Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board

Agenda

Monday 20 November 2017

4.00pm

Meeting Room 1 (upstairs)
Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre
176 Williams Street, Kaiapoi

Members:
Jackie Watson (Chair)
Chris Greengrass (Deputy Chair)
Neville Atkinson
Roger Blair
Martin Pinkham
Philip Redmond
Sandra Stewart
AGENDA FOR THE MEETING OF THE KAIAPOI-TUAHIWI COMMUNITY BOARD TO BE HELD IN MEETING ROOM 1 (UPSTAIRS), RUATANIWHA KAIAPOI CIVIC CENTRE, 176 WILLIAMS STREET, KAIAPOI ON MONDAY 20 NOVEMBER 2017 AT 4PM.

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

BUSINESS

1 APOLOGIES

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

3.1 Minutes of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board – 16 October 2017

8-19

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Confirms the circulated minutes of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting, held 16 October 2017, as a true and accurate record.

4 MATTERS ARISING

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

5.1 Kieran Straw, Civil Projects Team Leader will provide an update on the proposed Smith Street / Williams Street Intersection Upgrade.

20-24

Refer to Memo (Trim 171030117211)

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS
7 REPORTS

7.1 Kaiapoi Tanker Filling Point – Colin Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 171102118733.

(b) Endorses staff to work towards shutting down the Adderley Terrace tanker filling point, with the timing of this to be discussed with developers currently working in the area.

(c) Notes that staff will continue to investigate alternative options for a tanker filling point to serve the future development areas in south-west Kaiapoi and report back to the Board at a later date with a recommendation.

(d) Endorses the use of screen planting at the Williams Street site to address the aesthetic issues noted with this site.

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

7.2 Lees Road Speed Limit Review – Bill Rice (Senior Transport Engineer) and Chris Sexton (Intern Engineer)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 171026115931.

(b) Approves consultation being carried out on the proposal to change speed limit on Lees Road and Barkers Road to 60km/h, as outlined in the attached plan.

(c) Notes that consultation on this proposal will be carried out between 27 November and 18 December 2017.

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

(e) Notes that any submissions on the proposal will be taken into account before the change is presented to the Council on 6 February 2018 for consideration.
7.3 **Licence to Occupy to ESR for Denitrification Wall – Chris Brown (Community Green Space Manager)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No. 171102118813

(b) **Approves** a Licence to Occupy for an area of land in the Western end of Silverstream Reserve to ESR for the Purpose of installing a Denitrification Wall with standard conditions as well as the following:

(i) Licence to Occupy for a period of 5 years.

(ii) Resource Consent approved and issued by Environment Canterbury

(iii) WDC is notified immediately if any conditions of the licence are breached

(iv) All conditions set down by Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga are adhered to, in particular:

- Close monitoring be undertaken to detect any unexpected levels of contamination in groundwater downstream of the PRB
- That the Accidental Discovery Protocol of the Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan be included in the consent conditions to ensure correct procedure is followed should there be any archaeological discoveries during the course of earthworks
- That a copy of the monitoring data be supplied to Mahaanui Kurataio Ltd

7.4 **Board Meeting Dates for 2018 – Sarah Nichols (Governance Manager)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No. 171108121207.

(b) **Resolves** to hold Board meetings at the Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre, Williams Street, Kaiapoi, commencing at 4.00pm, on the following dates:

- Monday 19 February 2018
- Monday 19 March 2018
- Monday 16 April 2018
- Monday 21 May 2018
- Monday 18 June 2018
- Monday 16 July 2018
- Monday 20 August 2018
- Monday 17 September 2018
- Monday 15 October 2018
- Monday 19 November 2018
- Monday 17 December 2018
7.5 **Ratification of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board’s Submission regarding the District Plan Review ‘Comments and Issues’ Phase – Edwina Cordwell (Governance Adviser)**

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 171009108726.

(b) Ratifies the Board’s Submission regarding the Waimakariri District Council’s District Plan Review ‘Comments and Issues’ Phase (Trim 171005107431).

8 **CORRESPONDENCE**

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives the letter regarding Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan and Kerbside Options (Trim 171030116729).

(b) Receives the letter acknowledging Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board Objection to Bottle O Silverstream Liquor Application. (Trim 171026115624)

(c) Receives the request from the Waimakariri Access Group to appoint a representative to the group from the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board. (Trim 171113122918).

(d) Notes the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board Chairperson’s letter in support of Kaiapoi Community Garden’s application to the Rata Foundation 7 November 2017. (Trim 171107120875).

9 **CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT**

9.1 **Chair’s Diary for October-November 2017**

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 171113123446.

10 **MATTERS REFERRED FOR INFORMATION**

10.1 **Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting minutes – 5 October 2017** (Trim No. 171018112694)

10.2 **Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting minutes – 11 October 2017** (Trim No. 171018112700).

10.3 **Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting minutes – 9 October 2017** (Trim No. 171018112702)

10.4 **Road Safety Action Plan** – Report to Council 24 October (Trim No. 171004107285)

10.5 **Stormwater Drainage Bylaw Review 2017/18** – Report to Council 24 October 2017 (Trim No. 170907097266)
10.6 **CAREX Report on Glyphosate** - Report to Council 24 October 2017
(Trim No. 171012110892)

10.7 **Cam River Enhancement Allocation of Funding** – Report to Council 24 October 2017 (Trim No. 170925103162)

10.8 **Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery – Courtenay Drive Road Reconstruction Change to Consulted Design** – Report to Regeneration Steering Group 4 September 2017

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board receives the information in items 10.1-10.8.

*Note: Items were circulated to Board members separately.*

11 **MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE**

*The purpose of this exchange is to provide a short update to other members in relation to activities/meetings that have been attended or to provide general Board related information.*

12 **CONSULTATION PROJECTS**

12.1 **Stormwater Drainage Bylaw**
http://www.waimakariri.govt.nz/have-a-say/letstalk/consultations/stormwater-drainage-bylaw

12.2 **Ohoka Domain**
Consultation closes 5pm, 21 November 2017.
http://www.waimakariri.govt.nz/have-a-say/lets-talk/consultations/ohoka-domain

12.3 **Tram Road Speed Limit Review**
Consultation closes 5pm, 24 November 2017.

