (TRIM 170816088257)
2. **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No 170822090290

(b) **Approves** the speed limit change on roads within the Kaiapoi (West) area, as outlined below, and as shown on the attached plan (TRIM 170608058547).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Proposed Limit</th>
<th>Existing Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka Road</td>
<td>From the existing 50/70 change point, across Overbridge, to 100m west of Island Road</td>
<td>50km/h</td>
<td>70km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Arterial Road / Butchers Road</td>
<td>From 100m west of Island Road to the end of the houses on Butchers Road</td>
<td>60km/h</td>
<td>N/A / 100km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Arterial Road / Butchers Road / Island Road / Skewbridge Road</td>
<td>From the end of the houses on Butchers Road to west of Skewbridge Road Bridge</td>
<td>80km/h</td>
<td>100km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Road</td>
<td>From 300m south of Ohoka Road to Butchers Road</td>
<td>50km/h</td>
<td>70km/h / 100km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adderley Terrace</td>
<td>From the existing 50/70 change point to Island Road</td>
<td>50km/h</td>
<td>70km/h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(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 Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board for their information.

(f) **Circulates** this report to all Community Boards.

3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

3.1. In 2013 the scheme design for the NAR was prepared and at that time a speed limit assessment was carried out using the Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits 2003. That assessment concluded a 70km/h speed limit would be appropriate on the NAR and it was proposed the existing 70km/h speed limit across the Ohoka Road overbridge would remain.

3.2. Since that time NZTA has reviewed the way speed limits are managed and late last year the NZ Speed Management Guide was published. The speed limit for the NAR was then reviewed using the new guidelines. This was done in December 2016.

3.3. That review identified three options as follows

- Option 1 – the 70km/h option referred to in 3.7 above.
- Option 2 – same as Option 1 with a 60km/h speed limit including across the overbridge.
- Option 3 – a 70km/h speed limit on the NAR and a 50km/h speed limit across the Ohoka Road overbridge and across Island Road.
3.4. The recommended option at that stage was Option 3. The 50km/h speed limit across the overbridge and across Island Road was required to address safety issues at the Island Road intersection.

3.5. This option was sent to NZTA for comment. Also a safety audit was carried out on the detailed design for the new road. In addition feedback was obtained from the Community Board on this option and there have been comments from the residents of houses close to the new road about road noise.

3.6. This feedback is summarised as follows:
   - NZTA pointed out the NZ Speed Management Guide and the draft new rule for setting speed limit no longer consider 70km/h speed limits to be appropriate.
   - The safety audit identified potential safety issues at the Mill Road intersection that the auditors considered have the potential to be exacerbated with the operating speeds of 100km/h and they suggested a lower speed limit be considered in this location.
   - Board members suggested the speed limit should be lower to beyond the bridge on Skewbridge Road due to the narrow low speed nature of the bridge and the approaches. This issue has been raised by others in the past as well.
   - Some residents adjoining the new road raised a concern about traffic noise on the new road and a lower speed would lower the noise level.

3.7. When this feedback was taken into account a 4th option was developed.

3.8. This option is as follows:
   - A 50km/h speed limit across the Ohoka Road overbridge and across Island Road.
   - A 60km/h speed limit along the new road to the end of the last house on Butchers Road.
   - An 80km/h speed limit from the last house on Butchers Road to the west side of the curve onto the Skewbridge Road.

3.9. The advantages of this option is it aligns well with the new speed management guide, it addresses the issues raised in the safety audit and it takes into account the community feedback.

3.10. Also an 80km/h speed limit at the western end is consistent with the 80km/h speed limit on Flaxton Road on the approach to Rangiora.

3.11. A disadvantage of this option is the 60km/h speed limit along the new road might result in a low level of compliance due to the relatively wide open nature of the road however with houses adjoining the road, the number of intersections and the curve in the road it is unlikely to result in excessively high average speeds. Speeds in the mid to high 60’s rather than the low to mid 60’s might be more common. This would still be a safe speed in these conditions and for the road design.

3.12. Another issue is the lower speed limit might impact on people’s perception of this route being an attractive alternative route from Rangiora to the motorway. The length of road covered by the lower speed limit is about 2.5km. A 20km/h speed difference over that distance equates to about 20 seconds. For someone driving to Christchurch city this is not significant and it will be faster than the current route.

3.13. Staff have discussed this speed limit option with NZTA staff and they agree with the assessment and with the option.

3.14. When the new arterial road is opened Island Road between Cosgrove Avenue and where it will stop opposite Giles Road will be a local road and urban in nature. As such a 50km/h speed limit is
the appropriate speed limit. This section of Island Road currently has a temporary 50km/h speed limit.

3.15. The speed limit on Adderley Terrace has also been reviewed and while it is noted that Adderley Terrace currently has a 70km/h speed limit from Island Road through to the houses west of Sneyd Street the actual speed environment is closer to 50km/h due to the curves in the road. Also over time this area will be built up with houses. It is proposed to change this speed limit to 50km/h to be consistent with the other speed limits in the area and with the proposed Island Road speed limit.

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

4. THE 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 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. In July, feedback on the proposed new speed limits was sought through advertising in the local newspapers and on the Councils website. Also letters were sent to NZTA, the Police, the NZ Automobile Association Inc and the Road Transport Forum NZ as required by the Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits. A summary of the submissions is below and the details are attached.

4.3. A total of 44 submissions were received on the proposal, as summarised in Table 1 below.

**Table 2 Summary of Submissions Received**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Speed Limit</th>
<th>Support in Full</th>
<th>Conditional Support</th>
<th>Opposed in Full</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50km/h Speed Limit on Ohoka Road across Overbridge</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60km/h Speed Limit on New Arterial Road</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80km/h Speed Limit on New Arterial Road</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50km/h Speed Limit on Island Road &amp; Adderley Terrace</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4. Seventeen submissions fully supported the proposal to change the speed limit on all the roads within the Kaiapoi (West) area. 22 submissions supported the proposed speed limits along the New Arterial Road.

4.5. Ten submissions suggested extending the proposed 60km/h speed limit over the Skewbridge Road bridge. Six submissions suggested lowering the proposed 60km/h speed limit further to 50km/h past the houses on the New Arterial Road.

4.6. One submission fully opposed the proposal to change the speed limit on all the roads within the Kaiapoi (West) area. Ten submissions opposed the proposed speed limits along the New Arterial Road.

4.7. NZTA supports the proposal in full. There have been no formal responses from the NZ Automobile Association, the Police or from the Road Transport Forum NZ to this proposal.

4.8. The submissions received on this proposal have been distributed to the Board along with a covering memo for their information.
5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISK**

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. Statute

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. Links to 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

---

Ken Stevenson  
Roading Manager
## KAIAPOI (WEST) SPEED LIMIT REVIEW SUBMISSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRIM</th>
<th># NAME</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1707130729303</td>
<td>FEEDBACK FORM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A buffer zone on Island Road approaching the proposed 50km/h is needed to help vehicles slow down prior to reaching the change point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170714073209</td>
<td>M HOLAGATE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A to be added. Island Rd Wk. Ohoka Rd Overpass 70km. 80 km to west of Silverbridge is fine. The road is flanked by houses and traffic flow to Chih should be considered. People buying houses there knew what was happening.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170717073743, 17072507928</td>
<td>J &amp; P WRAY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>My wife and I agree with the new proposed speed limits. It is a good idea to slow down traffic coming from the Silverbridge Road bridge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170717073745</td>
<td>C &amp; S PAVIEIL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very much in favour of your proposed speed limits revised down from the original higher resource consented speeds (100 to 70km). We live on the corner and have a young baby at 1 Hayson Drive (corner Hayson Drive &amp; and Bulfinch Road). Safety is paramount and it obviously is to WDC as well. Very impressed with this initiative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170717073776</td>
<td>NZTA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As discussed previously with NZTA, I can confirm we are happy with the proposed speed limit changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170725076494</td>
<td>ANON SUBMISSION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I totally disagree with the proposed speed limits and zoning if those limits. Refer to TRIM 170721076499 for full submission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170721076499</td>
<td>K JAMES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>My submission is that the proposed 60km/h be extended to the west side of the new bridge. Two more comments at the intersection and be more considerate for the three houses adjacent to the intersection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170724077547, R217001468</td>
<td>D &amp; J MADELEY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I think Island Rd should be 50 km all the way to tram rd. Can go far to fast from anaika rd on and exiting past landfill park especially.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170725077982</td>
<td>DJ WORDSWORTH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Keep the speed limit constant at 50km/h from the Ohoka Road overbridge through to the end of the houses in the Silverstream substation i.e. no 60km as has been proposed in your file.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170726078536</td>
<td>R SHEPPARD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to say that I think they are brilliant and would really like to see these in place once everything is up and running. We are Silverstream residents and our property backs onto Butchers road so we were a little concerned about the speed it was going to be down along there but I think a 60km/h limit would be absolutely fine. So it's the big thumbs up to the new speed limits from us.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170726078537</td>
<td>J BAIK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to suggest you the new arterial road should be continued same speed as Ohoka road like 50 km/h speed limit, not 60 kmh speed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIM</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>SUPPORT</td>
<td>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</td>
<td>AGAINST</td>
<td>SUPPORT</td>
<td>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</td>
<td>AGAINST</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>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170726078539</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>A REID</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170726078468</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>E MARTIN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170726079078</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>W BELLANEY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170726076808</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>D &amp; M ALLAN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17073106015</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>ANON SUBMISSION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170803092458</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>J &amp; M BARRETT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In principal I agree apart from having a 60 km/h limit just around the Silverstream subdivision. Most commuters coming off the 100 km/h motorway and heading for Rangiora will be doing 80 km/h minimum and will ignore the 60 km/h limit. The real danger with the increased traffic flow will be at Skeewbridge which is already a dangerous area. I assume that bridge is remaining as it is and with a lot more traffic being projected to pass over it will become an accident black spot. Why not keep a 70 km/h limit right through to the north side of Skeewbridge.

I support the speed limit proposed for the road marked in yellow as "new arterial road" provided this is the speed limit suggested when traffic noise volumes were assessed as being reasonable for those living nearby. I also support the 80 km/h limit for the stretch of road which crosses the two bridges as, with more buses and increasing traffic volumes, there is a tight squeeze over Skeewbridge with, I believe, a high risk of serious accidents on this bridge. It is a bridge that I think should be monitored and included for an upgrade in time.

I would like to suggest that the proposed 60km/h speed on the new arterial road be extended to past the Skeewbridge Road bridge. As residents of Silverstream since 2015 we travel regularly over this bridge. In my opinion the narrowess of the bridge and its situation on the bend causes a potential hazard for cars encountering oncoming large trucks and buses. I have regularly encountered large trucks travelling on the centre line on the bridge forcing the opposing traffic over to the edge. Are there any plans in place to widen or replace the bridge?

As residents of Silverstream, we are happy with the various speed limits being proposed.

I would suggest you that the speed limits along the new Arterial Road to the end of the houses on Butchers Road should be a 50 km/h speed limit instead of a 60km/h speed limit.

We support fully the new proposed speed limits around the Silverstream Subdivision. However, Island Road, south of Ohoka Road, should also be considered. We presume Island Road will be a new secondary road relative to Ohoka Road and so Island Road will have the compulsory stop. Making a new 50km zone on Island Road from Neaves Road to the existing 50km sign will improve safety, and reduce noise and wear and tear on the road as heavy trucks brake to a stop.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRIM</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17082036255</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>HODGDON</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I strongly disagree with the suggested speed limits and zoning of these limits that are being considered for the new arterial road. It would be much safer for a new 60km speed limit to change before the start of the residential zone. With the increase of heavy traffic such as buses going over Skewbridge bridge and more trucks as the west Rangers commercial area grows this would seem to be a very positive step given new narrow the bridge is. A 50km speed limit past the reserve would be a lot safer than 80km for the people in and around the reserve and of course cyclists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170820364288</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>P. RENNEY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I agree with 50km/h from Onoka Road across the overbridge and through the Island Road intersection. The 60km/h along the new arterial road, in my opinion should go through to the west side of Skewbridge Road bridge as one moving to Skewstream. I have seen a number of accidents at Skewbridge. Also with buses now using this route the bridge is narrow enough without having an 80km/h speed limit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170820364441</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>D. BLACKWELL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The 50km/h speed limit as shown along Adderley Terrace to Fuller Street and along Island Road from Mill Road to Cargrove Street and Molong Road Interchange all look good, practical and sensible speed limits. For the new western bypass I would suggest the speed limit be reduced to 60km/h from 100m west of Mill Road to connect with the 60km speed limits around Skewstream.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 ONLINE SUBMISSION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We think it should be 70km/h (From end of houses to over Skewbridge Road Bridge) to limit traffic noise at Skewstream and to accommodate Mill Road Joining. Also the existing bridge on Skewbridge Road is a narrow bridge more suitable to 70km/h. The new arterial road should be 50km/h as a continuation of Onoka Road Joining.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 ONLINE SUBMISSION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Definitely slower past schools and I'm happy with the 80km/h limit past Louburn School with the reduced limit during school traffic hours, but why only 80km/h on Louburn Whitemoor road? Then the 50km/h past the skewgrounds? That should have been a temporary limited speed zone only used for the duration of events. The council is constantly working towards making my commute less and less bearable until I move out of the district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIM</td>
<td># NAME</td>
<td>SUPPORT</td>
<td>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</td>
<td>AGAINST</td>
<td>SUPPORT</td>
<td>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</td>
<td>AGAINST</td>
<td>SUPPORT</td>
<td>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</td>
<td>AGAINST</td>
<td>SUPPORT</td>
<td>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</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>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>ONLINE SUBMISSION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>ONLINE SUBMISSION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>ONLINE SUBMISSION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>ONLINE SUBMISSION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>ONLINE SUBMISSION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>ONLINE SUBMISSION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>ONLINE SUBMISSION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIM</td>
<td># NAME</td>
<td>SUPPORT</td>
<td>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</td>
<td>AGAINST</td>
<td>SUPPORT</td>
<td>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</td>
<td>AGAINST</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>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>ONLINE SUBMISSION 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I cycle this route every morning coming from Rangipa. If the traffic is too pass safely on the bridge it needs to be slowed right down for a clear view of oncoming traffic. Double yellow over the narrow bridge would help too. Adderley Tce is on my cycle route and as cars seem to want to pass whatever even though they can't see round corners the slower the better.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>ONLINE SUBMISSION 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I think the speed limit should be 50kmh all the way into Kaitaia. This way drivers may actually slow down a bit from 80 kmh as most drivers always drive 10kmh over the limit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>ONLINE SUBMISSION 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Speed has been an issue in this area for some time and this is a high level conflict intersection. Being the first southern access to the Northern Motorway for light and a large number of heavy vehicles this makes sense. This should be extended through to past the MM Road intersection. Vehicles will be accelerating from this point through the MM Road intersection and will not have fully decelerated before reaching the Hayson Drive intersection. This would create additional conflict. There were a number of accidents at the Island Road/Silverstream Boulevard over the past months due to the speed not being adhered to. The stopping of Island Road from Adderley Terrace will have the effect of moving the traffic normally using the Adderley Terrace/Island Road intersection moving to the Hayson Drive/Isleraier intersection. The present 70kmh is not safely achievable at present due to the narrow carriageway and number of blind corners. There are also a number of walkers, runners and cyclists encountered at various times.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>ONLINE SUBMISSION 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The proposed 60kmh area should be 60 kmh and the rest should be 50 kmh as its mostly urban.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>ONLINE SUBMISSION 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The limit should be 80kmh the entire way in keeping with the new road environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>ONLINE SUBMISSION 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>ONLINE SUBMISSION 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>ONLINE SUBMISSION 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>ONLINE SUBMISSION 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>ONLINE SUBMISSION 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>extend the 60 kmh speed limit to past Silverbridge for safety. The bridge has a 65km requirement and still has accidents on it, look at the old marks there present, the bridge is narrow and dangerous. The bending nature of Adderley Tce causes some danger, 50kmh road speed limit would be safer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>ONLINE SUBMISSION 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TRIM: 17081508364
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRIM</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>ONLINE SUBMISSION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The 50km/h speed limit should only be until the roundabout. The NAR should be 100km. Just make the rest one speed to stop confusion. The problem is there are too many intersections coming onto the new road so it will have to be slow which really makes the whole thing a waste of time after all the effort and delays. You might as well have just left the traffic on island road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>ONLINE SUBMISSION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>ONLINE SUBMISSION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEMO

FILE NO: RDG-31 / 170816088257
DATE: August 2017
MEMO TO: Kaiapoi-Tuahiw Community Board
FROM: Ken Stevenson – Roading Manager
SUBJECT: Kaiapoi (West) Speed Limit Review – Consultation Feedback

The purpose of this memo is to advise the Board of the results of the consultation on the proposal to change the speed limit on roads within the Kaiapoi (West) area.

A speed limit of 60km/h was proposed on the New Arterial Road to the end of the houses on Butchers Road, and an 80km/h speed limit through to the west side of the Skewbridge Road bridge.

A speed limit of 50km/h was also proposed on Island Road, Adderley Terrace and the Ohoka Road overpass in the areas shown on the attached plan (TRIM 170608058547).

The Board supported the proposal for consultation and it was noted that the Board would be updated at the end of the consultation process.

The full submissions are attached (TRIM 170810085964) and are also summarised below.

A total of 44 submissions were received on the proposal, as summarised in Table 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Speed Limit</th>
<th>Support in Full</th>
<th>Conditional Support</th>
<th>Opposed in Full</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50km/h Speed Limit on Ohoka Road across Overbridge</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60km/h Speed Limit on New Arterial Road</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80km/h Speed Limit on New Arterial Road</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50km/h Speed Limit on Island Road &amp; Adderley Terrace</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seventeen submissions fully supported the proposal to change the speed limit on all the roads within the Kaiapoi (West) area. 22 submissions supported the proposed speed limits along the New Arterial Road.

Ten submissions suggested extending the proposed 60km/h speed limit over the Skewbridge Road bridge. Six submissions suggested lowering the proposed 60km/h speed limit further to 50km/h past the houses on the New Arterial Road.

One submission fully opposed the proposal to change the speed limit on all the roads within the Kaiapoi (West) area. Ten submissions opposed the proposed speed limits along the New Arterial Road.
NZTA supports the proposal in full. There have been no formal responses from the NZ Automobile Association, the Police or from the Road Transport Forum NZ to this proposal.

It was noted that the feedback throughout the consultation process generally supported the proposed changes with one submitter opposing all the speed limit changes and an additional nine submitters opposing the proposed speed limits along the New Arterial Road. A small number of submitters suggested lowering the proposed speed limits further or altering the proposed change point locations, however this is not considered necessary or appropriate.

Staff will be reporting to the September meeting of the Council recommending the speed limit changes as per the original proposal.

If you have any questions or comments please contact me.

Ken Stevenson
Roading Manager
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT

FILE NO:             RDG-32-44 / 170825091852
REPORT TO:          Council
DATE OF MEETING:     5 September 2017
FROM:               Joanne McBride, Development Manager
                    Simon Hart, Business and Centres Manager
SUBJECT:            Rangiora Town Centre Feature and Street Lighting

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

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to provide further information to Council in relation to report no. 170725078225 referred from the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board.

1.2. As reported to the Board, the cost estimates were $265,000 for the feature lighting and $550,000 for the street lighting.

1.3. Since this time Mainpower have continued to refine their methodology for installing the feature lights and also finalising the pricing to a point where a formal quote for the work has now been supplied to staff. The formal quote for the feature lighting has come in at $330,000 which is higher than previously indicated by Mainpower (this is a difference of $65,000). The cost of installing the street light poles and lanterns is estimated at $485,000.

1.4. The reason for the higher quote is due to the amount of work required up front to install underground cabling for both the feature lighting and the future street lighting. In reviewing their methodology in detail, Mainpower have determined that carrying out additional work at this earlier stage would save costs in the future, when the decision to install the new road and footpath lighting is made.

1.5. Mainpower have confirmed that although the initial cost up front for this work will be slightly higher, the overall cost for the lighting (both feature and street lighting) is estimated to be the same at $815,000. This is being formalised in a quotation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous Estimate</th>
<th>Updated Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feature Lighting</td>
<td>$265,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Lighting</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$815,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Updated Estimate</strong></td>
<td><strong>$330,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** Estimate**</td>
<td><strong>$485,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note – this is the same total cost overall
1.6. Other options for providing lighting are festoon lights stung across the road or around the street light poles. The overall whole of life cost of the options are similar, noting that the recommended in-ground feature lighting has a higher up front cost, however has a much higher amenity value.

1.7. The in-ground feature lighting can be installed independently of the road lighting however the festoons will require the new poles for the street lighting to be installed along the road to achieve a consistent look.

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report no. 170825091852.

(b) **Approves** the feature lighting as detailed in Option Two of this report, consisting of in-ground LED Lighting.

(c) **Approves** the reallocation of $65,000 from the Waikuku to Pegasus Connection budget of $670,000.

(d) **Notes** that staff will report back on options to fund the street lighting of $485,000 through the next LTP process

(e) **Notes** that additional information is provided in relation to report no. 170725078225 referred from the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board.

(f) **Notes** that there is a separate report for Kaiapoi Town Centre feature lighting. Option Two in this report is the same level of service as is being proposed for Kaiapoi Town Centre.

3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

**Background**

3.1. The replacement of the street light poles along High Street was not part of the original town centre upgrade scope, however through the upgrade project it became apparent that there were deficiencies in the street lighting network which should be considered.

3.2. When assessing the street lighting there were a number of aspects to take into account and these included the current level of lighting achieved, the age of the lights and poles, any gaps in the coverage and requirements for Christmas lighting.

3.3. Currently the town centre has dim and inconsistent under veranda lighting with the exception of Farmers. The lighting is aging and well below current design standards. Poles have been removed post-earthquake due to building replacement along High Street and this has created gaps or ‘low light areas’. These low light areas can make both pedestrians and drivers feel unsafe or vulnerable and may encourage anti-social behaviour.

3.4. There are currently no requirements in the District Plan or in the Building Code for shops to light their frontages, and relying on individual businesses to provide lighting means that lighting is likely to be inconsistent along any street.

3.5. There are crime prevention cameras operating in the town centre area. CCTV systems operate less effectively in poorly or unevenly lit areas, as imagery is not well defined. There is less opportunity to identify anti-social behaviour and offenders.
3.6. For pedestrians walking in the town centre they must be safe. Safe public lighting ensures that pedestrians do not get injured. Pedestrians should be able to see clearly enough to negotiate possible obstacles and obstructions and the physical terrain without discomfort or physical harm. To minimise the risk of near misses or collisions, pedestrians should be easily visible to all other users of the space, such as motorists, cyclists, and other pedestrians.

3.7. Public lighting that promotes personal security may reduce the potential for harm to pedestrians and should deliver some comfort to users. Enhancing actual or perceived levels of personal security for pedestrians increases the likelihood that people use these areas. Lighting may contribute to providing pedestrians with protection from crime; and lighting may minimise the likelihood of antisocial behaviour.

3.8. Attractive public lighting has a positive effect on pedestrians and contributes to their enjoyment of the environment and experience. There has been quite an increase in the number of eateries in Rangiora Town Centre and more people are moving around the town centre at night. Providing a consistent level of lighting in the town centre would provide an environment where people want to spend time and enjoy the area.

3.9. With the things in mind, staff worked with Mainpower to look at the lighting design and light pole options. As part of the design process a structural review was carried out for the proposed poles. These were designed to hold the festoon lights which had been purchased for a portion of High Street (Victoria Street to Good Street Laneway).

3.10. The structural review of the pole design showed that the new street poles would require a significant foundation due to the stresses on the new poles from the proposed strung festoon lights. The additional cost to strengthen the pole foundations was estimated to be around $60,000 for the materials alone (without any labour). At that point the question was asked amongst the PCG Group as to whether there were other / potentially better feature lighting options, than installing the strung festoon lights.

3.11. Mainpower provided advice around feature lighting and subsequently Philips Lighting were approached by Mainpower to come in and talk to staff about what was available in terms of modern lighting, and how lighting was being approached in town centres. It became apparent that there were options such as programmable colour change LED lights which could enhance the town centre and provide a year round lighting solution rather than the strung festoons which are put up in November and taken down in January (when our darkness hours are the shortest).

3.12. Philips came to a subsequent Board meeting and demonstrated the lights which were available. Philips representatives were asked to provide a lighting design for the town centre but have failed to deliver this. At the recommendation of Mainpower, Mark Herring Lighting was approached to provide a lighting design for the town centre, which they have subsequently delivered.

Options

3.13. There are a number of options which are available to Council for both the street and feature lighting. As both options are interlinked staff are seeking feedback from Council in terms of what they would like to achieve for lighting in Rangiora Town Centre.

The options available include:

- Option One – Do minimum
This option would involve wrapping festoon lights around the poles between Good Street Laneway and King Street. The existing strung festoon lights at the eastern end of High Street would remain in use.

Retaining the existing street lights would keep the same level of service and low light areas would remain along High Street. This would not encourage pedestrians to utilise the area at night.

- **Option Two – In-ground lighting with street light upgrade later**

  The in-ground lights can be installed independently of the street lighting albeit that installation of the street light cabling for the future can be undertaken at the same time for ease of future works.

  The in-ground colour change LED lights have the advantage of providing year round enhancement and beautification of High Street – not just Christmas for time. The programmable nature of these lights would make the lights very versatile and a real asset especially given the increasing amount of activity around the town centre in the evenings.

- **Option Three – In-ground lighting and street lights now**

  This options would require additional budget for the street light poles to be allocated. Proceeding with the new street lights would mean that the Rangiara Town Centre would be lit to a level which meets the AS/NZ Standard for lighting and eliminates any low light areas. This would result in an area of higher amenity and a town centre that would be more attractive and therefore better utilised in the evenings as pedestrians would feel safer.

- **Option Four – New Street Lighting and Festoons (Strung or Wrapped around the pole)**

  This option would provide a consistent lighting effect along High Street in terms of both street lighting and festoon lighting. Below is an outline of the whole of life costs of strung festoon lights.

### 3.14. Strung festoon lights could not be installed along the full length of High Street at this time, due to the missing poles along the street (where the street lights have been removed for new buildings). In order to get full coverage the new street lights would need to be installed along the length of High Street. The street light poles would need to be manufactured and would not be installed by Christmas 2017.

### 3.15. There would also be additional costs associated with the extra foundations required for the street light poles, putting up and removing the strung festoons each year, replacement cost of the light strings due to a shorter life expectancy (8 to 10 years). Therefore the full life cost over 20 years for strung festoon lights is estimated at $250,000. This is considered comparable to the in-ground LED feature lights, with the note that the festoons are likely to only be used for a short time during the year. The overall life costs of strung festoon lights are as follows:

| Additional cost of materials for foundation | $60,000 |
| Labour associated with additional foundation work | $40,000 |
| Additional festoons for the remainder of High Street | $20,000 |
| Replacement lights for length of High Street after 10 years | $30,000 |
| Putting up / removing light strings ($5 to $10k annually) | $100,000 |

**Total** $250,000
3.16. Festoon lights wrapped around each pole could be investigated further. These would not require full strengthening of the new street light poles, however overall they create less impact / effect than the in-ground or strung festoon lights. The festoons selected would need to be larger style bulbs otherwise the lighting effect can be overwhelmed by the light from the existing street lights. Waiting until the new poles are in place would mean that the lighting would not be completed for this Christmas.

3.17. The table below outlines the advantages and disadvantages for the feature lighting options:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Festoon Lights (Strung or On Poles)</th>
<th>In-ground LED Lights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advantage</td>
<td>Disadvantages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower lights cost</td>
<td>Only used for a short time each year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need new poles to be installed</td>
<td>Programmable to coincide with events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 to 10 years</td>
<td>10 year warranty and a 20 plus year life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower amenity value</td>
<td>Higher amenity value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing cost to install and remove each year</td>
<td>No ongoing maintenance costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strung lights could not be delivered by Christmas 2017</td>
<td>Can be delivered by Christmas 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. As relayed through the Board and from town centre businesses, there is considerable support to have feature lighting installed in High Street. There is also an expectation the lighting will be installed by November and staff are working to achieve that.

4.2. The proposed Option Two feature lighting is supported by the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. Report no. 170725078225 to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board has been approved by the Board and a recommendation for funding referred to Council.

5.2. Since this time Mainpower have continued to refine their methodology for installing the feature lights and also finalising the pricing to a point where a formal quote for the work has now been supplied to staff. The formal quote for the feature lighting has come in at $330,000 which is higher than previously indicated by Mainpower (this is a difference of $65,000). The cost of installing the street light poles and lanterns is estimated at $485,000.

5.3. Mainpower have confirmed that although the initial cost up front for this work will be slightly higher, the overall cost for the lighting (both feature and street lighting) is estimated to be the same at $815,000.
5.4. The cost estimate to upgrade the street lighting is $485,000. There is no budget for this upgrade work. This could be funded from the future unallocated Town Centre Upgrade Budget or new funding could be sought through the next LTP process for this work.

5.5. Included in the 2017/18 budget was $670,000 for the Kaiapoi Pa Road Upgrade. This project will not be proceeding and the budget has been allocated to the Waikuku Beach to Pegasus Connection. The cost estimate for the Waikuku Beach to Pegasus Connection is $300,000, this leaves $300,000 unallocated.

5.6. If Option Two is chosen then the intention is for the lighting to be completed by early November 2017. If the strung festoon option is chosen then installation will not be achievable for this Christmas.

6. CONTEXT

6.1. Policy

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

6.2. Legislation

Local Government Act 2002

6.3. Community Outcomes

There is a safe environment for all

Businesses in the District are diverse, adaptable, and growing

The distinctive character of our towns, villages and rural areas is maintained

Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality

___________________________  __________________________
Joanne McBride            Simon Hart
Development Manager       Simon Hart, Business and Centres Manager
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT

FILE NO and TRIM NO: CON201640-02 / 170823091196

REPORT TO: Council

DATE OF MEETING: 5 September 2017

FROM: Kitty Waghorn, Solid Waste Asset Manager

SUBJECT: Southbrook Recycling Compactor Shelter: Request to Reallocate Budgets

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to seek Council approval to reallocate $26,300 budget from three other Solid Waste capital projects for the construction of the Southbrook recycling compactor shelter at Southbrook resource recovery Park (PPR).

1.2. The Council approved a budget of $200,000 in the 16/17 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.

1.3. The substructure design and tender documents for construction of the substructure and design-build of the building itself were completed in 16/17, however no tenders were received for the contract. The Management Team granted approval for staff to negotiate with Russell Construction Ltd, and the budget and costs incurred to date were carried over into the 17/18 financial year.

1.4. The negotiated price has been provided, and there is sufficient budget remaining to cover the construction, but not costs for a partial redesign owing to a change in the building configuration, building consent fees, project supervision, and a contingency allowance for such potential items such as relocation of services. The funding shortfall is in the region of $26,300.

1.5. Staff anticipate that there will be sufficient cost savings in three of the other capital works projects in the Solid Waste budgets to fund this shortfall, and is seeking approval from the Council to reallocate funds from these budgets to the Southbrook recycling compactor shelter budget.

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 170823091196.

(b) Approves reallocation of unused funding from the following budgets to fund the $26,300 short-fall for the Southbrook Recycling Compactor Shelter (PJ 100844.000.5043):

i. $13,900 from Garterys Pit roads and fencing (PJ 100846.000.5043)

ii. $6,300 from Recycling bottle bank/container (PJ100991.000.5044)

iii. $6,100 from RPZ installation (backflow protection) Oxford (PJ 100955.000.5043)
(c) **Notes** that these capital works are all to be loan funded out of the Solid Waste Disposal Account

3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

3.1. The Council engaged Harrison-Grierson to undertake the preliminary design and preparation of contract documentation for Contract 16/40: Southbrook RRP Kerbside Recycling Building Construction. The final contract documentation was for design & construction of the concrete foundations/substructure and steel-framed building that would cover recycling materials collected at kerbside, prior to them being loaded into a container for transportation into Christchurch.

3.2. An Open Tender process was undertaken. The tender was for a Design/Build contract for concrete foundations/substructure and steel-framed building to cover recycling materials at Southbrook RRP. Tenders were open between 10 April and 17 May 2017, the tender was publicly advertised on the Council Website, and available electronically on the LGTenders website, and Emailed to contractors on request.

3.3. No tenders were received prior to the closing date, even though at least a dozen companies downloaded the documentation. Additionally the documents were emailed directly to Contractors on request, due to the Builders not having access to the LGTenders website.

3.4. In order to progress the construction of the building, staff sought, and were granted, approval to negotiate with Russell Construction Ltd, a construction company that has previously been engaged by the Council for several construction projects. Russell Construction Ltd are on SiteWise and have a score of 66%.

3.5. Russell Construction Ltd have provided a price for the construction of the building, which includes design of the superstructure: this price varies from $160,081.73 to $171,983.34 dependent on type and number of piles and superstructure supplier. During the negotiations, some changes were made to the building configuration which will mean Harrison Grierson will need to undertake some additional design work over their original brief.

3.6. Option 1: Approve reallocation of funding to allow construction of the complete structure. This is the recommended option, which will allow the project to commence almost immediately and construction to be completed as soon as possible.

3.7. Option 2: Carry out a review of the project in order to lower costs, by either removing features (such as the shed wall cladding), or staging construction with elements to be completed in a future financial year. This option is not recommended, as it will delay the project completion, or reduce the effectiveness of the structure, and will most likely increase overall construction costs.

3.8. Option 3: delay the construction until 2018/19 and seek additional budget through the Long Term Plan process. This option is not recommended, as it will delay the project completion.

3.9. Option 4: do not continue with the project. This option is not recommended as the building is necessary in order to remove the kerbside recycling from the pit. This removal will resolve existing capacity issues, access problems for commercial customers at peak-use times, and cross-contamination from the refuse also being thrown into the pit.

3.10. As discussed in the Financial Implications and Risk section below, staff anticipate that there will be sufficient cost savings from three of the other capital works projects in this account that could be used to offset these additional costs. Should this not be the case staff will bring a second report to Council to seek approval for the preferred pathway forward.

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

4.1. Community views have not been sought.

5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

5.1. A total of $38,324.51 of costs for consultancy fees, project management and a geotechnical investigation had been incurred at the end of May 2016 when the request to proceed with negotiations with a single contractor was made to the Management Team. The remaining budget of $161,675.49 was considered sufficient to cover the estimated contract costs of $150,000 and additional project management fees. It was acknowledged in the report that there was a risk that the final negotiated price could be higher than the remaining budget.

5.2. The incurred costs at the end of the 16/17 year were $38,997.51 – these were carried over into the current year along with the $200,000 funding budget, leaving $161,002.49 available for completion of the project.

5.3. Russell Construction Ltd has provided a price for the construction of the building, which includes design of the superstructure: this price varies from $160,081.73 to $171,983.34 dependent on type and number of piles and superstructure supplier. The breakdown of these prices are as follows:

**General Works:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Works</td>
<td>$25,150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Situ Concrete Piles (*)</td>
<td>$15,280.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td>$4,933.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>$2,354.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>$3,983.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Walls and Floors</td>
<td>$68,460.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Markings</td>
<td>$840.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Works Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$121,000.73</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less</strong> savings from installing screw piles</td>
<td><strong>$5,765.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revised Works Price</strong></td>
<td><strong>$115,235.73</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) An Alternative of using screw piles instead of in-situ piles was proposed, with an indicated saving of $5,765.00

**Superstructure prices:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fair Dinkum Sheds:</td>
<td>$44,846.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Span:</td>
<td>$50,982.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Construction Costs** (General Works + Superstructure)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fair Dinkum Sheds (Screw Piles Option):</td>
<td><strong>$160,081.73</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Span (Screw Piles Option):</td>
<td><strong>$166,218.34</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fair Dinkum Sheds (In Situ Piles Option):</strong></td>
<td><strong>$165,846.73</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Span (In Situ Piles Option):</td>
<td><strong>$171,983.34</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was the opinion of the Contractor that the shed produced by Fair Dinkum Sheds were of a higher quality that those of Total Span, despite being a lower cost. It will be prudent to allow for the higher construction cost for (as highlighted in bold in the above table) in the event that the redesign confirms that In Situ piles will be necessary.

5.4. During the contract negotiations, and in discussion with Waste Management regarding operational needs, some changes were made to the building configuration, including a
potential reduction in the number of piles which would also reduce the installation costs. The amended configuration, and advice about type and number of piles, will require Harrison Grierson to undertake some additional design work. Harrison Grierson has provided a quotation of $5,420 to undertake this additional work.

5.5. The price received from Russell Construction Ltd does not include building consent fees, installation of a three phase electrical supply or an allowance for contingencies. An additional allowance needs to be added for project management costs by Harrison Grierson and the Council’s Project Delivery Unit. These costs, including the additional design fees, are estimated to be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Consent Fees</th>
<th>$2,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies (including electrical work)</td>
<td>$11,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Design</td>
<td>$5,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management Fees</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Additional Fees and Contingencies</strong></td>
<td><strong>$21,420</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.6. A summary of the costs, and the additional funding requirements, are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costs Incurred to 30 June 2017</th>
<th>$38,997.51</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Construction Costs</td>
<td>$165,846.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Fees and Contingencies</td>
<td>$21,420.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amended Estimated Project Costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>$226,264.24</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial budget</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difference to be funded</strong></td>
<td><strong>$26,264.24</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.7. Up to $26,300 in additional funding is needed for this work to be completed. This is an increase of 13% of the original budget. It should be noted that if screw piles can be used, and the number of piles can be reduced, there would be a saving to the Council of approximately $6,000.

5.8. Staff anticipate that there will be cost savings from some of the other capital works projects in this account that could be used to offset these additional costs. We estimate that there will be up to $26,200 in funding available from the Garterys Pit roads & fencing and the Oxford transfer station recycling bottle-bank container budgets.

5.9. In addition to these forecast savings, a report will be taken by staff to the Utilities & Roading Committee to discuss potential cost-savings to the double check-valve backflow prevention device (RPZ) projects for Southbrook and Oxford facilities (RPZ units protect potable water supplies from possible contamination by preventing back-flow of water). Some of the savings staff have identified for the Oxford transfer station RPZ could also be used to offset the above additional construction costs.

5.10. Staff estimate that the following cost savings will be achieved from these three projects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Estimated Final Costs</th>
<th>Estimated Surplus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Garterys Pit</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$36,100</td>
<td>$13,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling bottle-bank container</td>
<td>$6,301</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$6,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPZ at Oxford (*)</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$106,301</td>
<td>$76,100</td>
<td>$30,201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) The overall savings for the RPZ project will depend on the option that is approved by U&R at a future meeting.

Risks
5.11. If this shelter is not constructed as soon as is practicable, there is a risk that the refuse pit will exceed its capacity in busy periods, particularly during the summer season, because the recycling stored in the pit can limit space for refuse storage and access into the pit by commercial customers. This will result in delays for commercial customers who want to quickly dispose of their refuse and leave the site. In the past this has resulted in customers dropping refuse outside the pit floor area, which is an unacceptable situation.

5.12. Option 2 (carry out a review of the project in order to lower costs, by either removing features such as the shed wall cladding, or staging construction with elements to be completed in a future financial year) is not recommended. Removing features such as the wall cladding would reduce the effectiveness of the structure: the recycling would be exposed to wind and rain which would cause litter issues both on and off site, and allow the paper and cardboard to get wet. Staging the work will delay the project completion, will most likely increase overall construction costs and will reduce the effectiveness of the structure in the interim.

5.13. The current proposal is to erect and clad the superstructure on the ground and lift the ‘building’ into place on the concrete walls. This method would cost less than installing the wall and roof cladding once the entire structure is installed on top of the concrete walls. Delaying installation of cladding would incur additional set up and installation costs owing to the height of the concrete wall.