13 **REGENERATION PROJECTS**

13.1 **Town Centre, Kaiapoi**
Updates on the Kaiapoi Town Centre projects are emailed regularly to Board members. These updates can be accessed 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:
13.3 **Kaiapoi Regeneration Steering Group**

The next meeting of the Kaiapoi Regeneration Steering Group will be held in Meeting Room 1, Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre, 4pm on Monday 4 December 2017. This meeting is open to the public.

14 **BOARD FUNDING UPDATE**

14.1 **Board Discretionary Grant**

Balance as at 16 October: $2,400.

15 **MEDIA ITEMS**

16 **QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**

17 **URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**

**NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board is scheduled for 4pm, Monday 18 December 2017 at the Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Members’ Forum.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. **Regeneration Area – Road and Reserves Naming**  
  *Craig Sargison and Duncan Roxburgh* |
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE KAIAPOI-TUAHIWI COMMUNITY BOARD
HELD IN MEETING ROOM 1 (UPSTAIRS), RUATANIWHA KAIAPOI CIVIC CENTRE,
176 WILLIAMS STREET, KAIAPOI ON MONDAY 16 OCTOBER 2017
COMMENCING AT 4PM.

PRESENT
J Watson (Chair) (until 6.15pm), C Greengrass (Deputy Chair), N Atkinson, R Blair, M
Pinkham, P Redmond and S Stewart.
C Greengrass assumed the Chair at 6.15pm at time of departure of J Watson.

IN ATTENDANCE
Councillors J Meyer and A Blackie (from 4.05pm.)
J Palmer (Chief Executive), C Brown (Community Green Space Manager), S Morrow (Land
Information Officer), K Ward (Community Board Advocate), and A Smith (Committee
Advisor)

1 APOLOGIES
There were no apologies

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
There were no conflicts of interest recorded. Subsequently during consideration of
Item 8 - Correspondence, N Atkinson and S Stewart moved away from the table and
took no part in discussion or voting of recommendation (b).

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board – 18 September 2017
Moved J Watson seconded P Redmond
THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:
(a) Confirms the circulated minutes of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community
Board meeting, held 18 September 2017, as a true and accurate record.
CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
Item 4 – it was advised that there will be an update provided at the 20 November
board meeting on the safe pedestrian crossing points in the Kaiapoi Western arterial
route.

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS
5.1 Larina Tiffen “Miss Lilly’ Angel Trust”
Larina Tiffen owns and operates Miss Llyls Boutique Catering, an event and
function catering business in North Canterbury and Canterbury regions. The
business has a mobile boutique café. L Tiffen has previously resided in
Kaiapoi. The Miss Lilly Angel Trust was established on 22 November 2016
following the November 14 Kaikoura earthquake as a result of the community relief effort. What started as a Facebook Post on the Miss Lilly Catering business page, immediately following the first earthquake, resulted in the donation of goods from both local businesses and private donations from local families and the delivery of these to the Kaikoura region. There was subsequently delivery of over 30 Christmas packages to effected families in the Kaikoura region that following Christmas.

A book called “Come Together” is being written, which is a collection of stories of families involved in the Kaikoura earthquake and includes their family recipes. The Miss Lilly’s Angel Trust wishes to hold a community gala day, to be known as “Thrive ME” in the Kaiapoi East Regeneration area, on Sunday 18th February 2018 from 11am to 4pm, at which this book will be launched. This event would recognise the contribution from our district to the recovery efforts after the Kaikoura earthquake. The events would include a community pot luck meal, stalls, live music and children’s entertainment. Copies of the proposed programme of events for this day were circulated at the meeting for Board members information. There have already been several confirmed sponsors/donors for the event.

L Tiffen believes this day would be a good day to show how far the community has come in the past six years and has secured media promotion of the event through Seven Sharp TV programme and free radio advertising on Compass FM. Ms Tiffen is seeking approval of the Community Board to hold this event in the Regeneration area.

Members Questions:

C Greengrass asked if any of the existing support groups in the Waimakariri already been approached. Ms Tiffen advised there hadn’t been any approach made to other groups. There is a proposal in the bigger picture for resilient community plans, which would to be rolled out in Waimakariri, Kaikoura and Hurunui. Ms Tiffen is having discussions with local Civil Defence and in Christchurch and with Nathan Guy, the Civil Defence Minister.

A Blackie advised that one possible restriction to having the event on the regeneration area would be access to power, but this could be overcome.

The Chair advised Ms Tiffen that the Board members would need to give consideration to the matter and come back to her with a decision.

5.2 Chris Brown, Green Space Manager, presented the Parks and Playground Management Plan to the Board.

C Brown, Green Space Manager spoke to the Parks and Playground Management Plan. He spoke to a PowerPoint presentation. The purpose of the presentation was to provide the Boards with information about Levels of Service for Green Space and how those levels of service impacted the Long Term Plan, to get the Boards feedback on the projects and timing of those projects which have been identified by staff to fill gaps in levels of service, and to get the Boards feedback regarding any projects for consideration as part of the Long Term Plan 2018/2028.

As background C Brown explained that staff, as part of the preparation for LTP 2018/28, prepared a number of strategies which related to the key asset types of play spaces, toilets, sports facilities and community facilities. The strategies identified current levels of service (LoS) relating to the asset types as well as some new service levels. These LoS then inform the Activity Management Plan which informs the LTP. C Brown explained that there are many LoS which relate to the provision and development of reserves. These LoS are different depending on the park type and the catchment area of the park. He advised that there are a number of LoS changes which are being proposed in relation to the strategies which have been prepared.
For playgrounds the changes in LoS include

- An emphasis on the assessment of play value and a specified age and ability provision linked with park catchment type.
- Shade provision and UV protection. Shade sails or structures will be installed at key play spaces. High-use, long stay sites will be prioritised particularly junior play areas with no natural shade.
- Premium supplementary play assets (skate parks etc). Provision of skate parks – even distribution across districts key activity centres. Size and scale – reflective of the population catchment.
- More emphasis on integrating opportunities for inclusive play into play space general design rather than specific equipment provision.

C Brown explained that the implications of the new LoS meant there were several new playground developments required to meet the LoS.

- Millton Memorial Reserve
- Elm Green / Kippenberger linkage
- Hurunui Reserve Pegasus
- East Eyreton Domain
- Skate Park in Woodend/Pegasus Area

C Brown showed a list of playgrounds in order of replacement priority. The priority was based on the age of the playground, the play value that it provides and public expectations. There was an aim to complete one or two per year.