6. **CONTEXT**

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

6.2. Legislation
Local Government Act 2002

6.3. Community Outcomes
This report relates to the following community outcomes:

- Core utility services are provided in a timely, sustainable and affordable manner
  - 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 values from Ta matou mauri:

- Take responsibility; and
- We will work with you and each other

Kitty Waghorn
Solid Waste Asset Manager
1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report twofold:

1.1.1. To seek Council’s endorsement of a connection to the West Eyreton water supply scheme as the preferred strategy for consultation on options to upgrade the Poyntzs Road water supply scheme in order to achieve compliance with the Drinking Water Standards for New Zealand (DWSNZ).

1.1.2. To seek Council’s approval to consult with the residents along two potential pipe routes to connect the supplies, to identify the level of interest in these residents to connect to the possible new pipeline (which will help identify the preferred route for the new pipe).

Source Upgrade Strategy

1.2. The following options were considered to upgrade the Poyntzs Road water supply scheme to achieve compliance with the DWSNZ:

1.2.1. Connect the scheme with the West Eyreton scheme through the installation of approximately 8km of new pipework and the construction of a booster pump station.

1.2.2. Drilling a new deep well. This is not considered viable based on investigation of surrounding deep wells in the area which are shown to have insufficient yield for the scheme. It is also noted that the likely cost of a deep well, if it were successful, would be in the order of $730,000 which is similar to the option of joining with West Eyreton but carries a much higher level of risk (as there is no certainty in regards to the success of the well).

1.2.3. Treatment of the existing source. This is not considered to be viable due to the presence of nitrate in the current water supply at close to (approximately 80%) the maximum acceptable value (MAV) under the DWSNZ. The removal of nitrate is not considered to be economically viable in addition to the cost of treatment for protozoa.

1.2.4. Connect to the Oxford Urban scheme. This option has been ruled out as being viable due to the significant length of pipe that would be required to achieve this, making this option cost prohibitive.
1.3. The recommended strategy to upgrade the Poyntzs Road water supply source is to connect with the West Eyreton water supply scheme. This is due to the drilling of a new source, treatment of the existing source and connection with Oxford Urban all being ruled out as alternative options due to not being physically or financially viable.

1.4. The total cost of the works required to join the Poyntzs Road and West Eyreton water supply schemes is estimated at $800,000. This would involve the installation of 8km of pipe and the construction of a booster pump station.

1.5. It is proposed that Council endorse the preferred strategy so that staff can proceed with the following tasks:

- Sending a letter to residents on the Poyntzs Road and West Eyreton schemes advising options to upgrade are being considered and that the preferred option is joining the schemes.

- Carrying out community consultation with residents along the two possible pipe routes to identify the preferred route (which may depend on the level of interest of existing residents along these routes in joining the scheme once the new pipe is installed). The purpose of the consultation is to gauge the level of interest in connecting to a public water supply if it was made available.

- Completing the rating assessment after determining how many additional properties are likely to join the scheme after the pipeline is installed.

- Prepare a consultation plan for engaging with the existing Poyntzs Road and West Eyreton communities (which will be able to be completed once the rating assessment is completed).

Attachments:
1. Draft letter to residents along potential pipe routes (170804083087).
2. PDU Options Assessment Report (170809085149).

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 170816088611.

(b) Endorses the option of connecting the Poyntzs Road scheme with the West Eyreton scheme as the preferred option to upgrade the Poyntzs Road water supply source for preliminary consultation with the community.

(c) Notes that the options of drilling a new deep source or treating the existing source are not considered to be viable due to the risks associating with both options relative to the joining with West Eyreton option.

(d) Approves staff to consult with the residents along both possible routes for the new pipe to determine the level of interest that these residents have to connecting to this new pipe.

(e) Notes that, following the identification of the preferred route, staff will undertake a rating assessment and prepare consultation material to present to the existing Poyntzs Road and West Eyreton communities.

(f) Circulates this report to the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board for their information.
3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

**Background**

3.1. The Poyntzes Road water supply scheme is in need of an upgrade to its source in order to achieve compliance with the Drinking Water Standards for New Zealand (DWSNZ). There is currently $50,000 of budget allocated for the 2016/17 financial year and $450,000 for the 2017/18 financial year to complete this upgrade.

3.2. The scheme currently serves approximately 80 properties with water. The source is a 30m (approximately) deep well that is treated with chlorine. The chlorine treatment achieves compliance with the bacterial requirements of the DWSNZ, but not the protozoal requirements.

3.3. The existing source also has nitrate at levels of 80% of the maximum acceptable value (MAV) for this parameter in the DWSNZ. While this is within the limit in the DWSNZ at present, there is a risk that this value will continue to increase over time meaning that chemical compliance with the DWSNZ may not be achieved in the future if this source is retained.

**Source Upgrade Strategy**

3.4. The Project Delivery Unit (PDU) of the Council have carried out an investigation into options to upgrade the source to achieve compliance with the DWNSZ. Options considered include:

3.4.1. Connect the scheme to the West Eyreton scheme.

3.4.2. Drill new deep source with the aim of finding secure groundwater.

3.4.3. Treat existing source.

3.4.4. Connect the scheme to the Oxford Urban scheme.

3.5. The recommended strategy to upgrade the Poyntzes Road water supply source is to connect to the West Eyreton water supply scheme. The total cost of the works required to connect the Poyntzes Road and West Eyreton water supply schemes is estimated at $800,000. This would involve the installation of 8km of pipe and the construction of a booster pump station.

3.6. Other options that were considered but have been ruled out are described below:

3.6.1. Drilling a new deep well. This is not considered viable based on investigation of surrounding deep wells in the area which are shown to either be shallow (so likely to have the same water quality issues as the existing source) have insufficient yield for the scheme (refer to PDU Options Assessment Report for detail). It is also noted that the likely cost of a deep well, if it were successful, would be in the order of $730,000. This is approximately 10% less than the cost estimate for the option of joining with West Eyreton but carries a much higher level of risk (as there is no certainty in regards to the success of the well).

3.6.2. Treatment of the existing source. This is not considered to be viable due to the presence of nitrate in the current water supply at close to (approximately 80%) the maximum acceptable value (MAV) under the DWSNZ. Investigations have shown that it is not economic to remove nitrate from drinking water, and this value is only likely to increase over time. Therefore, even if a treatment system to achieve protozoal compliance for the scheme was constructed, there is a significant risk that the scheme would lose its chemical compliance with the DWSNZ over time as nitrate levels increase.
3.6.3. Connection with the Oxford Urban water supply scheme (at Domain Road). This option was considered for completeness, however it is not considered financially viable. It is noted that a connection to the Oxford Rural No.1 scheme was also considered, however was also determined to be uneconomic due to the distance between the schemes.

3.7. Based on the drilling of a new source, treatment of the existing source, and connecting to Oxford Urban being ruled out as alternative options, the construction of a pipeline and booster pump station to join to the West Eyreton scheme is seen to be the only viable option.

Selection of Preferred Route

3.8. It was identified in investigating the preferred option to join the Poyntzts Road scheme with West Eyreton that there are two potential routes to achieve this that are very similar in terms of expected cost. These are depicted on Figure 1 below:

![Figure 1: Potential Pipe Routes for Connection with West Eyreton and Poyntzts Road (exact point at which schemes will join is subject to hydraulic modelling being finalised)](image)

3.9. The potential costs with the two routes identified are similar upon initial investigation.

3.10. It is noted that both routes offer the potential to bring a water supply to properties that do not currently have a Council water supply scheme available to connect to. It may be if there was strong interest along one particular route, residents could be given the opportunity to join to the new pipeline and pay a development contribution which would help to offset the cost of the new infrastructure.

3.11. In order to help determine if there is interest along one particular route relative to another, it is proposed that a letter be sent to residents along both routes to identify any potential interest in connecting to the pipe.
3.12. If one route has strong interest relative to another this will assist staff in recommending a preferred route for the pipe. If there is strong interest to connect along both routes, consideration will be given to extending pipework along both routes to provide a larger number of properties with water, if it is economic to do so.

3.13. A draft copy of the letter proposed to be sent is attached to this report (Attachment i).

**Proposed Way Forward**

3.14. It is proposed that the project be progressed according to the timetable below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Council endorse recommended strategy to upgrade Poyntz's Road source by joining with the West Eyreton scheme</td>
<td>5 September 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Council endorse staff consulting with residents along the potential pipe routes to gauge their level of interest in joining, in order to help identify preferred route.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Initial letter delivered to residents on both West Eyreton and Poyntz's Road schemes, and along both possible pipe routes.</td>
<td>8 September 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Staff carry out rating assessment of recommended option based on preferred route (identified in step 3 above), and based on likely number of new connections to partially fund upgrade.</td>
<td>September October 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Staff prepare consultation material to engage with and consult the Poyntz's Road and West Eyreton communities about the recommendation for project and rating impacts, and to seek feedback.</td>
<td>September – October 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Staff report back to Community Board and Council to inform Council of rating impact, request required budget based on final concept design, and request authorisation to proceed with community consultation.</td>
<td>9 November 2017 (OOCB) &amp; 7 November 2017 (Council).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Community Consultation*</td>
<td>November – December 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Staff report back to Council with outcome of Community consultation, and to gain Council approval to proceed with implementation of recommended option</td>
<td>February 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Detailed Design</td>
<td>March - June 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>July – October 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: if it is preferred that consultation not extend into December, this could be deferred until January / February (however would result in delays to the above programme).

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

4. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

4.1. The proposal for community consultation for this project is covered in the Issues and Options section of this report.

4.2. It is noted that two residents have been in contact with Council staff along one of the possible pipe routes regarding joining the schemes. Staff will keep these residents informed of the progress of the project.
5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

5.1. The current budget for this project is $500,000. This was set previously when it was thought that treatment may be a viable option (based on treatment for protozoa but not nitrates). Given that the scope of the recommended solution has changed since the budget was initially set, the cost estimate has been revised.

5.2. The preliminary cost estimate for joining with the West Eyreton scheme is $800,000.

5.3. It is noted that there are $100,000 worth of upgrades at the Poynitzs Road headworks that are currently budgeted and programmed to be carried out in 2018/19 that will no longer be required if this site is relegated to a back-up site (when the scheme joins with West Eyreton). This will partially offset the proposed budget increase. This however still leaves a budget shortfall.

5.4. It is recommended that the budget be revised when staff report back to Council at the October Council meeting, following consultation with the residents along the two potential pipe routes and final confirmation of expected costs. At this point staff will give a recommended budget figure for approval.

5.5. A preliminary rating assessment has been carried out based on the recommended option to join with West Eyreton. This has been done in order to document the order of magnitude of the likely change in rates as a result of the project. This assessment is considered to be conservative, as it is based on the assumption that there are no new connections to the scheme. If additional properties indicate that they are interested in joining the scheme, these rates per property will reduce.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Preliminary Assessment of Rating Impact to Poynitzs Road Scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017/18 Rate ($ / conn. / year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 unit connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 unit connection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.6. It is noted that it is proposed that the West Eyreton and Poynitzs Road schemes are to remain financially separate following the physical joining. Therefore, any rating impact to the West Eyreton scheme would be negligible (less than $5 per connection per year).

6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. **Policy**

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

6.2. **Legislation**

   The Health (Drinking Water) Amendment Act is relevant in this matter.

6.3. **Community Outcomes**

   This project is related to the following community outcomes:
   
   - 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.
Our Reference: WAT-05-19-07-02 / 170804083087

14 August 2017

Dear Resident,

We are writing to you regarding a potential opportunity to connect to a Council water supply scheme. The Waimakariri District Council are considering options to upgrade the source for the Poyntzs Road Water Supply Scheme. One of the options being considered includes laying a new watermain to physically connect the Poyntzs Road scheme with the West Eryeton scheme, which has a high quality water source. There are two options for a potential route, one of which would involve a water main being installed in the road reserve in front of your property.

To assist in identifying the preferred route for this option as well as identifying funding options for the new infrastructure, we want to know if you would be interested in connecting to a Council water scheme. It would be appreciated if you could complete the attached form to confirm if you would be interested in connecting to a Council operated potable water supply either now or in the future (i.e. within the next 10 year timeframe). Please return the form to Council in the pre-paid envelope enclosed by 22/09/2017, or email mark.andrews@wmk.govt.nz. If we do not hear from you within the above timeframe we will assume that you have no interest in connecting.

The initial cost payable for each lot for a standard 2-unit (2m³/day) restricted connection is likely to be in the order of $6,000 (+ GST). Once connected, the annual water rate for properties connected to the Poyntzs Road water supply scheme is calculated to be in the order of $1,650 per 2-unit connection per year. It is noted that these figures are not definite as the final figures will depends on the potential number of properties that may be interested in connecting, as well as the design of the project being completed. However, it is intended to provide residents with an indication of the order of magnitude of the potential costs in order to gauge the level of interest.

It is noted that the cost to connect would include a contribution to the installation of the new trunk main as well as your lateral connection and installation of a toby box at the property boundary which would be your point of supply. In addition to the cost for this Council owned infrastructure, each resident who connects would be responsible for covering the cost of the infrastructure on the private side of the boundary (including private storage tank and pump, and lateral connection to connect into existing plumbing). The cost of this private infrastructure would depend on the specific details of each property, and would need to be determined by individual property owners.

Once we have an idea of the number of residents interested in connecting, we will stay in touch with those that are interested regarding final costs and options as the project progresses.
We look forward to hearing from you by 22 September 2017.

Yours sincerely

Mark Andrews
Civil Engineer
Waimakariri District Council
Our Reference: WAT-05-19-07-02 / 170804083087

Would you be interested in connecting to a Waimakariri District Council operated restricted potable water supply scheme?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes please (as soon as possible)</th>
<th>Yes please (not immediately but within the next 10 years)</th>
<th>No thank you</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Customer Details:**

Occupier Status: Tick as appropriate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Tenant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Property Address:


Name of Owner(s):


Name of Tenant(s):


Postal Address of Owner/Tenant:
(if different to Property Address)


Owner Contact Details:

Phone Number(s) (Owner):
(Please provide if interested in connecting)
Email Address (Owner):  
(Please provide if interested in connecting)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tennant Contact Details:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Phone Number(s) (Tennant):  
(Please provide if interested in connecting) |
| Phone Numbers (Tennant):  
(Please provide if interested in connecting) |

**Please return the completed form in the pre-paid envelope provided by 22 September 2017 to:**

Mark Andrews  
Waimakariri District Council  
Private Bag 1005  
Rangiora 7440

**Or by email to:**

mark.andrews@wmk.govt.nz

*Failure to return this form completed will be taken as customers confirming that they are not interested in connecting.*
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEMO

FILE NO AND TRIM NO: PD001223 / 170809085149
DATE: 04 August 2017
MEMO TO: Colin Roxburgh - Water Asset Manager
FROM: Mark Andrews – Civil Engineer (PDU)
SUBJECT: Poyntzs Road Water Supply Source Upgrade – Options Assessment

Scope:
The first stage of this project (and the subject of this memorandum) is an investigation of options to upgrade the Poyntzs Road source to achieve compliance with the Drinking Water Standards for New Zealand (DWSNZ).

The options assessment included:

- Analysis of relative risk, resilience and cost of the options identified (including capital and operating costs).
- Translating of costs to rating impacts for each option analysed.
- Analysis of rating impact on any other schemes, for options where multiple schemes are joining.
- Commentary on DWSNZ requirements for each of the options identified, and ongoing requirements to maintain compliance.

It should be noted that the Poyntzs Road scheme includes a combination of conventional restricted connections and fifteen 13 l/min connections. The activity management plan for the scheme identifies that growth will be accommodated by changing these 13 l/min connections (equivalent to 19 units) to conventional 2 unit restricted supplies.

This memorandum concludes the first stage of the project.

Options Considered:
The following options have been considered:

A. Do nothing
B. Treatment of existing source.
C. Connection with West Eyreton water supply scheme
D. Connection with Oxford Urban water supply scheme.
E. Drilling of a new deep water supply bore.

Option Discussion:

A. Do Nothing
Since legislative requirements are driving compliance with DWSNZ, doing nothing is not a viable option. Council has an obligation to take all practicable steps to comply with the DWSNZ under the Health (Drinking Water) Amendment Act, therefore has a legislative requirement to comply.

B. Treatment of existing source

The existing scheme is sourced from a shallow well (circa 26m deep) with water chlorinated to achieve bacterial compliance with the DWSNZ, but not treated for protozoal compliance. The existing source is also subject to elevated nitrate levels which are a priority 2 (P2) determinand for the scheme.

Figure 1 shows the nitrate trend since July 2015.

![Poyntz Road Water Supply NitrateN Data](image)

**Figure 1 - Nitrate sampling data.**

Figure 1 shows a gradual reducing trend in Nitrate since mid-2016. This slight reduction may be partly attributable to heightened awareness and changing farm practices, however the Poyntz Road scheme is in a rural part of North Canterbury where control of Nitrate sources is challenging.

Elevated levels of nitrate are best controlled at source, since nitrate is costly to treat. Ion exchange units, reverse osmosis, or distillation all remove nitrate from drinking water. However in the long term, preventing nitrate contamination is more effective than treatment.

Although below the Maximum Allowable Value (MAV) for Nitrate (NO₃-N), it is higher than other schemes and represents an elevated risk, which Council has limited ability to control due to water shed management being under the jurisdiction of Environment Canterbury. Therefore treatment of the existing source is not considered to be a viable long term option for the scheme.

C. Connection to West Eyreton Water Supply Scheme

The West Eyreton water supply source is approximately 8km north east of the Poyntz Road Scheme. Topography between the schemes is generally continuously falling from the Poyntz
Road Source to the West Eyreton Source. There is approximately 40m difference in elevation between source ground levels.

The West Eyreton restricted water supply scheme’s primary source is an approximately 100m deep well which provides secure drinking water that complies with the DWSNZ. The back-up source is a non-secure well, similar to the Poyntzts Road source but with lower nitrate levels (at last record). At the time of writing this report a separate study is being considered to drill a back-up well at West Eyreton. This could potentially benefit the Poyntzts Road Scheme. The West Eyreton source is dosed with chlorine due to the restricted nature of the scheme feeding into private tanks, but does not require treatment for Priority 1 DWSNZ compliance.

Due to the potential for physical joining of the West Eyreton, Poyntzts Road and Garrymere Schemes, Table 1 shows the consented, well pump, surface pump current peak and 50 year peak flows for the schemes.

Table 1 – West Eyreton, Poyntzts Road and Garrymere Consent and flow data (from WSP).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Source consented flow (l/s)</th>
<th>Current well pump capacity (l/s)</th>
<th>Surface pump current peak hourly flow (l/s)</th>
<th>Surface pump 50 year peak hourly flow projection (l/s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Eyreton and Summerhill</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poyntzts Road</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrymere</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Surface pump peak hourly flow is unchanged due to LOS conversion to restricted connections from current 13 l/min on-demand connections.

Table 1 demonstrates that the West Eyreton primary water supply source consent (for instantaneous maximum flow) is similar to the 50 year peak flow projections of all three schemes. The current West Eyreton well pump capacity meets the current peak flow of the West Eyreton and Poyntzts Road schemes, but not the 50 year projections or if Garrymere were also supplied. The West Eyreton well pump would also operate for increasingly extended durations, incurring increased operational and maintenance costs. Consideration should be given to future infrastructure improvements to address this potential issue (larger pump, additional well and/or more storage) in the event that the schemes are physically joined.

Consideration is currently being given to providing a secure DWSNZ compliant back-up source at West Eyreton source and/or the potential for cross-connecting to the Cust water supply scheme. The resulting infrastructure is intended to improve resilience, and provide a secure, DWSNZ compliant back-up supply.

The West Eyreton reticulation network extends across the Cust River and includes 100mm diameter pipework to which it would be possible to connect. Subject to the results of hydraulic modelling, initial investigations suggest that there are two main routes predominantly along the road reserve which it may be feasible to lay a new main (refer to Figure 2). These have been prepared considering the future potential to provide water supply connections to currently privately serviced lots along the two potential routes for the new main. The two potential routes are:

1. Along South Eyre Road, Poyntzts Road and Worlingham Road (connecting to the West Eyreton scheme DN100 PVC pipe at the intersection of South Eyre Road and Downs Road and the Poyntzts Road scheme and 50mm PVC outside 89 Worlingham Road. Approx. 8km of pipe laid with minimum 0.6m cover within the road reserve.
2. Along Downs Road, Main Race Road and through private land (approx. 250m) at 663 Poyntzs Road (Connecting to the West Eyreton scheme DN100 PVC pipe at the intersection of Downs Road and Eyredale Road and the Poyntzs Road scheme 50mm PVC within the private land of 663 Poyntzs Road. Approx. 9.0km of pipe laid with minimum 0.6m cover mainly within the road reserve.

Options C1 and C2 assume a peak flow of 7 l/s. Subject to detailed modelling, pump sizing and surge analysis, both options are likely to require PN16 pipework.

![Figure 2 – Potential pipeline routes (West Eyreton to Poyntzs Road)](image)

Due to the difference in elevation a new pumping station (potentially with chlorine monitoring/dosing facilities) would be required near Downs Road for both options. An initial review of GIS data (shown in Figure 3) shows that, with the exception of the road reserve, WDC own a property at 520 Downs Road. Investigations into the previous land use suggest that the property may be unsuitable for a new pumping station and associated tanks. Therefore, both options C1 and C2 would likely require additional land purchase considerations.

Option C2 also requires installation of a short section of pipework in private land. Although having infrastructure within private land is not the preferred location, the short section (approx. 250m) of pipe eliminates the requirement for an additional approx. 1.3km of pipe within the road reserve. Therefore the viability of Option C2 in its current form is reliant on obtaining an easement from owners of private property.
Figure 3 - WDC owned land in the vicinity of Downs Road (Red dots WDC land)

Options C1 and C2 would likely require upgrades to pipework and surface pumps at West Eyreton Headworks. The full scope of these upgrades requires further investigation and modelling. However, these are likely to include installation of a short section (approx. 50m) of DN150 pipework (and associated fittings) and surface pump upgrades.

It is anticipated that the existing Poyntzs Road Headworks would be taken out of service but retained as a back-up source. For improved resilience and subject to provision of appropriate infrastructure (valves and potentially a pressure reducing valve) it may be possible to back-feed parts of West Eyreton from the Poyntzs Road backup source if required in the future. This could be considered during a subsequent design stage.

Initial investigations identify that there are existing services in the vicinity, including but not limited to high voltage (HV) overhead power cables. Other risks include installation of pipework in the berm in an area with 100km/hr speed limits. However the berm in which the pipelines would likely be installed is wide and temporary traffic management and close approach permits should reduce risks during construction. Since the new main would initially be considered a trunk main, with few connections and potential deviations in elevation to pass services, either option would require air release valves in accordance with the WDC Engineering code of practice.

D. Connection to Oxford Urban Water Supply Scheme

The Oxford Urban water supply primary source (Domain Road) is approximately 12km west of the Poyntzs Road Scheme. Topography between the schemes is generally continuously falling from Domain Road to the Poyntzs Road Source. There is approximately 70m difference in elevation between source ground levels.

There is a small diameter pipe forming part of the Oxford Rural 1 scheme near Domain Road, however this infrastructure is too small to facilitate re-supply of the Poyntzs Road Scheme.

The Oxford Rural No.2 Water Supply scheme is scheduled for connection to the Oxford Urban scheme in 2017/18 which will increase the demand on the Domain Road source. To ensure an adequate back-up source is provided for both schemes, a second well has been drilled and is due to be commissioned August 2017. At the present rate of growth on both schemes, the capacity of a single well for average daily flow (ADF) will not be exceeded within the next 50 years.
The primary source for the Oxford Urban on-demand water supply scheme is an approximately 120m deep well (Domain Road). The source does not require treatment for Priority 1 DWSNZ compliance, but the Poyntzsz Road scheme would require chlorine dosing if connected to the Domain Road source.

Table 2 shows the consented, well pump, current peak and 50 year peak flows for the Oxford and Poyntzsz Road Schemes.

Table 2 – Oxford Urban and Poyntzsz Road Consent and flow data (from WSP).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Source consented flow (l/s)</th>
<th>Current well pump capacity (l/s)</th>
<th>Well/surface pump current peak flow (l/s)</th>
<th>Well/surface pump 50 year peak flow projection (l/s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oxford (Domain Rd Wells)</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>44.0*</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>71.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poyntzsz Road</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.2**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Variable speed - Nominal Duty at 160m THD (this will increase to consented flow with new well working in duty/assist)

** Peak hourly flow unchanged due to change to fully restricted from 13 l/min connections

Table 2 demonstrates that the Domain Road, Oxford water supply source consent (for instantaneous maximum flow) is insufficient to accommodate the 50 year peak flow projections of both schemes. However, historically during exceptionally high peak demand the Domain Road well, in conjunction with the two 450m³ reservoirs, have only marginally maintained supply to the Oxford Urban community. Whilst this may have been partially attributed to operational anomalies associated with a non-return valve (NRV) and actuated valve at Gammons Creek reservoir it is a significant risk. The Water Safety Plan (WSP) confirms that the reservoirs are intended to supplement bore pumps during periods of peak demand. Given historic issues regarding demand, re-supplying the Poyntzsz Road scheme from the Domain Road Source may negatively impact the existing scheme and would likely require accelerated infrastructure upgrades, potentially the drilling of a third well at Domain Road in order to ensure adequate back-up supply security.

There are several routes along the road reserve that would facilitate installation of a new main, however each is of a similar length (approx. 12km laid with minimum 0.6m cover). Initial investigations identify that, assuming a peak flow of 7 l/s, a single DN150 gravity pipeline should be viable, whilst providing approximately 450kPa at the connection point to the Poyntzsz Road Scheme. Consideration was given to a pumped option, however the pipe size required does not reduce significantly (resulting in similar construction costs and increased operational costs).

An alternative to the single DN150 could be two 125mm OD PE100 PN12.5 pipes, which might be installed via mole ploughing and achieving approximately 400kPa at the connection point to the Poyntzsz Road Scheme. High level costs have been prepared for both the single gravity (Option D1) and twin gravity pipeline (Option D2) options.

Initial investigations identify that there are existing services in the vicinity, including but not limited to HV overhead power cables. Other risks include installation of pipework in the berm in an area with 100km/hr speed limits. However the berm in which the pipelines would likely be installed is wide and temporary traffic management and close approach permits should reduce risks during construction. Since the new main would be a trunk main, with few connections and potential deviations in elevation to pass services, the pipeline may require air release valves in accordance with the WDC Engineering code of practice.
It is anticipated that the existing Poyntzs Road Headworks would be taken out of service but retained as a back-up source.

The new trunk main is unlikely to offer the quantity of potential new connections/customers or the reverse benefit to the Oxford Urban Scheme as that offered by Option C1 and C2. Pipeline velocities will also be relatively low (in the order of 0.5 m/s).

E. Drilling of a New Deep Water Supply Bore

Consideration was given to construction of a new deep well to service the Poyntzs Road Water Supply Scheme. Initial investigations within this section cover high level investigations of the existing consent, water quantity and water availability at deeper depths.

Table 3 summarises the existing WDC bore and its details.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bore Number</th>
<th>Diameter (mm)</th>
<th>Depth (meters below measuring point)</th>
<th>Screen (meters below measuring point)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M35/0181</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>26.3 – 29.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed ground water take is within the Eyre River Ground Water Allocation Zone (Eyre River GAZ) which is over allocated. However, an application could be prepared to add a new bore to the existing consent (potentially with only one bore being in operation at any one time). Provided that justification of the existing consented limits can be provided (if requested) and the assessment of environmental effects are less than minor, the likelihood of Environment Canterbury (ECan) granting modification to the existing consent is reasonable.

The majority of existing bores within approximately 2km of the existing bore site have been constructed to depths in the order of 30m. All wells appear to be relatively low yielding (most less than 4 l/s) and are likely to experience similar quality characteristics as the Poyntzs Road Source. There are a small number of wells constructed to a depth of up to 50m but they are also low yielding.

Between 2km and 5km south of the Poyntzs Road scheme there have been a number of deeper wells constructed, such as M35/0172 (drilled to 70m deep), BW23/0436 (drilled to 108m deep) and BW23/0175 (drilled to 149m deep). No water was found at M35/0172, BW23/0436 is documented to yield approximately 1.5 l/s (at March 2017) and BW23/0175 is documented to yield in the order of 6.82 l/s with draw down of 1.35m at November 2016. Refer to Appendix A for ECan well cards.

Well BW23/0175 is documented on the ECan website to be for Domestic and Stockwater use, however water quality data is not available. Water quality data should be procured and should be compared with the ‘Guideline Value’ (GV) and/or ‘Maximum Allowable Value’ (MAV) in the Drinking Water Standards for New Zealand 2005 (revised 2008) (DWSNZ) prior to constructing a new well. Subject to water quality testing, a new well is likely to be required to be in the order of 150m deep but is likely to be relatively low yielding (when compared to that of adjacent schemes, such as West Eyreton). Therefore, it is concluded that if a new well was drilled there is a significant risk that the required yield would not be achieved at the depth required to ensure that the quality is adequate.

High level Cost Estimates:

Table 4 identifies high level costs of the potentially viable options (refer TRIM 170809085150). Capital costs have been developed on the basis of lineal rates and lumps sums from previous
schemes including appropriate contingency (assigned based on confidence level) and an allowance for professional fees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Capital Cost ($)</th>
<th>Professional Fees ($)</th>
<th>Additional Annual Operational Cost ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Do Nothing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Treatment of existing source.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Options not priced</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Connection with West Eyrton water supply scheme – Route 1 **</td>
<td>704,000</td>
<td>70,500</td>
<td>16,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Connection with West Eyrton water supply scheme – Route 2 **</td>
<td>766,500</td>
<td>76,500</td>
<td>16,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>Connection with Oxford Urban water supply scheme – DN150 *</td>
<td>2,543,000</td>
<td>102,000</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Connection with Oxford Rural No.1 water supply scheme – Twin DN100 **</td>
<td>1,280,000</td>
<td>89,500</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Drilling of a new deep water supply bore. (approx. 150m deep)</td>
<td>630,500</td>
<td>94,600</td>
<td>6,750.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*including 30% contingency, excluding professional fees

** refer to TRIM 170809085150 for operational cost breakdown

* Open cut

** Mole Plough

Multi Criteria Analysis:

A high level Multi Criteria Analysis of the options was undertaken, the results of which are identified in Table 5. Options were assessed against five criteria (with equal weighting) and ranked from 0 to 4 (4 best relative to others and 0 worst relative to others).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Criteria</th>
<th>Score for options considered (assuming equal weighting)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Options A &amp; B</td>
<td>Options C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of good quality water (without additional infrastructure upgrades)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Cost</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Cost</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential for additional connections / financial contributions</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Scheme benefit / Resilience</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Good quality water available (consented) but may require bore pump upgrade to meet 50yr demand.

** Oxford peak demand reliant upon reservoir storage, history of reservoir levels getting very low at peak demand. Additional demand would be detrimental.

*** Availability and quality of water unknown – refer to Option Discussion Section.
Interrogation of Table 5 shows that, subject to a rating impact assessment and stakeholder engagement (including potential for additional connections along pipeline route), either Option C1 or C2 (physically joining Poyntz’s Road and West Eyreton Water Supply Schemes) is the preferred option.

**Other works in the vicinity:**

Co-ordination with utility providers will be required during a subsequent design stage. In the event that other works are planned this may offer efficiencies to the scheme.

**Rating Impact Assessment**

The elevated capital cost of Options D1 and D2 would have a significant impact on rates at Poyntz’s Road, which would be required to fund the upgrade. Therefore Options D1 and D2 have not been considered further.

Rating impacts have been prepared for Options C1, C2 and E assuming the following:

- Option E (New well at Poyntz’s Road):
  - Solely funded by Poyntz’s Road rates
- Options C1 and C2 (Physically connect to West Eyreton Scheme):
  - Capital cost of project to be primarily funded by the Poyntz’s Road scheme, with exception of a small proportion of funding which could be collected through development contributions (if additional properties wish to join the scheme along new pipe route).
  - An assessment will be undertaken to determine the number of additional properties that would be interested in joining the scheme by connecting to the new pipe (i.e. properties that are currently serviced off private wells, but would be given the opportunity to join the scheme when the new pipe is installed).
  - Once an indication of potential number of new properties joining is known, an assessment of the split of costs will be able to be completed, which in turn will determine the rating impact to the Poyntz’s Road scheme.

The full rating assessments will be completed and presented following the consultation with the properties along the potential pipe routes for Options C1 and C2.

**Development Contribution Calculation**

A calculation has been carried out to give an indication of the potential development contribution that new connections to the Poyntz’s Road scheme may pay. This calculation is shown below:
Poyntz Rd Water Development Contribution Calculation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total project cost</th>
<th>Proportion of total for growth funded by development contributions</th>
<th>Projected growth/total number</th>
<th>Contribution (Excluding GST)</th>
<th>Contribution (Including GST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soley Growth Related Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade surface pumps</td>
<td>$4,959</td>
<td>$4,959</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$124.00</td>
<td>$143.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partially Growth Related</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Expenditure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Well</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>$64,909</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>$1,623.00</td>
<td>$1,866.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution per unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,747.00</td>
<td>$2,009.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above calculation shows a likely development contribution in the order of $4,000 per new 2 units connection to the scheme.

**Summary:**

The Options Discussion, Multi Criteria Analysis and Rating Impact Assessment sections identify that the two most viable options for upgrading the Poyntz Road source are:

- Physical joining of the Poyntz Road and West Eyreton Schemes (Option C1 or C2), or
- Construction of a new deep well (Option E)

The other options considered are either not viable, not sufficiently robust or are prohibitively expensive.

The preferred pipeline option C1 or C2 will likely be defined by the alignment along which more lots wish to connect. Therefore consultation with lot owners along the potential route of Options C1 and C2 and additional modelling is required to ascertain the preferred pipeline route option. It should be noted that there are customers along Main Race Road (Option C2 route) who are actively enquiring about new connections.

Although the costs of Options C1 and C2 are greater than the capital cost estimate for Option E, Option E has a significantly greater level of risk due to unknowns regarding the available quantity and quality of water at depths in the order of 150m.

**Recommendation:**

It is recommended that the Water Asset Manager seek approval to and subsequently consult with potential water connection customers and affected land owners along the alignments of Options C1 and C2 to ascertain interest to connect to a new pipeline between West Eyreton and Poyntz Road. It is further recommended that staff consult based on the development contribution calculation presented previously (approximately $2,000 per unit). Following this first
stage of consultation it is recommended that a detailed rating impact assessment be carried out prior to direct consultation with the Poyntzs Road community.

It is recommended that further hydraulic modelling is undertaken to identify specific infrastructure requirements and upgrades associated with connection of the Poyntzs Road and West Eyreton Schemes.

It is recommended that consideration be given to the requirement for infrastructure upgrades at the West Eyreton Source for the 50-year demand scenario and also the potential implications of the available options for a source upgrade of the Garrymere Water Supply Scheme.
Appendix 1 – Well Cards for deep wells approximately 2km to 4km from existing Poyntzs Road Well (M35/0172, BW23/0436 and BW23/0175)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Well Number</th>
<th>File Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M35/0172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Well or Well No</th>
<th>M35/0172</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well Name</td>
<td>Poyntz Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Leigh Construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Well Number</th>
<th>M35/0172</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Leigh Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street/Road</td>
<td>Poyntz Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locality</td>
<td>EYREWELL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location Description</td>
<td>In pump shed at back paddock of property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZTM Grid Reference</td>
<td>BW23 41661-94633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZTM X and Y</td>
<td>1541961 - 5194633</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CWMS Zone</th>
<th>Waikakanui</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Public Water Supply,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater Allocation Zone</td>
<td>Eyre River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>60.90m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Level Monitoring</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Level Count</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diameter</th>
<th>127mm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Water Level</td>
<td>31.14m below MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Water Level</td>
<td>13.11m below MP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measuring Point Description</th>
<th>104C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measuring Point Elevation</td>
<td>161.08m above MSL (Lytleton 1937)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest Water Level</td>
<td>37.03m below MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevation Accuracy</td>
<td>&lt; 5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First reading</td>
<td>20 Sep 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Level</td>
<td>0.22m below MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last reading</td>
<td>27 Jul 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strata Layers</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calc Min 95%</td>
<td>36.79m below MP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aquifer Name</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aquifer Tests</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquifer Type</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield Drawdown Tests</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drill Date</td>
<td>25 Jul 1949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Tested Yield</td>
<td>0 l/s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Driller</th>
<th>Job Osborne &amp; Co (Ltd)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drawdown at Max Tested Yield</td>
<td>0 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drilling Method</td>
<td>Driwn Pipe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casing Material</td>
<td>Lost Updated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pump type</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Field Check</td>
<td>27 Jul 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Use Data</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

https://www.ecan.govt.nz/data/well-search/printwellcard/TTM112AzNzI= 9/08/2017
## Screens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Screen No.</th>
<th>Screen Type</th>
<th>Top (m)</th>
<th>Bottom (m)</th>
<th>Slot Size (mm)</th>
<th>Slot Length (mm)</th>
<th>Diameter (mm)</th>
<th>Leader Length (mm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**No step tests for this well**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 Jan 2007</td>
<td>Grid ref changed from: M35:518-565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Feb 2010</td>
<td>Grid ref changed from: M35:51635-56551 to M35:51652-56451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 Nov 2013</td>
<td>Visited at Eynswell Forest area investigation on 24/10/13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Jul 2016</td>
<td>Visited for CDWS field QA summer 2015/2016, CDWS and well details updated where required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Jul 2016</td>
<td>Surrounding landuse from CDWS field QA: Agricultural</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

https://www.ecan.govt.nz/data/well-search/printwellcard/TTMILzAxNzI= 9/08/2017
Bore Log

Borelog for well M35/0172
Grid Reference (NZTM): 1541661 mE, 5194833 mN
Location Accuracy: ±1 - ±2 m
Ground Level Altitude: ±160.9 m ±SD Accuracy: ±0.5 m
Driller: Job Osborne & Co Ltd
Drill Method: Driven Pipe
Borelog Depth: ±70.1 m Drill Date: 25-Jul-1949

Water Level Depth(m)
1.20m
1.20m
2.00m
6.08m
5
11.30m
13.70m
17.10m
19.70m

Drillers Description
Gravel and sand
Gravel and sand
Coarse gravel
Coarse gravel
Coarse gravel
Coarse gravel
Finer gravel
Rough gravel
Finer gravel
Rough gravel
Finer gravel and sand
Finer gravel and sand
Coarse gravel
Coarse gravel
Rough gravel
Finer gravel and sand
Rough gravel and sand
Finer gravel and sand

Bore or Well No | BW23/0436
---|---
Well Name | 227 Poyntz Road
Owner | Landcorp Farming Ltd

Well Number | BW23/0436
---|---
File Number | 
Owner | Landcorp Farming Ltd
Street/Road | 227 Poyntz Road
Locality | Eyrewell
Location Description | 
CWMS Zone | Waimakariri
Groundwater Allocation Zone | Eyre River
Depth | 109.6m
Diameter | 150mm
Measuring Point Description | 
Measuring Point Elevation | 
Elevation Accuracy | 
Ground Level | 
Strata Layers | 9
Aquifer Name | Aquifer Tests
Aquifer Type | Max Tested Yield
Drill Date | 19 Mar 2017
Driller | Hydull
Drilling Method | Rotary Rig
Casing Material | Steel
Pump type | 
Water Use Data | No

Screens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Screen No.</th>
<th>Screen Type</th>
<th>Top (m)</th>
<th>Bottom (m)</th>
<th>Slot Size (mm)</th>
<th>Slot Length (mm)</th>
<th>Diameter (mm)</th>
<th>Leader Length (mm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Stainless steel</td>
<td>103.3</td>
<td>107.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step Test Date</th>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Yield</th>
<th>Yield GPM</th>
<th>DrawDown</th>
<th>Step Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 Mar 2017</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>10.7072755</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No comments for this well

https://www.ecan.govt.nz/data/well-search/printwellcard/QheyMy8wNDM2 9/08/2017
Bore Log

Borelog for well BW23/0436

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Water Level</th>
<th>Full Driller's Description</th>
<th>Formation Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0 - 20</td>
<td>Brown TOPSOIL, Unsaturated (dry or moist), Yellow CLAY with minor gravel, Unsaturated (dry or moist)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>Yellow GRAVEL (2 - 60 MM), Unsaturated (dry or moist)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>Yellow silty GRAVEL (2 - 60 MM), Unsaturated (dry or moist)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>Yellow gravelly CLAY with some cobbles, Unsaturated (dry or moist)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yellow gravelly SILT with some cobbles. Unsaturated (dry or moist).

Yellow gravelly GRAVEL (1 - 60 M.b), Saturated (water-bearing).

Yellow cobbly GRAVEL (1 - 60 M.b), Saturated (water-bearing).

Yellow clayey Cobbles (60 - 200 M.b), Unsaturated (dry or moist).

https://www.ecan.govt.nz/data/well-search/printwellcard/QleyMy8wNDM2
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Screen No.</th>
<th>Screen Type</th>
<th>Top (m)</th>
<th>Bottom (m)</th>
<th>Slot Size (mm)</th>
<th>Slot Length (mm)</th>
<th>Diameter (mm)</th>
<th>Leader Length (mm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Stainless steel</td>
<td>148.81</td>
<td>148.81</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Step Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step Test Date</th>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Yield</th>
<th>Yield GPM</th>
<th>DrawDown</th>
<th>Step Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04 Nov 2016</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>32.049656</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 Nov 2016</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>34.05131</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 Nov 2016</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>58.95585</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 Nov 2016</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>90.01161</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>18.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

https://www.ecan.govt.nz/data/well-search/printwellcard/QhcyMy8wMTe1
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## Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22 Nov 2016</td>
<td>NZTM Eastings/Nothings updated from:1545919-5190029 shifted 5450m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

https://www.ecan.govt.nz/data/well-search/printwellcard/QkcyMyw8wMTc1  
9/08/2017
### Bore Log

**Borelog for well BW23/0175**

- **Grid Reference (NZTM):** 1541487 mE, 5194102 mN
- **Location Accuracy:** < 50m
- **Ground Level Altitude:** m + MSA Accuracy:
- **Driller:** McMillan Drilling Ltd
- **Drill Method:** Rotary/Percussion
- **Borelog Depth:** 149.0 m
- **Drill Date:** 04-Nov-2016

### Table: Bore Log

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Water Level</th>
<th>Full Driller Description</th>
<th>Formation Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.20m</td>
<td>Not Logged TOP SOIL, Not Recorded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grey GRAVEL (2 - 50 MM), Not Recorded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Logged clayey GRAVEL (2 - 50 MM), Unsaturated (dry or moist)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.00m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[https://www.eanc.govt.nz/data/well-search/printwellcard/QleyMy8wMTc1](https://www.eanc.govt.nz/data/well-search/printwellcard/QleyMy8wMTc1) 9/08/2017
1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is twofold:

1. To update the Council on the backup water supply source options for the West Eyreton and Summerhill water supply schemes that comply with the New Zealand Drinking Water Standards 2005 (Revised 2008) (DWSNZ).

2. To obtain approval to proceed with the recommended option

1.2. A budget of $590,000 was initially set to drill, develop, test, consent and connect a second well at West Eyreton to provide a secure back-up source for the West Eyreton and Summerhill schemes. At the Council meeting held on the 15th of February 2017 for the 2017/18 Annual Plan a question was raised as to whether back-up for West Eyreton and Summerhill could be provided by connecting to the Cust scheme, rather than drilling a second well at West Eyreton (Record number 170214013610, page 10). For this reason an options investigation has been undertaken on potential back-up source options, before committing to the option originally proposed.

1.3. Four options were assessed for the backup source for West Eyreton and Summerhill water supply schemes. These options are as follows:

- Option A – Drilling a new deep well at West Eyreton (recommended option).
- Option B – Connect to the Cust Water Supply Scheme at the existing Cust headworks.
- Option C – Connect to the Cust Water Supply Scheme at the corner of Swamp and Cust roads.
- Option D – Use the existing West Eyreton backup well.

1.4. The assessment of options is summarised in Table 1 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Compliance with DWSNZ</th>
<th>Future Capacity</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Upgrades required in Cust</th>
<th>Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$515,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>$407,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Med</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>$302,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.5. The recommended option is Option A – Drilling a new deep well at West Eyreton. This option would meet the requirements of achieving compliance with the DWSNZ, and ensuring that the scheme is resilient with a secure backup source being provided.

1.6. The key issues with the other options considered are summarised below:

Option B – The cost to West Eyreton and Summerhill is similar to Option A however the ability to meet future flow scenarios is limited, and it would require a capital project in Custo be brought forward.

Option C – Similar issues to Option B, but also would require a pump station site to be established in a residential area, and land to be purchased.

Option D – This option is limited in terms of the capacity it can provide, and the water quality is not sufficient to comply with the DWSNZ therefore has a public health risk.

Attachments:

i Overview of Wider Schemes

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 170627066208.

(b) Notes that staff have considered a number of options to provide a backup source for the West Eyreton and Summerhill water supply schemes and that drilling a new deep well at West Eyreton (Option A) has been identified as the recommended upgrade option.

(c) Approves the drilling of a new deep well at West Eyreton to provide the West Eyreton and Summerhill water supply schemes with a secure backup source.

(d) Notes that there is adequate budget of $190,000 under the capital budget for the West Eyreton scheme and $400,000 under the capital budget for the Summerhill scheme, both for the 2017/18 financial year for this project.

(e) Circulates this report to the Oxford - Ohoka Community Board and the Rangiora - Ashley Community Board for their information.

3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

**Background**

3.1. The Waimakariri District Council Long Term Plan 2015-2025 (LTP), allows for the West Eyreton and Summerhill water supply scheme backup source to be upgraded in 2017/18 in order to ensure that the scheme has a reliable and adequate (i.e. suitable quality to meet DWSNZ requirements and capacity for future flow projections) back-up supply in the event of an issue with the primary well.

3.2. It is noted that it is essential that Council has back-up sources available for all its water supplies. Providing a continuous supply of potable drinking water to its communities is one of Council’s core functions, and a key level of service is that there are no outages of greater than 8 hours on any scheme at any time. Over time, it is inevitable that there will be maintenance works required on any well, requiring it to be taken out of service, at times
this could be weeks. Therefore, the ability to have back-up sources of supply of appropriate
reliability and quality is essential.

3.3 It is noted that there is currently a back-up well at the West Eyreton water supply
headworks, however this has its limitation in terms of both water quality and capacity. This
is addressed further in the options investigation section of this report.

3.4 At the Council meeting held on the 15th of February 2017 for the 2017/18 Annual Plan
(record number 170214013610, page 10) a question was raised as to whether back-up for
the West Eyreton and Summerhill schemes could be provided by connecting to the Cust
scheme, rather than drilling a second well at West Eyreton. For this reason an options
investigation has been undertaken on potential back-up source options, before committing
to the option originally proposed.

**Options Investigation**

3.5 Four options were assessed for the backup source for West Eyreton and Summerhill water
supply schemes. These options are as follows:

- Option A – Drilling a new deep well at West Eyreton.
- Option B – Connect to the Cust water supply scheme at the existing Cust
  headworks.
- Option C – Connect to the Cust water supply scheme at the corner of Swamp and
  Cust Roads.
- Option D – Use the existing West Eyreton backup well.

3.6 Consideration was given as part of this investigation to the possible impact of two
additional potential future scenarios, which are currently subject to separate assessments.
These potential future scenarios include:

- Scenario 1 – That the Garrymere water supply scheme may connect to the
  Summerhill water supply scheme at the Hunters Glen Reservoir (this would
  require a total length of new mains of approximately 3.5km).
- Scenario 2 – That the Poyntzs Road water supply scheme may connect to the
  West Eyreton water supply scheme (requiring a total length of new mains of
  approximately 7.0km).

These potential scenarios are shown on the plan in Attachment i. It is noted that Scenario
2 (Poyntzs Road joining to West Eyreton) is recommended to proceed in a separate report
(record number 170816088611), while Scenario 1 (Garrymere joining with Summerhill is
one of the options still being considered, with a report on this to be finalised in the coming
months).

The above scenarios were considered at a high level to confirm the viability of joining them
to the West Eyreton and Summerhill water supply schemes in order to gain an
understanding of these scenarios on the range of options being considered for providing
a back-up source. The intention of this is to provide an understanding of the wider strategy
for providing high quality and reliable water to this wider area in the long term.

These considerations included which backup option (A – D) could accommodate the
additional demand that these potential future scenarios would require. The high level
assessment identified that Option A was able to accommodate Scenarios 1 and 2 while
Options B and C were capable of accommodating Scenarios 1 and 2 to some extent and
Option D was unable to meet either scenario.

3.7 Each of Options A to D were evaluated based upon the following factors:

1. Compliance with DWSNZ requirements in terms of water quality.
2. Capacity of backup source.
3. Cost analysis
4. Risk and resilience.

3.8. Option A – Drilling a new deep well at West Eyreton.

3.8.1. This option would involve drilling a new well at 1468 North Eyre Road, which is the same land parcel/site as the primary well (M35/9566). The new well would be located at the south west corner of the site, circa 80m away from the existing well. A new pipeline would convey water from the new well to the existing reservoirs at the site and the existing surface pumps and infrastructure would be used to discharge the water into the distribution network. This is presented on Figure 1 below:

![Figure 1: Proposed layout for new back-up well](image)

The back-up well proposed would be of similar diameter and depth to the existing well (98.3m deep, 200mm diameter). A well of this depth would be expected to be a secure ground water source, complying with DWSNZ requirements. Staff have a high degree of confidence in this assumption, given that it would be expected that the proposed back-up well would draw water from the same aquifer as the current primary well, given their close proximity.

The new backup well is intended to be added to the existing consent for the primary well (consent CRC100955) with only one of the two wells in operation at any one time. The existing consent allows for a take of 25 l/s, which provides sufficient capacity to accommodate the 50 year peak flow for Summerhill and West Eyreton and provides close to the 50 year peak flow of the potential future scenarios such as joining with the Garrymere and Poyntzs Road water supply schemes.

Based on this proposed “duty / standby” operation there would be no additional impact on the aquifer in terms of the total water take, which would simplify the consent process to take water from the well. Further to this there are not seen to be any issues gaining consent due to potential interference that the proposed new well may have, over and above any interference that may be caused by the existing well. This is based on an assessment of existing wells in the area, as documented on the Environment Canterbury (ECan) website.

While it was noted that there would be a minor shortfall in capacity in the 50 year scenario if both Garrymere and Poyntzs Road join the wider scheme, this difference could be made up by storage tanks or a variation to the resource...
consent at a later date. An upgrade of the pumps will also be required if these scenarios occur.

The future flows that could be supplied under this scenario are summarised on Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2: FUTURE FLOWS THAT OPTION A CAN SUPPLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A + scenario 1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Shortfall of 1.4l/s but could be made up by storage tanks or variation to resource consent in the future.

The estimated capital cost including professional fees and contingencies for this option is $515,000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3: OPTION A COST SUMMARY (this is a high level cost estimate with a 30% contingency)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drill, develop, test and construct well*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct well head and install pumps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipe work and connection to the network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional fees (15%) including consent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency (30%)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Assumes that water can be discharged onsite in existing gravel pit during development of well.

* 30% funding contingency applied given degree of uncertainty with well drilling costs.

3.8.2. The risks associated with this option include:
- The new well may be drilled to a depth of circa 100m and not find ground water of the required yield or quality. This is considered a very low risk due to the proximity to the main well (80m away).
- A deeper well than expected being required in order to achieve the required yield and quality. This is considered a low risk due to the location in relation to the main well (80m away).
- Interference with other wells meaning that consent cannot be obtained to take water from the new well. This risk is considered to be low given that there would be no additional amount of water proposed to be taken, over and above that already taken from the existing well.

3.8.3. Significant benefits of this option are that:
- Consenting and construction of the new well can take place immediately. There were previously concerns raised regarding the potential for contamination within the adjacent gravel pit. For this reason a contaminated land assessment has been completed and no contamination was found (record number 170403032451). This would mean that a secure backup source would likely be available relatively quickly when compared with other options.
- The cost and scope of this option is already allowed for, with a budget of $590,000 for the 2017/18 year. This budget is expected to be more than sufficient based on the latest more detailed assessment of likely costs.

3.9. Option B – Connect to the Cust water supply scheme at the existing Cust headworks.
3.9.1. This option to use the Cust water supply scheme as the back-up source for the Summerhill and West Eyreton schemes would require the following works:

- A new circa 220m long, 150mm diameter main connecting the existing Summerhill 150mm PVC main at the corner of Cust Road and Earlys Road to the Cust headworks site.

- A new water storage tank, booster pump station and chlorine dosage unit at the Cust headworks site.

- Reconfiguration of pipework at the West Eyreton water supply headworks site to allow water to be fed backwards from Cust into West Eyreton.

- The delivery main upgrade that is planned between Springbank and Cust in 2021/22 would be required to be fast tracked. It is also noted that the budget currently allocated for this project is expected to be insufficient, and would be required to be increased.

In an emergency, when a backup water source is needed for the West Eyreton and Summerhill water supply scheme, a valve could be opened to allow water from the new pump station that would be required at the Cust headworks to supply the West Eyreton and Summerhill reticulation network. Although the Cust source does not require treatment to comply with DWSNZ requirements for the on-demand Cust water supply scheme, chlorine dosing would be required for the Summerhill and West Eyreton restricted supply schemes. In order to deliver the water from Cust to West Eyreton and Summerhill, a booster pump station would be required at the Cust headworks.

In order to facilitate this option (in terms of the extra demand that would be placed on the Cust scheme) the existing small diameter supply mains which are at the limit of their capacity between the Cust sources (at Springbank) and the Cust headworks, would require replacement sooner than programmed.

There is currently a capital works budget of $500,000 to upgrade this main in the 2021/22 year. In order for Cust to provide back-up to West Eyreton and Summerhill, this upgraded main project would be required to be brought forward to the 2017/18 financial year, and the budget increased to be consistent with recent estimates for this work.

Once this delivery main upgrade is completed the capacity will be sufficient to supply the Cust, West Eyreton and Summerhill water supply schemes in an emergency for the projected 50 year average and the 20 year peak demand. Should the Poyntz’s Road and Garrymere schemes be joined to the greater scheme in the future, the availability of water would not be sufficient to accommodate flows greater than the projected 50 year average or the current peak demand.

### Table 4: Future Flows That Option B Can Supply

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPTION</th>
<th>AVERAGE FLOWS</th>
<th>PEAK FLOWS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CURRENT</td>
<td>20 YEAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B + scenario 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The estimated capital cost including professional fees and contingencies for Option B is $1,171,500. This includes an estimate of $765,000 for the Cust supply main upgrade. For the West Eyreton and Summerhill water supply schemes the cost estimate is $406,500. These costs are summarised on Table 5.
### TABLE 5: OPTION B COST SUMMARY (this is a high level cost estimate with a 20% contingency)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New pipe from Earlys Road to Cust headworks.</td>
<td>$44,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New storage tank, booster pump station and chlorine dosing at Cust headworks.</td>
<td>$216,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection to scheme</td>
<td>$31,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P &amp; G (10%)</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional fees (7% before contingency)</td>
<td>$22,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency on construction (20%)</td>
<td>$64,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal (additional works)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$406,500</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springbank to Cust delivery main (P&amp;G Inc.) (fast tracked)</td>
<td>$602,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional fees (7% before contingency)</td>
<td>$42,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency on construction (20%)</td>
<td>$120,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal (Cust main)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$765,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,171,500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*20% funding contingency deemed appropriate based on recent similar construction costs being available to give reasonable degree of confidence in cost estimate.

3.9.2. The risks or limitations associated with this option include:

- Backflow of chlorinated water into the Cust reticulation. This is considered a low risk because pipework will be recorded within the asset management system and backflow prevention will be incorporated within the design.

- For the option to be feasible, it requires the Cust supply main upgrade to be undertaken earlier than currently programmed. The Cust supply main upgrade is not scheduled until 2021/22 year, therefore, the DWSNZ compliant backup source for the West Eyreton and Summerhill schemes would either have to wait until 2021/22 or the Cust upgrade will need to be brought forward. Bringing forward this upgrade would have a cost implication to the Cust scheme, which may be difficult to justify to the existing Cust scheme members given that the primary reason for bringing the project forward would be to benefit other schemes.

- The effect of bringing forward the project from 2021/22 to 2017/18 (4 years) has been assessed and is deemed to have an equivalent capital value of $104,100 (based on comparison of net present value of $765,000 at present or in four years time, at an interest rate of 5%). To reduce the financial impact that bringing this project forward would have to the Cust scheme, this cost could be borne by the Summerhill and West Eyreton schemes.

- This option does not provide for projected 50 year peak flows of the combined Cust, West Eyreton and Summerhill Schemes.

- Joining the schemes would require community consultation. During previous consultation regarding the joining of Cust, West Eyreton and Summerhill schemes, there was strong community opposition to the schemes joining.
3.9.3. Benefits of this option include:

- Improved resilience and operational flexibility due to interconnection of the West Eyreton, Summerhill, and Cust water supply schemes. Therefore:
  - If the West Eyreton well was out of commission, the Cust scheme could supply DWSNZ compliant water to the West Eyreton and Summerhill schemes.
  - If both the primary and secondary wells at Springbank (Cust water supply) were out of commission then the West Eyreton well would be able to supply the Cust scheme.
- Use of existing land and an operational site at Cust – no land purchase required.
- Cost to the West Eyreton and Summerhill schemes – the cost estimate for these schemes is less than that of Option A (when the cost of the delivery main between Springbank and Cust is excluded).

3.10 Option C – Connect to the Cust water supply scheme at the corner of Swamp and Cust Roads.

3.10.1. The scope of this option would include:

- A new water pump station and chlorine dosage unit (located at the corner of Swamp and Cust Roads) and a connection to the Cust supply main.
- Reconfiguration of pipework at the West Eyreton water supply headworks site to allow water to be fed backwards from Cust into West Eyreton.

In an emergency when a backup source is needed for the West Eyreton and Summerhill water supply schemes, a valve would be opened to allow water from the Springbank source to Cust headworks supply main to discharge to the West Eyreton and Summerhill water supply schemes. Cust Water would be chlorine dosed and pumped directly into the West Eyreton and Summerhill scheme reticulation network. A new booster pump station would be required to be constructed for this option to provide the required pumping.

As per Option B, this option (C) requires chlorine dosing for the restricted scheme and upgrade of the supply pipe between the Cust source and Headworks. This option could meet peak flows to supply the, West Eyreton, Summerhill and Cust schemes up to the 50 year average and 20 year peak scenarios but could not accommodate supplying Garrymere and Poynts Road schemes past the current peak flow if these schemes do join in future.

The flow projections that this option would be able to meet are summarised on Table 6 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPTION</th>
<th>AVERAGE FLOWS</th>
<th>PEAK FLOWS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CURRENT</td>
<td>20 YEAR</td>
<td>50 YEAR</td>
<td>CURRENT</td>
<td>20 YEAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C + scenario 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The estimated capital cost including professional fees and contingencies for Option C is $1,067,500. This includes an estimate of $765,000 for the Cust supply main upgrade. For the West Eyreton and Summerhill water supply schemes the cost is $302,000. These costs are summarised on Table 7.
TABLE 7: OPTION C COST SUMMARY (this is a high level cost estimate with a 20% contingency)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land purchase, new booster pump station and chlorine dosing at Earlys Road.</td>
<td>$208,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection and modification to network</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P &amp; G (10%)</td>
<td>$21,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional fees (7% before contingency)</td>
<td>$17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency (20%)</td>
<td>$47,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (additional works)</td>
<td>$302,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springbank to Cust delivery main (P&amp;G Inc.) (fast tracked)</td>
<td>$602,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional fees (7% before contingency)</td>
<td>$42,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency (20%)</td>
<td>$120,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (Cust main)</td>
<td>$765,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$1,067,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*20% funding contingency deemed appropriate based on recent similar construction costs being available to give reasonable degree of confidence in cost estimate.*

3.10.2. The risks associated with this option are the same as Option B, as well as the following additional risks:
- Availability of land and potential land purchase/easements required.
- Potential opposition of neighbouring residents to a pump station being constructed in a residential area.
- Creating an additional operational site.

3.10.3. Benefits of this option are similar to Option B (excluding the existing land benefit – as Option C would require land purchase/easements).

3.11. Option D - Use existing West Eyreton backup well.

3.11.1. This option is to continue to use the existing shallow backup source (M35/0055) at the West Eyreton water supply headworks. Under this scenario, in an emergency when the main well isn’t operational, the existing shallow backup well would be used to supply the West Eyreton and Summerhill schemes.

The flow projections that this option would be able to meet are summarised on Table 8 below:

TABLE 8: FUTURE FLOWS THAT OPTION D CAN SUPPLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPTION</th>
<th>AVERAGE FLOWS</th>
<th>PEAK FLOWS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CURRENT</td>
<td>20 YEAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D + scenario</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.11.2. The risks and limitations associated with this option are the following:
- The well has a depth of 15.2m and is not a secure source of drinking water and does not meet DWSNZ standards. Therefore, this source is assessed as presenting an unacceptable health risk to the communities it would serve.
- The maximum consent rate for abstraction from this well is 8 l/s which is only enough to supply the West Eyreton and Summerhill schemes to the current peak flow and not enough to meet any future scenarios.

3.11.3. The benefit to this option is that the well is already constructed and connected to the schemes there will be no set up costs.

3.12. Evaluation of Upgrade Options

3.12.1. The upgrade options that have been assessed that involve joining to the Cust scheme are summarised on Figure 2 below:

![Figure 2: Summary of infrastructure upgrades of Options B & C](image)

3.12.2. The relative costs, and ability to provide future flow projections for each of the options analysed are summarised on the table 9 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPTION DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>COST TO WEST EYRETON / SUMMERHILL</th>
<th>COST TO CUST</th>
<th>PEAK FLOWS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>$515,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A + scenario 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>$515,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>$406,500</td>
<td>$765,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B + scenario 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>$406,500</td>
<td>$765,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>$302,000</td>
<td>$765,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C + scenario 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>$302,000</td>
<td>$765,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$765,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D + scenario 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$765,000</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.12.3. Following the options assessment, the recommended option is Option A (Drilling a new deep well at West Eyreton) and has an estimated capital cost of $515,000. The key reasons for this recommendation are as follows:

- Option A would meet the requirements of achieving compliance with the DWSNZ, and ensuring that the scheme is resilient with a high quality back-up source being provided.
- Option A is currently allowed for within existing budgets and can be swiftly progressed further following approval of this report.
- There are no issues with capacity for this option, regardless of the final outcome of the potential projects to connect other schemes, under the 50 year growth scenarios for all schemes.
- This option has already been included in the Long Term Plan which has been consulted with the community.
- This option is the best option for West Eyreton and the Council, regardless of the decisions made on options for Poyntzts Road and Garrymere.

3.12.4. Option B (Connect to the Cust water supply scheme at the existing Cust headworks) is not recommended for the following reasons:

- The cost for West Eyreton and Summerhill schemes is less than Option A, however it is reliant on the Cust main upgrade which is not scheduled until the 2021/22 year. Bringing this project forward would have a high cost to Cust, so would be difficult to justify to these scheme members.
- Option B does not allow for projected peak 50 year demand for all 3 schemes (Cust, West Eyreton and Summerhill) or the flows required should West Eyreton and Summerhill schemes be joined with the Garrymere and/or Poyntzts Road Schemes at a future date.
- Therefore, the approximate 20% cost saving projected to the West Eyreton and Summerhill schemes associated with this option relative to Option A is not seen to be justified by the impact on the Cust residents, and the limitations in terms of future capacity.

3.12.5. Option C (Connect to the Cust water supply scheme at the corner of Swamp and Cust Roads) is not recommended for the following reasons:

- Although estimated costs are approximately $100,000 lower than Option B, operational costs and risks associated with land purchase and creating another operational site are not sufficient to justify the capital cost benefit afforded by this option.
- As with Option B, this option is reliant on the Cust main upgrade which is not scheduled until the 2021/22 year and has a high cost to Cust, which would be difficult to justify.
- Option C does not allow for projected peak 50 year demand for all 3 schemes or the flows required should the West Eyreton and Summerhill schemes be joined with the Garrymere and/or Poyntzts Road Schemes as part of the source upgrade project for these schemes.

3.12.6. Option D (Use existing West Eyreton backup well) is not recommended for the following reasons:

- Option D does not meet DWSNZ standards and therefore is assessed as presenting an unacceptable level or risk to the residents on these schemes when this back-up source is in operation.
Option D does not have the capacity to meet future peak demands for the West Eyreton and Summerhill schemes, or the potential future scenarios if Garrymere and/or Poyntz's Road join to the scheme.

3.13 Note in the 2017/18 financial year $590,000 has been budgeted for the West Eyreton and Summerhill Backup Source Upgrade to implement Upgrade Option A

3.14 Recommendations

Recommendation for Backup Source

It is recommended that Option A (Drilling a new deep well at West Eyreton) is progressed. This will provide a secure backup source in a relatively short time frame, with sufficient capacity for the future scenarios for the West Eyreton and Summerhill as well as Poyntz's Road and Garrymere should these schemes join to the greater scheme as part of the source upgrade projects for these schemes.

Future Recommendation for Improved Resilience

In addition to drilling the back-up well at West Eyreton, consideration should be given to the installation of a large diameter (DN150), normally closed, cross connection between the Cust scheme and the West Eyreton and Summerhill schemes, when the new Springbank to Cust main is being installed to improve resilience.

This would provide Cust with a backup if both Springbank wells become non-operational. Under this scenario, the valve could be opened and the West Eyreton / Summerhill water could supply the Cust scheme. Likewise but to a limited extent (the 20 year peak flows), if both the West Eyreton wells become non-operational the valve can be opened for the Cust water to supply the West Eyreton scheme, however water from the Cust scheme would not be able to supply Summerhill without the assistance of a pump due to the elevation difference. If Garrymere and Poyntz's Road join the greater scheme in future and both the wells at either West Eyreton or Cust fail, this valve could still be opened to supply all the schemes but only to average flows so restrictions would need to be put in place.

3.15 The Management Team has viewed this report and supports the recommendations.

4. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

4.1. The community has not been consulted specifically regarding the plan to drill a second well at West Eyreton to provide back-up to the existing bore, however this was signalled as part of the 2017/18 Annual Plan process.

4.2. If one of the options involving joining to the Cust scheme was recommended, additional consultation would be required regarding this. Given that the recommendation is to proceed with the approach indicated previously, no additional consultation is proposed.

5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

5.1. Table 10 summarises the costs and risks associated with each of the options identified:
Table 10: Summary of Benefits, Costs and Risks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Compliance with DWSNZ</th>
<th>Future Capacity</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Upgrades required in Cust</th>
<th>Risks / Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$515,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>- All risks identified are low.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| B      | Yes                   | Limited         | $407,000 | Yes (assessed NPV of $104,000 to bring this work forward). | - Long term capacity issues  
|        |                       |                 |      |                           | - Cust community may oppose this option  
|        |                       |                 |      |                           | - Project may be delayed by consultation. |
| C      | Yes                   | Limited         | $302,000 |                           | - As above with Option B.  
|        |                       |                 |      |                           | - Likely opposition to constructing pump station in residential area.  
|        |                       |                 |      |                           | - Land may not be able to be obtained for proposed pump station. |
| D      | No                    | No              | $-    | No                        | - Capacity issues (future demand will not be able to be met).  
|        |                       |                 |      |                           | - Public health risk as back-up source will not be compliant with DWSNZ*. |

*Note Darfield water contamination event was a result of a back-up source that did not comply with the DWSNZ being used which led to contamination of the public water supply.

5.2. Based on the assessment of benefits, cost and risk (as summarised in Table 10), the drilling of a back-up well at West Eyreton is assessed as providing the optimum balance of these factors.

6. CONTEXT

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

6.2 Legislation
The Health (Drinking Water) Amendment Act 2007 requires drinking-water suppliers to take all practicable steps to ensure they provide an adequate supply of drinking water that complies with the Drinking Water Standards New Zealand (2008).

6.3 Community Outcomes
This report relates to the following community outcomes:

- 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.
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT

FILE NO and TRIM NO: WAT-05-11-03 / 170811086311

REPORT TO: Council

DATE OF MEETING: 5 September 2017

FROM: Colin Roxburgh, Water Asset Manager

SUBJECT: Request for Funding to be Brought Forward for Bramleys Road Well Consent to take Water

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is request Council’s approval to bring forward $25,000 of funding for the Bramleys Road New Source project in order to secure a consent to take water from the well.

1.2. It has been signalled in the 2017/18 Annual Plan that $1,600,000 is required in the 2021/22 financial year in order to connect the Bramleys Road well up to the Woodend / Tuahiwi / Pegasus water supply scheme. This will have the benefits of providing additional capacity to the scheme, reducing the need for reservoir storage or surface pump upgrades, improving water quality of the schemes (as no treatment will be required), increased resilience and also addressing cultural concerns from Tuahiwi residents about their water coming from Pegasus in the future.

1.3. It is recommended that the funding for the consent application of $25,000 be brought forward to allow a consent to take water from the well (that has already been drilled, developed and tested) be secured.

1.4. There would be a risk that if consent is not obtained now that other parties may drill wells in the interim period which may impact on Council’s ability to gain this consent in the future.

1.5. The $25,000 would cover professional services fees to analyse the test data from the well, prepare the assessment of environmental effects and lodge the consent application with Environment Canterbury (ECan).

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 170811086311.

(b) Approves $25,000 of the Bramleys Road Well Level of Service Component capital works budget currently set for the 2021/22 year to be brought forward to the current 2017/18 financial year.
(c) **Notes** that this will allow staff to submit an application to take water from the Bramleys Road well to Environment Canterbury with the aim of securing this consent, before other wells are drilled and consented in the area.

(d) **Circulates** this report to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi and Woodend-Sefton Community Boards for their information, and authorises staff to inform the local Runanga at the next scheduled meeting.

3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

3.1. There is a project proposed for the 2021/22 financial year to bring the Bramleys Road well online to connect up with the Woodend / Tuahiwi / Pegasus water supply scheme.

3.2. A budget of $1,600,000 was allocated through the 2017/18 Annual Plan for this work. This covers the cost of consenting the well, constructing a well head, installing the well pump and electrical equipment and constructing a pipe to connect the well up to the water main that runs through Tuahiwi, which is part of the Woodend – Tuahiwi water supply scheme.

3.3. In the 2018/19 financial year the Woodend – Tuahiwi scheme is to be joined to the Pegasus water supply scheme. As part of this the current treatment system at Pegasus is being upgraded to biologically treat the manganese in the water (as opposed to the chemical treatment system that is currently used in Pegasus).

3.4. As part of this work the Bramleys Road source was identified as a key part of the long term strategy for these schemes. The benefits of this well include:

3.4.1. No treatment required. The Bramleys Road well does not require any treatment, being a very high quality water source, without any issues relating to manganese (which is an issue with the Woodend and Pegasus water supply wells).

3.4.2. Cultural benefits. During the consultation process for the joining of the Woodend – Tuahiwi schemes with the Pegasus scheme, some Tuahiwi residents indicated cultural concerns regarding their water passing through the Pegasus water treatment plant. The Bramleys Road well would alleviate these concerns, as when operational all of Tuahiwi’s water would be sourced from Bramleys Road and water from Pegasus would not pass through Tuahiwi.

3.4.3. Offsetting other capital works. With the Bramleys Road well being of a quality suitable to connect straight into the reticulation, this offsets other headworks projects such as pump upgrades and reservoir upgrades will be able to be offset.

3.4.4. Increased resilience for scheme as this source is in a different location to the current source for Pegasus and Woodend.

3.5. Based on the benefits above a budget has been set for 2021/22 to connect up this well. It has been identified however that the consent to take water from this well should be secured now, to reduce the risk that it will not be able to be obtained in the future. For this reason it is recommended that $25,000 of the future budget be brought forward to the current 2017/18 financial year to allow the consent application to be progressed in the coming months.

3.6. This application would involve professional services to analyse the test data from the well, prepare the assessment of environmental effects (AEE) and lodging of the consent application with Environment Canterbury (ECan).

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

4.1. The community has been consulted regarding the joining of the Woodend and Pegasus schemes, which included signalling future intentions to connect the Bramleys Road well to the system. In particular Tuahiwi residents were supportive of the proposal to connect the Bramleys Road well for cultural reasons.

4.2. Consultation and engagement will be carried out with the nearby property owners who have wells that may be impacted by the Council’s Bramleys Road well. Staff will work to understand their concerns, any impacts and any mitigation that may be required.

4.3. It is proposed that staff inform the local Runanga of the proposal to apply for consent to take water from this well at the next scheduled meeting.

5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

5.1. Bringing forward of the proposed budget to secure the resource consent is considered to have minimal effect relative to the scale of the total project, and given that this budget is already signalled and allowed for in future years (calculated rating impact of less than $1 per connection per year).

5.2. There would be risks if this budget is not brought forward that the consenting process would have a higher cost in the future, if additional private wells are drilled in the interim period, or if requirements to obtain consent become more stringent.

6. **CONTEXT**

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

6.2. **Legislation**
The Health (Drinking Water) Amendment Act is relevant in this matter.

6.3. **Community Outcomes**
This project is linked to the following community outcome:

- There is sufficient clean water to meet the needs of communities and ecosystems.
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT

FILE NO: GOV-01-11 / 170824091839

REPORT TO: Council

DATE OF MEETING: 5 September 2017

FROM: Sarah Nichols, Governance Manager

SUBJECT: Appointment to Rural Primary Health Organisation

SIGNED BY: 

Department Manager

Chief Executive

1. SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to consider a replacement representative on the Rural Canterbury Primary Health Organisation (PHO) Board, following the resignation of the current Waimakariri Community representative.

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives Report No. 170824091839.

(b) Approves the appointment of Councillor Gordon as the Council Community Representative to the Rural Canterbury Primary Health Organisation Board, effective from 5 September 2017.

3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1 For the past two electoral terms the Waimakariri District Council and Community representation to the Rural Canterbury PHO has been Councillor Peter Allen. During that time Councillor Allen has been an active Board member, including holding the position of Acting Chair until recently when Dr Lorna Martin was appointed. In August 2017 Councillor Allen resigned from the Board due to ill-health and a new community representative is now sought.

3.2 The Council received a briefing on this matter in August with the matter being fully discussed by Councillors and the Mayor.

3.3 Rural Canterbury PHO operates as a charitable company and Trust, and has a governance board of 12 members: four community representatives, three Māori representatives, three provider representatives, one Practice Nurse and an Independent Chair (a three year term). Each Board member contributes according to their background and all report back to their representative groups on PHO activities. They are also available to the public as a link to ensure relevant health issues are brought forward to the PHO.
3.4 The current Board comprises of:
Dr Lorna Martin (Chair)
Susan Mowat          Hurunui District Council – Community Representative
Vacant                Waimakariri District Council – Community Representative
Peter Sparks         GP Representative Ashburton
Sandy Hunt-Lockhart  Maori Representative (Manawhenua ki Waitaha)
Kerry Maw            Ashburton District Council TLA Community Representative
Pam Richardson       Akaroa/Waiwera Community Board Representative

3.5 The Board meets monthly, usually on the last week of the month. Meetings are held at the Rural Canterbury PHO office located in Wairakei Road, from 2pm. The meetings are open to the public.

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

4. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

4.1 Not sought.

5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

5.1 There are no financial implications or risk.

6. **CONTEXT**

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

6.2 **Legislation**
Legislation not applicable but delegated from Council Delegation.

6.3 **Community Outcomes**
6.3.1. There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision-making by public organisations that affect our District.

6.3.2. Creating a strong sense of community.

Sarah Nichols
Governance Manager
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT

FILE NO: RDG-32-44 / 170725078225
REPORT TO: Rangiora – Ashley Community Board
DATE OF MEETING: 9 August 2017
FROM: Ken Stevenson, Roading Manager
Joanne McBride, Development Manager
SUBJECT: High Street Feature Lighting

SIGNED BY:

Department Manager
Chief Executive

(for Reports to Council or Committees)

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Boards approval for feature lighting in High Street, Rangiora, and to recommend to Council a funding plan.

1.2. Traditionally there have been ‘Christmas Lights’ in High Street in Rangiora. These have basically consisted of lights strung across the road from the street light poles.

1.3. With the upgrade of High Street and the lighting technology that is now available there is an opportunity to install controllable feature lighting that will serve a more all-round purpose rather than just for Christmas and it will future proof the lighting for a number of years.

1.4. Lighting options consisting of feature up lighting of trees have been demonstrated to the Board and the feedback from the Board was positive and supportive of those options. A lighting design has now been developed and is being presented the Board for approval.

1.5. Timing is a critical aspect as it is essential the lights are installed before December 2017.

1.6. Funding is also an issue as the allowance for the lighting in the approved Town Centre Budget is inadequate to fund the feature lighting option being presented here. However as the Good Street upgrade component of the Town Centre Budget will not be required this financial year there is the opportunity to use that funding to get the lighting completed this year.

1.7. The Good Street upgrade cannot happen until the building on the east side of the laneway is rebuilt. At this stage the new building is likely to be at least a year away so that puts the Good Street upgrade into the 2018/19 year. It is also noted that the budget allocation for the Good Street laneway was based on just replacing the paving. It is likely a more comprehensive upgrade will be required and desirable and so there are advantages in considering separate funding for Good Street to enable a better outcome to be achieved.

1.8. A possible funding source for Good Street is the general unallocated Town Centre Budget. There is $100,000 per year from 2018/19 in the current LTP for this item. $350,000 of this funding could be brought forward into the 2018/19 year to fund the Good Street upgrade. There are no other known demands on the general Town Centre Budget at this stage.

1.9. Another factor is the street lighting along High Street. The current lighting is only just adequate and the poles are not particularly attractive and options need to be considered for upgrading the lighting both from an amenity point of view and a light output point of view. Ducting has been laid for the new street lighting and some of the cable will be
installed when the feature lighting is installed. The estimated cost to upgrade the lighting is $550,000. The timing of the installation of the new lighting is flexible and it could be phased over a period of time. Funding options are to use more of the general unallocated Town Centre Budget referred to above or to request additional funding through the next LTP process.

1.10. Upgrading the street lighting earlier rather than later will result in the whole town centre upgrade being completed to provide an impressive overall effect. Carrying out the work later or by phasing will mean the town centre will remain and look uncompleted for a longer period.

Attachments:

i. High Street – Concept Plan for Feature Lighting (TRIM 170728080053)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Rangiora–Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives report No 170725078225.

THAT the Rangiora–Ashley Community Board recommends to the Council that it:

(b) Approves the feature lighting for High Street as detailed on the attached plan (TRIM 170728080053).

(c) Approves the reallocation of the remaining $265,000 High Street Upgrade budget in 2017/18 to fund the feature lighting in High Street.

(d) Notes that the current allocation of the remaining $265,000 is $205,000 to Good Street upgrade and $60,000 to the feature lighting.

(e) Notes the Good Street upgrade cannot now be completed until 2018/19 because of the delay in the new building on the east side of the street and that the likely cost to achieve the required outcome will be more than the $205,000 that is currently allocated.

(f) Approves the allocation of $350,000 from the future Town Centre Upgrade budget of $100,000 per year to the Good Street Upgrade project in 2018/19.

(g) Considers options to fund the street lighting of $550,000 through the next LTP process.

3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. As part of the High Street upgrade the issue of ‘Christmas’ lighting has been raised. Traditionally this has been provided by coloured lights strung across the road. With new technology many more and more flexible and effective lighting options are now available. Earlier this year some lighting options were demonstrated to the Board. Coloured and controllable in ground up lighting of trees was considered an attractive option and generally supported.

3.2. This lighting can provide feature lighting all year round and can be programmed for themes if necessary. For example green lighting for St Patricks Day.