N Atkinson queried the different play equipment that is available in parks, and the age groups that are catered for. C Brown said the Council cannot provide equipment for all age groups in every park, as an example, the specific equipment for older age groups (such as skateboard parks), cannot be provided everywhere. But as an example, C Brown noted that Sovereign Palms subdivision has three playgrounds, if all these were looked at collectively, it would show that all the different age groups are catered for (0 – 5 years, 5-10 years, and 10-15 years). N Atkinson mentioned Hinemoa Park, which has a bowling club, and noted that there is groups who use the play equipment, and older children who bike and use the BMX track. C Brown said this is a local catchment park and it is planned to continue providing these facilities at Hinemoa Park. There are other local parks which won’t be providing play equipment for every age group (suggested example is Torlesse Park in Rangiora, a small local park which has play equipment for younger children).

Regarding Playgrounds, C Brown said staff would be looking at the provision of shade over play equipment and the levels of service, including where higher level specific equipment is provided (i.e. skate parks),

N Atkinson suggested it is important that the strategy doesn’t block skate parks in on small sites. For future proofing, it would be better to make sure that there is room available to build onto existing parks, as the need arises with population growth. This would be a better option rather than having to develop a new park in a different area.

Staff have identified the parks where the play equipment will need replacing in the next five years – which includes Kairaki reserve and NCF Park (in the Regeneration area)

N Atkinson asked about the play equipment available in Silverstream – C Brown said it is proposed to have a toilet facility provided adjacent to the current playground.
S Stewart, mentioned Darnley Square which is close to the Plunket Rooms, and noted that the play equipment currently there, is not suitable for the younger age group (this includes a climbing frame better suited for older children). It was suggested that there is the need for more equipment there to suit younger children.

N Atkinson noted that a lot of people use the play equipment beside the rugby clubrooms, even when there is no event happening at the Clubrooms, but the remainder of the domain doesn’t get used a lot as a playground.

Toilets
The criteria has been looked at to determine if toilets are required in neighbourhood parks, within a large catchment area. A different level of service for provision of toilets in town centres has been considered. It is planned to have discussions with owners of land where there could be benefit of having toilets, when the Council doesn’t own land.

S Stewart said the design of toilets needs to be innovative (“fabulous”), so they are attractive pieces of architecture. C Brown noted that in the Towns Level of Service it has been identified that these locations need well designed architectural toilets. C Brown said that the Plan hasn’t gone to this extent for the design of neighbourhood toilets. S Stewart believes that every single toilets could be attractive and would ask the Council designers to “think outside the square” and provide attractive pieces. C Brown said for the neighbourhood reserves, they will do what can be done, noting that there is some toilet blocks which have already been built with some small adjustments to make them a bit different (i.e. Elephant Park in Rangiora, and Sovereign Lakes). S Stewart believes there would not be the need to go over budget to provide more attractive toilet blocks for all areas in the district and suggests that staff could look at this.

New Toilets required to meet Levels of Service are:

- Mandeville Sports Ground Equestrian
- Rangiora Town Centre
- Millton Memorial – a very well used area which needs to have a toilet facility provided, especially the dog park.
- West Oxford Reserve – this area will become more highly used and in the future a toilet will be required here.

To build a new Rangiora town Centre stand alone toilet block, would cost in the vicinity of $350,000. The options being considered are updating the Victoria Park toilets, or looking at possibly working in with a business owner. The Strategy preference is improving these existing toilets, rather than investing in a new stand alone facility which would require a big investment.

Toilets to be upgraded will be undertaken at one every two years in the Ten Year Plan. This does not include the removal of the toilets opposite the Kaiapoi Workingmens Club, on Raven Quay. Members agreed with this proposal and S Stewart suggested the extension of the flower beds in place of this toilet block, once it is removed.

There is extensive consultation with neighbours of parks when a reserve development is proposed, which can include having a toilet installed. Many neighbouring residents ask about the proposed design of the toilets, i.e. the way it will face, what planting will be done, and what lighting will be provided.

Sports Facilities
A study has shown that the district does not need to have as many sports fields as previously thought. C Brown confirmed that the Council doesn’t need to buy any more land to develop sports grounds for the next ten years as the
available Council land is sufficient. Alternatively the Council will look at using the facilities they have more efficiently. This will mean increasing the carrying capacity of many fields by improving drainage. For some areas the first thing to do will be an irrigation investigation.

Regarding irrigation of sports fields, S Stewart asked would there need to be discussions and approval granted from Ecan before this can be allocated. C Brown said this would be looked at, and also staff would need to look at installing sand carpet on sports field. There is already consent at Mainpower Oval for irrigation and extra capacity is stored in three tanks. Swannanoa Domain also has irrigation system available, from water stored in tanks.

C Brown highlighted the key service enhancements which have been identified by staff and in some cases by members of the public:

Milton Memorial Park concept plan implementation

Old Kaiapoi Dump Site development

Sealing of Kairaki Beach car park (which would need to be half cost share with Ecan)

Development of old pit land at Kaiapoi Lakes - S Stewart suggested the Urupa development. The cemetery was part of a project from 1990, and this is the last part of this project which has not been completed. There was involvement with members of the community at the time, and input provided into the plans. There is a lot of history of those buried in this cemetery. N Atkinson asked is there anything in the strategy which talks about how to bring people on board with these developments. C Brown said when any of these projects are looked at, there is the opportunity to involve local community groups (e.g. Lions. C Brown said it is important to note that if this were done for each of these projects, there would need to be more staff resourcing required to do this, but it was acknowledged that there is many benefits of community involvement as well. It was suggested that the Silverstream Reserve project is a good template that could be used for other projects. C Brown said the community has indicated that they want the developments provided, and did note that there has been many occasions when the Council has involved the community in developments already (e.g. Koura Reserve, Rangiora, when the development was completed, a community planting day was held, which brought many people together to complete the project).

Town Centre entrances were discussed, C Brown noted there has been discussion held with Roading department staff, with support from the PDU staff in that department. This has been put on hold due to staff resourcing issues. It was agreed that there would be an update provided back to the Board members on the current situation with this.

J. Meyer asked of the Royalties funding for the Kaiapoi Lakes development, suggested that there might be some funding still available for this north west area. Mr Palmer said there would be a check made of this and if there was any funds available.