3.3. Staff initially worked with Philips to develop options. Philips are an international supplier with considerable experience in controllable outdoor public space feature lighting and Mainpower suggested engaging with Philips to discuss options around lighting”. However Philips were slow to respond and they failed to deliver a design. Staff then approached Mark Herring Design who market the We-ef lighting products. We-ef are also an internationally recognised supplier of controllable outdoor public space feature lighting. Mark Herring Design has previously worked with the Council on lighting in Kaiapoi.
3.4. Mark Herring Design has provided a design for the feature lighting and the delivery time for the We-ef product is shorter than the Phillips product, and that will enable the lights to be installed by November.

3.5. The plan is to individually light all the established trees along High Street including the two large trees in front of the Council building. There are four small trees on each side of the pedestrian crossing at Conway Lane. Lighting these trees would not be effective until they are bigger in size. It is proposed to install the cable to these trees so lights can be installed at a later date.

3.6. While ducts have been laid along High Street for the lighting and controller cable, pavers will have to be lifted and holes dug in the new paver areas to enable the cable to extend from the duct out to the new light positions.

3.7. Included in the High Street upgrade project was the Good Street pedestrian area upgrade. The original scope of this work was to just replace the pavers with new pavers to match High Street and to be more consistent with Conway Lane. However with a new building being built on the east side of Good Street and the expectation that just replacing the pavers may miss an opportunity to provide a much better outcome it is likely more funding will be required than what was allowed.

3.8. Also timing wise the Good Street upgrade will not be able to be commenced until the new building is built. That will not now be until later in 2018. Hence the funding for the upgrade won’t be required until the 2018/19 year. This provides the opportunity to properly scope the work and to consider funding options. It is recommended the future unallocated Town Centres Upgrade budget be used to fund the Good Street upgrade and the 2017/18 allocation for Good Street be reallocated to the new feature lighting.

3.9. The existing street lighting in High Street is only just adequate and the poles are not particularly attractive. Two poles were removed when new buildings were constructed because the poles clashed with the verandas. These could not be replaced and so the light levels along High Street are uneven. The amount of lighting from the new buildings, for example Farmers, compensates for the lack of street lighting to a point. From a pure condition point of the view the concrete poles are still structurally sound and the lamps are still performing well.

3.10. There is currently no funding provision for the replacement of the lights because the condition is still adequate and the upgrading of the lights was not included in the High Street upgrade scope and budget.

3.11. So the issues with the street lighting is the level of lighting and the attractiveness of the poles and the lack of funding to replace them. Options for funding the street lighting upgrade are to fund them from the future unallocated Town Centres Upgrade budget or to seek funding through the next LTP process.

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

4. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

4.1. As relayed through the Board and from town centre businesses there is considerable support to get feature lighting installed in High Street. There is also an expectation the lighting will be installed by November and staff are working to achieve that.

5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

5.1. These lights are specialist lights that cannot be sourced ‘off the shelf’ from local suppliers. Being in public spaces they need to be vandal proof and robust enough for a public open space use. They are also controllable to provide the greatest benefit and flexibility and to
do that they need to be integrated with a control system. Longevity is also important and these lights have a 10 year warranty with low light loss over time.

5.2. The cost estimate for the feature lighting as detailed in the attached plan is $265,000. This includes all cabling, controllers, restoration and the supply and installation of the lights. It also includes the installation of cabling for the future street lighting in those areas were the feature lighting cable is being laid. The breakdown of this estimate is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Install 450m of cable at $190/m</td>
<td>85,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of 30 in-ground luminaires at $3,600.00 each</td>
<td>108,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainpower to install the festive lights at $500.00 each</td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply and install two control cabinets at $12,000 each</td>
<td>24,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming and commissioning cost from We-eF</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinstatement of pavers following trenching</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>7500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$265,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note – At this stage we have allowed for 30 lights along High Street with the final number to be confirmed. There are 25 trees mature trees which do require lighting and 5 juvenile trees (four at Conway Lane / Farmers and one at Durham Street) which are currently not proposed to be lit but could be if this was the desired outcome.

5.3. The product being recommended is the We-eF lights through Mark Herring Design. These are supplied from Europe and assembled in Australia. The supply time is 6 weeks from the date of order so this will enable them to be installed by November.

5.4. Mainpower recommend the use of the We-eF products. They have provided feedback to staff on alternative lower cost lighting options which have a low upfront cost and have advised that:

- A low upfront cost fitting will have a larger ongoing maintenance cost. It is likely that more reactive maintenance and vandalism costs will occur and this is likely to include the requirement for full replacements. The performance of low cost products is likely to require replacement at 4 – 5 years.

- Low lumen output lights would not create the same effect with colour wash on the trees as the We-eF light and therefore more lights would be required to achieve the same effect.

5.5. Prices were also obtained for an equivalent Philips product and overall the prices was similar however the delivery time was 16 weeks and so these are not recommended. The Philips system required more controllers and specialist cable. Their unit price per light was cheaper than the We-eF light however the total cost considering the controllers and cable was similar to the We-eF price.

5.6. The High Street Upgrade budget currently has $265,000 available in the current (2017/18) year. This was previously allocated to the Good Street upgrade ($205,000) and to the feature lighting ($60,000). It is recommended the $265,000 is used to fund the feature lighting.

5.7. The Good Street upgrade is likely to cost in the order of $350,000 if a better outcome than just replacing the existing paving is desired. It is recommended the $350,000 for the Good Street upgrade be funded from the future unallocated Town Centre Upgrade Budget. The current allocation in the LTP is $100,000 per year from 2018/19 onwards.
5.8. The cost estimate to upgrade the street lighting is $550,000. There is no budget for this upgrade work. This could be funded from the future unallocated Town Centre Upgrade Budget or new funding could be sought through the next LTP process for this work.

5.9. A significant risk with the feature lighting is getting it installed by November. To achieve that the lights need to be ordered as soon as possible. There is significant work in installing the cable to the light positions and this will be done by Mainpower. This work can start immediately.

5.10. To minimise the risk of late delivery of the lights, an order could be placed before formal Council approval in September and if for some reason the Council does not approve the lighting then the order can be cancelled. This may include a cancellation fee however this is not likely to be significant when weighed up against the risk of late delivery. In saying that Mark Herring Design are confident the delivery dates quoted can be achieved.

6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. **Policy**

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

6.2. **Links to Community Outcomes**

6.2.1. There is a safe environment for all:

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

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

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

---

Ken Stevenson
Roading Manager

Joanne McBride
Development Manager
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL
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FILE NO:       RDG-32-49 / 170810086146
REPORT TO:    Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board
DATE OF MEETING: 21 August 2017
FROM:         Joanne McBride, Development Manager
              Simon Hart, Business and Centres Manager
SUBJECT:      Kaiapoi Town Centre Feature Lighting
SIGNED BY:    [Signature]
              Department Manager
              Chief Executive

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Board’s approval for feature lighting in Williams Street, Kaiapoi and to recommend a funding plan to Council.

1.2. Traditionally there have been “Christmas Light Boards” in Kaiapoi. These have been hung on the street light poles outside of the main shopping area (south of the railway line and north of Charles Street. These lights are no longer viable and alternative lighting has been considered.

1.3. There is now a range of new lighting technologies available which provide an all year round lighting solution to enhance public spaces. These include controllable functions so that lighting can be pre-programmed for coloured displays.

1.4. Lighting options including up lighting of street trees have been demonstrated to the Board and the feedback from the Board has been very positive and supportive of these options.

1.5. A lighting plan has been developed and is now being presented to the Board for discussion and approval.

1.6. Proposed Stage One lighting includes nine LED lights being installed in Raven Quay to light the large tree on the south eastern corner of the Williams Street Bridge and the three Plane trees along Raven Quay. Also included is six in-ground LED lights for established trees in Trousselot Park.

1.7. The lighting is proposed to be staged as work on the north side of the river is yet to begin.

1.8. It is proposed to have Stage One lighting completed in time for Christmas this year.

1.9. There is funding available in the Kaiapoi Town Centre budget should the Board wish to utilise this.
2. **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No. 170810086146.

(b) **Notes** that staff will report back to the Board with an estimate of the cost of Stage Two lighting before the end of the year

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board **recommends** to Council that it:

(c) **Approves** the Stage One feature lighting for Kaiapoi Town Centre as detailed in this report.

(d) **Approves** the allocation of $125,000.00 of the Kaiapoi Town Centre budget to fund the Stage One feature lighting in Kaiapoi.

3. ** ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

3.1. The issue of ‘Christmas’ lighting has been raised as the lighting previously used in the town centre was well beyond its life expectancy and replacement bulbs are no longer available. Traditionally the lighting has been provided by coloured lights on a board which was attached to street light poles. With new technology more flexible and effective lighting options are now available which provide year round lighting and enhancement.

3.2. Earlier this year lighting options were demonstrated to the Board. Coloured and controllable in ground up-lighting of trees was considered an attractive option and generally supported.

3.3. This lighting can provide feature lighting all year round and can be programmed for themes if necessary (e.g. green lighting for St Patricks Day).

3.4. Staff initially worked with Philips to develop options. Philips are an international supplier with considerable experience in controllable outdoor public space feature lighting and Mainpower suggested engaging with Philips to discuss options around lighting. However Philips were slow to respond and they failed to deliver a design. Staff then approached Mark Herring Design who market the We-eF lighting products. We-eF are also an internationally recognised supplier of controllable outdoor public space feature lighting. Mark Herring Design has previously worked with the Council on lighting in Kaiapoi.

3.5. Mark Herring Design has provided a design for the feature lighting.

3.6. The proposed staging of lights is as follows:

- Stage One - Individual lights for the large tree on the south eastern corner of the Williams Street Bridge along with the three plane trees along Raven Quay opposite the library service centre. Also installation of colour change LED lights for six well established trees in Trousselot Park.

- Stage Two – Replace the existing lights under the William Street Bridge with We-eF BUC’s blue light under the bridge (existing lights are repeat faulting and due for replacement). Also installation of the Gobo Projectors on the bridge (following a demonstration for the Board and confirmation of the pattern required). Replace the existing lights on the Williams Street Bridge with the We-eF lights used through the town centre (note - this will require the top of the existing poles to be replaced).

3.7. Ducts have been laid along the stop bank as part of the Riverbank Steps project. Mainpower will need to pull cables through to the new poles and install a controller cabinet for the feature lights.
3.8. Installation of cables and lights could be carried out in Trousselot Park with minimal disruption.

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

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. As relayed through the Board there is considerable support to get feature lighting installed in Kaiapoi Town Centre. There is also an expectation the lighting will be installed by Christmas 2017 and staff are working to achieve that.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. The approved budget for the project with the completed work is detailed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>LTP Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town Centre Project Manager</td>
<td>Previously approved but no plans to implement</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Purchase 178, 178A, 143 Williams St</td>
<td>Sale of surplus property will offset purchase cost. $315,000 returned to date. To be confirmed.</td>
<td>$289,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith Street Off Ramp contribution</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Improvements and North of Bridge in conjunction with the EQ Repair work</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>$630,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raven Quay at Library/Service Centre and Blackwell’s</td>
<td>Complete. Overspend $50k on shared space at the Library Service Centre</td>
<td>$825,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocate Mainpower Kiosk on Williams St</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams Street South of the Bridge and Hilton Street</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>$1,924,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTC Plan Review</td>
<td>Underway. Third funding from the Town Centre Budget.</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Town Centre Linkages with Mixed Use Business Areas</td>
<td>Place holder</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL COMMITTED** $5,299,000

**UNALLOCATED** $701,000

**GRAND TOTAL** $6,000,000
The following projects are likely to be discussed with the Board to be funded from this budget:

- Painting of the Williams Street Bridge. Estimate $30,000.
- Kaiapoi Town Centre Feature Lighting. Estimate for Stage One is $125,000. Estimate for Stage Two is $125,000. The Stage Two estimate is to be refined and will be reported back to the Board.
- New Street lights north of the Williams Street Bridge (to match south of the bridge). High level estimate $400,000 based on Raven Quay to the Railway Line costs.
- Total cost of future works $680,000

5.2. In summary there is approximately $700,000 of ‘committed’ cost to be funded from the Unallocated Town Centre Budget.

5.3. The cost estimates for the remaining work in Kaiapoi Town Centre is high level at this stage and a refinement of the estimate will be required.

6. **CONTEXT**

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

6.2. **Legislation**
Local Government Act 2002

6.3. **Community Outcomes**
There is a safe environment for all
Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable, affordable and sustainable
Businesses in the District are diverse, adaptable, and growing
The distinctive character of our towns, villages and rural areas is maintained
Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality

______________________________  ______________________________
Joanne McBride                Simon Hart
Development Manager           Business and Centres Manager
REPORT

FILE NO and TRIM NO: RGN-06 / 170711071699
REPORT TO: Regeneration Steering Group
DATE OF MEETING: 7 August 2017
FROM: Cathy Batchelor, District Regeneration Communications Advisor
       Roxanne Ramsay, District Regeneration Project Administrator
       Duncan Roxburgh, Implementation Project Manager
SUBJECT: Kaiapoi East Reserve Roading Access Options Consultation Feedback
SIGNED BY: (for Reports to Council or Committees)

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to inform the Regeneration Steering Group of the outcome from the public consultation process, to enable the Steering Group to make a decision and recommendation to Council (if required), for the preferred road access option to the Kaiapoi East sport and recreation reserve.

1.2. In Option 1, Cass Street remains open to access the reserve. This is as shown in the Waimakariri Residential Red Zone Recovery Plan. If this option is adopted as the preferred configuration by the Steering Group, then this will be recommended to Council for approval, and master planning and design for the sport and recreation reserve area will continue in the meantime.

1.3. Option 2 is an alternative option where Cass Street is closed to vehicles at the entrance to the sport and recreation reserve and Jollie Street reinstated. If this option is adopted as the preferred configuration by the Steering Group, then a recommendation report for the Steering Group to Council is required, seeking approval of the preferred option initiating further process with the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet. Master planning and design for the sport and recreation reserve area will continue in the meantime.

1.4. This report is based on the analysis of consultation feedback, received from Wednesday 5 July 2017 up until 5pm, Tuesday 1 August 2017.

Please note; the consultation period closes at 5pm, Wednesday 2 August 2017. A further consultation feedback received between 5pm 1 August and 5pm 2 August 2017 along with any associated change to staff recommendation, will be tabled and present at the meeting on 7 August 2017.

Option 1 – Recovery Plan Option (Cass Street remains open)
22 submissions were in favour of Option 1 (feedback; written-6, online - 15, facebook -

Option 2 – Alternative Option (Cass Street closed to vehicles, Jollie Street reinstated)
4 submissions were in favour of Option 2 (feedback; written - 1, online - 3)
Attachments:

i. Option 1. Recovery Plan Option (access via Cass Street)
ii. Option 2: Alternative option (Cass Street closed to vehicles, Jollie Street reinstated)
iii. Kaiapoi East Regeneration Area Reserve Roading Options – Community Consultation Feedback Summary table (Trim No. 170728079997).

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Regeneration Steering Group recommends:

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 170711071699.

(b) **Approves** the adoption of Option 1 as the preferred configuration to be taken to the next stage of design, based on the feedback from the community consultation, and the staff recommendations within this report.

(c) **Notes** that the outcomes of the community consultation process and the Steering Group resolution will be made public via media release, and direct response to those who made submissions.

3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. Background

3.1.1 Council staff are currently working on the master-planning for the new sport and recreation reserve in Kaiapoi East regeneration area. This reserve is a key component of the approved Recovery Plan.

3.1.2. At the Regeneration Steering Group on 3 July 2017, approval was given for consultation with the community on the Kaiapoi East sport and recreation reserve roading access options. In Option 1, Cass Street remains open to access the reserve. This is as shown in the Waimakariri Residential Red Zone Recovery Plan. Option 2 is an alternative option where Cass Street is closed at the entrance to the sport and recreation reserve and Jollie Street reinstated.

3.2. Community Consultation

3.2.1. Consultation with the community on the two roading access options was scheduled for Wednesday 5 July to Wednesday 2 August 2017. Three sources of feedback were identified for this consultation; written, online and Facebook.

3.2.2. The feedback tools included;

- an online survey link through the Council’s website,
- a written feedback form available at the Kaiapoi and Rangiora Service Centre,
- Facebook engagement.

Feedback required a preference for either option 1 or 2 and the reason for the preference.
3.2.3. Print, online and public display information was prepared and the consultation promoted to residents in the Kaiapoi area and the wider Waimakariri district.

Promotion of the consultation included:

- Emails to strategic partners, local stakeholders and interest groups with the option roading maps on 4 July
- Kaiapoi East Reserve Road Access Options web page on waimakariri.govt.nz/regeneration, a specific set of FAQs and links to the consultation feedback survey web page live from 5 July
- Latest News website article published on 5 July
- Flyers and feedback forms available in the Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre and Rangiora Service Centre from 5 July
- Public signboard display (large sign) on the corner of Williams St and Raven Quay from 7 July
- Four small public signs on street fences near the proposed Kaiapoi East sport and recreation reserve from 6 July
- Double page advertisement in the Kaiapoi Advocate on 14 July
- Northern Outlook Community Noticeboard advertisements on 7, 14, 21 and 28 July
- Digital signage in Kaiapoi and Rangiora Libraries, Rangiora Service Centre and Dudley Aquatic Centre from 5 July
- Facebook posts published on 18 and 28 July
- A news article and link included in the July 2017 Regeneration e-newsletter distributed by email, Council’s website and Facebook on 21 and 25 July
- An article included in the Regeneration quarterly advertorial published in the Kaiapoi Advocate on 28 July
- Regeneration July 2017 video, released on 26 July through Council’s Facebook and website
- Letterbox drops or direct engagement with residents within the regeneration area whose private vehicle access is directly affected by the consideration of roading options.

3.3. Community Consultation Results

3.3.1. Community feedback;

- Twenty two (22) submissions were in favour of Option 1, Cass Street remains open, as per the Recovery Plan (feedback sourced from; written - five, online - fifteen, facebook - one)
- Four (4) submissions were in favour of Option 2, the alternative option to close Cass Street to vehicles (feedback sourced from; written - one, online - three)

The community consultation feedback summary is attached (Attachment iii).

3.3.2. Feedback was also received suggesting an alternative option. One person disagreed with options 1 and 2, due to these roads carrying traffic to two no ext roads, and offered an alternative option 3. This alternative option suggests connecting Cass Street with Jollie Street as a ring road, to take any confusion to access out of the equation, less sign posting for directions on which road to go down for access to any area.

3.3.3. The staff response to the suggested alternative Option 3 suggestion is that whilst a ring road option would provide good access through the new reserve area, there are however several drawbacks, including:
• This adds an additional section of road that would need to be rebuilt.
• It is not considered necessary as both Cass Street and Charles Street are considered to provide sufficient access to the reserve, rural area and private properties.
• For typical or average reserve use Cass Street or Charles Street are considered to be sufficient.
• A ring road could potentially create a ‘crusing route’ for after-hours activities.

It is noted that with slight modification, adoption of option 1 would possibly allow for a ring road to be implemented at some stage in the future if desired, with no loss of sport and recreation area or car parking provision.

3.3.4. The community perspectives for the options are;

Option 1:
• Six submitters referred to the benefits of this roading configuration; keeping Cass St open to Hall St gives better access to what is planned now as well as keeping access to what may eventuate later, is already a major arterial road and built for higher-level traffic, much tidier, no reason for any confusion on approach to the grounds, less traffic on Charles St.
• Eleven submitters referred to the preference for a larger dog park area, which allows space to separately run large and small dogs. Staff response about the dog park area is detailed below in section 3.4.
• One submitter commented about the inclusion of a fitness track surrounding all of this area. Staff response to this comment is the Recovery Plan includes walking and cycling tracks in this area and these tracks will provide connectivity and fitness opportunities within Kaiapoi and the surrounding environs.
• Four submitters include comments in their preference for the design but one submitter states option 2 has a better car park.
• Within the written submissions received for the consultation, the Kaiapoi Softball Club have expressed a preference for option 1. We are still waiting for the feedback from the Kaiapoi Bulldogs Rugby League Club; these are the two principal clubs who have expressed interest in using the new sports fields in the Kaiapoi East sport and recreation reserve area.

Option 2:
• One submitter noted both schemes are good, but felt option 2 is more logical and this option is more central.
• One submitter prefers the design and commented that this will remove all memory of a red zone and move forward to the future.
• One submitter commented that cars wouldn't be driving through the car park and the car park could be closed if need be. The staff response to this comment is that the car park in option 1 is immediately north of Cass Street, and the car park does not actually act as a 'through-road' (traffic movements will involve cars entering and exiting the car park only).
• One submitter commented this will reduce traffic in Cass Street and some facilities will be easier to get to with option 2.

3.4. Dog Park Area Discussion

3.4.1 The space considerations for the dog park area were noted in the Kaiapoi East Reserve Roading Access Options report to the Regeneration Steering Group on 3 July. In both options the dog park is located along the Charles Street boundary. The respective sizes for the dog park achieved for each options are
shown in the following Table 1. The size of the recently built dog park at Milton Reserve in Rangiora is included for comparison purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dog park for Scenario:</th>
<th>Size (approximate)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>2.1 ha</td>
<td>Approx 2 rugby fields equivalent. This would allow fenced enclosures for small and big dogs as well as space for agility equipment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>1.6 ha</td>
<td>This would allow a single fenced enclosure and space for agility equipment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton Reserve Dog Park (for comparison purposes only)</td>
<td>2.6 ha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4.2 The detailed design for the stormwater management area in the Kaiapoi East sport and recreation reserve has not yet been completed. There is a risk that the area required for stormwater management may need to expand, and this would potentially impact on the dog park areas shown in Table 1. In the case of Option 1 there is scope to maintain the dog park size achieved by moving the memorial gardens area further east. For option 2, the dog park area would be comprised and reduce the 1.6 hectare size of the dog park even further, due to being constrained by Jollie Street.

3.5. **Staff Assessment and Recommendation**

3.5.1. A weighted attribute assessment of the two options was carried out by staff, with discussion of assessment criteria, methodology and results included in the previous report to the 3 July Regeneration Steering Group meeting. The weighted assessment criteria showed a marginally higher score for option 1 over option 2. The summary results are reproduced below in Table 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary scores from weighted assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1 (Cass Street remains open)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2 (Jollie Street reinstated)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5.2. As summarised in the previous report, Option 1 scored higher in relation to the following attributes in particular:
- Good access into the reserve
- Easy to find parking (legibility)
- Maximum passive surveillance
- Connection to town centre
- Consistency with Recovery Plan
- Alignment with community expectations.

3.5.3. Based on the feedback from the community, the staff weighted assessment of options, and the additional considerations of potential risk of stormwater management area size impact on the dog park; the staff recommendation is to accept Option 1 as the preferred configuration.

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

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. The purpose of the consultation process was to seek community feedback on the two options proposed for the Katapoi East Reserve Roading Access Options. The community views are included in section 3 of this report.

4.2. The views of the community were sought through the comprehensive consultation processes undertaken during the development of the Recovery Plan. The recommendations included within this report are consistent with the Recovery Plan.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. Cost

5.1.1. The necessary upgrades of the roads retained in either option would need to be funded entirely from the District Regeneration budget. For both options this includes part sections of Charles Street and Cass Street, and for option 2 would also include Jollie Street.

5.1.2. The necessary road removals / decommissioning are budgeted for and funded from the Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery programme budget.

5.1.3. The net effect of costs required for necessary upgrades / modifications of existing roads and utilities is similar for both options.

5.1.4. There is a provisional budget provision of $3.1 million dollars for the development of the sports fields and associated facilities. This includes the playing fields, softball diamonds, on-site car parking, landscaping, drainage public toilets and changing rooms.

5.2. Risks

5.2.1. The potential closure of Cass Street and reinstatement of Jollie Street (as per Option 2) was not included in the Recovery Plan. Staff have not yet approached the Crown, via the Department of Prime Minister in Cabinet and Land Information New Zealand, for formal endorsement or approval of this refinement. Staff have had informal discussions on the proposed refinement in principle and no significant issues were raised.

5.2.2. In order to progress the implementation of the Recovery Plan staff would continue to work on the development of the sport and recreation reserve based on the Regeneration Steering Group resolution, while awaiting feedback from the Crown. There is the potential for rework depending on the response from the Crown.

5.2.3. Option 2, which includes a road network refinement would need approval from the Minister supporting Greater Christchurch Regeneration.
6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. **Policy**

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

6.2. **Legislation**

6.2.1. Reserves Act 1977

6.2.2. Greater Christchurch Regeneration Act 2016

6.3. **Community Outcomes**

6.3.1. There is a safe environment for all

6.3.2. Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality

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

6.3.4. There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision making by local, regional and national organisations that affects our District.
Option 2 - Access via Cass Street and Jollie Street

- Cass Street narrowed with on-street parking. Jollie Street retained.
- Car park (about 300 spaces)
- Area for toilets, changing rooms, & clubrooms
- Main path
- Playing fields (full size, intermediate & junior)
- Glass roundabout & viewing
- Softball diamond & link track (0.25 hectares)
- Area for the community
- Area for the dog park
- Existing pump station
- Proposed new road link between Jollie Drive & Cass Street
- Stormwater management area

[Diagram of the area with numbered points and labels for each feature mentioned above.]
Kaiapoi East Regeneration Area Reserve Roading Access Options – community consultation feedback summary (without names and addresses) – as at 5pm Tuesday 1 August 2017

Written feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitter</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Reason for preference</th>
<th>Key words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Cass Street,</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Keeping Cass St open to Hall St. Gives better access to what is planned now as well as keeping access to what may eventuate later. Why build a new road from Charles Street to Askeaton Park when the centre of Cass Street to Askeaton Park is quite a serviceable road. Charles St east of Jones St is very broken and distorted and would require much work to make it safe for any traffic.</td>
<td>Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Ohoka Road,</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Would like to include a fitness track that surrounds this area. <em>(abridged)</em></td>
<td>Walking &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cycling track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Heywards Rd,</td>
<td>Wrote own option</td>
<td>It seems illogical to have two main roads carrying traffic to two No Exit roads. Connect Cass St with Jollie St and you have a ring road. Simply move the 300 car spaces to one side as in one. If staff disagree then I ask Councillors to consider my suggestion. It would take any confusion to access out of the equation. Less sign posting for directions on which road to go down to access any areas. Seems a no brainer to me.</td>
<td>Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD2 Kaiapoi 7692</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Gray Crescent,</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>So you don't have cars driving though car park and also car park can be closed if need be.</td>
<td>Traffic /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi 7630</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Belcher Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Really good to have a dog park included in the Regeneration Area. Would like small dog area separate from the large dog area. Also provides a place where dog owners can socialise and make friends. <em>(abridged)</em></td>
<td>Dog park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi 7630</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Ohoka Road</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Would like small dog area separate from the large dog area. <em>(abridged)</em></td>
<td>Dog park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi 7630</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Option</td>
<td>What is the reason for your preference?</td>
<td>Key words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray Cres, Kaiapoi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Prefer the design and removing all memory of a redzone and moving forward to the future.</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAllister Pl, Kaiapoi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Less traffic on charles st</td>
<td>Road / traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Pl, Kaiapoi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gives better use of the land, dog park layout / size Better overall flow</td>
<td>Design / dog park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewbridge Rd, Kaiapoi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>larger dog park.</td>
<td>Dog park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitefield Street, Kaiapoi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bigger dog park</td>
<td>Dog park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No address given</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>It would be good to have a small dog area separate from the big dog area as there could be problems if they were both together especially if people don’t have control of their dogs.</td>
<td>Dog park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray Crescent, Kaiapoi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>This option is more central. Both schemes are good but 2 is more logical.</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cass Street, Kaiapoi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>it is already a major arterial rd and built for higher level traffic</td>
<td>Road / traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Street, Rangiora</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Much tidier, no reason for any confusion on approach to the grounds. Existing owner can access property is a shorter route.</td>
<td>Road / property access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Woodend Beach Road</td>
<td>The bigger dog park. We have the space. Use it.</td>
<td>Dog park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Main North Road, RD1, Kaiapoi</td>
<td>I just like the option1 layout. More effective.</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Adderley Tce, Kaiapoi</td>
<td>Better layout for spectators as a viewing platform is on the south side which will cut the southerly BUT: option 2 has a better car park</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Cass Street, Kaiapoi</td>
<td>Reduce the traffic in Cass Street. Some facilities will easier to get to with option 2.</td>
<td>Traffic / design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Gray Cres, Kaiapoi</td>
<td>Larger dog park, closer BMX track</td>
<td>Dog park / BMX track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Mill Road, Ohoka, R D 2, Kaiapoi</td>
<td>I like the idea of driving or walking down Cass St to the proposed recreation park, Car park &amp; dog park,</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Adderley Terrace Kaiapoi</td>
<td>Cass Street is already there and open and gives good access to the boat ramp at Askeaton. I would like to see a dog park with areas for small &amp; large dogs and if option 2 goes ahead the dog park will be reduced in size and not have separate areas. A lot of small dogs are intimidated by bigger playful dogs and we should have the best dog park possible and get it right the first time.</td>
<td>Dog park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Cumberland Place</td>
<td>I would love a dog park with two separate dog areas to separate the two different sizes of dogs. It would be great to also include natural materials to create different obstacles for the dogs, whilst also making them weather proof so they don't deteriorate like the ones are doing at the Groynes. Please include access to water for the dogs to be able to drink as well :) I think introducing a dog park to the Kaiapoi area is absolutely fantastic and is much needed! A great use of red zone land.</td>
<td>Dog park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Moore St, Kaiapoi</td>
<td>1) larger dog park 2) Keeps sports facilities and public away from long suffering residents allowing them to get on with their lives. 3) Keeps facilities near the township</td>
<td>Dog park / design - sports facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Facebook engagement / comments

18 July facebook post

- Eighteen people (including groups) engaged; 8 comments, 5 comment link shares and 5 post shares
- One specific comment for Option 1 – because there may be some dogs chasing BMX bikes if too close and yes to bigger dog park.

Consultation feedback responses as at 5pm 1 August 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Written</th>
<th>Online</th>
<th>Facebook</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total 27</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE REGENERATION STEERING GROUP HELD IN THE RUATANIWHA KAIAPOI CIVIC CENTRE ON MONDAY 7 AUGUST 2017 AT 4.00PM.

PRESENT:

Kaiapoi Community Board – A Blackie (Chair), J Watson, P Redmond, S Stewart, C Greengrass, R Blair, J Meyer, N Atkinson.

Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust (Chair) representative A Joliffe; D Ayers (Mayor); J Palmer (Chief Executive); C Sargison (Manager Community and Recreation); D Roxborough (Implementation Project Manager - District Regeneration).

Jackie Watson arrives at 5pm.

Alan Joliffe departs at 5.30pm.

David Ayers departs at 5.15 pm.

IN ATTENDANCE:

Hamish Crombie (LINZ), Brent Cairns (Kaiapoi Food Forest)

1. **APOLOGIES**

   Moved: A Blackie  Seconded: P Redmond

   An apology was received and sustained from M Pinkham, J Barr and C McKay for absence.

   An apology was received and sustained from J Watson for lateness.  CARRIED

2. **CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**

   Moved: J Meyer  Seconded: C Greengrass

   THAT the Regeneration Steering Group:

   Confirms as a true and correct record the minutes of a meeting held on Monday 31 July 2017.  CARRIED
3. **MATTERS ARISING**

Nil.

4. **DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS**

**KAIAPOI FOOD FOREST**

On behalf of the Kaiapoi Food Forest Trust, Brent Cairns presented the Trust’s vision, ten year plan and introduced the Trustees. The vision and purpose of the Kaiapoi Food Forest is to connect, nourish, educate and inspire. The Trust’s website is kai.net.nz.

The Regeneration Steering Group thanked Mr Cairns for his presentation, congratulated the Trustees work to date and acknowledged the Food Forest’s vision is exciting for Kaiapoi.

S Stewart and R Blair asked what funding support the Trust is expecting from the Council. B Cairns replied the Trust needs an agreement with the Council for the land and $45,000 is required for year 1; moving fruit trees from the Kaiapoi East Regeneration Area, water, fencing and pathways. To move trees will cost $7,500.

C Sargison advised staff would prepare a report for the September Regeneration Steering Group meeting that will include the details for a licence to occupy and the principles of how Council will work with the Trust. A Blackie advised there would be a briefing about the Food Forest following the meeting tonight.

D Ayers asked how much conversation the Trust has undertaken with the immediate neighbours.

B Cairns replied this has been limited until there is approval for discussion with the neighbours.

C Sargison noted wider public communications would be developed and this will include making direct contact with immediate neighbours.

J Meyer asked how may trees can you move for $7500. How will these trees be affected by the move, will they survive.

C Sargison replied this involved work over two days to move approximately 12 trees, and if this work is to go ahead will be undertaken in the next month.

5. **LINZ UPDATE**

Hamish Crombie, Project Lead – Waimakariri Recovery Plan from LINZ advised good progress has been made on the Crown’s Land Divestment Plan which is currently being reviewed internally. LINZ are planning to share the Plan with the Minister later this month or early September. LINZ are currently drafting an initial agreement which has been drawn from the Recovery Plan and will share this with Council and the Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust. This is not the final document but ultimately how the land will divest.

6. **REPORTS**

6.1 **DISTRICT REGENERATION – DRAFT ROAD STOPPING PLANS**

That report No. 170710071095 sits on the table until after the Kaiapoi East Reserve Roading Access Options report decision is agreed and the Council approval of the Regeneration Steering Group’s recommended option.

C Sargison advised this will also include the Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust’s decision of road stopping through their land

Moved: D Ayers  
Seconded: N Atkinson
6.2 KAIAPOI EAST RESERVE ROADING ACCESS OPTIONS CONSULTATION FEEDBACK

C Sargison refers to the consultation feedback documents on the table and the option 1 and 2 maps.

D Roxborough refers to the consultation feedback from the community and the staff weighting which led staff to recommended Option 1 as the preferred option.

C Sargison referred to the size of the dog park and the example of the comparable size of the Milton Ave Dog Park in Rangiora and the high level of usage by the community; in Option 1 the area is 2.1 hectares and Option 2 the area is 1.6 hectares where there will be limited ability to have two areas for big and little dogs.

C Sargison advised that Gerard Cleary, WDC Manager Roading & Utilities, has confirmed the area for the stormwater management would be sufficient and if required the stormwater management area further east could become bigger. This mitigates the risk referred to in the report.

A Joliffe asked if the stormwater management area will contain water all year; C Sargison advised it will.

N Atkinson asked if the stormwater management area could be included in the dog park. C Sargison replied it could be, but it would not be usable due to planting at the edges designed for treatment of water run off.

D Ayers asked if Corcoran Reserve could ever be used. C Sargison suggested a workshop should be facilitated about what the Corcoran Reserve is used for such as passive recreation, Maritime Trust, a wider art sculpture trail, treatment of the Corcoran Reserve through to the Askeaton boat ramp, walkways, viewing platforms.

N Atkinson commented that it is the sizing of the dog park areas that is the key feedback for option 1 and for option 2 it is around traffic and road safety.

J Meyer asked if the BMX track could go on the Morgan Williams Reserve and would this allow the dog park to be a larger area, and suggests Option 2’s car park could be positioned in the same place as shown on Option 1.

At 5.15pm D Ayers apologises for leaving the meeting early and states his preference for Option 1.

S Stewart acknowledges there are elements in both options that appeal; Option 2’s Jollie Street gives a separation of the dog park and the Memorial Gardens and would like to see this buffer and Option’s 1 dog park is larger.

N Atkinson states Option 2’s closing of Cass Street will allow a safer option, there are more parking options and this allows the increased growth of the sports clubs to be future proofed.

J Palmer acknowledged the desire for the community to have a dog park and the size required must meet the needs and be future proofed. Safety and design to be paramount. There should be a buffer between the dog park and the Memorial Gardens. Option 1 allows for the Memorial Gardens to be moved further east. Option 2 restricts the ability to give further space to the east for the dog park area due to Jollie Street.

Moved: N Atkinson
Seconded: A Blackie

THAT the Regeneration Steering Group recommends:

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No.170711071699.

(b) Approves the adoption of Option 2 as the preferred configuration for the sports and recreation reserve and roading configuration subject to Crown approval.

(c) Requests staff to provide alternate configuration of the dog park and BMX facility to achieve a dog park no smaller than was provided on Option 1.
(d) **Notes** that the alternate configuration may include use of the Corcoran Reserve.

(e) **Notes** that the outcomes of the community consultation process and the Steering Group resolution will be made public via media release, and direct response to those who made submissions.

A Jolliffe, J Palmer and C Sargison abstained

CARRIED

7. **COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT**

7.1 **DISTRICT REGENERATION COMMUNICATIONS REPORT – JULY 2017**

D Roxborough advised the draft August 2017 Regeneration Newsletter will be circulated to the Regeneration Steering Group prior to publication.

Moved: A Blackie  
Seconded: J Watson

**THAT** the Regeneration Steering Group:

(a) **Receives** report N° 170726079072.

(b) **Approves** content for the August 2017 Regeneration Newsletter.

CARRIED

8. **MATTERS REFERRED FROM COUNCIL**

Nil.

9. **GENERAL**

Nil.

10. **MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED**

*Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987*

Moved: A Blackie  
Seconded: P Redmond

**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)</td>
<td>Riverview Pontoon Feasibility Study and Preferred Option</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 5.55pm.

The public excluded portion of the meeting concluded at 5.58pm and the open meeting was resumed.

11. NEXT MEETING

The next scheduled meeting of the Regeneration Steering Group commences at 4.00pm on Monday 4 September 2017 at the Ruataniwha Centre, Kaiapoi.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS THE MEETING CLOSED AT 6PM.
WAIMAKARI District Council

REPORT

FILE NO: RDG-32-62-01/170808084823

REPORT TO: Hearings Panel for the sealing of Barkers Road targeted rate

DATE OF MEETING: 22 August 2017

FROM: Ken Stevenson, Roading Manager

SUBJECT: Establishment of targeted rate for the sealing of Barkers Road (Loburn)

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to present the written submissions from the Special Consultative Procedure (SCP) for the targeted rate for the sealing of Barkers Road to enable the Hearings Panel to prepare for the hearings on Tuesday 22 August 2017.

1.2. The proposal was to put in place a targeted rate on those properties as shown on the map in the attached Statement of Proposal to enable the property owners to pay, through their rates, for their share of the cost of sealing the sections of Barkers Road adjacent to their properties.

1.3. Property owners were given the option of paying their share by one separate lump sum payment or a targeted rate over 10 years to repay a loan.

1.4. A total of 5 submissions have been received. 4 submitters support the proposal while, one do not support the proposal. No submitters indicated they wished to be heard.

1.5. It is proposed that the Hearings Panel will deliberate on the submissions on Tuesday, 22 August and from those deliberations make a recommendation to Council.

1.6. Attached for the panel’s information is a copy of the Statement of Proposal along with all of the written submissions and a summary of the submissions.

1.7. It is noted that the targeted rate is a means to help property owners pay their share to enable Barkers Road to be sealed. If the targeted rate is declined the road can still be sealed provided the property owners as a whole pay the $48,408 (incl GST) to the Council.

Attachment:
   i. Copy of Statement of Proposal (Doc 170220015597)
   ii. Summary of the submissions (Doc 170810085650)
   iii. Copy of all written submissions (Doc’s; 170807083681, 170807083659, 170801081566, 170731080688 and 170719075271)
2. **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Hearing Panel:

(a) **Receives** report No. 170808084823

(b) **Receives and considers** all submissions.

(c) **Notes** that 5 written submissions were received on the proposal to put in place a targeted rate for the sealing of Barkers Road, with 4 supporting the targeted rate and one submission not supporting the targeted rate.

(d) **Notes** that the Hearings Panel will consider these submissions and make a recommendation to the Council on whether to approve the targeted rate or not approve the targeted rate.

(e) **Recommends** to the Council that:

Either

1. **Approves** the targeted rate for the sealing of Barkers Road as detailed in the Statement of Proposal (Doc 170220015597).

2. **Notes** that property owners have the option of paying by lump sum rather than by a targeted rate.

Or

3. **Declines** to approve the targeted rate for the sealing of Barkers Road as detailed in the Statement of Proposal (Doc 170220015597).

4. **Notes** that Barkers Road can still be sealed if the property owners pay the $48,408 (inc GST) to top up the financial contribution to reach the 30% trigger for sealing noting that the targeted rate was just a means to help property owners pay their share.

3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

3.1. The Council approved the sealing of Barkers Road on the condition the property owners pay a contribution to top up the financial contributions to reach the 30% trigger as provided by the Rural Seal Extension Policy. While the majority of the property owners agreed to pay by lump sum a number stated their preferred method of payment was by a targeted rate.

3.2. On 7 March 2017 the Council approved the commencement of the Special Consultative Procedure for the targeted rate.

3.3. The proposal gave property owners the option of paying their share by a lump sum payment rather than a targeted rate on their property.

3.4. The consultation period opened on Friday 7 July 2017 and closed on Monday 7 August 2017. All affected Barkers Road property owners were sent a letter with the Statement of Proposal attached. The proposal was also advertised in the local newspapers and Council’s webpage. Copies of the Statement of Proposal were on display at all Council service centres and libraries.
3.5. A total of 5 submissions have been received with 4 supporting the proposal and one not supporting the proposal and this is detailed in attachments.

3.6. The submitter who did not support the proposal noted that they would pay a further contribution if they were to subdivide after the road is sealed. This is not correct as once the road is sealed no further financial contributions can be taken for upgrading Barkers Road.

3.7. Subject to the decision the timetable would be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submissions closed</td>
<td>7 August 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing of submissions</td>
<td>22 August 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions to Council</td>
<td>5 September 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters to residents sent</td>
<td>7 September 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options for lump sum close</td>
<td>30 September 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion to AP 2018/19</td>
<td>Jan 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st charge on rates</td>
<td>1 July 2018 – 30 June 2019 rating year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. Earlier this year the Council sought feedback from the Barkers Road property owners on their willingness to pay a share of sealing Barkers Road and on their preferred method of payment with the options being by lump sum payment or through a targeted rate. 27 properties front onto this section of Barkers Road however one property is owned by the Council so 26 properties have private owners. Of the 26 properties written to 22 returned a completed feedback form. 20 of the 22 agreed to pay and of those 7 preferred a targeted rate with the remainder preferring a lump sum payment.

4.2. The SCP has enabled property owners to formally submit on the proposal with the opportunity to speak to their submission.

4.3. The Statement of Proposal has been sent to all affected property owners and was advertised in the local newspapers inviting submissions.

4.4. Compared with the number of property owners the number of formal submissions to this SCP is low. This is possibly due to the fact most property owners provided feedback when requested earlier this year as noted above. This feedback showed there is widespread support for paying to seal the road.

4.5. A copy of the submissions and a summary of the submissions are attached to this report.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. The Council approved a price of $419,237 from Sicon Ltd for the sealing work on 7 March 2017, subject to the property owners paying their share.

5.2. The rural seal extension policy requires financial contributions to be at least 30% of the cost of the sealing, or $125,771 in this case.

5.3. Financial Contributions from the developers of the land in Barkers Road are currently $83,677; therefore the difference of $42,094 is required to be paid by the property owners.

5.4. All of the above amounts exclude GST. The property owners share will include GST.

5.5. The property owners share is, therefore, $42,094 plus GST, or $48,408 spread over 27 properties. That equates to $1793 (including GST) per property. Property owners have previously been told the contribution per property would be in the order of $1,800.
6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. **Policy**

This matter should be considered by the Council, as it relates to a new rate.

Council has appointed Councillors Meyer, Doody, and Williams to consider submissions and make recommendations to the Council.

6.2. **Legislation**

The provisions of the Local Government Act and the Rating Powers Act are relevant to this matter.

Under the Local Government Act a Special Consultative Procedure is required to be followed when setting targeted rates.

6.3. **Community Outcomes**

There is a safe environment for all:

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

Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable, affordable and sustainable

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

Ken Stevenson
Roading Manager
Statement of proposal for a targeted rate for

Barkers Road Property Owners

Public submissions are required by:
Monday 7 August 2017
Contents

1. Summary of Information
2. Statement of Proposal
3. Map
4. Submission Form
Summary of Information

Proposed Targeted Rate for Barkers Road (Loburn) property owners for their contribution for sealing Barkers Road adjacent to their properties

The Council proposes to put in place a Targeted Rate on those properties as shown on the attached map to enable the property owners to pay, through their rates, for their share of the cost of sealing the sections of Barkers Road adjacent to their properties as shown on the attached map.

Property owners will have the option of paying their share by one separate lump sum payment or a targeted rate over 10 years to repay a loan.

In recent years a number of subdivisions were developed on Barkers Road. As this road is an unsealed road, the developers of these subdivisions were required to and have paid financial contributions to the Council for their share of sealing Barkers Road.

The Council policy for sealing unsealed roads using financial contributions is that “The Council will seal all rural unsealed roads when financial contributions from subdivisions to at least 30% of the cost of sealing the road are available.”

The cost of sealing the section of Barkers Road as shown on the attached map is $419,237 (excluding GST). The financial contributions are $83,677 (excluding GST) or 20% of the cost of sealing. To reach the 30% level required by the policy the financial contributions would need to be $125,771 (excluding GST) therefore, there is a shortfall of $42,094 (excluding GST).

Over the past few years property owners along Barkers Road have regularly requested the Council to seal the road because the dust from the roads has a very negative impact on their quality of life and the road surface is often rough. The Council has agreed to fund the 70% cost of the sealing as required by the policy on the condition the property owners pay the balance of $42,094 plus GST. This amounts to $1,793 (including GST) per property.

The Council’s 70% share of the sealing is included in the Council’s Long Term Plan in the 2017/18 year.

The Council has sought feedback from the Barkers Road property owners on their willingness to pay this share and on their preferred method of payment with the options being by lump sum payment or through a targeted rate. The majority of the property owners agreed to pay their share and a number of property owners preferred to pay through a targeted rate.

It is on the basis of this feedback that this proposal is being put forward in order to formalise the targeted rate.

The lump sum payment option will be $1,793.00 (including GST) per property and payable by 30 September 2017.

The targeted rate option will be $232.19 per year (including GST) for a period of 10 years per property. This amount includes interest on the loan the Council will need to take out to fund the work. The targeted rate will apply from 1 July 2018 and will end on 30 June 2029.
Copies of the Proposal

Copies of the Statement of Proposal for the proposed targeted rate can be picked up or viewed at any Council Service Centre or Library during ordinary office hours, or downloaded from the Council’s website: waimakariri.govt.nz, during the consultation period.

Submissions

Submissions on this proposal can be made to the Council between 7 July 2017 and 7 August 2017. Please include a name and address. Anonymous feedback will be considered at the Council’s discretion.

The submissions will be heard by a Council Hearing Panel on 22 August 2017 at 6:30pm at the Council building in Rangiora. Please state if you wish to speak to your submission at the Hearing. Submissions on this proposal can be made either:

Email: records@wmk.govt.nz

Post: Barkers Road Submissions
Freepost 1667
Waimakariri District Council
Private Bag 1005
Rangiora

Hand deliver: The Council building at 215 High Street, Rangiora or any Library branch or Service Centre.

For more Information:

Contact:
Ken Stevenson – Roading Manager
03 311 8947 / 03 327 6834 (toll free)

Email: ken.stevenson@wmk.govt.nz
Statement of Proposal

Statement of Proposal for a Targeted Rate for Barkers Road (Loburn) property owners for their contribution for sealing Barkers Road adjacent to their properties

Introduction

This Statement of Proposal is prepared to formalise the funding arrangement for the sealing of Barkers Road as shown on the attached Draft Rating Policy map and is made under Section 83 of the Local Government Act 2002.

The documents relating to this proposal are attached to this Statement of Proposal. Copies of the Statement of Proposal are also available on the Council’s website at waimakariri.govt.nz and at all Council Service Centres and Libraries during the consultation period which runs from 7 July 2017 to 7 August 2017.

Nature of Proposal

The Council proposes to introduce a Targeted Rate for inclusion in the 2018/19 Draft Annual Plan under Sections 16-18 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 to fund the property owners’ share of the cost of sealing the sections of Barkers Road as shown on the attached map.

The Targeted Rate will be a fixed amount on each rating unit situated within the Barkers Road Rating Area, illustrated on the attached map, where a lump sum contribution was not received prior to 30 September 2017.

The proposed rate will take effect from 1 July 2018 for a period of 10 years, ending on 30 June 2029.

The amount of the targeted rate will be $232.19 per year (including GST). This amount includes interest on the loan the Council will need to take out to fund the work.

Property owners will have the option of paying a one-off lump sum of $1,793.00 (including GST) by 30 September 2017, instead of having a targeted rate applied to their property.

Any future subdivisions within the new rating area will be required to contribute towards the outstanding balance of the rating area account.

As part of this targeted rate process the Council invites the affected property owners and members of the public to comment on the proposal.

Reason for this Proposal

Background

In recent years a number of subdivisions were developed on Barkers Road. As Barkers Road is an unsealed road, the developers of these subdivisions were required to and have paid financial contributions to the Council for their share of sealing Barkers Road. The contributions paid were based on the impact the additional traffic that would be generated from the developments would have on Barkers Road.

Since that time the Council has received complaints from people who have built houses on Barkers Road about the dust from the road and the road condition.
In August 2016 Barkers Road property owners presented a petition to the Council requesting Barkers Road be sealed. Council staff then worked with the petition organisers to work out a way of getting the road sealed under existing Council policies. This included an option of the property owners contributing to the cost of the sealing.

**Council Policy for Sealing Unsealed Roads**

The Council policy for sealing unsealed roads using financial contributions states that “The Council will seal all rural unsealed roads when financial contributions from subdivisions to at least 30% of the cost of sealing the road are available.”

The cost of sealing the sections of Barkers Road as shown on the attached map is $419,237 (excluding GST). Financial contributions would need to be at least $125,771 (excluding GST) in order for the sealing to take place.

**Barkers Road Financial Contributions**

The current financial contributions for sealing the sections of Barkers Road as shown on the attached map are $83,677 (excluding GST) therefore there is a shortfall of $42,094 (excluding GST).

**Council Decisions and Long Term Plan Provisions**

In November 2016 the Utilities and Roading Committee approved the sealing of Barkers Road between Swamp Road and 530 / 534 / 538 Barkers Road under the Seal Extension Policy subject to the adjoining property owners agreeing to pay the difference between the current financial contributions and the amount required to reach 30% of the cost of the sealing.

In March 2017 the Council approved the commencement of a Special Consultative Procedure for a targeted rate for the sealing of Barkers Road between Swamp Road and 530 / 534 / 538 Barkers Road. The Council also approved a price of $419,237 from Sicon Ltd for the sealing work, subject to the outcome of the Special Consultative Procedure.

Accepting the price from Sicon Ltd gives certainty on the amount to be paid by the property owners.

There is funding available in the Roading Subdivision Contribution Budget in the 2017/18 year for the Council’s share of the sealing.

**Barkers Road Consultation**

As noted above the Barkers Road property owners presented a petition to the Council in August 2016 requesting Barkers Road be sealed. Council staff then worked with the petition organisers to look at how the road might get sealed.

On 2 November 2016 Barkers Road property owners were invited to a meeting at the Loburn School Hall to discuss options for sealing the road. This included the option of the Barkers Road residents contributing to the cost. The majority of those at the meeting agreed with the option of paying a contribution to get the road sealed.

However, in order to obtain all property owners views it was agreed that the Council would write to all property owners seeking feedback on their willingness to pay and their preferred payment method.

This was carried out between November 2016 and February 2017 and of the 26 properties written to 22 returned a completed feedback form. 20 of the 22 agreed to pay and of those 7 preferred a targeted rate.

It is on the basis of this feedback that this proposal is being put forward in order to formalise the targeted rate.
Options Available to the Council

The following options are available to the Council

1. **Put in place a targeted rate as per this proposal.**
   
   This option meets the wishes of the property owners who are willing to pay a share of the sealing but prefer the targeted rate to make it affordable to them. This option would require all property owners within the Proposed Target Rate Area to contribute to the cost, including those who are opposed. This is likely to be the only option that would guarantee the road being sealed.

2. **Do not put in place a targeted rate and request the property owners pay their share by lump sum**
   
   This option would most likely result in the road not being sealed as some property owners are unable to afford the lump sum or are not willing to pay the lump sum. If the road is not sealed the property owners will continue to be negatively impacted by the dust and road condition.

3. **Do not seal the roads now and wait for more development to take place**
   
   The Council has already agreed to seal the roads on the condition the property owners pay their share and so this option would not be consistent with Council decisions.

Community Outcomes

The sealing of Barkers Road will contribute to the following community outcomes:

There is a safe environment for all
- Crime, Injury and road accidents are minimised.
- Harm to people from natural and man-made hazards is minimised and our district has the capacity and resilience to respond to natural disasters.

Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable, affordable and sustainable
- The standard of our District’s roads is keeping pace with increasing traffic numbers.

Related Documents

The following documents are attached to this Statement of Proposal and form part of the Statement of Proposal:

- Summary of Information
- Draft Rating Policy map

Ken Stevenson
Roading Manager
Submission Form

Any individual or organisation can make a written submission. We welcome both general and detailed comment. Your submission will be considered by Council in an open meeting. Please complete the name and contact details below. Anonymous feedback will be considered at the Council’s discretion.

**Please return your submission no later than 7 August 2017.**

Organisation
(if applicable):

*Name: ____________________________________________

Email: ____________________________________________

Primary Phone: ____________________________ Alternate Phone: ____________________________

*Postal Address: ____________________________________________

City: ____________________________ Postcode: ____________________________

We welcome your opinion on the options below or any other aspect of the Proposal.

**Your Submission**

**Option 1)**  *Put in place a targeted rate as per this proposal.*

**Option 2)**  *Do not put in place a targeted rate and request the property owners pay their share by lump sum.*

**Option 3)**  *Do not seal the roads now and wait for more development to take place.*

*Please complete name and address details. Anonymous feedback will be considered at the Council’s discretion.*
4) Your opinion on any other aspects of the proposal.

Please attach additional pages as required

Hearings – Dates/Times
If you would like to present your submission in person the hearings will take place on 22 August 2017 at 6.30pm at the Council’s Rangiora Service Centre.

Mail to: Barker Road Submissions
Free Post 1667
Waimakariri District Council
Private Bag 1005
Rangiora 7440

Submit by email:
records@wmk.govt.nz
### Proposed Targeted Rate for sealing Barkers Road - Public Summary of Submissions 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBMITTER</th>
<th>ADDRESS 1</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Do not Support</th>
<th>Trim Number</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Submission points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graham and Dianna Bevins</td>
<td>326 Barkers Road</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>170630067911</td>
<td>Option 3. Do not seal the road now and wait for more development to take place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. For a number of years we've paid more to road maintenance and still do in our WDC rates, more than the majority of the land holders in the proposed new rating area. 2. Therefore we would be paying additional contribution should sealing go ahead. 3. Thirdly we pay again should we subdivide... Gee lucky us! We are funding the need for an upgrade that is not of our making. 4. The completely spurious statement that the &quot;crime, injury and road accidents are minimised&quot; is, in our view, misleading. We feel it would place children and animals at far greater jeopardy with the inevitable increase in traffic speeds.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raewyn and Reginald Hardy</td>
<td>479 Barkers Road</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>170801081566</td>
<td>Option 1. Put in place a targeted rate as per this proposal</td>
<td>Support Option 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesley and Rick McCaw</td>
<td>424 Barkers Road</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>170807083659</td>
<td>Option 1. Put in place a targeted rate as per this proposal</td>
<td>Support Option 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma and Jeremy Parker</td>
<td>460 Barkers Road</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>170807083681</td>
<td>Option 1. Put in place a targeted rate as per this proposal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It is our opinion that having this road sealed is going to be the best thing for our Community and increase our enjoyment of living where we do. The damage and dust on our vehicles will be reduced - no pot holes / dust. The amount of dust in our homes will diminish. My son is already talking of sying to High School / Rangiora once the road is sealed - so he has a chance to be more independant. I am also sure that the $1793.00 we pay to do this will be re-imbursed with an increase of property value. Selling properties on sealed roads is much easier than on an unsealed one. Our whole family is in approval of this and we thank the Council for hearing us and making this possible. Please note that we have now decided to put the cost of this onto our rates rather than pay the lump sum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny Wilkinson and Dave Cutfield</td>
<td>361 Barkers Road</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>170719072271</td>
<td>Inwards Correspondence</td>
<td>Support Option 1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LET'S TALK
ABOUT THE PROPOSAL TO SEAL BARKERS ROAD

Submission Form

Any individual or organisation can make a written submission. We welcome both general and detailed comment. Your submission will be considered by Council in an open meeting. Please complete the name and contact details below. Anonymous feedback will be considered at the Council's discretion.

Please return your submission no later than 7 August 2017.

Organisation (If applicable):

*Name: I D Beving
Email: tony.dinz.2@gmail.com
Primary Phone: 03 328 3266 Alternate Phone: 03 328 6469
*Postal Address: 386 Barkers Road, Rangiora, RD2
City: Chch Postcode: 7472

We welcome your opinion on the options below or any other aspect of the Proposal.

Your Submission

Option 1) Put in place a targeted rate as per this proposal.

Option 2) Do not put in place a targeted rate and request the property owners pay their share by lump sum.

Option 3) Do not seal the roads now and wait for more development to take place.

*Please complete name and address details. Anonymous feedback will be considered at the Council's discretion.
4) Your opinion on any other aspects of the proposal.

Hearings - Dates/Times
If you would like to present your submission in person the hearings will take place on 22 August 2017 at 6.30pm at the Council's Rangiora Service Centre.

Mail to: Barkers Road Submissions
         Free Post 1667
         Waimakariri District Council
         Private Bag 1005
         Rangiora 7440

Submit by email:
records@wmk.govt.nz

Please attach additional pages as required.
OPTION THREE

Our objections are based on the following:

1) For a number of years we’ve paid more to roading contribution and still do in our WDC rates, more than the majority of the land holders in the proposed new rating area.
2) Therefore we would be paying an additional contribution should sealing go ahead.
3) Thirdly we pay again should we subdivide... Gee lucky us!!

We are funding the need for an upgrade that is not of our making.

4) The completely spurious statement that the “crime, injury and road accidents are minimised” is, in our view, misleading. We feel it would place children and animals at far greater jeopardy with the inevitable increase in traffic speeds.

Graham and Dianna Bevins
Submission Form

Any individual or organisation can make a written submission. We welcome both general and detailed comment. Your submission will be considered by Council in an open meeting. Please complete the name and contact details below. Anonymous feedback will be considered at the Council’s discretion.

Please return your submission no later than 7 August 2017.

Organisation (if applicable): 
*Name: Jenny & Davis Cuttford
Email: jenny.wilkinson@hotmail.co.nz
Primary Phone: 027 557 8521 Alternate Phone: 
*Postal Address: 391 Barkers Road Rd
City: Ruakura
Postcode: 7472

We welcome your opinion on the options below or any other aspect of the Proposal.

Your Submission

Option 1) Put in place a targeted rate as per this proposal.

Option 2) Do not put in place a targeted rate and request the property owners pay their share by lump sum

Option 3) Do not seal the roads now and wait for more development to take place.

*Please complete name and address details. Anonymous feedback will be considered at the Council’s discretion.
Your Submission continued

4) Your opinion on any other aspects of the proposal.

Hearings - Dates/Times
If you would like to present your submission in person the hearings will take place on 22 August 2017 at 6.30pm at the Council’s Ra Service Centre.

Mail to: Barkers Road Submissions
Free Post 1667
Waimakariri District Council
Private Bag 1005
Rangiora 7440

Submit by email: records@wmk.govt.nz
Submit the proposal to seal Barkers Road

About the Proposal to Seal Barkers Road

Submission Form

Any individual or organisation can make a written submission. We welcome both general and detailed comment. Your submission will be considered by Council in an open meeting. Please complete the name and contact details below. Anonymous feedback will be considered at the Council’s discretion.

Please return your submission no later than 7 August 2017.

Organisation (if applicable): N/A

*Name: RAEWYN & REGINALD HARDY

Email: rcpaparamu@outlook.com

Primary Phone: 03 312 8809 Alternate Phone: 021 1682 2377

*Postal Address: 479 BARKERS RD RD2

City: RANGIORA Postcode: 7472

We welcome your opinion on the options below or any other aspect of the Proposal.

Your Submission

Option 1) Put in place a targeted rate as per this proposal.

Option 2) Do not put in place a targeted rate and request the property owners pay their share by lump sum

Option 3) Do not seal the roads now and wait for more development to take place.

*Please complete name and address details. Anonymous feedback will be considered at the Council’s discretion.

WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

waimakariri.gov
4) Your opinion on any other aspects of the proposal.

Hearings – Dates/Times
If you would like to present your submission in person the hearings will take place on 22 August 2017 at 6.30pm at the Council’s Rangiora Service Centre.

Mail to: Bankers Road Submissions
Free Post 1667
Waimakariri District Council
Private Bag 1005
Rangiora 7440

Submit by email:
records@wmkgovt.nz
Submission Form

Any individual or organisation can make a written submission. We welcome both general and detailed comment. Your submission will be considered by Council in an open meeting. Please complete the name and contact details below. Anonymous feedback will be considered at the Council’s discretion.

Please return your submission no later than 7 August 2017.

Organisation (if applicable):
*Name: LESLEY RICK MCCAW.
Email:
Primary Phone: 0375327882 Alternate Phone:
*Postal Address: 424 BARKERS RD.
City: LOBURU Postcode:

We welcome your opinion on the options below or any other aspect of the Proposal.

Your Submission

Option 1) Put in place a targeted rate as per this proposal.

YES, IN FAVOUR OF OPTION 1.

Option 2) Do not put in place a targeted rate and request the property owners pay their share by lump sum

Option 3) Do not seal the roads now and wait for more development to take place.

*Please complete name and address details. Anonymous feedback will be considered at the Council’s discretion.
Your Submission continued

4) Your opinion on any other aspects of the proposal.

Hearings – Dates/Times
If you would like to present your submission in person the hearings will take place on 22 August 2017 at 6.30pm at the Council’s Ra Service Centre.

Mail to: Barkers Road Submissions
Free Post 1667
Waimakariri District Council
Private Bag 1005
Rangiora 7440

Submit by email:
records@wmk.govt.nz
Submission Form

Any individual or organisation can make a written submission. We welcome both general and detailed comment. Your submission will be considered by Council in an open meeting. Please complete the name and contact details below. Anonymous feedback will be considered at the Council’s discretion.

Please return your submission no later than 7 August 2017.

Organisation (if applicable):

*Name: Emma + Jeremy Parker
Email: stonyfield460@gmail.com
Primary Phone: 03 3123863 Alternate Phone: 021 1515788
*Postal Address: 460 Barkers Rd, Lohin, RD2
City: Rangiora Postcode: 7472

We welcome your opinion on the options below or any other aspect of the Proposal.

Your Submission

Option 1) Put in place a targeted rate as per this proposal.
This is our choice for this Submission.

Option 2) Do not put in place a targeted rate and request the property owners pay their share by lump sum

Option 3) Do not seal the roads now and wait for more development to take place.

*Please complete name and address details. Anonymous feedback will be considered at the Council’s discretion.
Your opinion on any other aspects of the proposal.

It is an opinion that having this road sealed is going to be the best thing for our community and increase our enjoyment of living where we do.

The damage and dust on our vehicles will be reduced - no pot holes/dust.

The amount of dust in our homes will diminish.

My son is already talking of cycling to high school/Rangiora once the road is sealed - so he has a chance to be more independent.

I am also sure that the $1793.00 we pay to do this will be re-imburseable with an increase of property value. Selling properties on sealed roads is much easier than on an unsealed one.

Our whole family is in approval of this and we thank the Council for having us and making this possible.

Please note that we have now decided to put the cost of this onto our rates rather than pay the lump sum.

Hearings – Dates/Times
If you would like to present your submission in person the hearings will take place on 22 August 2017 at 6.30pm at the Council’s Rail Service Centre.

Mail to: Barkers Road Submissions
         Free Post 1667
         Waimakariri District Council
         Private Bag 1005
         Rangiora 7440

Submit by email:
records@wmk.govt.nz
WAIMAKARI DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE HEARING FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF TARGETED RATE FOR THE SEALING OF BARKERS ROAD, LOBURN HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA ON TUESDAY 22 AUGUST 2017 COMMENCING AT 6.30PM.

PRESENT:
Councillors W Doody, J Meyer and P Williams.

IN ATTENDANCE:
K Stevenson (Roading Manager) and S Nichols (Governance Manager).
Ten members of the public were present.

1. APPOINT A HEARING PANEL CHAIRPERSON

S Nichols called for the nomination of the Chairperson for the duration of the hearing panel.

Moved: Councillor Doody    Seconded: Councillor Williams

THAT Councillor Meyer be appointed as the Hearing Panel Chairperson of the Targeted Rate for the Sealing of Barkers Road, Loburn.

CARRIED

Councillor Meyer assumed the Chair.

Councillor Meyer welcomed members of the public, who introduced themselves as residents of Barkers Road, Loburn.

2. APOLOGIES

Nil.

3. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Nil.

4. HEARING OF SUBMISSIONS

No submitters indicated they wished to speak at the hearing.

5. STAFF REPORT

K Stevenson presented the report, reflecting on a petition presented in August 2016 seeking sealing of Barkers Road, Loburn. K Stevenson provided an overview of the process to date with staff working with residents exploring possible options available. Initial consultation occurred with over 20 residents responding with their views before the Council sought formal consultation, and today is a result of the end of the process for community views. The formal consultation involved five submitters, four supporting and one objecting to the proposal.

Councillor Doody sought clarity on the area affected by the targeted rate area. K Stevenson advised that last November all residents of Barkers Road through to Fishers Road were invited to a meeting where an option was suggested to enable the whole unsealed portion of the road to be sealed but it would involve a 50% cost option to developers, however
there was no interest from property owners. Staff then suggested a shorter length to be sealed which was more affordable, and found favour with the majority of residents. The shorter section of road suggested to be sealed is from the current Swamp Road intersection up to 538 Barkers Road.

Councillor Doody sought clarification on any future subdivision of the proposed sealed area, and contribution apportionment. K Stevenson clarified the targeted rate would be pro rata and payment would be the same as other property owners.

Councillor Doody sought clarification on the next steps. K Stevenson explained property owners will be written to advising they have until 30 September 2017 to pay the lump sum or chose the option of a portion added to their rates that will commence 1 July 2018. Road sealing would be programmed to occur late September / early October 2017.

5.1. Establishment of targeted rate for the sealing of Barkers Road, (Loburn) – K Stevenson (Roading Manager)

Moved: Councillor Williams  seconded: Councillor Doody

THAT the Hearing Panel

(a) Receives report No. 170808084823
(b) Receives and considers all submissions.
(c) Notes that five written submissions were received on the proposal to put in place a targeted rate for the sealing of Barkers Road, with four supporting the targeted rate and one submission not supporting the targeted rate.
(d) Notes that the Hearings Panel will consider these submissions and make a recommendation to the Council on whether to approve the targeted rate or not approve the targeted rate.

CARRIED

Moved: Councillor Williams  seconded: Councillor Doody

THAT the Barkers Road Hearing Panel Recommends that the Council:

1. Approves the targeted rate for the sealing of Barkers Road as detailed in the Statement of Proposal (Doc 170220015597).
2. Notes that property owners have the option of paying by lump sum rather than by a targeted rate.

CARRIED

Councillor Meyer addressed the public gallery, commenting on the positive aspect of the process, with the Council listening to requests raised by residents, believing the improvements will be positive for the local community.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 6.46pm.

CONFIRMED

______________________________
Chairperson

______________________________
Date
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT

FILE NO: RDG-31 / 170713072881

REPORT TO: Rangiora – Ashley Community Board

DATE OF MEETING: 9 August 2017

FROM: Ken Stevenson, Roading Manager

Bill Rice, Senior Transport Engineer

Harriette Davies, Roading Projects Engineer

SUBJECT: Changes to Cones Road Speed Limit

SIGNED BY: [Signature]

Department Manager

Chief Executive

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to seek Boards approval to change the speed limit on Cones Road, north of Carrs Road.

1.2. A speed limit of 40km/h is recommended on Cones Road, north of Carrs Road, along with the following safety improvements:

- Speed advisory and pedestrian warning signage.
- Improvements to the timber site rails at the beginning of the unsealed portion of Cones Road.
- Localised shaping of the vertical curve north of 352 Cones Road and minor widening of the road.
- Outdoor convex mirror opposite the driveway at 352 Cones Road.
- Clearing of vegetation adjacent to the road and including the berm areas in the Council’s maintained mowing list.
- Letter drops to residents, who are the predominant users of this road, leading up to the installation of the new walking track. These will outline the protocols to enable safe operation of this section of road.

1.3. In March, a speed limit of 30km/h was proposed on Cones Road, along the unsealed portion north of Carrs Road. The Board supported the proposal for consultation and feedback was sought between 16 June and 14 July 2017.

1.4. A total of 32 submissions were received on the proposal. Ten submissions fully supported the proposal.

1.5. Two submissions thought a combination of lowering the speed limit and widening the road was needed. Two more submissions agreed with decreasing the speed limit on Cones Road, however thought a speed limit of 30km/h was too low.

1.6. Eighteen submissions were fully opposed to the change and thought the speed limit should stay at 100km/h. It is noted that five of the eighteen submissions stated they opposed the proposed walking track, and ten of the eighteen submissions thought other safety measures were required, including improvements to the Cones Road / Carrs Road intersection. Options for improvements

Cones Road Speed Limit
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to the Cones Road / Carrs Road intersection are being developed. Feedback on these options will be sought from the Community Board and local residents shortly.

1.7. Based on the feedback received, the mean operating speed of the road and a re-evaluation of the road environment and possible safety improvements it is recommended a 40km/h speed limit be approved. A 40km/h speed limit is likely to have a higher level of compliance than a 30km/h speed limit and the additional safety measures will ensure pedestrians using the road are safe.

Attachments:

i. Plan showing proposed speed limits (TRIM 170713072824)

ii. Submission Details (TRIM 170713072801)

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Rangiora – Ashley Community Board recommends to Council that it:

(a) **Receives** report No 170713072881

(b) **Approves** a speed limit of 40km/h on Cones Road, north of Carrs Road, along with the following safety improvements:

- Speed advisory and pedestrian warning signage.
- Improvements to the timber site rails at the beginning of the unsealed portion of Cones Road.
- Localised shaping of the vertical curve north of 352 Cones Road and minor widening of the road.
- Outdoor convex mirror opposite the driveway at 352 Cones Road.
- Clearing of vegetation adjacent to the road and including the berm areas in the Council’s maintained mowing list.
- Letter drops to residents, who are the predominant users of this road, leading up to the installation of the new walking track. These will outline the protocols to enable safe operation of this section of road.

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

(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.

3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

3.1. Cones Road, north of Carrs Road, is a low volume unsealed road with a 100km/h speed limit, which provides access to a small number of private properties. The Average Daily Traffic (ADT) is 47 vehicles per day. Cones Road is approximately 3.5m wide and holds a generally straight alignment, with a slight bend in the vicinity of the driveway at 352 Cones Road. The road gently inclines north of Carrs Road to a vertical crest 10m north of 352 Cones Road.

3.2. A walking track from the end of Cones Road to Boundary Road, through the unformed road reserve, is proposed. In March, the Rangiora – Ashley Community Board approved the walking track subject to the implementation of a 30km/h speed limit, installation of pedestrian warning signage, installation of an outdoor convex mirror at 352 cones Road and clearing of the area adjacent to the road.
3.3. The reason for reviewing the speed limit on Cones Road is that concerns have been raised by residents regarding the expected increase in numbers of pedestrians sharing the road with property owners’ vehicles and an independent safety review recommended a 30km/h speed limit.

3.4. In June, feedback on the proposed new 30km/h speed limit on Cones Road was sought through advertising in the local newspapers and on the Councils website. Also letters were sent to NZTA, the Police, the NZ Automobile Association Inc and the Road Transport Forum NZ as required by the Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits.

3.5. NZTA has recently released their new Speed Management Guide. This document includes guidance on appropriate speeds for different road environments. The new guide places an increased emphasis on roadside hazards, and carriageway width. It also outlines measures to manage speeds, including the use of speed limits and other treatments and activities.

3.6. For narrow, rural unsealed roads, NZTA’s new Speed Management Guide recommends a speed limit of 60km/h.

3.7. Abley Transportation Consultants carried out a safety assessment on Cones Road (TRIM 161202124829) which recommended that a speed limit of 30km/h on the unsealed portion of Cones Road be implemented. Further recommendations included installation of pedestrian warning signage, outdoor convex mirror, and widening of the road, to increase the visibility for road uses.

3.8. The existing operating speed was determined using data collected from a special count site on Cones Road, 200m north of Carrs Road. A mean speed of 50.3km/h and an 85th percentile speed of 67.2km/h were recorded between Thursday 22 June 2017 and Wednesday 5 July 2017. The Speed Management Guide requires a speed limit of less than 50km/h to have a mean operating speed within 5km/h of the proposed limit. If the mean speed is not within 5km/h of the proposed limit then traffic engineering measures will be required to achieve lower speeds.

3.9. The straight portion of Cones Road, between Carrs Road and 352 Cones Road, has good visibility and areas adjacent to the road where pedestrians can walk away from vehicle traffic. It should be noted that this length of road does not lend itself to a 30km/h speed limit, as shown from the operating speed count taken 200m north of Carrs Road.

3.10. The Abley Transportation Consultants safety assessment highlights visibility and stopping site distance as potential safety issues. The area where visibility is considered an issue is in the vicinity of the vehicle entrance to 352 Cones Road.

3.11. The vertical curve just north of the vehicle entrance to 352 Cones Road limits a driver’s Stopping Sight Distance (SSD) considerably. Abley Transportation Consultants safety assessment estimated the existing SSD on the curve to be between 40 to 45 metres. An on-site accurate measure of the site distance was carried out as part of the speed assessment and was found to be 38 m.

The table below outlines the required SSD for a vehicle travelling at 30km/h, 40km/h and 50km/m.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speed of Vehicle</th>
<th>Existing SSD at Vertical Curve</th>
<th>Required SSD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 km/h</td>
<td>38 m</td>
<td>35 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 km/h</td>
<td>38 m</td>
<td>52 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 km/h</td>
<td>38 m</td>
<td>75 m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table indicates that a driver travelling on this vertical curve at 40km/h or 50km/h would not be able to come to a complete stop for a hazard on the road. Targeted improvement work is required for a 40 km/h and 50 km/h speed limit. Clearing the area adjacent to the road at this location will help increase visibility. The steep incline can also be eased through localised shaping at the peak of the crest, which will in turn increase the visibility at this location. Positive traffic calming can be carried out through 30km/h speed advisory and pedestrian warning signage.
3.12. The intersection of Cones Road and the vehicle entrance to 352 Cones Road has steep banks and trees either side of the road that limit the Safe Intersection Sight Distance (SISD). Base on Abley’s Safety Assessment the existing intersection site distance is estimated to be 15 to 20 metres.

The table below outlines the required SISD for a vehicle travelling at 30km/h, 40km/h and 50km/m.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speed of Vehicle</th>
<th>Existing ISD at #352</th>
<th>Required SISD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 km/h</td>
<td>15 m</td>
<td>60 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 km/h</td>
<td>15 m</td>
<td>90 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 km/h</td>
<td>15 m</td>
<td>120 m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table indicates that a driver approaching the intersection of Cones Road and the vehicle entrance to 352 Cones Road at 30km/h, 40km/h or 50km/h would not be able to come to a complete stop for a hazard on the road. Targeted improvement work is required. An outdoor convex mirror opposite the driveway at 352 Cones Road would significantly increase the driver’s field of vision along the road. Clearing the area adjacent to the road and localised road widening will also help increase visibility.

3.13. Improvements to the timber site rails at the beginning of the unsealed portion of Cones Road, will help create a “threshold” and minimise through traffic. Improvements include re-painting the timber site rails, and installing “No Exit”, and “No Turning or Parking Available Beyond this Point” signage.

3.14. The table below outlines the speed limit options for Cones Road, north of Carrs Road, which have been considered, and assessed against predicted outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Advantage</th>
<th>Disadvantage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 km/h Speed Limit</td>
<td>Adequate SSD is achieved without any targeted improvement work carried out.</td>
<td>Under the Speed Management Guide, this option requires a mean operating speed of no more than 35km/h. The existing mean operating speed is 50km/h so positive traffic calming would need to be installed to create the lower speed environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less dust generated on the road.</td>
<td>Severe traffic calming improvements would be required to obtain a mean operating speed of no more than 35km/h. These improvements may create other negative impacts (e.g. limiting accessibility for larger vehicles).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The straight section Cones Road, starting at Carrs Road, does not lend itself to a 30km/h speed limit. This section has good visibility and areas adjacent to the road where pedestrians can walk away from vehicle traffic. Compliance is predicted to be low.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There may be some resistance from local residents. Therefore, compliance may be an issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed Limit</td>
<td>Required Traffic Calming</td>
<td>Required SSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 km/h Speed</td>
<td>Less traffic calming</td>
<td>Less targeted work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit</td>
<td>is required than</td>
<td>than the 50km/h speed limit option. Traffic calming can be concentrated at the locations where SSD is an issue. Less targeted improvement work is required to achieve the required SSD than the 50km/h speed limit option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 km/h Speed</td>
<td>Under the Speed Management Guide, this option requires a mean operating speed of no more than 55km/h. The existing mean operating speed is 50km/h, so therefore this speed limit complies.</td>
<td>Severe targeted improvement work is required to increase the SSD at the required locations. Site constraints may make this level of improvement work impractical. Increase in dust generated on the road may create amenity issues. However, this may also help warn pedestrians of an approaching car. There may be some resistance from local residents. However, the existing mean operating speed is 50km/h and consultation with residents outlining this will help mitigate this risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit</td>
<td>The road environment is anticipated to change with the development of the new walkway. The mean operating speed is currently 50km/h. This option is not considered appropriate for the new road environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.15. Based on the above assessment a speed limit of 40km/h is recommended on Cones Road, north of Carrs Road, along with the following safety improvements:

- Positive traffic calming through speed advisory and pedestrian warning signage concentrated at the locations where SSD is an issue. 30km/h speed advisory signs are to be installed either side of the vertical curve north of 352 Cones Road.
- Improvements to the timber site rails at the beginning of the unsealed portion of Cones Road, to create a “threshold” and minimise through traffic. Improvements include re-painting the timber site rails, clearing and maintaining vegetation adjacent to the rail, and installing “No Exit”, and “No Turning or Parking Available Beyond this Point” signage.
- Localised shaping of the vertical curve north of 352 Cones Road and minor widening of the road, to help provide improved stopping site distance.
- An outdoor convex mirror opposite the driveway at 352 Cones Road to increase visibility at the intersection with Cones Road.
- Clearing of vegetation adjacent to the road and including the berm areas in the Council’s maintained mowing list. This will also help with visibility, while also providing an area for pedestrians to walk.
Letter drops to residents, who are the predominant users of this road, leading up to the installation of the new walking track. These will outline the protocols to enable safe operation of this section of road.

3.16. All improvements will be monitored to ensure the correct outcomes are being achieved.

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

4. **THE 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 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. In June, feedback on the proposed new speed limits was sought through advertising in the local newspapers and on the Council’s website. Also letters were sent to all adjoining property owners, NZTA, the Police, the NZ Automobile Association Inc and the Road Transport Forum NZ as required by the Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits. A summary of the submissions is below and the details are attached.

4.3. A total of 32 submissions were received on the proposal. Ten submissions fully supported the proposal to change the speed limit to 30km/h on Cones Road.

4.4. Two submissions thought a combination of lowering the speed limit and widening the road was needed. Two more submissions agreed with decreasing the speed limit on Cones Road, however thought a speed limit of 30km/h was too low.