Regarding installation of fully accessible beach viewing platform at Waikuku and Pegasus, C Brown advised that this was looked at as part of the Pegasus Bay Bylaw. This would allow wheelchair access to view the beach. This is achievable at Pegasus, but a little more work would be required to make this available at Waikuku. It is suggested this be located at the Waikuku Beach Surf Lifesaving Club end of the beach.

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS

There was no adjourned business.
7 REPORTS

7.1 Road Naming – Beach Road Developments Limited – Scott Morrow (Land Information Officer)

S Morrow presented this report, seeking approval of the Board to alter a road name, in the Beach Grove subdivision on Beach Road, Kaiapoi. The original name for Tapauta Street came from the pre-approved road name list for Kaiapoi and was approved for the subdivision in September 2013. The street is named after the ship Taupata which used to operate from Kaiapoi River in the 1960’s. There are nine residents living in this street and it was confirmed that all these residents will be notified of the change. The developer has agreed to cover any costs of new road name blades and other associated costs.

It was advised that Jean Turvey has reviewed the current suggested name list for streets, to keep it updated.

Moved J Watson seconded N Atkinson

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:
(a) Receives report No 170926103733.
(b) Approves the alteration to the existing road name from Tapauta Street to Taupata Street.

CARRIED

P Redmond abstained from voting

N Atkinson acknowledges that there is a lot of history in the naming of streets in Kaiapoi, and doesn’t believe there will be too much inconvenience.

P. Redmond supports the change but would encourage consultation with the residents to advise why there is to be a change of name for the street.

R Blair supports the recommendation, and advising the nine residents of the proposed name change to their street.

7.2 Draft Public Domain Policy Reference Group – Geoff Meadows (Policy Manager)

C Brown presented this report on behalf of Policy Manager, G Meadows. The report seeks nomination of one member of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board as the representative on the Draft Public Domain Policy Reference Group. The public domain in this instance, refers to public space adjacent to Business 1 and 2 zones in the Waimakariri District around Town Centres. The Policy will include consideration of outdoor dining areas, busking and charitable collections, display of goods, mobile vendors and amenity lighting.

Moved N Atkinson seconded J Watson

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:
(a) Receives report No. 170926103988.
(b) Approves Board member C Greengrass to represent the Kaiapoi- Tuahiwi Community Board on the Draft Public Domain Policy Review Reference Group.

CARRIED
The meeting adjourned at 5.45pm and reconvened at 5.55pm, to allow for administrative update.

Moved J Watson seconded P Redmond

**THAT** the meeting adjourn at 5.45pm and reconvene at 5.55pm.

CARRIED

---

**8 CORRESPONDENCE**

J Watson noted that a subcommittee will have to be created to discuss the placement/sites for historic panels.

Board members N Atkinson and S Stewart moved away from the table during consideration of recommendation (b).

Moved J Watson seconded R Blair

**THAT** the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) **Receives** the letter regarding Decisions by Council on the Draft Annual Plan 2017/18 (pg 155-160 of Trim 170703068122)

(b) **Ratifies** the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board Objection to Bottle O Silverstream Liquor Application 21 September 2017 (Trim 170921102331)

CARRIED

---

**9 CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT**

9.1 **Chair’s Diary for September-October 2017**

Moved J Watson seconded M Pinkham

**THAT** the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No. 171010109318.

CARRIED

---

**10 MATTERS REFERRED FOR INFORMATION**

10.1 **Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting minutes – 7 September 2017** (Trim No. 170926103789)

10.2 **Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting minutes – 11 September 2017** (Trim No. 171003106542)

10.3 **Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting minutes – 13 September 2017** (Trim No. 170919101095)

10.4 **Capital Projects Report for the period ended 30 June 2017** – Report to Audit and Risk Committee 19 September 2017 (Trim No. 17090609337).

10.5 **Draft Submission to the Productivity Commission’s issues paper on a Low-emissions Economy** – Report to Council 3 October 2017 (Trim No. 170920101559).

10.6 **Battle of Passchendaele Commemoration 2017** – Report to Council 3 October 2017 (Trim No. 170922102546).
Moved N Atkinson seconded P Redmond

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board receives the information in items 10.1-10.6.

CARRIED

Note: Items were circulated to Board members separately.

11 MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE

The purpose of this exchange is to provide a short update to other members in relation to activities/meetings that have been attended or to provide general Board related information.

S Stewart

- Issues with Rural Drainage were highlighted, noting that historic drainage areas in the rural areas only cover small patches and there are concerns about the water coming into and through these areas from rural 4ha developments and these landowners don’t pay a drainage rate. This continues to be an issue for most of the rural drainage areas, with members of these groups continually asking that the drainage rating be reviewed and for the council to consider district wide rural drainage.

- Update from the Water Zone Committee: Ecan is starting a lifestyle block project to familiarise lifestyle block owners with the sub-regional plan. This project has involved circulating information how Ecan would like these property owners to have good management practices in their lifestyle blocks. S Stewart believes the Board should be informed of how this will impact on the rural areas of this Ward, possibly through having attendance at a workshop with Board members. A Blackie advised that flyers had been sent out to rural residents. It was suggested that Ecan be asked to provide copies of any of the information that has been circulated to rural residents.

- S Stewart has visited Baker Park, and noted that there is a lot of water laying in the area of the new playground equipment. Photo to be sent to C Brown to show him this.

- S Stewart suggested that the Board members should go on a walk through the Kaiapoi Town Centre and believes there could be improvements in the landscaping in Williams Street. S Stewart does not believe this is a good example of the regeneration of Kaiapoi and would like to know what the policy is about the plantings in Kaiapoi and suggested there needs to be consideration given to improvements. It was noted that there is new planting in Sewell Street but that no one can see them.

P Redmond

- RSA organized the Passchendaele Memorial service at the cenotaph on 12 October, which was well attended and well organized.

- Attended the All Boards briefing

- Attended the Kaiapoi Community Groups meeting

- Attended the Kaiapoi Town Centre Review workshop

- Canterbury Museum visit. The Museum is going to be closed for three years for updating the building, hoping to relocate to a temporary site during this time. The lack of appropriate storage for exhibits not on display was noted.

- Attended ENC networking meeting. Civil Defense Officer spoke on business interruption
• Attended the Waimakariri Health Advisory Group meeting. Current Chair, who has been in the role for five years is wanting to retire. The role has been advertised and there was a good response. A decision to be made soon on the replacement for this role.