4.5. Eighteen submissions were fully opposed to the change and thought the speed limit should stay at 100km/h. It was noted that five of the eighteen submissions were opposed to the future walking track, and ten of the eighteen submissions thought other safety measures were required, including improvements to the Cones Road / Carrs Road intersection. Options for intersection improvements on the Cones Road / Carrs Road intersection are being developed. Feedback on these options will be sought from the Community Board and local residents.

4.6. A letter was sent to NZTA on 23 June 2017 and a following up email on 30 June 2017 requesting feedback on the speed limit proposal. No formal submission has been received from NZTA. However, WDC carried out a site visit with NZTA earlier this year, where no concerns were raised regarding the speed limit proposal. There have been no formal responses from the NZ Automobile Association, the Police or from the Road Transport Forum NZ to this proposal.

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

5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISK**

5.1. The total cost of the new speed limit and other signage and road improvements 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. **Statute**

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. **Links to 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

Ken Stevenson
Roading Manager

Harriette Davies
Roading Projects Engineer

Bill Rice
Senior Transport Engineer
## CONES ROAD SPEED LIMIT REVIEW SUBMISSIONS

### PROPOSED 30km/h SPEED LIMIT ON CONES ROAD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRIM</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>FULLY SUPPORT</th>
<th>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</th>
<th>FULLY OPPOSE</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>170713072748</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P MORRIN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I wish to go on record as being strongly opposed to this speed change proposal as it represents an unworkable safety compromise. If the elected WDC Councilors decide that it is in the greater public good to support a walking track through the unformed portion of Cones Road then I call on them to take responsibility for both pedestrian and vehicle users' safety. (See TRIM 170713072748 for Full Submission)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170717073756</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M SKELLEY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I would suggest 30Km is too low for the first section of the road where it is wide enough for pedestrians to walk well away from the road. In fact it is wider than Carrs road's boundary at places on this section. My other concern is the lack of visibility where Carrs Road joins Cones Road (See TRIM 170717073756 for Full Submission)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170718074255</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ONLINE SURVEY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The road would need to be widened for the walkers so they aren't walking on the road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170718074255</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ONLINE SURVEY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. The recommendations by Abley for a 30 kph restriction MUST be implemented for the walking/cycling track to operate safely, but this will be extremely hard (and potentially impossible) to do; 2. As the reduced speed limit is a vital part of the Abley recommendations, it MUST be put in place before any work starts on the walking/cycling track; 3. Even with the speed limit in place, some sort of physical measure is required at the crest curve to slow vehicles down in this critical location but nothing has been proposed; 4. Cars will park at the Carrs/Cones intersection and will increase the road safety risk in an already dangerous location 5. The proposed budget is way off target because it misses important elements and places huge reliance on volunteer donations of time and materials. The Council is being set up for ongoing costs that are not discussed. (See TRIM 170718074255 for Full Submission)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170718074255</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ONLINE SURVEY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quite simply the road is not suitable for both traffic and pedestrians. I personally drive the road at least twice a day. I have a large vehicle often towing a large heavy trailer. With the steep gradient and metal road the stopping distance is greatly extended. If you are going to do this project, do it properly and safely otherwise do nothing at all. If you want to spend ratepayers money on something then fix Cones/Carrs intersection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIM</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>FULLY SUPPORT</td>
<td>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</td>
<td>FULLY OPPOSE</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170718074255</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>ONLINE SURVEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>One day that road just may be useful as a road so if you now give it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to walkers now, you'll be stuffed then. Look what happened with river</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>road. The walkers wanted a footpath. The speed was dropped, at the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>inconvenience of the majority of road users, till the footpath was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>built. Then the walkers said oh no it would be dangerous to walk on our</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>footpath and have cars and truck using the road a the old speed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>So now we have a road on the proposed bypass route at 50 km/h, for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ever more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170718074255</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>ONLINE SURVEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Walkers should be kept back and out of the way of road users, not the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>road users inconvenienced for the sake of walkers. This section of road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>at present may only be in use by residents, but future plans and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>expansion might make it a more major thoroughfare, where the current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>speed limit of 100km/h would be more appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170718074255</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>ONLINE SURVEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes without a doubt &amp; severely enforced by police.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170718074255</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>ONLINE SURVEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I support the formation of a walking track. I support the proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>reduction in speed limit. Knowing the road in question it is only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>common sense that 100kph is just not possible by anyone other than</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Haydon Patton. Also the actual speed done now by residents would be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>around 30kph because it simply is not possible to go any faster.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thus a 30kph limit would not inconvenience anyone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170718074255</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>ONLINE SURVEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The law requires you to be able to stop within half your visable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>distance on a road without a center line, having driven along this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>road, this would limit the speed to about 30kmh anyway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170718074255</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>ONLINE SURVEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anyone who tried to do 100km/h on that pot-holey road would really</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>have their work cut out!!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170718074255</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>ONLINE SURVEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ultimately, the roadside fences will need to be shifted to the correct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>alignment to provide adequate seperation for pedestrians on the long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>acre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170718074255</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ONLINE SURVEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30km is too slow - 60km is appropriate. As a walker in the area I'm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>more concerned for my safety with cars zooming around the Carrs Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>corner (BLIND) WAY TOO FAST. If a speed alteration is being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>considered for Cones rd, what about Boundary rd at the other end of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the proposed walking track.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170718074255</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>ONLINE SURVEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>You would be doing pretty good driving along there at 100. if you are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>going to open it up for pedestrians surely you will be putting in a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>walking track along the road, far to narrow as it is and a danger to all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>people using it. Would think there is more important things to be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170718074255</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>ONLINE SURVEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What about the dangerous corner at Carrs Rd/Cones Rd? Where about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>are pedestrians going to walk? What about widening the road? What about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>addressing the 'blind' spots on Cones Rd?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIM</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>FULLY SUPPORT</td>
<td>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</td>
<td>FULLY OPPOSE</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170718074255</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>ONLINE SURVEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reducing the speed limit to 30km/h does not address the more dangerous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>issues that are far more important, ie the dangerous corner at the Ganns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rd/ Cones Rd intersection and the need for a separate walking track to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>get pedestrians off the road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170718074255</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>ONLINE SURVEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>the council should be spending our rate paying money on making the Ganns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rd / Cones Rd corner safer for turning traffic and other road users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>before any thought of chasing some mans pipe dream of a walking track,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>also if there is going to be a track there has to be a separate foot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>path for walkers and look at widening the cones rd to allow 2 cars to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pass safely!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170718074255</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>ONLINE SURVEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>This option is a cheap compromise that leaves pedestrians at risk by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>encouraging them to share the same road space as cars and farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>equipment on a narrow and substandard unsealed road/track. (See TRIM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>170718074255 for Full Submission)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170718074255</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>ONLINE SURVEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Won't fix the problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170718074255</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>ONLINE SURVEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>It doesn't fix the issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170718074255</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>ONLINE SURVEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>This does not solve the issue!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170718074255</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>ONLINE SURVEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Changing the speed limit is not the real issue to be debated first.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shouldn't the survey be about who supports the walking track?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170718074255</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>ONLINE SURVEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Really looking forward to this track being formed. ... but I understood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>it was also for cycling?!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170718074255</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>ONLINE SURVEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30kmh might be tediously slow and in practice, almost no-one would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>stick to it. This is another example of how ridiculous speed limits are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in NZ. On this particular stretch of road, 100kmh would be ludicrous,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>plus it effectively &quot;goes nowhere&quot;, so a change is a good idea, but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>that change must be practical or it's pointless. Best course of action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>would be to amend the speed limit to 50kmh, and provide signage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>around pedestrian use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170718074255</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>ONLINE SURVEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>walkers- cyclists and cars don't mix. it needs to be 30km/h or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170718074255</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>ONLINE SURVEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Just another wee zone for our boys and girls in blue to sit on fridays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and get their quota! People who walk the paths will be fine. Stupid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>idea to lower it to 30!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170718074255</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>ONLINE SURVEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170718074255</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>ONLINE SURVEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170718074255</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>ONLINE SURVEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170718074255</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>ONLINE SURVEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170718074255</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>ONLINE SURVEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170718074255</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>ONLINE SURVEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT

FILE NO and TRIM NO: EXC-34-20 / 170825092092

REPORT TO: Council

DATE OF MEETING: 5 September 2017

FROM: Jim Palmer, Chief Executive

SUBJECT: Health and Safety Report – August

SIGNED BY: Department Manager Chief Executive

(for Reports to Council or Committees)

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to update the Council on Health and Safety matters for the month of August.

Attachment

1 Discharging Officer Health and Safety Duties
2 August 2017 Health and Safety Dashboard Report

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 170825092092

3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. The overview of this month’s work-related accidents/incidents is as follows:

- Six occurrences were reported this month. Only four were in the month of August. One near miss and one property damage were also recorded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Occurrence</th>
<th>Event description</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 July</td>
<td>Accident</td>
<td>4 staff members are all suffering pain and irritation in right hand shoulder or neck due to new office set up with inappropriate workstations for type of work. Injured staff had burning sensation pain/irritation in right hand shoulder due to inappropriate workstation set up from about six weeks prior.</td>
<td>In-house workstation assessor has provided information on correct workstation setup and desk replaced with ergonomic desks. Corrective action taken by Governance Manager is professional massages provided for affected staff, specifically working on right shoulder. (CLOSED)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Health and Safety
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 July</td>
<td>Accident</td>
<td>Hit head on a cupboard, covered area and iced the injury. Spare dry towels are stored in a cupboard at reception.</td>
<td>Staff member to ensure they pack a towel when she is teaching in the water and being more aware of surroundings. No corrective actions possible, storage space is limited so unable to move towels from current location. (CLOSED)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 August</td>
<td>Incident</td>
<td>Abusive phone call from customer regarding contractor blocking accessway. Customer was still using offensive language and despite attempts at calming reassurance (that staff would look into it/try to help).</td>
<td>The contractor has been informed of their actions which initiated this incident. During phone call to customer, it appeared that they were not willing to have a conversation and at times uses long streams of expletives. Consideration will be made as to whether this property should be flagged for the H&amp;S Person/Property Alerts system. (CLOSED)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 August</td>
<td>Accident</td>
<td>Digging a hole and stood on the nail, puncturing his boot and into his foot by about 5mm.</td>
<td>Currently issued with PPE (boots) for foot protection. Unlucky event which could not have been prevented. (CLOSED)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 August</td>
<td>Property Damage</td>
<td>Backed into a residential letterbox. Damage to vehicle (smashed tail-light). Letterbox was in blind spot, and vehicle doesn’t have a reversing camera. Owners of letter box have repositioned the letter box, and are happy with the outcome. Fleet manager has been briefed on the incident.</td>
<td>Staff member is scheduled to attend driver safety training in October. Camera installation would prevent recurrence, however current vehicle is up for replacement. Reversing camera has been ordered for replacement vehicle. (OPEN until actions are complete)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 August</td>
<td>Near Miss</td>
<td>Inspecting drain slipped on steep side. No water in swale. Slipped while walking down slope to reach invert of drain to inspect for outlet. Drain is approx. 1500 mm deep with sloping sides (fairly steep). Sides covered in grass. Weather conditions were fine, drain did not contain water but soil was saturated on banks making the ground slippery. Other factors: Person was working alone which is generally appropriate for task being undertaken. Person was carrying a mobile phone and was using a pool car so absence would have been noticed.</td>
<td>Difficult to prevent. Option existed to enter drain further along where access was better/less steep, but person is physically fit and judged access as being ok. No corrective action required. Person has increased awareness of slippery conditions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2. The dashboard review shows:

- We have seen an increase in incident and hazard reporting since the new electronic reporting system has been finalized (as evidenced by statistics in report). This went live at the start of July. Staff are commenting on the ease of use. Reporting will be further
improved over the next month, as the final actions to configure TechnologyOne health and safety system are completed.

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>KNOW</td>
<td>• Updates on new activities/major contracts</td>
<td>Various Committee reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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>UNDERSTAND</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></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>RESOURCES</td>
<td>• LTP or Annual Plan to have a specific report on H&amp;S resources</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reports to Committees will outline H&amp;S issues and resourcing, as appropriate</td>
<td>As required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONITOR</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></td>
<td>• Risk register review by Audit Committee</td>
<td>Six monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPLY</td>
<td>• Programme of H&amp;S internal work received by Audit Committee</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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>VERIFY</td>
<td>• Receive ACC WSMP audit results and remedial actions (if any) reported to Audit Committee</td>
<td>Two yearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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>
<tr>
<td>Major Projects</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 1: Improve Health and Safety data management, and encourage all staff to report incidents and hazards.</strong></td>
<td></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 has been scheduled for 7 September 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action 1:</strong> Safety Management System investigation and procurement project (includes carry-over of ‘Reporting improvement’ project from 2016/17).</td>
<td></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. Still working on the link to Technology 1, which will become the database for hazard and incident data, and will workflow any actions to relevant staff. Completion of the Technology 1 aspect of the project is imminent, with IT currently working to finalise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action 2:</strong> Implementation of Tech1/Mobile Hazard, Incident and Take-5 systems (carry-over project).</td>
<td></td>
<td>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 commenced, and is due for finalisation by end August.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>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.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Linked with Action 2, the finalisation of the Technology 1 hazard and incident database will allow for improved due diligence reporting of both hazards and incidents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action 5:</strong> Review and re-develop internal health and safety auditing system, aligned with best practice.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Informal investigation has started. Formal initiation of project will commence in September 2017. Initial investigation has lead to reviewing WorkSafe’s proposed Safety Star Rating (SSR) as a model. SSR has not been designed to replace WSMF. It has a different approach from a purely compliance audit. SSR 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).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 3: Ensure that all contractors are managed according to health and safety procedural requirements, and improve staff knowledge of those requirements.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project has been formally initiated, with first Project Control Group meeting held during July, and second meeting held in August. 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 due by end August with proposed next steps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 4: Improve the Health and Wellbeing of staff, and create measures to ensure success.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposal for Wellbeing Strategy Development has been created, and shared with key groups (Community Team, WDO Committee and Social Club). Creation of Wellbeing Survey to be designed during August/September, for distribution October/November. Strategy development will be dependent on the outcomes of the survey, and is planned for end 2017/early 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 5: Improve traceability and of staff working alone outside of hours, and appropriate response in the event of an incident.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action 8:</strong> Lone working equipment procurement project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEGEND:**
- **On track**
- Slightly behind schedule (less than one month)
- Behind schedule (greater than one month)
## ACTIONS RELATING TO HIGHEST H&S RISK ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Description</th>
<th>Rating (out of 25)</th>
<th>Current actions</th>
<th>Action Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Contractor Health and Safety Management| 15                 | *Train all contract managers in H&S processes/requirements at time of induction.  
*Develop comprehensive contract administration/contract management training package to deliver to all staff managing contractors.  
*Identify volunteer groups and leaseholders that engage contractors on behalf of WDC and train in contract H&S management processes.  
*Complete development of Safety in Design procedures and embed in design processes. | Charlotte Browne   |
| Vehicle Use & Driver Safety            | 15                 | *Deliver driver training as per training strategy (Driver Safety / 4WD)  
*Identify any drivers that require further progressive driver training on an as-needs basis and provide relevant training.  
*Provide information and training regarding use of safety equipment such as fire extinguishers in staff pool vehicles to all drivers. | Charlotte Browne   |
| Volunteers  
*Conducting hazardous activities  
*Injury/death                            | 15                 | *Undertake a review of operations to ensure that all activity and training is being carried out as per internal H&S processes.                                                                                         | Liz Ashton         |
| Adverse Weather                        | 15                 | *Develop protocols for response to adverse weather events (especially at night), and include in Safe Working in the Field Manual  
*Include in Emergency Management Plan out-of-hours deployment in adverse weather.                                                                                      | Charlotte Browne   |
| Airfield Operations                    | 15                 | *Develop of Airfield Safety Committee and appointment of Airfield Safety Coordinator to administer all actions from safety review.  
*Develop of Airfield Operations Manual, and adoption of the manual by Council as the key safety document for the Airfield operations.  
*Provide regular Airfield Operations report to Council                                                                                                                   | Craig Sargison     |
MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF THE CANTERBURY WATER MANAGEMENT STRATEGY WAIMAKARIKI ZONE COMMITTEE HELD IN THE FUNCTION ROOM, RANGIORA TOWN HALL, 303 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA ON MONDAY 10 JULY 2017 AT 3.00PM

PRESENT
David Ashby (Chair), Grant Edge (Deputy Chair), Carolyne Latham, Michael Blackwell, Cameron Henderson, Judith Roper-Lindsay, Gary Walton (departed at 6.27pm), and Sandra Stewart (WDC Councillor), and Claire McKay (Environment Canterbury Councillor).

IN ATTENDANCE
Mayor David Ayers (WDC), Geoff Meadows (WDC Policy Manager), Rachel McClung (WDC Senior Policy Analyst), Lionel Hume (Federated Farmers), Robert Johnson (Oxford), Jason Holland (ECan Planning Team Leader), Ryan Hepburn (Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu), Lisa McKenzie (Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu), Paul Reese (WIL), Jason Butt (ECan Biodiversity Officer), Anna Veltman (ECan Land Management Advisor), Matt Dodson (ECan Hydrogeologist), Meredith Macdonald (ECan Senior Planner), Larry Burke (NZ Salmon Anglers Association), Karl French (Silverstream Hatchery), Owen Davies (WDC Engineering Design Team Leader), Michael Bate (Kaiapoi), Stephen Bragg (ECan CWMS Tangata Whenua Facilitator), Murray Griffin (ECan CWMS Facilitator) and Louise Courtney (WDC Governance Secretary). Craig McIntosh (Rangiora), Charlotte Wright (Dairy NZ)

KARAKIA
The meeting commenced with a karakia conducted by S Bragg.

WELCOME
The Chair welcomed C Henderson to his first meeting of the Committee.

1 APOLOGIES AND INTRODUCTIONS
Nil.

REGISTER OF INTEREST
The Committee noted the Register of Interest with changes for new members to be incorporated for the August meeting.

2 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
2.1 Minutes of the Canterbury Water Management Strategy Waimakariri Zone Committee meeting – 19 June 2017

Moved G Walton seconded G Edge

THAT the CWMS Waimakariri Zone Committee:
(a) Amends the minutes of the Canterbury Water Management Strategy Waimakariri Zone Committee meeting, held 19 June 2017, as follows:

• Page 3, final paragraph: Amend “immediate stages” to “Immediate Steps”
• Page 6, paragraph 1, line 7: Amend “bittens” to “bittern”
• Item 5, heading: Amend “Breifing” to “Briefing”
MATTERS ARISING

D Ashby provided an update in relation to item 3. To date, ten farms have consents with another ten still undertaking the consent process.

G Edge noted the deadlines for consents to be lodged had passed, with the deadline for orange zoned properties having been 1 July 2016 and red zoned properties 1 July 2017. He was concerned that the missed deadlines would not reflect well on ECan.

It was clarified that all WIL farms are covered by the WIL discharge consent and that those outside this group have been targeted as a priority by ECan. It was noted that not all those still to engage with the process will require a consent, with D Ashby adding that the issue may be in relation to getting nitrogen baselines done by specialists in this field. D Ashby explained that it was a process that would take some time, and the important point was that farms were in the system and would be processed in due course.

J Roper-Lindsay suggested that the deadlines had not been realistic considering the time it takes to get the information required to process each consent ECAn Staff assured members that the remaining 68 farms were being followed up, and will report back next meeting. C Henderson queried whether there were any statistics regarding the number of farms who were engaged with the process. It was suggested that information also be sought from Beef and Lamb, as not all the farms involved were dairy farms. C Henderson highlighted that the delay in the process may relate to the upcoming transition to Plan Change 5 (PC5), with farms awaiting to see how it would affect them. D Ashby suggested ECAn communications deliver a message to encourage farmers to engage in the process.

G Edge, regarding item 3.4, asked if an update had been received from the Trust. Staff advised that this was still to be followed up.

G Edge, also regarding item 3.4, sought an update to C McKay’s query regarding a covenant. There was some discussion regarding the matter. It was advised that the site was protected.

3 PUBLIC FORUM

3.1 Robert Johnson

R Johnson spoke in relation to Alternate Pathways community meetings, where a Potential Storage option in the upper Ashley, was explored as a means to enhance flows in the Ashley River. He believed that enhancing the flow would destroy the swimability of the Ashley Gorge. He believed the mechanism for providing better flow down the Ashley River was to encourage ECOn to address the issue of erosion in the river which leads to gravel build up, and causes the river flow to go underground and therefore dry stretches. He commented that he had been impressed with a presentation from the Rūnanga on the matter and referenced Project Rainbow, which had been proposed to mitigate the issue.
Regarding Plan Change 5 (PC5), R Johnson said he was unclear whether Overseer would be used in a regulatory regime. He stated that Overseer was suitable for providing a nutrient baseline but not appropriate for regulatory purposes. C McKay responded that an upcoming presentation would address R Johnson’s concerns. Jason Holland advised that PC5 proposed new thresholds for consent, based on hectares irrigated, or of winter feed for cattle, and Overseer will be an essential part of the FEP, required with the application.

R Johnson referred to the Land and Water Solutions Programme community meetings where he felt there had been no opportunities to speak, and queried what happened to all the feedback. M Macdonald advised that all feedback had been recorded and transferred to an electronic format which have been made available through an online forum. Staff were happy to work with R Johnson directly.

R Johnson concluded that the information was not clear to the community and needed to be better communicated.

3.2 Michael Bate

M Bate expressed his extreme disappointment that the Committee granted IMS funds to the Pines Beach Wetland Weed Control project when the method of control was with glyphosate, and tabled several documents.

He also commented that many pools in the lower Kaiapoi were scoured out with water levels dropping considerably when the tide went out, and suggested ECan put in weirs to protect the aquatic life there.

M Bate concluded that he believed Plan Change 5 would be ineffective.

4 COMMITTEE UPDATES – ZONE COMMITTEE MEMBERS, A ARPS (WAIMAKARIRI ZONE DELIVERY TEAM LEADER, ECAN) AND M GRIFFIN (FACILITATOR, ECAN)

- CWMS Regional Committee Meeting – 13 June 2017
- Waimakariri Zone Delivery – Update
  - Immediate Steps
  - Communications and Media Reports
- Silverstream Salmon Hatchery – briefing and follow
- Towards a Draft Waimakariri Land & Water Solutions Programme
- Greater Christchurch Networking for the Environment Forum
- Action List

4.1 CWMS Regional Committee Meeting 13th June 2017 – C Latham (Zone Committee Representative)

C Latham took the report as read.

J Roper-Lindsay, regarding item 5, commented that signage on bridges required improvement. Staff to follow up who is responsible for the signage.

G Edge, regarding item 7, queried the basis of the merger of two seemingly different groups. C McKay responded that there was a close association, and that the groups were only being brought together for specific projects which overlapped both groups’ jurisdiction, for example braided rivers.
4.2 **Ashley Rakahuri Weed Clearance and Island Enhancement 2017**

J Butt spoke briefly to the application, referencing a presentation made to the Committee by the group at its February meeting. Machinery would be utilised to remove woody weeds and followed up with on-going maintenance.

J Roper-Lindsay queried the other financial sources for the project. J Butt advised that funding was sought from the Rata Foundation, as well as utilising existing funds.

S Stewart asked if there was any possibility of utilising gravel extract contractors to undertake the work as part of their corporate responsibility.

J Butt advised that it had been considered. It was noted that staff do work with contractors who have carried out similar work when required.

D Ashby supported comments relating to companies working with community groups and ECAn for similar projects.

Moved G Edge seconded G Walton

**THAT** the CWMS Waimakariri Zone Committee:

(a) **Approves** $13,170 of Immediate Steps funding to the Ashley Rakahuri Rivercare Group for the Ashley Rakahuri Weed Clearance and Island Enhancement 2017 project.

**CARRIED**

4.3 **Immediate Steps – Funding Overview 2017 – J Butt (Biodiversity Officer, ECAn)**

J Butt spoke to the report, noting a review had been carried out in the past year which allowed funds to be allocated to future projects.

In response to a query from S Stewart staff will provide a detailed report on progress of past projects.

C Latham queried the use of IMS funding for fencing J Butt advised that funds could not be used for fencing that would be necessary for statutory or compliance situations. Members expressed concern regarding the protection of plants, if fencing was not in place.

4.4 **Waimakariri Water Zone Committee June Update**

M Griffin spoke to the report, and tabled a summary of the Committee’s workshop of 19 June 2017.

M Dodson provided a brief summary of meeting with representatives of the Silverstream Hatchery. Staff would provide a more detailed update on the matter including nutrient, water flows, river temperature, and springhead protection. The representatives suggested possible solutions to some of the issues raised, which could also be explored.

D Ashby queried whether any discussion had been held with any parties regarding getting water to Silverstream. However, this raised the issue of the mixing of waters which could be in conflict with Rūnanga values in relation to water.

Moved D Ashby seconded C McKay

**THAT** the CWMS Waimakariri Zone Committee:
(a) **Receives** items 4.1-4.4 for its information, and with regard to the Committee’s:

- 5 Year Outcomes
- Drafting of the Land and Water Solutions Programme recommendations, and
- 2017 community engagement priorities.

**CARRIED**

5 **PLAN CHANGE 5 – BRIEFING – O COOK (PRINCIPAL PLANNING ADVISOR, ECAN)**

Olivia Cook spoke to a PowerPoint presentation. She advised that Plan Change 5 (PC5) would not affect the Land and Water Regional Plan (LWRP), and that the rules of PC5 would not apply until it was operative. Hearings were held in 2016, with recommendations adopted by the Council at its June 2017 meeting. PC5 has now been notified and is currently in appeal stage of the process, where appeals can only be made on a point of law.

PC5 Outcomes include, farming at Good Management Practice (GMP), farming to Limits, some flexibility for low emitters, giving effect to the NPSFM 2014, and will provide catchment accounting.

In relation to the GMP booklet, she advised the narratives had been incorporated into proxies which are applied to Overseer files fed into the Farm Portal to estimate the nitrogen loss at GMP. The Portal was also the tool to work out whether a consent was required. All farms, over 10 hectares must register with the Farm Portal, with the information gathered to be collated by ECAN for future reference and statistical analysis.

Permitted Activities would no longer be regulated by nitrogen limits, and GMPs demonstrated in the farm management plan would have to be provided on request.

S Stewart queried whether independent scrutiny of data being inputted would be in place. O Cook replied that the information provided could be verified/checked, however there was no system yet in place and staff would be reliant on the accuracy of the information provided.

Farms that require Resource Consents would have nitrogen losses capped at Baseline GMP Loss Rate from 1 July 2020 and must operate at GMP for the farm’s current activity.

G Edge queried going beyond PC5 requirements. O Cook advised it was not restricted.

G Edge expressed concern at a process which did not seem to allow for changes in farming practices. O Cook replied that the planning process has to set out requirements to the community, however PC5 does allow greater flexibility by not confining farmers to prescribed practices. C McKay added that it is anticipated regular reviews of the GMP booklet would allow for changes in farming practices and technology advances.

C Henderson enquired about the ability to report at a catchment level. O Cook replied that in time that is what the information can be used for.

Following on S Stewart queried when such data maybe available. O Cook stated that this was dependent on PC5 being Operative and subsequent consents in place.

C Henderson asked about the timeline to PC5 being operative. O Cook replied it was also dependent on the appeal process. If there were no appeals, then approximately 16 months.

J Roper-Lindsay asked about catchments being defined. It was advised that the Council have decided that catchments will be assessed through the sub-regional
plan process. It was raised that Water Management units need to be addressed as part of the NPSFM reporting. Staff confirmed that a detailed report on the matter would be provided at an upcoming meeting.

Mr R Johnson queried phosphorus losses. O Cook replied that the FEP could be utilised to manage contaminants, for example riparian management.

M Bate queried the projections on the expected improvement of water quality from farming to GMP. O Cook responded that modelling revealed a projected 15% reduction in nitrogen.

M Blackwell queried the water quality of the Hurunui-Waiau region. It was advised that they operate under their own Management Plan. M Blackwell further queried what the water quality would be, ECan’s criteria were applied. O Cook replied it would be classified as a red zone.

6 FARM ENVIRONMENT PLAN PROCESS - A BARBATTI (TEAM LEADER, DELIVERY SUPPORT, ECAN), AND I BROWN (PRINCIPAL STRATEGY ADVISOR, LAND, ECAN)

A Barbati spoke to a PowerPoint presentation.

A Farm Environment Plan (FEP) is required for those who require a Resource Consent, highlighting that a new element in PC5 is identifying mahinga kai targets as well.

S Stewart, queried how a report like the Cam River Rehabilitation Study, effectively a sub catchment management plan, could be incorporated into the FEP process. Paul Reece, of WIL, advised there would be a crossover between farmers and catchment advisory groups, and that the FEP was just another tool for farmers to utilise. O Cook cautioned fixing such reports into a FEP as it could change over time. P Reece clarified that the FEP was not an inward looking document and was a means of assessing outcomes. I Brown added that an FEP should reflect what and how activities are said to occur with actual practice.

S Stewart wanted to ensure that similar reports were not disregarded and were utilised. Staff advised that it would be expected that these kinds of documents were made available to farmers who border the relevant catchments, or to auditors to enable the information to be passed on or incorporated into appropriate plans.

I Brown reiterated that a FEP addresses many issues. It was up to the auditors to ascertain whether the plan/actions were effective and would achieve the outcomes set. He stated that auditors spent a few hours on site, which is preceded by the evaluation of the FEP, past audits and relevant documentation. The audit is about ensuring that the information provided is accurate and corresponds with actual practices. It also involves face to face discussions regarding the operation, to understand the farming system being undertaken.

G Edge queried whether the farm was required to regularly monitor that water quality in that water way. I Brown advised that it was possible in some water systems but it was not always possible to clearly identify where the water comes from.

S Stewart queried whether FEPs were publically available. I Brown advised that an FEP was required as part of a Resource Consent, so it is noted, but no detail is provided. He reiterated that FEPs were tools as a means to an end and should outline what outcomes are hoped to be achieved.

Moved S Stewart  seconded G Edge

THAT the CWMS Waimakariri Zone Committee:

(a) Receives the information provided in the Plan Change 5 and Farm Environment Plan Process presentation.

CARRIED
Meeting adjourned at 5.41pm for a brief break, resuming again at 5.46pm.

7  STATUTORY FRAMEWORK FOR BIODIVERSITY – S LEONARD (ECAN), AND B BRAY (WDC)

S Leonard spoke to a PowerPoint presentation, noting this was the first time that a District Plan Review had occurred in parallel a Sub-region Plan Review.

S Leonard outlined the different responsibilities of EC and WDC, in relation to biodiversity. With many areas overlapping a shared approach to responsibility is undertaken.

G Edge, regarding the Canterbury Biodiversity Strategy (CBS), asked whether WDC, as a signatory, held responsibility. S Leonard confirmed that WDC was a signatory, however, the CBS was not a statutory document.

G Edge sought clarification whether WDC had to protect environmental sites. S Leonard replied that it was a joint responsibility, with EC responsible for associated earthworks and discharges and WDC responsible for land use activities in a wetland, for example a boardwalk.

B Bray spoke to a PowerPoint presentation District Development Strategy (DDS) which would inform strategies such at the District Plan, noting community consultation would close 14 July 2017.

G Edge sought an explanation to the term ‘environmentally rich’. B Bray replied that it is in relation to a wealth of biodiversity and supporting existing initiatives, noting the DDS was a high level strategy.

G Edge noted the lack of reference to the Canterbury Water Management Strategy or Zone Committee Outcomes for biodiversity. B Bray responded it was a matter that could form part of the District Plan Review.

J Roper-Lindsay suggested a meeting with WDC staff to discuss findings of the Biodiversity Stakeholders Group.

G Edge raised that the Maharaunui iwi Management Plan was missing from the slide. Staff to follow up.

S Leonard concluded that the reviews would be an opportunity to streamline processes within WDC and EC, to avoid ‘double handling’ of information and applications by consent applicants. S Leonard encouraged members to forward any further queries directly to staff.

J Roper-Lindsay commented that the plans should not focus solely on significant sites, as all indigenous sites were significant.

Moved J Roper-Lindsay   seconded C Latham

THAT the CWMS Waimakariri Zone Committee:

(b) Receives the information provided in the Statutory Framework for Biodiversity presentation.

CARRIED

8  GENERAL BUSINESS – D ASHBY AND ZONE COMMITTEE MEMBERS

G Edge, stated that he would like a date regarding the production of sub catchment management areas and surface water catchments confirmed, to suggesting a draft of the plans at the Committee’s next workshop. M Dodson highlighted the work involved in collating the detailed hydrological catchment data required to create the
models and added this work is being developed at present. Staff assured members that the plans would be provided once all the information required had been gathered and assessed.

NEXT MEETING
The next scheduled meeting of the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee is on Monday 14 August 2017 commencing at 4.00pm.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 6.30PM.

CONFIRMED

______________________________
Chairperson

______________________________
Date
MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE COMMUNITY AND RECREATION COMMITTEE
WILL BE HELD IN THE WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 215 HIGH
STREET, RANGIORA ON TUESDAY 18 JULY 2017 AT 1.00PM.

PRESENT
Councillors W Doody (Chairperson) P Allen (from 1.15pm), A Blackie, R Brine and
D Gordon.

IN ATTENDANCE
Deputy Mayor K Felstead, Councillor P Williams
Messrs J Palmer (Chief Executive), C Brown (Community Green Space Manager), M
Greenwood (Aquatic Facilities Manager), Mrs T Sturley (Community Team Leader), and
Mrs A Smith (Committee Advisor).

APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR FOR MEETING
The meeting was opened by Mr Palmer, who called for nominations for a Committee Chair
for this meeting, in the absence of Councillor Allen, at the meeting commencement time.
Moved Councillor Gordon seconded Councillor Brine
THAT Councillor Doody be appointed Chair of the Committee for this meeting of the
Community and Recreation Committee.

CARRIED
Councillor Doody assumed the Chairpersons role at this time, for the duration of the
meeting.

1  APOLOGIES
An apology was received and sustained from Mayor Ayers for absence and from
Councillor P Allen for lateness.

2  CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
No conflicts of interest were noted.

3  CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Community and Recreation Committee held
on Tuesday 15 May 2017

Moved Councillor Brine seconded Councillor Gordon
THAT the Community and Recreation committee:
(a) Confirms the circulated minutes of a meeting of the Community and
Recreation Committee, held on Tuesday 16 May 2017, as a true and
accurate record.

CARRIED

3.2 Minutes of the Public Excluded portion of the meeting of the Community
and Recreation Committee held on Tuesday 18 May 2017
(see blue agenda papers)
4 MATTERS ARISING

There were no matters arising.

5 PRESENTATION / DELEGATION

Members of the Rangiora and Southbrook Tennis Clubs were present to speak on a proposal for a tennis court complex at Coldstream Road. Those present were:

Brian Heron (Secretary, Southbrook Tennis Club)
Johnny Carter (President, Southbrook Tennis Club)
Jim Martin (representative of Rangiora Tennis Club)
Stuart Wilson (Former President and Life Member, Rangiora Tennis Club)

Copies of information were circulated to members (copy in Trim doc. 170801081595) and Brian Heron spoke to a Powerpoint presentation (Trim doc. 170801081663).

Both these tennis clubs currently own the land and their club facilities, Rangiora at 229A King Street, and Southbrook at 2 Buckleys Road, Southbrook. Both Clubs have held special general meetings where there was unanimous support to sell their present facilities and to be part of the proposed new complex. Rangiora Tennis Club currently has five asphalt courts, a two story clubhouse built in the 1960s. The club has 21 senior members and 25 junior members. Southbrook Club has four asphalt courts, which are in poor condition, and clubhouse built in early 1980s in good condition. The club has 28 senior plays and no juniors. Participation in tennis in North Canterbury has declined over recent years and this proposal is intended to revitalise the sport in the district. A ten court complex with clubrooms would make the sport more attractive to people, make the courts more visible, attract coaches and administrators, increase the number of players, provide courts with lighting and provide courts for public use. It would be intended to have two courts available for public use. Issues with both existing club sites include the asphalt surfaces (as players prefer to play on the more modern surfaces), lack of full time coach, low club memberships, lack of funds for either club to advance where they are, both clubs operating with a small number of volunteers and antisocial behaviour at the clubs means both clubs have had to lock their facilities. Because of the current siting of both clubs, there is a lack of visibility. Brian noted that there had previously been proposals for a larger, better quality and more visible tennis facility in North Canterbury, but none of these have proceeded. Both Clubs now give their full support for a complex to be part of the new sports hub in Coldstream Road. The proposal at Coldstream Road site would be for ten courts, modern surfaces, six courts with lighting, two courts available for public use and a fit for purpose clubrooms. This site is seen as a good location with good public visibility and has the possibility of sharing some facilities with other sports. The ten court complex, with six courts lit, at this location would be an asset to the Waimakariri district and complement the existing Kaiapoi tennis facility. Favourable consideration by this committee would allow the tennis clubs committees and the Council to proceed to a planning stage of the project.

The contribution from both clubs to the proposed development would be the proceeds from the sale of their club land. The total "Market" value estimated in March this year was $1,190,000. There is a shortfall of funding from the preliminary cost estimate based on the courts and clubhouse sketch plans provided by AECOM to the Council. There is further discussion required around the actual costs and funding arrangements.

Questions

Councillor Brine asked, which other clubs were still operating in the district which participate in the combined North Canterbury competition. Brian advised that these are Amberley, Clarkville, Fernside, Kaiapoi, Leithfield, Oxford, Sefton, Swannanoa
and Woodend. Other clubs have indicated favour for this proposal as this could encourage more people to play.

Councillor Gordon asked where the valuations of the current facilities of the two clubs were from, and it was advised these were from a real estate agent. No other funding sources have been investigated at this point. Mr Martin said with proper facilities in the district this will help to promote the sport. It was also noted that a clubhouse facility could be made available for hire to outside organisations.

Councillor Williams asked, would this proposal progress without Council funding being available. It was noted that the amount from the land sales of current facilities could cover the costs of the courts, with cabling for the lighting being laid, and if no further funding was available at the time, the lighting could be done when further funding was available.

Deputy Mayor Felstead asked, what would be the ability to stage the building of the courts – Mr Heron considered it would be more economical to have all the courts laid at one time, and reiterated that the proceeds from sale of the two clubs current facilities would cover the costs of the ten courts.

The presenters were thanked for their presentation and advised that the next step is for a staff report on this proposal to come to the committee.

6 REPORTS

6.1 Contract 11/54 Street, Reserve and Cemetery Trees Maintenance Contract Extension - Chris Brown (Community Green Space Manager)

Mr Brown presented this report, seeking approval of a one year extension of the Street Reserve and Cemetery Trees Maintenance Contract. This contract is currently with Treetech Specialist Treecare Ltd and is due to expire at the end of September this year. Currently council has 18,500 trees in the district and the tree maintenance contract states maintenance is to be carried out on a three year cycle. With the current number of trees, this is not feasible and noted that some trees are in quite out of the way places. This proposal is to develop different levels of service which may require budget provision in the Long Term Plan, and the extension will allow staff to consider different options.

Councillor Doody asked, does this include trees in campgrounds? Mr Brown advised this does not, though noted that council has recently had some work undertaken on trees in the Ashley Gorge Campground, due to safety issues. It is proposed to report back to this committee regarding campground trees.

Councillor Williams asked if there was reports from Treetech on the hours they spend on the contract. Mr Brown said Treetech provided the cheapest price at the time the Council called for tenders for the job, and have health and safety procedures in place that meet the standards required by the Council.

Moved Councillor Brine seconded Councillor Blackie

THAT the Community and Recreation Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 170601056139

(b) Notes that Council’s current tree budget for 2017/18 is $537,490 which consists of the original contract price of $195,637 plus a provisional sum of $341,853.

(c) Approves the extension of the Street, Reserve and Cemetery Tree Maintenance Contract 11/54 with Treetech Specialist Treecare Ltd at
the original contract cost of $195,637 plus cost escalations as allowed under the contract over the original five year term for a 12-month period until 30 September 2018.