M Pinkham
• Attended the Enquiry By Design Workshop.
• Noted the good progress with the Passchendaele Walkway.
• Attended All Board briefing.
• Attended the ENC meeting, and quality of speakers was good with a good attendance.

J Meyer
• Noted that many Councillors have been away this month.
• There is potential issue with the servicing of the well heads on Smith Streets land.
• Silverstream bypass is running to schedule.

A Blackie
• Attended many meetings as previously noted above.
• Laid the wreath on behalf of the Council at the Passchendaele Centenary Commemoration .on 12 October at the Kaiapoi Cenotaph.

R Blair
• Nothing to report.

N Atkinson
• Has been in Cromwell for the Zone 5 and 6 meeting.

C Greengrass
• Offered congratulations at the Council’s AA rating, awarded in the LGNZ Excellence Review
• Attended Kaiapoi Museum meeting – it is hoped to get many of the museums items out of storage. Kaiapoi Lions Club has recently gone into recess and the organization has donated all items to the Museum.
• Opening function for the Pines Kairaki Hall is to be held on 4 November, which all Board members have been invited to.
• You Me We Us, the Amazing race date is now December 3 (not November 26). Chris noted that the Social Inclusion group do not come under the You Me We Us umbrella.
• The Darnley Club are back to their new facility, with the new extension which looks very good. The Club are grateful to the Community Board and the Council for this.
12 CONSULTATION PROJECTS

12.1 District Plan Review

Consultation closes 5pm, 27 October 2017.


Moved C Greengrass seconded P Redmond

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Resolves that they wish to submit on the District Plan Review Consultation.

CARRIED

13 REGENERATION PROJECTS

13.1 Town Centre, Kaiapoi

Updates on the Kaiapoi Town Centre projects are emailed regularly to Board members. These updates can be accessed 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:


13.3 Kaiapoi Regeneration Steering Group

The next meeting of the Kaiapoi Regeneration Steering Group will be held in Meeting Room 1, Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre, 4pm on Monday 6 November 2017. This meeting is open to the public.

14 BOARD FUNDING UPDATE

14.1 Board Discretionary Grant

Balance as at 16 October: $2,400.

15 MEDIA ITEMS

No media items.
16 MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

Moved N Atkinson seconded C Greengrass

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>16.1</td>
<td>Minutes of the public excluded portion of a meeting of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board Meeting 18 September 2017</td>
<td>Confirmation of Minutes</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
</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>16.1</td>
<td>To carry out commercial activities without prejudice</td>
<td>A2(b)ii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CARRIED

CLOSE MEETING

Resolution to resume open meeting

Moved N Atkinson seconded P Redmond

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

CARRIED

OPEN MEETING
17 QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS
There were no questions.

18 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS
There was no urgent general business.

NEXT MEETING
The next meeting of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board is scheduled for 4pm, Monday 20 November 2017 at the Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 6.25pm.

CONFIRMED

_______________________
Chairperson

_______________________
Date

Workshop
1. Members’ Forum.
   Opportunity for members to share potential new ideas and initiatives.
Background

On 16 October 2017 an Information Notice regarding the proposed construction of a roundabout at this intersection was circulated to Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board members for their information.

Members raised a variety of queries and it was felt that wider community consultation on the proposal would be appropriate. A “Let’s Talk” consultation process was put in place to enable feedback to be gained from the community as to whether or not a roundabout is desirable at the intersection of Smith Street / Williams Street / Beach Road.

Feedback has been sought via the following methods:

1. Flier delivery to nearby residents
2. Advertisement in the Kaiapoi Advocate
3. Survey Monkey – Online Survey
4. WDC Facebook Page

(There are no specific controls in place preventing residents from providing feedback multiple times by responding to each communication method although it is deemed unlikely in this instance).

This memo aims to provide members with an overview of that feedback and next steps on the project.

Summary of Findings

The feedback from the community has been overwhelmingly in favour of the installation of the roundabout.

A summary of the feedback received is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not Specified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fliers Returned</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emails Received</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Monkey</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook Post</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>101</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is worth noting that all three “No” responses received were still in favour of an intersection upgrade, however they believed that traffic signals would be their preferred option.

**Flier Delivery**

A total of 170 fliers were distributed to surrounding properties. Of these 39 were returned, with 37 of these being in favour of the roundabout. The remaining two responses were in favour of traffic signals.

A sample of the comments received are as follows:

1. “A long time waiting”
2. “Frustrating and dangerous”
3. “Witnessed a few near misses at this intersection, usually by vehicles trying to cross Williams Street”
4. “Traffic lights would be much better. Terrible corner to get across from Beach Road”
5. “Yes, yes. Yes very dangerous intersection, seen many accidents & near misses. Almost impossible to turn at 3pm or 5pm”
6. “It is often difficult and dangerous to exit Beach Road”
7. “Yes please”

Some comments also offered differing opinions as to whether or not there should be any planted gardens, some suggested including raised ramps, while others thought the circulating island was too big for buses, while others suggested making it bigger to slow down the cars.

During the flier delivery, I also took the opportunity to discuss the project with stakeholders that may be more affected by the proposal than others. This included staff at the Kaiapoi North School, who were very supportive of the project.

I also discussed the project with the owner of No. 197 Williams Street (located on the corner of Smith Street), and will continue to liaise directly with them, as well as the other property owners located in the immediate vicinity of the project.

**Email Responses**

The advertisement in the Kaiapoi Advocate, and the Waimakariri District Council (WDC) Facebook post directed people to either email in their responses, or to complete an on-line survey via “Survey Monkey”.

Four emails were received, all of which were in favour of installing a roundabout. One of these emails did also consider that traffic signals would slow the traffic more than a roundabout.

**Survey Monkey**

The results from the on-line survey were as per the table below:
Let’s Talk About the Williams Street Beach Road Intersection

Q1 Should the Council install a roundabout at the intersection of Williams Street, Beach Road and Smith Street?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>94.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two “No” votes were both in favour of traffic signals being installed rather than a roundabout.

A sample of the comments received as follows:

1. “Great idea that’s long overdue. Go for it...”
2. “Or maybe future proof with lights first time around. Either way it really does need traffic control.”
3. “Great idea. Often a dangerous intersection where people frequent dash across. Please consider also lowering the speed limit at the north end of Williams Street to 50 as well! Now that cars are entering Sovereign Lakes from Lees Rd it’s becoming busier and more dangerous!”
4. “Cantabrians do not know how to work roundabouts. You would be far better with traffic lights. e.g. you have just replaced a roundabout in Rangiora for traffic lights. While we are at it the corner of Tunas and Smith street is dangerous.”
5. “This was suggested to the council long before the Beach grove subdivision and the revamp of Meadow street had taken place. The intersection was better until it was choked by reducing the size meaning that most times only one car can be at the intersection at once. In the weekend there can be upwards of 15 cars on one side especially if there is a car turning right on either side....Go for it.”
6. “With increased traffic there is now issues with crossing Williams St. A roundabout will help to alleviate this.”
7. “definitely need a roundabout there, seen so many near missed where people take chances because they have to wait so long”

Facebook

The Facebook Post directed people to fill out the online survey, however many people do not follow the link, and will only read the post, or comment directly on the post.
Overall, the post received 31 comments, of which the majority were positive comments in support of the roundabout, with some neutral comments. There were no negative comments received.

The initial Facebook post reached 5,483 people. This is greater than 85% of Council posts.

Accident History

In the past five years, there have been 4 recorded incidents at this intersection. All four incidents involved a vehicle turning right from either Smith Street or Beach Road into the path of an oncoming vehicle on Williams Street.

The upgrade of this intersection to a roundabout will make this movement out of both Smith Street and Beach Road significantly safer, and less demanding on the driver due to now only having to give way only to traffic coming from the right through the roundabout.
Financial Information

The Council has received funding through development contributions towards the upgrade of this intersection. These development contributions, along with the 51% NZTA funding subsidy result in the project being cost neutral to the Council.

Should this project not proceed the development contributions may need to be reimbursed to the property developers that have paid the contribution.

Any decision to upgrade the intersection in the future will require funding from Council to complete the project should the project not be approved this current financial year.

Next Steps

In view of the feedback to the consultation it is planned to proceed with the planned intersection upgrade this current financial year.

The timetable for this project has been slightly delayed due to this consultation process, however it is still the project team’s aim to have tender closing on 20 December 2017, and award of contract at the first WDC Management Team meeting of 2018, to be held 08 January 2018.

Kieran Straw
Civil Projects Team Leader.
1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to gain the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board’s feedback on the options for the location and/or upgrades to the tanker filling points in Kaiapoi.

1.2. Tanker filling points have been installed throughout the district to provide contractors with approved points to fill water tankers from, that are safe in terms of the public, the contractors and also the public water supplies.

1.3. While the tanker filling points in the large part have been a success in reducing the number of complaints regarding contractors filling from hydrants throughout the district, the two tanker points in Kaiapoi have had some issues identified:

1.3.1. Adderley Terrace tanker filling point:

This filling point is located on Adderley Terrace near the Annaliese Haven Resthome. This site was selected due to the proximity to development areas to the south-west of Kaiapoi, and to take advantage of the area of land for vehicles to pull over away from the main road.

1.3.2. The issues that have been identified are that the spilt water does not drain away from the site, which creates a muddy area surrounding the point, and the traffic hazard that has been identified predominantly due to retirement village residents and visitors using the road as a footpath which creates a risk of a clash with the water tankers.

1.3.3. Williams Street tanker filling point by Kaiapoi Lakes:

This filling point location was selected due to its proximity to development areas in the north Kaiapoi area, and to take advantage of the existing area of land for vehicles to pull over away from the main carriageway. The key issue identified with this site is that aesthetically it detracts form the amenity value of the area, in particular given the scenic outlook over the lakes at this point.

1.4. Solutions to the issues identified at both sites have been considered and are discussed below.

Adderley Terrace Site (South West Kaiapoi)
1.5. A range of options of been considered for the Adderley Terrace site in terms of either upgrading the existing site, or relocating this filling point to an alternative location.

1.6. None of the options identified were considered to achieve all the desired criteria for a new site. It is noted that the level of development in the part of Kaiapoi that this tanker filling point is serving is reducing. Therefore it is proposed that:

1.6.1. The tanker filling point be shut down as an interim step. The timing of this will be discussed with developers in the area prior to confirming an exact date.

1.6.2. Staff will continue to investigate alternative options and will report back to the board prior to making a long term decision.

Williams Street Site (North Kaiapoi)

1.7. The recommendation for the Williams Street site is to improve the amenity value of this site through the use of native plantings surrounding the backflow preventer cage that is the key visible element of this site. It is proposed that if this can be screened with planting the issue identified will be sufficiently mitigated.

1.8. Relocation of this site was considered by not deemed appropriate due to the high cost, the lack of alternatives available, and the suitability of the proposed solution to the issue.

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 171102118733.

(b) Endorses staff to work towards shutting down the Adderley Terrace tanker filling point, with the timing of this to be discussed with developers currently working in the area.

(c) Notes that staff will continue to investigate alternative options for a tanker filling point to serve the future development areas in south-west Kaiapoi and report back to the Board at a later date with a recommendation.

(d) Endorses the use of screen planting at the Williams Street site to address the aesthetic issues noted with this site.

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

3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. Tanker filling points have been installed throughout the district to provide contractors with approved points to fill water tankers from, that are safe in terms of the public, the contractors and also the public water supplies.

3.2. Prior to the installation of the dedicated tanker filling points, water tankers that require water for construction would fill from potentially any hydrant throughout the district. This had the following issues:

3.2.1. It would result in complaints from residents due to the nuisance caused by the filing of tankers in residential areas.

3.2.2. It could create traffic hazards due to the tankers stopping to fill within the live traffic lane at times. There was in particular one ‘near miss’ incident in which a moving vehicle came close to striking the operator filling their tanker from a hydrant.
3.2.3. A risk was introduced to the public water supplies as not all contractors would use the correct backflow prevention devices, therefore there was a risk of backflow of contaminants from the tankers into the public water supply.

3.3. While the tanker filling points installed throughout the district have in the large part been a success in addressing the above issues, the two tanker points in Kaiapoi have had some issues identified. The location of the two sites, the growth areas (that drive demand for these filling points), and potential alternative locations for the Adderley Terrace site are summarised on the figure below:

![Figure 1: Kaiapoi Development Areas (2014) and Potential Tanker Filling Point Sites.](image)

3.4. It is noted that the growth areas depicted by the shading in Figure 1 above were generated in 2014. While this figure is not completely up to date, it gives an indication of the areas that are required to be served by the tanker filling points.