CARRIED

6.2 Aquatic Facilities Update Report - Matt Greenwood (Aquatic Facilities Manager)

Mr Greenwood presented this report providing a summary of the aquatic facilities year to date performance against the units most significant Key Performance Indicators. Currently Kaiapoi Aquatic Centre is in its second week of scheduled maintenance close down. Timing of this closure has been carefully considered so as to cause minimal disruption. There has been mixed feedback on the timing of this closure, but noted that there had been updates provided to the more regular users of the facility.

Following a question from Councillor Allen on access arrangements for the disabled, Mr Greenwood advised there is a hoist available, a water wheelchair which can go right into the main pool, and facilities available to allow showering. Also there is a lifting facility available for the spa pool. Staff are trained regularly on the safe use of this equipment.

Mr Palmer noted this is the first time Matt has presented to the committee since his appointment to the role of Aquatic Facilities Manager. Both he and Tina Brough have shared the role in recent months, and their contributions were acknowledged.

Moved Councillor Doody seconded Councillor Gordon

THAT the Community and Recreation Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 170601056455.

(b) Notes the Aquatic Facilities year to date achievement against key performance indicators including Water Quality and Customer Satisfaction.

CARRIED

6.3 Community Team Update – Tessa Sturley (Community Team Leader)

Mrs Sturley presented this report which provided an update in May and June. The recommendation notes the application for Lotteries funding for suicide prevention and family violence initiatives.

The report highlights the different initiatives and groups that help with engaging, connecting, informing and empowering the community. This includes the Time Bank Waimakariri which is progressing well. The steering group has worked closely with both the Lyttelton Time Bank and Time Bank Hurunui, which have successful models. Mrs Sturley noted the recent progress with the Youth Council and WaiYouth, both groups being aware of their brief, and also working together on some projects.

Councillor Allen noted that there is some situations with power outages, where people with breathing difficulties would be affected. Mrs Sturley advised that Mainpower maintain a register of names of any people who are reliant on power sources in an emergency. Mrs Sturley agreed to source more information on this matter.

Following a suggestion from Councillor Doody, it was agreed that a visit to the Shared Services facility in Kaiapoi would be arranged.
Moved Councillor Gordon seconded Councillor Brine  

**THAT** the Community and Recreation Committee:

(a) **Receives** report No 170705069653.

(b) **Notes** that staff have applied to the July Lotteries funding round for $63,627 to support the facilitation of suicide prevention and family violence initiatives.

**CARRIED**

Councillor Gordon noted the encouraging work of the Youth Council.

7 **MINUTES FOR INFORMATION – REGENERATION STEERING GROUP**

7.1 **Minutes of a meeting of the Regeneration Steering Group held on Monday 29 May 2017**

7.2 **Minutes of a meeting of the Regeneration Steering Group held on Monday 3 July 2017**

Moved Councillor Blackie seconded Councillor Doody

**THAT** the information in Items 7.1 and 7.2 be received.

**CARRIED**

Councillor Blackie noted there will be an extra meeting of the Steering Group to be held on 31st July, to allow on final ratification by the Council at the 1 August meeting.

8 **PORTFOLIO UPDATES**

8.1 **Greenspace (Parks Reserves and Sports Grounds) – Councillor Robbie Brine**

Noted the tennis proposal presented to the Committee at this meeting and the impact of the recent rain event on local sports fields.

8.2 **Community Facilities (including Aquatic Centres, Halls, Libraries and Museums) – Councillor Wendy Doody**

Nothing to add.

8.3 **Community Development and Wellbeing – Councillors Peter Allen and Wendy Doody**

Councillor Doody acknowledged the enthusiasm of members of the Waimakariri Youth Council.

8.4 **Regeneration – Councillor Al Blackie**

Nothing to add.
9 MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED
Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

Moved Councillor Gordon seconded Councillor Brine

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item N°</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>9.1</td>
<td>Minutes of the Public Excluded portion of the Community and Recreation meeting held on 16 May 2017</td>
<td>Confirmation of Minutes</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item N°</th>
<th>Reason for protection of interests</th>
<th>Ref NZS 9202:2003 Appendix A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>Protection of privacy of natural persons To carry out commercial activities without prejudice</td>
<td>A2(a) A2(b)ii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CARRIED

CLOSED MEETING

Resolution to resume in Open Meeting

Moved Councillor Doody seconded Councillor Allen

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

CARRIED

OPEN MEETING

10 QUESTIONS

There were no questions.
11 **URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS**
There was no urgent General Business.

**NEXT MEETING**
The next scheduled meeting of the Community and Recreation Committee is 1pm, Tuesday 19 September, in the Council Chambers at the Rangiora Service Centre, 215 High Street, Rangiora.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING CLOSED AT 2.08PM.

CONFIRMED

______________________________
Chairperson

______________________________
Date
MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF THE AUDIT AND RISK COMMITTEE HELD IN THE
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA
ON TUESDAY 18 JULY 2017 COMMENCING AT 4PM.

PRESENT
Deputy Mayor K Felstead (Chairperson), Councillors N Atkinson, A Blackie, S Stewart
and P Williams

IN ATTENDANCE
Councillors D Gordon, W Doody (until 5.55pm)
Messrs J Palmer (Chief Executive), J Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support),
S Markham (Manager Strategy and Engagement), G Meadows (Policy Manager), S Hart
(Business and Centres Manager), Ms L Ashton (Manager Organisational Development
and HR) Ms C Brown (Health and Safety Coordinator) and Mrs A Smith (Committee
Advisor).

1 APOLOGIES
An apology was received and sustained from Mayor Ayers.

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
There were no conflicts of interest noted.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of the Audit and Risk Committee held on Tuesday 16 May 2017

Moved Deputy Mayor Felstead seconded Councillor Blackie

THAT the Audit and Risk Committee:
(a) Approve corrections to minutes of a meeting of the Audit and Risk Committee held on the 16 May 2017, as follows

Comments from Councillor Stewart on Page 3, second paragraph, second/third sentences following recommendation, to read:
This is one of a series of reports put out by Ecan in 2016. This report is written by Simon Harrison from Land Water People to Ecan and supplied to the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee

(b) Confirms the circulated minutes of a meeting of the Audit and Risk Committee, held on the 16 May 2017, as a true and accurate record, with the corrections as noted in (a) above.

CARRIED

MATTERS ARISING
Councillor Stewart asked regarding item 6.1 in the minutes, to follow up if Mr Markham had responded to the Zone committee on this matter.

4 PRESENTATION / DEPUTATION
There were no presentations/deputations.
5 **ADJOURNED BUSINESS**

No adjourned business.

6 **REPORTS**

6.1 *2016/17 Health and Safety Review (Annual Report) and submission of 2017/18 Annual Plan – Liz Ashton (Manager Organisational Development and HR), and Charlotte Brown (Health and Safety Advisor)*

Ms Ashton and Ms Brown presented this report. Risk register development and process is very robust throughout the organisation. The positives highlighted included the Council’s safety management review, which saw the Council receiving tertiary accreditation, which is the highest accreditation. The reporting of accidents and incidents is hoped to improve, as well as near misses. It is hoped that the updated reporting system will encourage this.

With regard to Anti-skid driver training, in future this will only be made available to staff who drive Council vehicles.

Councillor Doody asked on the two projects that are noted as being “on hold” – it is considered that with behavioural safety, there has been noted a shift in management with taking accountability for actions, and this was not seen as a priority now and has been deferred. Field Work systems check is on hold as the new field work tools are introduced, with a proposed start date to be in the third quarter of 2017.

Ms Brown highlighted the proposed annual plan objectives for 2017/18.

Councillor Doody questioned the effectiveness of just headlights being used by Water Unit staff, and whether there was any other systems that could improve safety and visibility of these staff.

Councillor Atkinson asked if future reports could show comparison graphs with the previous year’s information. It was agreed that these comparisons could be provided in future.

Moved Councillor Atkinson seconded Councillor Williams

**THAT** the Audit and Risk Committee:

(a) **Receives** report No. 170705069380

(b) **Notes** the Health and Safety outcomes for 2016/17 against the Health and Safety Workplan.

(c) **Notes** the key Health and Safety lagging and leading indicators for 2016/17.

(d) **Notes** the proposed set of Health and Safety objectives and Workplan for 2017/18.

(e) **Notes** the proposed objectives to be included in the 2017/18 Health and Safety Workplan have been reviewed and accepted by Health and Safety Committee and Management Team.

**CARRIED**
6.2 **Long Term Plan 2018-2028 Project Update - Maria Edgar (Senior Policy Analyst)**

Mr Geoff Meadows presented this report showing the progress of the Long Term Plan 2018-2028 project.

Councillor Stewart questioned the currency of some of the information provided in the report, specifically the note of community engagement for the Draft Annual Plan 2017/18 deliberations, which have already been undertaken. An explanation of the “Big Issues” noted in the report was provided. There will be another health check undertaken later in the year and this matter will be covered then. Councillor Stewart had concerns that the report was not clear and would not be clear to any members of the public reading it.

Moved Deputy Mayor Felstead seconded Councillor Blackie

**THAT** the Audit and Risk Committee:

(a) **Receives** report no. LTC-03-13/ TRIM No. 170704068754 Long Term Plan 2018-2028 Project Update

(b) **Notes** that the Long Term Plan 2018-2028 is on track for this stage of the project.

**CARRIED**

6.3 **Audit New Zealand’s Interim audit report for the year ending 30 June 2017 – Jeff Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support)**

Mr Millward presented this report and Audit New Zealand Director John Mackey was present and commented on the audit. Mr Mackey noted it was pleasing to see that Management have introduced suggested recommendations for improvements. Councillor Stewart questioned how there are different issues that need resolving after each audit has been undertaken. Mr Mackey noted that each Audit shows that things are improving, though acknowledged that there are different people undertaking different tasks each year, or in some cases there have been changes in processes.

Mr Millward provided an explanation of the Audit recommendation on Delegations, with the clarification that delegations cannot be combined.

The Council is to be commended as to where it has got to in planning for the Long Term Plan. There are issues with community interest in matters that need to be consulted on. Mr Mackey noted that a key part of the LTP is the Asset Management Plan, and combining that with the Infrastructure Strategy, questioned if this matter is under control. Mesrs Millward and Palmer confirmed that this is in hand and the affordability of programmes and is under active management. Another issue noted by Mr Mackey is the residential red zone, which will impact on the Annual Plan, and also the Annual Report. Grants from Governments are complex, and this will need to be incorporated in the audit. Mr Palmer noted that the value of the land will need to be estimated, there will need to be a conversations with both LINZ and the Auditors on this matter when the time comes. There was discussion on the issue of FENZ, and the fire assets. This matter requires further discussion.
Councillor Atkinson noted the potential complications with the roading assets in red zones, and the transfer of these parcels of land back to the Council.

Councillor Gordon, asked Mr Mackey if he could offer advice on any ways that this Council could be operating using better practice. It was noted that if there was any suggestions, these would have been included in the Audit report.

Moved Councillor Atkinson seconded Councillor Stewart

THAT the Audit and Risk Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 170705069442

(b) Receives Audit New Zealand’s Interim Management Report for the year ending 30 June 2017

(c) Notes there are no significant matters arising from the interim audit, however there are a number of recommendations made by Audit New Zealand within the report where improvements could be made and the Management have agreed within their response to undertake

(d) Notes there will be a further report to the Audit & Risk Committee on the progress of the recommendations.

CARRIED

Councillor Atkinson and Stewart offered congratulations to management and staff in operating the Council business at a level “above the bar”, as noted by Mr Mackey.

6.4 Enterprise North Canterbury 2017/18 Statement of Intent and Business Plan and District Promotions Plan – Simon Markham (Manager Strategy and Engagement)

Messrs Markham and Hart presented this report, which requests the Committee to recommend to Council the adoption of the ENC proposed Statement of Intent for 2017/18, receives the related Business Plan and approves the proposed District Promotions Business Plan for 2017/18.

Moved Councillor Atkinson seconded Councillor Blackie

THAT the Audit and Risk Committee:

(a) Receives Report No. 170712072157

AND recommends that the Council:

(b) Adopts Enterprise North Canterbury’s (ENC) proposed Statement of Intent (SOI) for the 2017/18 year

(c) Receives Enterprise North Canterbury’s 2017/18 Business Plan

(d) Adopts Enterprise North Canterbury’s proposed District Promotions Business Plan for 2017/18.

CARRIED

Councillor Stewart abstained from voting

Councillor Williams noted his concerns, which had also been highlighted at previous meetings, with the value for money that the Council receives for the costs for the Enterprise North Canterbury contract. It is understood that Enterprise North Canterbury are providing some good outcomes, but not for the cost to this Council. It was noted that members have not been receiving
copies of minutes of the ENC Board meetings. This matter will be followed up.

Councillor Stewart advised she would abstain from voting, and has concerns with the vehicle delivery and the lack of accountability. Councillor Stewart believes this function is a legitimate one that a Council should be involved in, but does not support the way this is undertaken, in this case. Until some transparency is seen, Councillor Stewart will abstain from voting. It is suggested there needs to be a review of this delivery.

Councillor Atkinson asked if there was different approaches from other Councils on the deliveries from their Council Controlled Organisations. Mr Palmer provide some information on this. The current arrangements between ENC and this Council is a standard arrangement, with accountability of what they deliver. ENC have always been very prompt with accountability.

Councillor Gordon suggests that having the delivery of this work constantly questioned, is destabilising the work of ENC. The Council has made a decision on Section 17A, and staff can be asked to review this. Another option is for Council to raise a Notice of Motion.

Councillor Williams said he has asked several times what value is the Council receiving for the amount of money they are paid. Mr Markham noted that there was a workshop undertaken earlier this year on this which provided this information. Councillor Williams said he did not see any evidence of this at that meeting.

Councillor Stewart asked for copy of the previous review of this CCO, and this will be provided. Councillor Stewart said she does not wish to destabilise ENC at all and does not have any problem with the service being delivered, but has concerns with the way it is delivered.

Councillor Atkinson said ENC are delivering what they are being asked by the Council to deliver. He does not support having a review, and this would not be economic.

7 PORTFOLIO UPDATES

7.1 Audit, Risk, Long Term Plan and Excellence Programme – Deputy Mayor Kevin Felstead

Deputy Mayor Felstead said the Councils mark in the Excellence Programme is still to be confirmed. Mr Palmer provided an update on this, and an explanation of the categories of scoring.

7.2 Communications - Councillor Neville Atkinson

Nothing further to add.

8 QUESTIONS

There were no questions.

9 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS

There was no urgent general business.
10 MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

Moved Deputy Mayor Felstead seconded Councillor Williams

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>Minutes of the public excluded portion of the Audit and Risk meeting of 16 May 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>10.2</td>
<td>Report of Sarah Nichols (Governance Manager)</td>
<td>Potential Sale of Civic Assurance House</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>Report of Sarah Nichols (Governance Manager)</td>
<td>Insurance Renewal Update for 2017/18</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Reason for protection of interests</th>
<th>Ref NZS 9202:2003 Appendix A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.1-10.3</td>
<td>Protection of privacy of natural persons To carry out commercial activities without prejudice</td>
<td>A2(a) A2(b)(ii)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CARRIED

CLOSED MEETING

Resolution to resume in Open Meeting

Moved Deputy Mayor Felstead seconded Councillor Atkinson

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

CARRIED
OPEN MEETING

11 NEXT MEETING
The next meeting of the Audit and Risk Committee is scheduled for 4pm, Tuesday 19 September 2017 in the Council Chambers, 215 High Street, Rangiora.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS THE MEETING CLOSED AT 5.55PM.

CONFIRMED

______________________________
Chairperson

______________________________
Date

Briefing (Public Excluded)
1. Revenue and Financing Policy Review - Jeff Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support)
   The current Policy was looked at and committee considered whether there is an appetite to review any aspects of the policy leading into the LTP.
MINUTES OF THE DISTRICT PLANNING AND REGULATION COMMITTEE MEETING HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA ON TUESDAY 15 AUGUST 2017 1.00PM.

PRESENT
Councillor J Meyer (Chair), Mayor D Ayers, Councillors N Atkinson, W Doody, and D Gordon.

IN ATTENDANCE
Councillor P Williams
Messrs J Palmer (Chief Executive), N Harrison (Manager Regulation), S Markham (Manager Strategy and Engagement), V Caseley (District Plan Manager), M Johnston (Environmental Services Manager), Ms H Downie (Principal Planning Analyst), M McIlraith (Communications and Engagement Manager) and E Stubbs (Minute Secretary).

1. APOLOGIES
Moved J Meyer seconded N Atkinson
An apology was received and sustained from P Allen for absence.

CARRIED

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
Nil.

3. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of a meeting of the District Planning and Regulation Committee held on 20 June 2017
Moved W Doody seconded D Gordon
THAT the District Planning and Regulation Committee:
(a) Confirms as a true and correct record the minutes of a meeting of the District Planning and Regulation Committee held on 20 June 2017.

CARRIED

4. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES
Nil.

5. PRESENTATION
There were no presentations.
6. **REPORTS**

6.1 **Draft Waimakariri District Development Strategy (DDS) Hearing Panel Amendment – Heike Downie (Principal Planning Analyst)**

H Downie spoke briefly to the report noting it was a procedural matter of replacing Councillor Gordon with Councillor Williams on the hearing panel for the draft ‘Our District, Our Future – Waimakariri 2048, District Development Strategy’ due to Councillor Gordon’s absence.

There was some discussion over the procedure for replacement as the hearings were to be held prior to the next Council meeting. N Harrison noted that the Committee had a broad delegation for District Development matters.

Moved N Atkinson Seconded D Ayers

**THAT** the District Planning and Regulation Committee **Recommends** that the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 170801081543.

(b) **Endorses** the replacement of Councillor Gordon with Councillor Williams on the previously nominated hearing panel for the draft ‘Our District, Our Future – Waimakariri 2048, District Development Strategy’.

(c) **Notes** that with this replacement, the hearing panel consists of Mayor Ayers and Councillors Meyer, Felstead, Atkinson and Williams.

(d) **Notes** that the hearing for those who indicated they wish to speak to their written submission on the draft ‘Our District, Our Future – Waimakariri 2048, District Development Strategy’ is scheduled for 17, 18 and 21 August 2017.

**CARRIED**

N Atkinson commented that by requesting that Council endorse the replacement rather than retrospectively approve the procedure was transparent.


M Johnstone advised that the Dog Control Act stipulated that an Annual Report on Dog Control must be provided to the Department of Internal Affairs. The purpose of the report was to adopt that annual report. A copy of the report would be placed on the Council website and figures would be advertised in the local paper.

D Gordon referred to the briefing Councillors had had on dog control noting the need for a new animal shelter location. He commented that there appeared to be an adequate, available site at the front of the Water Unit and asked why they were searching for an alternative location rather than getting on with relocating to the available site. M Johnstone advised that there had not been the opportunity yet to explore further sites around the district. He advised there was 3000m² available at the potential site. N Harrison advised that they had not gone so far as to get a quantity survey,
or consider whether it would be a relocate or a rebuild. A rough order estimate of cost was $500,000. D Gordon commented he would support the project being brought forward from year 5 of the next LTP.

D Ayers queried how easy it was to get a permit for more than two dogs on an urban property, and if a neighbour had a right to veto a third dog. M Johnston replied it was relatively straightforward and required liaison with neighbours. A neighbour did not have exclusive right to veto.

D Ayers asked if there were any numbers regarding use of the dog parks noting that there were discussions around dog parks for Kaiapoi and Oxford. N Harrison commented that anecdotally they were popular but that had not been quantified.

D Ayers commented on the number of dogs being walked at Northbrook Wetlands when there were signs that dogs were not allowed. M Johnston commented that the majority of dog owners were responsible however there was a small percentage who allowed dogs off leads which meant there needed to be a blanket ban in some locations. W Doody requested an up to date map of public places where dogs were not allowed or were allowed either on or off lead so that the public knew where they could take their animals. M Johnston commented that was a good idea. It could be displayed at the dog parks.

Moved D Gordon Seconded W Doody

THAT the District Planning and Regulation Committee:

(a) Receives report No: 170710071156.

(b) Adopts Table 1 Annual Report for 2016-2017 (Dog Control Act 1996 s10A), for the year ending 30 June 2017, as the Waimakariri District Council Annual Report in terms of the Dog Control Act 1996.

(c) Circulates a copy of this report to the Boards.

CARRIED

D Gordon commented that the briefing on the report had been helpful and noted that WDC dog registration fees were not expensive compared to other jurisdictions. The current animal shelter was not in an ideal location behind gates and near the sewerage ponds. He would support a paper being brought to the committee regarding a suitable location to relocate.

D Ayers noted his specific questions around Northbrook Wetlands raised a wider issue around the problem of enforcement.

6.3 2016 – 2017 Annual Report to Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority – Malcolm Johnston, (Environmental Services Manager)

M Johnston advised the purpose of the report was for the Committee to adopt the Annual Report to the Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority (ARLA) which was a statutory requirement. A number of metrics were included in the report. M Johnston commented that the District Licensing Committee was going well.

W Doody noted item 5 in the Annual Report which raised frustration around lack of consistency with application forms and procedures across the
country and M Johnston commented there was a need to keep reiterating the issue with ARLA.

Moved N Atkinson  Seconded D Ayers

THAT the District Planning and Regulation Committee:

(a) Receives report No: 170713072849.

(b) Adopts the Annual Report to the Alcohol Regulatory and Licensing Authority as the Waimakariri District Council Annual Report for the year ending 30 June 2017, in terms of Section 199 of the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012.

CARRIED

N Atkinson commented that this committee, under the guidance of M Johnston, addressed a serious part of regulation in the district. He believed that the community did have power in this matter through public hearings. N Atkinson expressed gratitude for the guidance and leadership the committee had. He was disappointed in the number of controlled purchasing operation infringements. It was up to the Licensee’s to do the right thing so that extra rules were not required. The Committee needed to act as a leveller between the two extreme views in the community around alcohol licencing.

D Ayers commented on the role of market forces in licensing.

W Doody expressed appreciation on behalf of the Committee of the work M Johnston was putting in with training.

D Gordon commended M Johnston on his fair approach and the excellent job he was doing across environmental services. He noted his proactive approach to public relations.

7. PORTFOLIO UPDATES

7.1 District Planning Development – Councillor Neville Atkinson

N Atkinson commented that the goal was to have the District Plan in draft around 2019. Selwyn would be working to a similar timeframe and it would assist to get learnings from each other and would be beneficial in terms of the settlement plan.

N Atkinson expressed concern around deficiencies in resources to complete the project. J Palmer noted the concern.

7.2 Regulation and Civil Defence – Councillor John Meyer

J Meyer commented on the rapidness of change and that they were lucky with the support team they had.

7.3 Business, Promotion and Town Centres – Councillor Dan Gordon

D Gordon noted the events of the last month including the Kaiapoi Art Expo, Blackwells Fire and Ice and the Rangiora Winter Festival commenting that the events were extremely well attended. As a volunteer at the Rangiora Winter Festival, it was good to see first-hand the effort that went into running the event and the awesome effort by the committee. He
believed the events should be commended. He acknowledged the efforts of the Mayor and others in the Big Splash.

D Gordon noted his attention had been focused on lighting features for the town centres following the commitments given last year.

D Gordon advised that he had had meetings with the chairs of the Town Centre promotions groups, Heather Warwick of ENC and Simon Hart in order to keep up to date.

8. **MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED**

*Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987*

Moved D Gordon  Seconded N Atkinson

**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>8.1</td>
<td>Minutes of the Public Excluded Portion of the meeting of the District Planning and Regulation Committee meeting of 20 June 2017</td>
<td>Confirmation of Minutes</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Nº</th>
<th>Reason for protection of interests</th>
<th>Ref NZS 9202:2003 Appendix A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>Protection of privacy of natural persons To carry out commercial activities without prejudice</td>
<td>A2(a) A2(b)ii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. **QUESTIONS**

Nil.

10. **URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS**

Nil.
11. **NEXT MEETING**

The next scheduled meeting of the District Planning and Regulation Committee is Tuesday 17 October 2017.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 1.44pm.

CONFIRMED

__________________________________  Chairperson

__________________________________  Date
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE UTILITIES AND ROADING COMMITTEE HELD IN
THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA ON TUESDAY 15
AUGUST 2017 AT 4.00PM

PRESENT
Councillor R Brine (Chairperson), Mayor D Ayers, Deputy Mayor K Felstead, Councillors
J Meyer, S Stewart and P Williams.

IN ATTENDANCE
Councillors D Gordon, W Doody (late arriving)
Messrs J Palmer, (Chief Executive), G Cleary (Manager Utilities and Roading), K Simpson
(3 Waters Manager), C Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager), Mrs K Waghorn (Solid Waste
Asset Manager), Ms J Fraser (Utilities Planner), O Davies (Drainage Asset Manager) and A
Smith (Committee Advisor)

1 APOLOGIES
An apology from Councillor Brine for early departure at 5.30pm was received and
sustained. The meeting subsequently finished before this time.

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
No conflicts of interest were noted.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Utilities and Roading Committee held on
Tuesday 20 June 2017
Moved Deputy Mayor Felstead seconded Councillor Meyer
THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee:

(a) Confirms, as a true and correct record, the minutes of a meeting of the
Utilities and Roading Committee held on Tuesday 20 June 2017.

CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
There were no matters arising.

5 PRESENTATION
There were no presentations.
6 Reports

6.1 Water Conservation Strategy Implementation Summary for 2016/17 – Colin Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager)

Colin Roxburgh presented this report to provide an annual update to the committee on the implementation of the Council’s Water Conservation Strategy.

Following assessment of the average leakage figure district-wide, this figure equated to water loss of 18% of the water supplied to the network. This is less than the mandatory performance measure target of 22%. Some schemes didn’t meet the target which is where the Council will focus its work over the next few years. It has been found to be challenging actually measuring the leakage on some restricted schemes. It is planned to find a better way to measure estimated leakage on these schemes.

Water conservation education is an important part of the process and as part of the Community Awareness Programme in the 2016/17 year, there has been school education programmes to raise awareness of water conservation issues. 88 classroom sessions were held in schools and pre-schools in the 2016/17 year. There has also been participation in the SMART waterering programme, which promotes smarter use of water throughout the region.

There is further investigations to be undertaken into the use of water metering. For several years there has been water use data being collected at approx. 114 sites, which were selected as potential high users, industrial and commercial sites. A report will come back to the Council with information from this investigation, as to whether there could be any rating for water use on this type of property. It was noted that previous Councils have not favoured having water metering, but it could be something that could be considered in future on a targeted property basis.

Mayor Ayers enquired on the benefits of having a desk top exercise to get an indication of what resources would be required for the introduction of water metering in the district and how much planning would be involved. Knowing what likely costs involved would be helpful. Colin said there was work started in 2010 on this, but further work would be undertaken to provide more current information and this will be reported back to the committee.

Deputy Mayor Felstead asked if there was information available from other neighbouring districts to compare the percentage figures of average water leakage of total water used across the district. Colin advised it is a mandatory performance measure that all Councils must report on. Staff will source the information from neighbouring authorities and provide it back to the committee.

Councillor Stewart expressed concern with the reported leakages and water losses in the water schemes across the district, highlighting the 91% leakage recorded at Summerhill Water Supply, stating this is totally unacceptable. It was asked what timeframe is suggested for getting this percentage down? Colin replied that this scheme is one of the schemes where a better way of measuring the leakage was needed and is being investigated. If there was instances of illegal connections to a water supply scheme, this would be reported as water leakage, because this is water that is going out that the Council can’t account for. The district wide figure of 18% does sound high, with a lot of water lost, but in terms of comparing this Council’s with others nationally, this is about middle of the range of percentages.
Moved Councillor Williams seconded Deputy Mayor Felstead

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee:

(a) **Receives** report No. 170803082745.

(b) **Notes** the progress on the implementation of the Water Conservation, including the active leak detection and analysis work, Community Awareness Programme and investigations in water metering as documented in this report.

(c) **Notes** that Council is meeting its mandatory performance measure target set by the Department of Internal Affairs of achieving leakage of less than 22% of total water used, achieving an actual assessed leakage value of 18% across the district’s public water supply schemes.

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

CARRIED

Deputy Mayor Felstead said there is obviously room for improvement but also understands that it is hard to source the leaks.

Councillor Stewart suggested that water metering needs to be considered by the Council and looks forward to the report coming back to the committee with information on this and the costs involved for updating the technology required.

6.2 **Update on Cam River Enhancement Project – Janet Fraser (Utility Planner) and Owen Davies (Drainage Asset Manager)**

Janet Fraser and Owen Davies presented this report with the annual update on the status of the Cam River Enhancement Project. The $100,000 of the fund already allocated has gone to Environment Canterbury and they will be bringing information back to the Cam River Enhancement subcommittee on Thursday. This is for planned works within Tuahiwi Stream and around the springs and headwaters of South Brook in the Fernside area.

Councillor Stewart questioned the information coming from Ecan and whether this already approved funding may need to be reviewed. Owen Davies replied that Council staff are working closely with Ecan staff, aligning any planned work with the recommendations in the Henry Hudson report and what Ecan proposes is acceptable to the sub-committee. There will be an opportunity to discuss this work at the next meeting of the Subcommittee on the 24 August, and to possibly adjust any funding to align that with what Henry has in his report.

Moved Councillor Meyer seconded Councillor Brine

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee:

(a) **Receives** report No. 170803082835.

(b) **Notes** the Cam River Enhancement Fund has a value of $208,437 as at 3 August 2017.
(c) **Notes** $100,000 has already been allocated to projects in the Tuahiwi Stream and in Fernside, but has yet to be spent.

(d) **Notes** that staff will bring a report to the October meeting of the Utilities and Roading Committee detailing how the remainder of the budget will be allocated, following the Cam River Enhancement Fund Subcommittee meeting on 24 August 2017.

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

Councillor Meyer is pleased to see this matter move forward and looks forward to improvements in the Tuahiwi Stream.

Councillor Stewart endorses the comments of Councillor Meyer and welcomes the adoption of the report from Henry Hudson. Councillor Stewart hopes that all authorities are working down the same path to achieve the same objectives and would be disappointed if other authorities don’t work to implement improvements as in Henry Hudson’s report.

Councillor Brine noted the Tuahiwi Stream is a very important waterway, and noted the work that has already been undertaken by farmers along this stretch of water. There are improvements being made. It is good to see the fund being available to progress work and to make a difference. Councillor Brine believes there is now a much greater awareness of water ways and what goes in the waterways.

Councillor Meyer is very confident that the improvements to the waterways will be measurable.

### 7 REPORT FOR INFORMATION ONLY FROM KAIAPOI-TUAHIWI COMMUNITY BOARD MEETING OF 19 JUNE 2017

#### 7.1 Approval to Install Intersection Controls in Rich Street at Raven Quay – Ken Stevenson (Roading Manager)

Moved Deputy Mayor Felstead Seconded Councillor Williams

**THAT** the report be received for information.

**CARRIED**

### 8 PORTFOLIO UPDATES

#### 8.1 Roading – Councillor John Meyer

Regarding the switching on the traffic lights at Southbrook – Councillor Meyer noted that he had had discussions with residents who live in the vicinity of the intersection relayed positive comments from these residents.

#### 8.2 Drainage and Stockwater – Councillor Sandra Stewart

There has been a full round of drainage advisory groups in June/July. At the recent meeting of the Water Race Advisory Group on 20 July, there was discussion on the use of race system to do a stream augmentation trial – inputting water upstream from Silverstream to supplement water flow. Councillor Stewart suggested that this Council staff need to be more aware of this trial.
Councillor Stewart noted the erosion of the banks of the stream at the corner of Flaxton Road, with pressure from the road and the run off from the industrial sites. The Council needs to show a lead to have some barriers, planting or something to stop the roadside slipping into the stream. Looks forward to seeing a report back from staff on what plans are in place.

8.3 Utilities (Water Supplies and Sewer) – Cr Paul Williams

In the wake of recent announcements of some water schemes in Hurunui to be chlorinated, the Hurunui District Council has been asked to advise if they have any plans to upgrade the Ashley Rural Water scheme to comply with Drinking Water Standards of New Zealand. The Ashley Rural Water Scheme currently has MIOX, which is an equivalent of chlorination.

8.4 Solid Waste – Cr Robbie Brine

Robbie advised, there has been approximately 3,000 submissions received in response to the public consultation on the Waste Management Minimisation Plan. Of these, currently 35 submitters have indicated they wish to speak to their submissions.

At this time, Gerard Cleary took the opportunity to introduce Chris Parton, who has recently been appointed to the Council in the role of Wastewater Asset Manager. The Chairperson welcomed Chris to the Council and wished him an enjoyable association with the Council and this Committee.

9 MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

Moved Councillor Brine seconded Councillor Meyer

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>9.1</td>
<td>Minutes of the public excluded portion of a meeting of the Utilities and Roading Committee 20 June 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>9.2</td>
<td>Report of Kitty Waghorn (Solid Waste Asset Manager)</td>
<td>Renewal of Waste Receipt Agreement with Transwaste Canterbury</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This resolution is made in reliance on section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, and the particular interest or interests protected by Section 6 or Section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Reason for protection of interests</th>
<th>Ref NZS 9202:2003 Appendix A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9.1 and 9.2 | Protection of privacy of natural persons  
To carry out commercial activities without prejudice | A2(a)  
A2(b)ii |

CARRIED

**Resolution to Resume Open Meeting**

Moved Councillor Brine seconded Councillor Meyer

**THAT** open meeting resumes and that the resolution(s) made with the public excluded be made public.

CARRIED

9.2 **Renewal of Waste Receipt Agreement with Transwaste Canterbury – Kitty Waghorn (Solid Waste Asset Manager)**

Moved Deputy Mayor Felstead seconded Councillor Williams

**THAT** the Utilities and Roading Committee:

(e) **Receives** report No. 170728079952.

(f) **Approves** the renewal of the General Waste Receipt Agreement between the Waimakariri District Council and Transwaste Canterbury Ltd for a further three year term, to 30 June 2020.

(g) **Delegates** authority to the Chief Executive to sign the General Waste Receipt Agreement on behalf of the Council.

CARRIED

**Open meeting**

10 **QUESTIONS**

There were no questions.

11 **URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS**

There was no urgent general business.

12 **NEXT MEETING**

The next scheduled meeting of the Utilities and Roading Committee is Tuesday 17 October 2017.
There being no further business, the meeting closed at 4.55pm

CONFIRMED

__________________________
Chairperson

__________________________
Date

**BRIEFING**

At the conclusion of the meeting, staff gave an overview of the preparation and response to the storm event on the 21 July from a 3 Waters perspective, including outlining areas that will require further investigation and potentially upgrading works.
MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF THE OXFORD-OHOKA COMMUNITY BOARD
HELD IN THE WEST EYRETON HALL, 2 EARLYS ROAD, WEST EYRETON ON
THURSDAY 3 AUGUST 2017 AT 7PM.

PRESENT
D Nicholl (Chair), M Brown (Deputy Chair), W Doody, J Ensor, J Lynn and T Robson.

IN ATTENDANCE
S Markham (Manager, Strategy and Engagement), G Reburn, (Parks & Recreation
Operations Team Leader), Mayor Ayers, S Nichols (Governance Manager) and E Stubbs
(Minutes Secretary).

1 APOLOGIES
Moved W Doody  Seconded J Ensor
Apologies were received and sustained from K Felstead and S Farrell for absence.

CARRIED

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
W Doody declared a conflict with item 7.3 as a Councillor on the hearing panel.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

3.1 Minutes of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board – 6 July 2017
Moved M Brown  seconded J Ensor

(a) THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

Confirms the circulated minutes of the Oxford-Ohoka Community
Board meeting, held 6 July 2017, as a true and accurate record.

CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
Nil.

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

5.1 Swannanoa Cricket Club

Mike Martin, Club Captain and Tim Fulton, Club Secretary provided an update
on the Club’s plans to develop the Swannanoa Domain into a niche North
Canterbury cricket venue and make it a more beautiful location for cricket and
other users.

M Martin outlined the progress made recently with the size of the club growing
to include a second competition team. The club had raised $15,000 for new
quality nets along with new sightscreens installed. M Martin noted that
alongside the improvements at the cricket club there had also been an
increased number of people using the domain recreationally including dog
walkers, and other cricket teams utilising the ground for training.

M Martin advised that there were two main projects for the next step in
development. Firstly the club wanted to shift the existing pavilion to the
location of the new nets which was out of the easterly wind, and lay decking around the pavilion to provide a shady space for spectators and social functions. The estimated cost to move the pavilion and decking was $35,000. They had been in discussion with the Rata Foundation regarding funding and the Rata Foundation had been receptive to the proposal. Support was required from the Council for the proposal which had been discussed with Green Space staff.

The second main project was irrigation for the cricket ground. The club was looking for support from the Council as they believed that irrigating the ground would not just benefit the club but also other users of the domain. The increase in local population and the focus on increasing participation in sport was noted. It was suggested that the installation of a bore would be very beneficial, which had an estimate of approximately $35,000.

D Nicholl asked if the club believed it would get a permit for a water take and M Martin advised he did not think it would be an issue having spoken to Clemence Drilling Ltd. J Ensor advised that the area was in the 'red zone' which meant water was already over allocated. He suggested the club speak to a neighbour who had a historic water take.

W Doody queried the relationship with the Mandeville Cricket Club and M Martin advised they worked closely with Mandeville and had its full support. W Doody noted that the pitch was artificial at the moment and commented on the increased care and maintenance required for a grass wicket.

J Lynn asked about the toilet facilities, particularly if the pavilion was moved. M Martin advised that the toilets would remain where they were. Power and water was already available to the new pavilion site. The club had two units of water a day.

T Fulton the Club Secretary introduced himself. He noted that in the 2005 Draft Concept Plan for the Domain there had also been the proposal to move the pavilion to the same site. He noted that the club was 120 years old and asked about the Council’s role in developing supporting infrastructure at Mandeville. W Doody advised that the Mandeville Cricket Club had applied to the Annual Plan and Long Term Plan for funding. S Markham commented that it was a good time to bring the development proposals to the Board highlighting the potential for an application to the Council’s 10 year budget plan.

G Reburn advised of a conversation with M Martin that morning confirming the Council had tried to provide irrigation to the ground in the past and that the two units of water were not enough. Further time was required to look into solutions as there was potential to explore providing other units of water without having to go to a bore. Mainpower Oval could provide a comparison for the water quantity required. In terms of moving the building, the Council had no issue with that. Following a conversation with C Sargison (Community and Recreation Manager) a report on the Swannana Domain could be brought to the Board in October 2017. There was also a Sports Field Strategy that considered future use.

It was asked if there was any timing around the application to the Rata Foundation and M Martin advised that the proposal needed to be ratified at the AGM. S Nichols advised the Board could supply a letter supporting the club’s application to the Rata Foundation.

M Brown suggested that once the pavilion had been moved, consideration could be given to providing funding from the Board’s General Landscaping budget for landscape enhancement around the pavilion.
J Ensor queried whether the presenters had seen the moved Pony Club buildings at Mandeville which included wheelchair access. He suggested that to begin with only the pitch should be irrigated as an interim measure as had happened at Mainpower Oval when that was set up.

W Doody and D Nicholl requested an invitation to the Club’s AGM.

The Chair thanked the presenters for their informative discussion.

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS

Nil.

7 REPORTS

7.1 Oxford Public Toilet Mural – C Brown (Community Green Space Manager)

S Nichols advised she would take the report as read.

W Doody believed that until the Art in Public Places Policy was operational the Board needed to postpone making a decision on a mural for the Oxford Town Centre Toilets.

S Nichols advised that C Sargison had made a suggestion that a potential Board initiative could be to run a local competition for a design for the mural, however that decision did not need to be made tonight.

S Markham commented that it would be best to wait until the new Oxford Library and Service Centre building and landscaping was complete so the community could envisage the concept better.

W Doody noted there was potential to apply to Creative Communities for funding.