3.5. Options to mitigate the issues at the two existing sites are covered in the following sections of this report. This includes those options depicted above to relocate the Adderley Terrace site, as well as options to mitigate the issues identified at the Williams Street site.

Adderley Terrace tanker filling point Options

3.6. This filling point is located on Adderley Terrace near the Annaliese Haven Resthome. This site was selected due to the proximity to development areas to the south-west of Kaiapoi, and to take advantage of the area of land for vehicles to pull over away from the main road.
3.7. The issues that have been identified are that the spilt water does not drain away from the site, which creates a muddy area surrounding the point, and the traffic hazard that has identified predominantly due to retirement village residents and visitors using the road as a footpath which creates a risk of a clash with the water tankers.

Figure 2: Location of Adderley Terrace Tanker Filling Point

Figure 3: Adderley Terrace Filling Point - note water not draining from site
3.8. A range of options of been considered for the Adderley Terrace site in terms of either upgrading the existing site, or relocating this filling point to an alternative location. The key criteria used in identifying potential sites are below:

- Must be accessible to contractors working in west Kaiapoi area, preferably south of the Kaiapoi river.
- The impact / drainage of water spilt during the filling of tankers must be able to be managed.
- It must not create a hazard for other road users (i.e. tankers shall be able to pull away from main traffic flow).
• Public impact must be considered, with the impact on residential areas or other community activities minimised.

• Cost.

3.9. Five options have been considered for a potential location to best satisfy the criteria identified above.

3.9.1. Upgrade Existing Site on Adderley Terrace

This option involves retaining the existing site, but making improvements to address the issue with the water ponding at the site, and relocating the area that the tankers pull over to fill up. The works proposed would include:

• Installation of kerb and channel to prevent runoff going onto grass verge, and also to ensure tankers stay within sealed asphalt area.
• Relocation of footpath around new pull over area.
• Relocation of fire hydrant for tankers to fill from (but retain existing location of backflow prevention cage).

The proposed upgrades are shown below:

![Figure 6: Potential relocation of tanker pull over area on Adderley Terrace](image)

It is envisioned that the above works would address the issues regarding the drainage of spilt water by constructing new kerb and channel that could be tied into the existing drainage system. The issues regarding tankers driving through the area utilised by residents and visitors for parking and walking would be mitigated by relocating the area that tankers park away from this area. It is acknowledged that this option would not completely remove the activity of tankers filling from this area so may not be fully supported by the local residents, however it would mitigate the issues that have been raised.

The advantages and disadvantages of the above option are:
- Greater separation between where tankers pull over and residential and retirement village area.
- Tankers are pulling over closer to a main road (rather than off the main road).
- Cost of relocation is minimised relative to other options as backflow preventor cage location is retained.

3.10. Smith Street

An alternative site considered is on Smith Street close to Hakarau Road. This site has the following key advantages and disadvantages:

- Located away from live traffic lane (minimal risk with road traffic).
- Existing gravel area that could be used for turning vehicles.
- Located away from residential area.
- Adjacent to stormwater basin meaning easy discharge of runoff from site.
- There is an existing water main in a convenient location that could be utilised (this was installed previously for developers in this area to utilise).
- This site is not ideal in terms of location being north of the Kaiapoi river (rather than south).
- This area is used by some parents and caregivers to pick and drop off school children at Kaiapoi Borough School (which is accessed by a footbridge over the Kaiapoi River). This has the potential for some conflict between the tankers and school children / school traffic at certain times of the day.

Figure 7: Potential Smith Street site
3.11. Island Road (near Streamside Terrace intersection)

A site on Island Road is being considered in between the cemetery and a recreation reserve, near the Streamside Terrace intersection. The key advantages / disadvantages with this site are listed below:

- There is adequate grass berm available to construct a zone for tankers to pull over.
- There is some separation between this site and residential housing (with immediately adjacent land being a cemetery and a recreation reserve.
- Ideal location for development areas in South-West Kaiapoi.
- While the recreation reserve does mean there is potential for members of the public to be close to this site, the nature of the reserve area means there is unlikely to be a large amount of people concentrated in this area.
- The cost will be higher than other options considered due to the need to extend the reticulation beneath the existing road to reach this point.

It is also noted that a superior location within this vicinity has also been identified at the intersection of Island Road and Adderley Terrace. This site has adequate existing area that could be utilised for tankers to pull over, however at present water mains do not extend this far. Therefore, if this site was to be used, the water reticulation would need to be extended to this point which would add cost to this option. Both potential sites are shown on the figure below.
3.12. Ranfurly Street (near Walker Street intersection).

A site on Ranfurly Street was considered in between an industrial area and reserve land. This site has the following advantages and disadvantages:

- Not ideal location for South-West Kaiapoi development areas.
- Impact on residential housing minimised due to location between industrial land and reserve land.
- Potential impact on early childhood centre and playground to the north of site.
3.13. Island Wilson Road (near Parnham Lane)

A site was considered on Isaac Wilson Road near Parnham Lane. The key advantage of this site is that one site of the road has a cemetery so impact on residents on this side of the road is minimised.

The other key advantages and disadvantages are summarised below:

- Some potential impact on residents on south side of Isaac Wilson Road.
- Reasonable access to South-West Kaiapoi.
- Foot traffic on footpath on north side of Isaac Wilson Road will be impacted / need to be managed as part of design.

3.14. Red Zone Area on Courtenay Drive
An area within the Courtenay Drive red zone was considered, primarily due to the lack of residential housing. This site has the following advantages / disadvantages:

- Lack of immediate impact on residential housing.
- Potential impact on houses on the non-red zone parts of Courtenay Drive with tankers driving past their properties (potentially shaking houses).
- Site is north of Williams Street, so would require traffic to cross Williams Street to access South-West Kaiapoi area.