T Robson had an issue with waiting especially with no end date in sight. He commented there would not be enough time after the Long Term Plan for painting before winter. S Nichols commented that the recommendation could be amended to review the option again in December.

W Doody suggested that there were a number of groups in Oxford including Keep Oxford Beautiful with whom the mural should be discussed. S Markham asked if there was a liaison role with Keep Oxford Beautiful. W Doody replied no but that she could speak with them. M Brown queried whether the Pearson Park Advisory Group should also be included in discussion. He would like to think as many groups as possible would be involved.

Moved W Doody seconded D Nicholl

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No 170713072891.

(b) Lays the report on the table until the September 2017 meeting, pending further information.

CARRIED

7.2 Application for Oxford-Ohoka Community Board Discretionary Grant 2017-2018 – E Cordwell (Governance Adviser)
S Nichols advised the Board that the group had also approached the Rangiöra-Ashley and Woodend-Sefton Community Boards for funding for this project, and proposed seeking funding for other projects from the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board.

J Lynn had a number of questions about the application including: how did they promote themselves over the wider district area? How did community groups connect with them? How long had the group been around? The project had a value of $12,000 of which $1,500 was requested from the community boards – where did the rest come from? It was noted that the group had answered that the project could not continue without the funding from the Board.

S Nichols suggested that staff from the Community Team attend the next meeting in order to answer some of the Board’s questions.

Moved M Brown seconded J Lynn

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No 170720075877.

(b) Lays the report on the table until the September 2017 meeting, when staff will attend to provide additional information on the project.

CARRIED

7.3 Approval of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board’s Submission to the Waimakariri District Council regarding the Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan – Edwina Cordwell (Governance Advisor)

W Doody declared an interest and did not take part in discussion.

S Nichols noted that the report was seeking approval of the Board’s submission to the Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan and asked if the Board was satisfied with the submission or requested changes.

Moved M Brown seconded T Robson

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 170713072831.

(b) Approves the Board’s Submission to the Waimakariri District Council regarding the Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan (Trim 170711071987).

CARRIED

D Nicholl commented that he was happy with the submission.

8 CORRESPONDENCE

The Board had received an invitation to the Gatekeepers Lodge on 2 September 2017.
9 **CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT**

**9.1 Chairperson’s Report for July 2017**

Moved T Robson  seconded J Ensor

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

(a) **Receives** report No 170727079813.

**CARRIED**

10 **MATTERS FOR INFORMATION**

10.1 **Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting minutes – 17 July 2017**

(Trim No. 170713072971)

10.2 **Waimakariri District Rural Fire Assets and Functions transfer to FENZ** – Report to Council – 4 July 2017 (Trim No.170619062744)

10.3 **Submission to the Canterbury Regional Transport Committee on the proposal to vary the Regional Land Transport Plan** – Report to Council – 4 July 2017 (Trim No.170630063196)

J Ensor commented that the Rural Fire Assets and Functions transfer to FENZ was a comprehensive report and believed the changes outlined in the report were a huge gain for the district. J Ensor noted the Council’s submission to the Canterbury Regional Transport Committee commenting that the motorway addition was a ‘no-brainer’ and that this Board was largely affected by the transport issues.

Moved M Brown  seconded W Doody

**THAT** the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board receives the information in items 10.1-10.3.

**CARRIED**

11 **MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE**

11.1 **J Ensor**

- Attended Waimakariri Health Advisory Group (WHAG) meeting commenting it was great to see the engagement and coordination of health issues in the district.

11.2 **T Robson**

- Attended Youth Council Meeting. The Youth Development Strategy survey was reviewed. The survey looked at what had changed for young people in the district and how young people felt about interaction with the Council including decision making. It also looked it issues around mental health. There was to be a Meet the General Election Candidates session on 22 August 2017.
- Attended OPAC (Oxford Promotions) meeting where a number of ways to better promote Oxford were discussed.
- Attended Oxford Farmers Market as part of the Waste Minimisation Consultation. A number of people had commented positively on the Council’s fast response to recent flooding issues.
11.3 **M Brown**
- Had been a volunteer judge at the recent large Pony Club event in Mandeville.
- Had facilitated the attendance of the Swannanoa Cricket Club.
- Commented there had been a good response by the Council to the recent flooding.

11.4 **J Lynn**
- Gatekeepers Lodge – there was an estimate of $25,000 to shift the building. Invited Board members to attend the open day so they would have an idea of the proposal prior to any request for Council funding.
- Commented it was good to see the consultation on the Ohoka Domain. S Nichols advised that results from public consultation would assist with the formation of a concept plan which would come to the Board for consideration. S Markham commented further on the consultation processes to formulate a proposal.

11.5 **W Doody**
**Council**
- The Three Waters Working Party had provided recommendations to the Council on a district wide rating strategy. It would be considered further through a special engagement process.
- Commented on a new initiative in Christchurch where there was electronic monitoring of mobility parking spaces.
- The Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw Working Party had provided recommendations for the Implementation Plan.
- Following consultation changes to speed limits around Mandeville and Rangiora had been approved.
- Discussion around findings of government inquiry into Havelock North drinking water incident. LGNZ Conference 2017
- Commented that the conference was beneficial, with good exhibitors and interesting progress with technology. Noted the walking tours and especially the Devonport Library which embraced the history of the township.

11.6 **D Nicholl**
- Attended Oxford Farmers Market where there was good interest in the Waste Minimisation Strategy. Over 2,000 people from the district had already submitted comments.

12 **CONSULTATION PROJECTS**
12.1 **Waste Minimisation and Management Plan**
Consultation ends Friday 11 August 2017.

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:


S Nichols advised that following on from the June transport briefing there would be a report from staff regarding Main Street, Oxford in September 2017 for consideration.

14 **BOARD FUNDING UPDATE**

14.1 **Board Discretionary Grant**

Balance as at 3 August 2017: $5,533.25

15 **MEDIA ITEMS**

Nil.

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 September 2017 commencing at 7.00pm, at the Mandeville Sports Club.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 8.10pm

CONFIRMED

__________________________________________
Chairperson

__________________________________________
Date
MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF THE RANGIORA-ASHLEY COMMUNITY BOARD
HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, RANGIORA SERVICE CENTRE, 215 HIGH
STREET, RANGIORA ON WEDNESDAY 9 AUGUST AT 7PM.

PRESENT
J Gerard QSO (Chair), D Lundy (Deputy Chair), R Brine, M Clarke, K Galloway, D Gordon,
J Hoult, S Lewis, G Miller and P Williams.

IN ATTENDANCE
J Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support), Mayor Ayers, J McBride
(Development Manager), B Rice (Senior Transport Engineer), S Hart (Business and
Centres Manager), E Cordwell (Governance Adviser) and E Stubbs (Minute Secretary).

1 APOLOGIES
Moved J Gerard seconded J Hoult

That the apologies from P Allen and C Prickett be received and sustained.
CARRIED

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
R Brine advised of a conflict of interest for Agenda Item 7.2 as a serving Police
Officer.
R Brine and P Williams both advised of a conflict of interest for Agenda Item 7.4
being the Chair and a member of the Hearing Panel respectively.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board – 26 July 2017
Moved J Hoult seconded D Lundy

THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:
n (a) Amends the minutes of the Rangiora Ashley Community Board
meeting held on 26 July 2017. Item 7.4 to add “D Gordon” also left the
room. Item 7.4 editorial change to paragraph sequence regarding
discussion of school fundraising.

(b) Confirms the circulated minutes of the Rangiora-Ashley Community
Board meeting, held on 26 July 2017, as a true and accurate record.
CARRIED

3.2 Receive Minutes of the Rangiora-Ashley Road Naming and Reserve
Naming Committee – 13 June 2017
Moved J Hoult seconded K Galloway

THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:

(c) Receives the minutes of the Rangiora-Ashley Road and Reserve
Naming Committee meeting, held on 13 June 2017.
CARRIED
4 MATTERS ARISING

Nil.

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

Stuart Harris thanked the Board for allowing him to speak regarding Agenda Item 7.2 Changes to Cones Road Speed limits. He supported the recommendations. Once any walkway was in place he requested appropriate signage be installed. Mr Harris noted that it had been two years since he had put forward the community walkway idea.

D Gordon asked about the signage and Mr Harris commented that it would be to advertise the track at both ends of the walkway.

Sarah Pallet, a resident of 308 Cones Road, spoke to the Board regarding the speed limit changes. She noted that the report addressed a number of her concerns however, she had some remaining matters that were not fully addressed (Trim No: 170817089019).

Referring to Section 3.15 of the report S Pallet agreed with improvements to the timber site rails but noted that they required regular maintenance which was not being carried out at the moment. She supported localised shaping of the vertical curve and widening of the road to increase visibility. S Pallet supported clearing of vegetation adjacent to the road but noted this had not been maintained in the past and requested that it be added to the regular mowing and maintenance schedule.

S Pallet was pleased to see the reference to monitoring the improvements. She requested that following the improvements to the vertical curve that the stopping sight distance be reassessed and appropriate remedial action taken if required.

S Pallet drew attention to the Board’s 6 March 2017 recommendation for a 30km/h speed limit whilst the recommendation in the report was for 40km/h.

D Gordon referred to the critical corner and asked if S Pallet had a view whether it should be 40km/h or 30km/h. S Pallet commented that if the safety improvements were made and were effective then she would be comfortable with 40km/hr. She believed the safety methods should be shown to be effective before the walkway was considered.

D Gordon queried whether S Pallet believed there were still problems at the Cones Road/Carrs Road intersection. S Pallet advised that there were many issues associated with the lack of visibility for drivers due to parking of both cars and large trucks. The corner required urgent attention and parking needed to be prevented in that area.

P Williams asked what S Pallet saw as the most important areas of concern. The intersection or the crest of the hill? S Pallet commented that there were really two crests and that improving visibility at both should be considered.

S Lewis thanked S Pallet for her deputation noting her observations of what could be improved and the maintenance and monitoring of improvements.

Robyn Eyles spoke with regard to the North Canterbury Musical Society’s funding application (Agenda Item 7.3). She commented on the role of the Society in the community and that the request for funding was for signage for the costume hire facility. Costume hire was a fundamental aspect of the North Canterbury Musical Society activity and used by members of the public and other societies for a wide range of events and activities. It was also a key contributor to income.

The Chairperson thanked all for their respective deputations.
6 **ADJOURNED BUSINESS**

Nil.

Note that items 7.1 to 7.4 were taken in the sequence 7.2, 7.3, 7.1, 7.4. The minutes have been recorded in accordance with the order of the Agenda as circulated.

7 **REPORTS**

7.1 **High Street Feature Lighting – K Stevenson (Roading Manager), J McBride (Development Manager)**

S Hart and J McBride spoke to the report. S Hart noted that most of the material had been covered at the previous meeting. However, further work had been completed on lower cost options and investigation of alternative products with the same specifications. There was no change to previous staff advice arising from this further work. Supplier delivery time-frame issues had also been considered as the lights are required to be installed prior to Christmas 2017. Council had received a briefing on the matter and were supportive of the recommendations. An indicative order for the lights had been placed with a cancellation option.

K Galloway asked how the timeframe tied in with Mainpower. S Hart advised that they were working closely with Mainpower who were relatively confident they could meet the required timeframes. Pre-cabling options were being considered. K Galloway asked if a completion date was available and S Hart replied that all involved were working towards mid-November.

Moved K Galloway, seconded G Miller

**THAT** the Rangiora–Ashley Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No 170725078225.

(b) **Approves** the feature lighting for High Street as detailed on the attached plan (TRIM 170728080053).

(c) **Approves** the reallocation of the remaining $265,000 High Street Upgrade budget in 2017/18 to fund the feature lighting in High Street.

(d) **Notes** that the current allocation of the remaining $265,000 is $205,000 to Good Street upgrade and $60,000 to the feature lighting.

(e) **Notes** the Good Street upgrade cannot now be completed until 2018/19 because of the delay in the new building on the east side of the street and that the likely cost to achieve the required outcome will be more than the $205,000 that is currently allocated.

(f) **Approves** the allocation of $350,000 from the future Town Centre Upgrade budget of $100,000 per year to the Good Street Upgrade project in 2018/19.
Consider options to fund the street lighting of $550,000 through the next LTP process.

CARRIED

K Galloway believed the lighting was one of the best projects the Board had established and was keen to see installation as soon as possible.

G Miller commented that the High Street needed the lighting.

J Gerard reiterated his thanks to staff and Councillors for taking the necessary steps to enable the project to progress and finally be achieved this year.

7.2 Changes to Cones Road Speed Limit – K Stevenson (Roading Manager), B Rice (Senior Transport Engineer), H Davies (Roading Projects Engineer)

B Rice spoke to the Board regarding the report and provided a brief update on potential alterations to the Cones Road/Carrs Road intersection. Indicative drawings were tabled.

B Rice reminded members of the background to the proposed speed limit change which was linked to Mr S Harris’s concept for a community project to construct a walkway along Cones Road. At its 8 March, 2017 meeting the Board had supported the potential for a walkway, if a 30km/h speed limit could be achieved on the unsealed portion of Cones Road.

Formal consultation had been undertaken from which the results were mixed. Some in support of 30km/hr and others in strong opposition.

Staff had therefore taken a step back and considered alternatives. Sight distances at the first vertical curve had been assessed and ways in which to increase this through appropriate earthworks had been investigated. Speed surveys had shown that the current actual average speed of vehicles halfway down the hill was around 50km/h. This meant that extensive physical changes to the road layout would be needed to achieve compliance with a 30km/h limit.

B Rice went on to describe the safety improvements that were being recommended for Cones Road given a 40km/h limit.

B Rice advised that the Carrs Road/Cones Road intersection had also been reviewed. Road widening had been considered as well as moving the entrance to Cones road further along Carrs road so drivers had more visibility before making the decision to turn. The option of removing the hedge had been investigated but required land purchase/easement and would therefore be costly in terms of both time and money. This option was not being progressed.

J Gerard asked if there was any reason why S Pallet’s suggestions could not be incorporated and B Rice confirmed that this would be possible. J Gerard asked if continued maintenance would occur and B Rice advised that it would.

D Lundy noted the earthworks required to reshape the vertical curve and asked if this would still be minor works for which funds were available. B Rice advised that the curve would need to be lengthened so that the height of the top of the curve could be reduced. There would be a limit to how much the curve could be reduced but he expected it to be adequate.

B Rice understood that the work could be accommodated from the current minor works budget but would need to be assessed against other priorities.

K Galloway asked if B Rice had driven the whole road at 40km/hr and B Rice advised that he had not driven at 40km/hr over the curves as the proposed safety improvements were not yet in place. If a driver could adequately see a cyclist or pedestrian and stop in time then that was a safe environment. K
Galloway noted the unpredictability of children and asked if the road was safe for them and B Rice commented that was a consideration in any pedestrian environment.

P Williams expressed concern that when the project was first considered it was expected to be cost neutral but now earthworks were required to reshape the vertical curve. He asked if there was a cost estimate for the earthworks. B Rice replied that he was not aware whether this had been undertaken. J Gerard commented that the cost implications were a matter for Council. P Williams believed it was not sensible for the Board to consider the matter further or make a recommendation to the Council without a rough estimate of cost. B Rice advised that further detailed work would be undertaken prior to staff seeking any consideration of the proposals by the Council.

M Clarke queried whether staff had considered that some agricultural machinery could only travel slowly and the impact this might have on other road users. B Rice said that farm vehicles had not been specifically considered but that in this type of environment agricultural machinery would be expected. He reminded the Board that the current legal speed limit was 100km/h and had not created too many issues due to the actual terrain and road contours. Road users had driven according to the conditions.

D Lundy noted that the concerns raised in S Pallet’s deputation regarding the Carrs/Cones Road intersection and that B Rice had provided some detail on possible solutions. He asked whether this was considered a major works and if there was sufficient budget. B Rice replied that it was still classed a minor works if land purchase was excluded.

D Gordon noted that the Board’s March 2017 resolution had requested greater safety and adequate parking for the Carrs/Cones Road intersection and asked why parking had not been factored in. B Rice commented that what had been tabbed was a draft only and was for the purposing of updating the board on progress. Parking would remain a difficulty as some parking could be provided but not a significant amount.

D Gordon noted the existing trucks parking adjacent to the intersection and B Rice commented that he was not aware of this and that it had not been specifically considered. The first priority had been to address safety aspects.

D Gordon queried whether B Rice would regard the road as safe at the 40km/h limit with the proposed improvements. B Rice advised that he would. D Gordon also queried whether there was a safety difference between 30km/h and 40km/h. B Rice responded that the difference between 30km/h and 40km/h feels greater to the driver than that between 100km/h and 110km/h. However, he was comfortable that the 40km/h limit coupled with the improvements described in the report would be appropriate for the environment.

D Gordon asked whether he thought the six-month review clause raised by S Pallet was reasonable and B Rice replied yes.

D Gordon also asked if Abley had reviewed the 40km/h proposals. B Rice advised that there was sufficient expertise in the team and that all analysis had to comply with AUSNZ standards. This had not been deemed necessary but could be undertaken.

D Gordon asked when the intersection improvement work would be undertaken and whether it would be brought back to the Board after consultation. B Rice noted that the intersection work was still a draft and only presented to the Board at this time for information. The intersection work was a separate exercise to the speed limit reduction.

K Galloway noted that if the speed limit was 30km/h people tended to drive at 40km/h and if the limit were 40km/h that could increase to 50km/h and asked
why it could not be set at 30km/h. B Rice again advised of the actual geography of the road and the limitations this placed on the ability to drive at higher speeds and replied that the result would be poor compliance with the 30km/hr speed limit.

J Hoult asked if the speed limit would be adequate and safe if there was increased development and B Rice replied that if there was extensive development that would need to be reviewed regardless of the walkway.

The meeting adjourned for a workshop at 7.50pm resuming again at 7.58pm.

Moved D Gordon seconded G Miller

THAT the Rangiora–Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives report No 170713072881

THAT the Rangiora – Ashley Community Board recommends to Council that it:

(b) Approves a speed limit of 40km/h on Cones Road, north of Carrs Road, along with the following safety improvements:

- Speed advisory and pedestrian warning signage.
- Improvements to the timber site rails at the beginning of the unsealed portion of Cones Road.
- Localised shaping of the vertical curve north of 352 Cones Road and minor widening of the road.
- Outdoor convex mirror opposite the driveway at 352 Cones Road.
- Clearing of vegetation adjacent to the road and including the berm areas in the Council’s maintained mowing list.
- Letter drops to residents, who are the predominant users of this road, leading up to the installation of the new walking track. These will outline the protocols to enable safe operation of this section of road.

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

(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) Requests that staff continue to investigate the intersection access and area of Carrs and Cones Roads in order to:

- Provide greater safety
- Provide adequate parking

(f) Requests that within six months of the vertical curve being reshaped, a speed survey will be carried out in this location, and an assessment made to ensure that the appropriate stopping sight distances are provided.

CARRIED

P Williams against, K Galloway and M Clarke abstain

D Gordon commented that he had sympathy with the proposal to raise the recommended speed from 30km/h to 40km/hr. He believed the review clause
was a sensible suggestion. His primary concern was the Carrs Road/Cones Road intersection.

G Miller advised that he fully supported D Gordon in the recommendation and felt that the walkway project should be progressed.

S Lewis commented that she supported S Pallet’s suggestions, the staff recommendations and the proposed review.

7.3 Applications for Rangiora-Ashley Community Board Discretionary Grant 2017-2018 - E Cordwell (Governance Adviser)

E Cordwell spoke briefly to the report noting that R Eyles had earlier addressed the Board with regard to the application from North Canterbury Musical Society. The second application was from Reflections Community Trust towards engaging entertainment for the Waimakariri Light Party. The third application was from the Social Inclusion Initiatives Group for ‘Welcome Bags’ which was an initiative that had arisen following the earthquakes. The SIIG group was community run and under an umbrella charitable trust – You Me We Us. She noted there had been a few queries regarding the third application and tabled an example of a Welcome Bag and the leaflet that WDC also provided as a welcome to the district. The Welcome Bag was crafted with schools.

K Galloway requested detail on what was included in the WDC pamphlet and E Cordwell provided an outline.

P Williams asked if the pack contained information on the Board and E Cordwell replied that it did not.

K Galloway queried the Council involvement in the Social Inclusion Initiatives Group and J Millward advised that the Community Development Officer spoke to a wide variety of groups across many sectors.

J Hoult asked where the group was planning to distribute the welcome bags and noted that the community team delivered a good package. J Millward commented that the community team provided an electronic version of the welcome letter and that the bags were more like a gift especially after the earthquakes.

E Cordwell noted that the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board had requested to lie the report on the table until further information had been provided.

Moved K Galloway seconded D Lundy

THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 170713072867.

(b) Approves a grant of $350 to North Canterbury Musical Society Inc towards the costs of signage to promote the Costume Hire service.

CARRIED

K Galloway commented that he strongly supported the North Canterbury Musical Society Inc. application to assist with its own funding.

Moved K Galloway seconded J Gerard

THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:

(c) Declines the application from Reflections Community Trust.
CARRIED

K Galloway commented that the application from Reflections Community Trust was a request they had had before and he believed that the Light Party was a Kapaipoi activity rather than district wide.

Moved K Galloway seconded J Gerard  

THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:  

(d) Declines the application from Social Inclusion Initiatives Group.

CARRIED  

D Gordon and J Houl against

K Galloway commented that the Welcome Bags had initially been for earthquake refugees and provided a necessary social service in that turmoil. Since that time Council had taken over and produced excellent material for newcomers, that material was also available online.

J Gerard supported not granting the application as it was already happening at the ratepayer’s expense. The funding request was also not equally distributed through the Boards.

R Brine commented that the Newcomer’s Network had started 15 years ago with Sylvia Temple helping create packages. He agreed with the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board who had requested more information in order to make a decision.

7.4 Approval of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board’s Submission to the Waimakariri District Council regarding the Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan – E Cordwell (Governance Adviser)

E Cordwell spoke briefly to the report advising that the purpose was to approve the Board’s submission to the Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan.

Moved J Houl seconded M Clarke

THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:  

(a) Receives report No. 170713072856.  

(b) Approves the Board’s Submission to the Waimakariri District Council regarding the Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan (Trim 170713072838).

CARRIED

J Houl supported the submission commenting that she had been very impressed with the content. It had addressed all the issues raised and had thought about the community they were serving.

M Clarke believed that the submission was well written and prepared and covered all points raised in the workshop.

8 CORRESPONDENCE

Nil.
9 CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT
9.1 Chair’s Diary for July 2017
   Moved J Gerard  seconded G Miller
   THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:
   (a)  Receives report No. 170801081769.
      CARRIED

10 MATTERS FOR INFORMATION
10.1 Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting minutes – 6 July 2017
    (Trim No. 170630067752)
10.2 Woodend-Setton Community Board meeting minutes – 10 July 2017
    (Trim No. 170706069821)
10.3 Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting minutes – 17 July 2017
    (Trim No. 170713072971)
10.4 Waimakariri District Rural Fire Assets and Functions transfer to FENZ – Report to Council – 4 July 2017 (Trim No.170619062744)
10.5 Submission to the Canterbury Regional Transport Committee on the proposal to vary the Regional Land Transport Plan – Report to Council – 4 July 2017 (Trim No.170630063198)
10.6 Rangiora Speed Limit Changes – Report to Council – 1 August 2017 (Trim No.170719074969)
   Moved R Brine  seconded D Lundy
   THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board receives the information in items 10.1-10.6.
      CARRIED

11 MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE
11.1 J Gerard
   • Commented that the Winter Festival events in Rangiora the previous weekend had been exceptional.
   • Noted S Lewis had raised the second highest funds for the Winter Splash.
   • Commented that the Council and all the Waimakariri Community Board submissions regarding the third laning of the Waimakariri Bridge were excellent.

11.2 M Clarke
   • Waimakariri Health Advisory Group (WHAG): discussion regarding provision of toilets in the town. Most people considered there were enough but the signage was poor. There was concern that there was no disabled toilet in town. It was noted that those points had been raised in the Board’s submission to the Annual Plan 2017/2018. Advised that arrangements were being made to shift buildings from Christchurch Hospital. Had spoken to CDHB to gain support for the Orbiter bus to go via the hospital.
   • Had provided support to two residents having issues with IAG insurance assessors.
11.3 **J Hoult**
- Timebank Group making good progress, currently setting up Facebook Page.
- Queried whether a Facebook page should be progressed for the Board. E Cordwell advised that a workshop could be set up to discuss.

11.4 **S Lewis**
- Noted North Loburn School visit and the importance of engaging with the community.

11.5 **G Miller**
- Attended Community Services Group meeting with 20 groups attending and providing an update of their services.
- Commented that the Rakahuri Mountain Bike track was excellent.

11.6 **P Williams**
- Commented that the Winter Festival was a success and well run.
- Noted the Hurunui District Council’s proposal to chlorinate all their water supplies. The Ashley scheme would not be chlorinated.
- Noted a number of meetings regarding Easterbrook Road.

11.7 **D Gordon**
- Commended the organisers of the Rangiora Winter Festival noting the many attractions for young people. Congratulated S Lewis and Mayor Ayers for participating and raising the profile of the Board.
- Attended Friends of Rangiora Town Hall AGM in July and was retained as Chair. The group was working on ‘value added’ initiatives.

11.8 **D Lundy**
- Organised and attended Loburn Reserve meeting.
- Attended Farm Environment Workshop run by Beef and Lamb NZ at the Loburn Reserve.

11.9 **K Galloway**
- Complimented Winter Festival organisers and Sarah Lewis for participating.
- Noted that he had spoken to WDC IT staff regarding a potential mobile phone App that highlighted amenities including public toilet locations.
- Attended first meeting of the Friends of Rangiora Dog Park, possibility of putting up shelters thanks to Lions.
- Acknowledgement of a number of upcoming 100-year-old birthdays in the District.
- Attended Greypower meeting – waste management discussed.
- The Council had assisted the Rangiora Museum with the use of a building for archiving.

11.10 **R Brine**
- Noted there were over 2000 submissions regarding the Waste Minimisation consultation.

12 **CONSULTATION PROJECTS**

12.1 **Ohoka Domain**
http://www.waimakariri.govt.nz/have-a-say/lets-talk/consultations/about-ohoka-domain

12.2 **There’s a better way to deal with rubbish**
Consultation ends 11 August 2017.
http://www.waimakariri.govt.nz/have-a-say/lets-talk/consultations/Lets-Talk-Rubbish

12.3 **Kaiapoi (West) Speed Limit Review**
Consultation ends 11 August 2017.

12.4 **Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 Implementation – 11-28 August 2017**

13 **REGENERATION PROJECTS**
Updates on the Rangiora Town Centre projects are emailed regularly to Board members. These updates can be located using the link below:

14 **BOARD FUNDING UPDATE**
14.1 **Board Discretionary Grant**
Balance as at 26 July 2017: $11,264.04

15 **MEDIA ITEMS**
Nil.

16 **QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**
Nil.

17 **URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**
Nil.

**NEXT MEETING**
The next meeting of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board is scheduled for 7pm, Wednesday 13 September 2017 in the Council Chambers at the Rangiora Service Centre.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 8.42PM.

CONFIRMED

________________________
Chairperson

________________________
Date
Workshop

1. Members’ Forum. 8.42pm – 8.45pm
MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF THE WOODEND-SEFTON COMMUNITY BOARD
HELD IN THE PEGASUS COMMUNITY CENTRE, MAIN STREET, PEGASUS ON
MONDAY 14 AUGUST AT 7PM.

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

IN ATTENDANCE
S Markham (Manager, Strategy and Engagement), S Nichols (Governance Manager),
D Ayers (Mayor) 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 – 10 July 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 10 July 2017, as a true and accurate record.
CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
Nil.

5 DEPUTATIONS FROM THE COMMUNITY
Nil.

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS
Nil.
7 REPORTS

7.1 Memorial Seat: Alison Swain – C Brown (Community Greenspace Manager)

S Nichols advised she would take the report as read.

A Allen queried the upkeep of the non-standard design. J Archer believed the design would be robust than what was shown in the diagram. J Archer liked the personalisation of the seat and that it was an organic design in an organic area and expressed concern that not accepting it diminished local character. R Mather commented she was surprised the option was not provided to accept the seat as proposed.

S Powell asked if there was a policy around memorials as the issue was coming up more frequently. S Markham advised that memorial plaques were relatively standard. S Markham commented that the recommendation to decline the non-standard seat was Green Space being prudent as they had a lot of seats to manage from an operational practicality, and the concept seat was open to potential vandalism over the passage of time.

A Thompson believed the concept needed to be made more robust. He suggested that if it a non-standard design was requested then it should be up to the family to maintain the seat. S Markham commented that in reality once it was a Council asset then the Council had an obligation to maintain. A seat in disrepair would reflect poorly on the Council.

A Blackie commented that with some alterations the concept could become reasonably robust and he supported an artistic concept rather than standard. S Nichols advised it would have concrete footings to anchor in place.

The location of the seat was noted. It was suggested that if it was placed at the head of Park Terrace it would be seen as a Council seat.

J Archer requested that a more robust design of the seat approved by Green Space come back to the Board. S Markham noted that the recommendation was to approve the standard design. To approve a nonstandard design was accepting the liability that it would withstand vandalism. It was not appropriate for Green Space responsibilities to make the final decision. The Art in Public Places Policy was taking some time to get in place but included a category around public memorials. There was a balancing factor between artistic merits and practicalities.

J Meyer commented that there was a reason why seats were standard.

A Thompson commented that he heard what was being said but if the family was asked to come up with a design that meet some standard of robustness he would be much less concerned. He appreciated that uniformity was easier but believed individuality was good.

S Powell noted that community views referred to consultation with the Rūnanga and believed that referred more to the location than design as it was suggested to be a ‘healing place for women’. S Markham advised that he would be meeting with the Rūnanga on 17 August 2017 and would discuss then.

Moved A Blackie    seconded R Mather

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 170721076337
(b) **Lies the report on the table pending consultation with Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga, discussion with the family and consideration of the robustness of design.**

CARRIED

7.2 **Applications for Woodend-Sefton Community Board Discretionary Grant 2017-2018 – E Cordwell (Governance Adviser)**

S Nichols advised that the Reflections Community Trust was providing an alternative to Halloween in Kaiapoi which people from all round the district attended. An application to the Rangiora Ashley Community Board had been declined and there would be an application to the Kaiapoi Tuahiti Community Board on 21 August 2017.

The second application was from the Social Inclusion Initiatives Group for Welcome Bags. S Nichols tabled a sample welcome bag which included maps and information on various district facilities such as the library; it was tailored to a particular area. The Council also provided information packs which were more general. An application for the welcome bags to the Rangiora Ashley Community Board had been declined. An application to Oxford Ohoka had been lain on the table pending further information.

R Mather requested clarification and asked if the Welcome Bags were for Kaiapoi and S Nichols replied no they were for the entire district. Different schools and residents groups helped personalise the bags to an area. R Mather commented a lot had been distributed in the Pegasus area and had been well received.

S Powell asked how may they were looking to produce. S Nichols noted that in the application there was a total cost of $13,000 and if the application for $500 was declined then the project would not occur. A Thompson noted the costs were outlined on page 66 of the Agenda. S Nichols advised that Community Team staff were keen to speak to the Board and that the report could be lain on the table until that time.

S Powell asked if it was advertised throughout the district and S Nichols confirmed it did.

Moved S Powell seconded J Archer

**THAT** the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No. 170718074699.

(b) **Approves** a grant of $234.03 to Reflections Community Trust towards the costs of a large corflute sign to be used at the 2017 Waimakariri Light Party

(c) **Lies** the application from Social Inclusion Initiatives Group on the table pending further information.

CARRIED

S Powell commented it was a comprehensive application and that she supported events for children.

J Meyer spoke in support of the Light Party.

J Archer was pleased it provided an alternative to Halloween.

A Blackie commented that the Light Party was an excellent event which did include children from other areas.
J Archer was pleased to support the application.

7.3 Ratification of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board’s Submission to the Waimakariri District Council regarding the Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan - E Cordwell (Governance Adviser)

S Nichols advised that the report was to ratify the Board’s submission to the Waste Management and Minimisation Plan. The point R Mather raised in terms of bins tipping over were not included in the submission but S Powell would be speaking to it at the 4 September hearing. It was noted that there had been a high level of interest with over 2,500 submissions received.

A Blackie commented that the issue of bins tipping over was on the radar around the Council table.

Moved S Powell seconded A Allen

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 170713072841.

(b) Ratifies the Board’s Submission to the Waimakariri District Council regarding the Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan. (Trim 170713072834).

CARRIED

8 CORRESPONDENCE

Nil.

9 CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT

9.1 Chairperson’s Report for July-August 2017

S Powell advised that she met with Jackie Watson, the chair of the Kaiapoi Tuahiwi Board and that they had discussed drop in sessions, public transport (as the two wards were linked in that regard) and the Community Board Facebook pages. They had agreed to meet on a more regular basis.

Moved S Powell seconded R Mather

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 170807083924.

10 MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

10.1 Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting minutes – 6 July 2017 (Trim No. 170630067752)

10.2 Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting minutes – 26 July 2017 (rescheduled to 26 July 2017) (Trim No. 170706070106)

10.3 Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting minutes – 17 July 2017 (Trim No. 170713072971)

10.4 Waimakariri District Rural Fire assets and functions transfer to FENZ – Report to Council – 4 July 2017 (Trim No. 170619062744)
10.5 **Draft Submission to the Canterbury Regional Transport Committee on the proposal to vary the Regional Land Transport Plan** – Report to Council – 4 July 2017 (Trim No. 170620063196)

S Markham commented that it had been good to have S Powell and the other Community Board Chairs contributing at the Third Lane South hearing.

Moved A Blackie  seconded R Mather

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

**CARRIED**

11 **MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE**

11.1 **July-August Diary for A Thompson, A Allen, J Archer, R Mather and J Meyer** (Trim No. 1708080084276)

S Powell advised that the Waikuku School was up for deadline sale on 31 August 2017.

S Powell noted that expressions of interest were being called for forestry logging operations. Harvesting would occur over the next 12-24 months with replanting two years after harvest. There would be communication with the community prior to harvest.

There was some discussion around harvesting. A Thompson requested the opportunity for board members to discuss it with Council staff involved. Issues raised were the importance of communication, the philosophy behind removing trees, the importance of the sand dune system, the management plan following logging, the increased use of the coast by the community and the easterly wind conditions.

S Nichols advised concerns raised would be taken back to staff.

12 **CONSULTATION PROJECTS**

12.1 **Ohoka Domain**

http://www.waimakariri.govt.nz/have-a-say/lets-talk/consultations/about-ohoka-domain

12.2 **There’s a better way to deal with rubbish**

Consultation ends 11 August 2017.

http://www.waimakariri.govt.nz/have-a-say/lets-talk/consultations/Lets-Talk-Rubbish

12.3 **Kaiapoi (West) Speed Limit Review**

Consultation ends 11 August 2017.


12.4 **Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 Implementation – 11-28 August 2017**

A Thompson suggested it was important for the board to put in a submission to the Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw as it was hugely important to the area. A submission could at least support what was laid out.

S Powell noted the upcoming Accessibility Strategy on the 8 September.
13  FOSTERING COMMUNITIES

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 naming of the Rangiora Woodend Cycleway was raised. It was noted that the Woodend Kaiapoi Cycleway had been named the Passchendaele Cycleway at the request of the Passchendaele Trust. The Board could put a name forward for the Rangiora Woodend Cycleway. A Thompson requested assistance from staff on how to start that process.

15  BOARD FUNDING UPDATE
15.1  Board Discretionary Grant
Balance as at 11 August 2017: $3,190

16  MEDIA ITEMS
Nil.

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 September 2017 at the Woodend Community Centre.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 8.08pm

CONFIRMED
Chairperson

Date

---

**Workshop**

1. *Members’ Forum.*  
   Opportunity for members to share potential new ideas and initiatives.

2. *Discuss and potentially formulate submission in regard to the Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw Implementation Plan.*
# WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

## REPORT

**FILE NO:** GOV-18 / 170828092548  
**REPORT TO:** Council  
**DATE OF MEETING:** 5 September 2017  
**FROM:** David Ayers Mayor  
**SUBJECT:** Mayor’s Diary 26 July to 20 August 2017

### 1. SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 26 July</td>
<td>ENC Board Meeting and Sponsor Function 26 July 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rangiora Ashley Community Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 27 July</td>
<td>Waste Management and Mayor Presentation of Funds to Waikuku Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surf Lifesaving Club, Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 28 July</td>
<td>Interview with David Hill - North Canterbury News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury Registered Master Builders House of the Year Event, Wigram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 29 July</td>
<td>Rangiora Promotions Association – Big Splash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attended Rangiora Winter Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 30 July</td>
<td>Re-opening of St Bartholomew’s Anglican Church, Kaiapoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attended Friends of the Rangiora Town Hall AGM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attended gala show at invitation of Chinese Consulate-General, Christchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 31 July</td>
<td>Powhiri to welcome school from Wuhan – Rangiora New Life School, Southbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geoff Dangerfield – Greater Christchurch Regeneration Act Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waimakariri-Passchendaele Trust Meeting, Kaiapoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 1 August</td>
<td>Interview with Compass FM Radio Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 2 August</td>
<td>Farewell to Donna Dawber (office manager for Clayton Cosgrove MP), Kaiapoi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 3 August</td>
<td>Regional Road Safety Working Group, Rolleston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attended funeral service of former Oxford County Councillor, Gavin Inch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Citizenship Ceremony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spoke at Rangiora Rotary on challenges facing Local Government across New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 4 August</td>
<td>Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee - Workshop on strategic planning context for the Settlement Pattern Review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with David Hill - North Canterbury News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 5 August</td>
<td>Visited Oxford Garage Sale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 7 August</td>
<td>On hearing panel for Waimakariri Bridge Submissions (Regional Transport Committee), Christchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regeneration Steering Group Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opening of Belgians Have Not Forgotten Exhibition – Wigram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 8 August</td>
<td>Interview with Compass FM Radio Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gulliver and Tyler Short Story / Poetry Presentations, Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 9 August</td>
<td>Waimakariri Road Safety Co-ordinating Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 10 August</td>
<td>Opening of Kahukura Building at Ara by Prime Minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 11 August</td>
<td>Local Government Excellence Programme workshop for Councils – Wellington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 12 August</td>
<td>Kaiapoi High School production of &quot;Oliver!&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 13 August</td>
<td>Pegasus Community Centre Open Day - Cake Cutting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 14 August</td>
<td>Waimakariri Bridge Hearing Submissions – Deliberations (Christchurch)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury Museum Trust Board meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waimakariri Water Zone Committee meeting and Zone Workshop, Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting, Pegasus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 15 August</td>
<td>Interview with Compass FM Radio Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Met with McAlpine's management re floor levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 16</td>
<td>Kaiapoi Promotions Association Breakfast Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>Canterbury Museum Executive Committee Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 17</td>
<td>District Development Strategy – Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>District Development Strategy – Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 18 August</td>
<td>Seven Rivers Walking Première – Isaac Theatre Royal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 19</td>
<td>Art Exhibition Opening at the Chamber Gallery, Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>Interview with David Hill - North Canterbury News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 21 August</td>
<td>Kaiapoi-Tuahiw Community Board meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 22</td>
<td>Interview with Compass FM Radio Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>Attended presentation by Canterbury Stadium Trust on proposed new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>stadium, Christchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 24</td>
<td>Mayoral CREDS Workshop, University of Canterbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>Mayoral Forum Working Dinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 25 August</td>
<td>Mayoral Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Civil Defence Emergency Management (CDEM) Joint Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury Regional Transport Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 26 August</td>
<td>Kaiapoi Brass Band performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kaiapoi Volunteer Fire Brigade Honours Evening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 27 August</td>
<td>Attended Cultural Diversity Event, Kaiapoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 28 August</td>
<td>Interview with David Hill - North Canterbury News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting with Miss Lilly’s Angels Trust re CDEM preparedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury Museum Employment Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury Employers’ Chamber of Commerce Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report Nº 170828092548.

David Ayers

**MAYOR**