3.15. The options considered are summarised in the table below:

Table 1: Options Summary Table for West / South Kaiapoi Tanker Filling Point Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Proximity to South-West Kaiapoi</th>
<th>Drainage for spill water</th>
<th>Traffic Hazard with other vehicles</th>
<th>Public impact</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do nothing</td>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>Issues with ponded water</td>
<td>Minor (away from main road)</td>
<td>Issues with retirement village users</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adderley Terrace – relocate area for tankers to pull over</td>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>Can tie in with existing system</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Issues with retirement village users mitigated to some degree</td>
<td>27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith Street</td>
<td>Average (north of river)</td>
<td>Close access to stormwater basin</td>
<td>Minor (away from main road)</td>
<td>No residents in close proximity but this area is used as a drop off zone for school children</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Road (near Streamside Tce intersection)</td>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>Can tie in with road drainage system</td>
<td>Moderate (improvement works required to construct area to pull over)</td>
<td>Minimal (between unused Council land and cemetery)</td>
<td>45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Road (at Adderley Terrace intersection)</td>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>No formal drainage system in this area.</td>
<td>Minor (existing area where tankers can pull over)</td>
<td>Minimal (between unused Council land and cemetery)</td>
<td>67,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranfurly Street</td>
<td>Average (north of river)</td>
<td>Can either tie in with existing stormwater system or drain to grass (not ideal).</td>
<td>Moderate (improvement works required to construct area to pull over)</td>
<td>Can be situated away from housing but relatively close proximity to pre-school / playground</td>
<td>29,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac Wilson Road</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Can tie in with road drainage system</td>
<td>Moderate (improvement works required to construct area to pull over)</td>
<td>Potential issues due to proximity of residential housing.</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtenay Drive Red Zone</td>
<td>Average (east of Williams Street)</td>
<td>Can be managed within new road design.</td>
<td>Minimal immediate impact (due to low use of road) but potential wider impact to access site.</td>
<td>Potential impact on houses on edge of red zone.</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.16. Based on the above analysis, there is not one site that clearly satisfies all the criteria for a tanker filling point site. It is noted that the level of development in the south-west part of Kaiapoi is declining at present, and therefore the demand for a site in this area is expected...
to decline in the coming months. Based on this, the following steps are proposed to address the issues with the Adderley Terrace site:

3.16.1. The Adderley Terrace tanker filling point be shut down as an interim step. The timing of this will be discussed with developers in the area prior to confirming an exact date.

3.16.2. Staff will continue to investigate alternative options and will report back to the board prior to making a long term decision.

3.16.3. One alternative that will be considered as a long term solution will be a developer in the south-west Kaiapoi area incorporating the installation of a filling point as part of their development. This would potentially be of benefit to them during their construction, and would be of benefit to Council as well if this were to be vested to Council. In this scenario the equipment on Adderley Terrace could be re-purposed.

3.17. Williams Street tanker filling point by Kaiapoi Lakes:

This Williams Street site is the second tanker filling point site within Kaiapoi. This site is situated to serve the northern Kaiapoi area. The expected development areas within Kaiapoi are shown on the map below:

The Williams Street site has the advantages that it is ideally situated to serve the Northern Kaiapoi area, and there is an area on the side of the road that is designed for vehicles to pull over.

The key issue identified with this site is that aesthetically it detracts from the amenity value of the area, in particular given the scenic outlook over the lakes at this point. Given the cost associated with relocating this site, and the lack of superior alternatives, the recommendation to address the aesthetic issues is to plant vegetation to tie in with the surrounding landscape to screen the view of the filling point. Other measures that could be considered would include painting of the cage to an alternative colour.

The following sketch has been produced to illustrate the potential impact of plantings and painting at the Williams Street site:

Figure 13: Existing Williams Street site
3.18. The Management Team has reviewed this report and supports the recommendations.

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. A group of residents in the area of the Adderley Terrace site have been in contact with Council to raise their concerns regarding this site. This report has been prepared in response to these concerns.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. The costs of the various options are summarised on the following tables:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Decommissioning of existing filling points</th>
<th>Installation of filling point at new location</th>
<th>Additional pipe (where connection not directly to existing main)</th>
<th>Roading improvements (asphalt, kerb and channel etc.)</th>
<th>Total Construction Estimate</th>
<th>Total Recommended Budget (incl. 30% contingency and professional fees allowance)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adderley Terrace – relocate area for tankers to pull over</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith Street</td>
<td>$4,800</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$11,800</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Road (near Streamside Tce intersection)</td>
<td>$4,800</td>
<td>$8,500</td>
<td>$8,100</td>
<td>$13,100</td>
<td>$34,500</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Road (at Adderley Terrace intersection)</td>
<td>$4,800</td>
<td>$8,500</td>
<td>38,100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$51,400</td>
<td>$67,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranfurly Street</td>
<td>$4,800</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$9,200</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac Wilson Road</td>
<td>$4,800</td>
<td>$6,600</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$14,500</td>
<td>$30,400</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtenay Drive Red Zone</td>
<td>$4,800</td>
<td>$6,600</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$14,500</td>
<td>$30,400</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. **Policy**

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

6.2. **Legislation**

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

6.3. **Community Outcomes**

This report is related to the following community outcomes:

- There is a safe environment for all.
- Core utility services are provided in a timely, sustainable, and affordable manner.
1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Board’s support to consult on a proposal to change the speed limit on Lees Road and Barkers Road.

1.2. A speed limit of 60km/h is proposed on Lees Road and Barkers Road over their entire length.

1.3. Feedback from the local community along with the further development of the Sovereign Palms Development has raised concerns with the current speed limit.

Attachments:

i. Plan showing proposed speed limits (TRIM 171025114968)

ii. Speed Count Results on Lees Road (TRIM 171025114913)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 171026115931.

(b) Approves consultation being carried out on the proposal to change speed limit on Lees Road and Barkers Road to 60km/h, as outlined in the attached plan.

(c) Notes that consultation on this proposal will be carried out between 27 November and 18 December 2017.

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

(e) Notes that any submissions on the proposal will be taken into account before the change is presented to the Council on 6 February 2018 for consideration.

3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. Lees Road is a secondary collector road to the north of Kaiapoi Township and the Sovereign Palms Development. Lees Road currently has a speed limit of 80km/h over
its full length. Barkers Road is a short no exit road off Lees Road with a similar road environment to Lees Road.

3.2. Concerns from residents, along with the expansion of Kaiapoi's northern developments such as Sovereign Palms has resulted in the need to reconsider the speed limit along both Lees Road and the adjoining road of Barkers Road.

3.3. The NZTA has recently reviewed the way speed limits are managed nationally and last year the new NZ Speed Management Guide was published. The NZ Speed Management Guide sets out a framework to set safe and appropriate speed limits for different road environments. The new Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits 2017 came into effect on 21st September 2017.

3.4. A traffic count survey carried out between the 18th and 27th of September. This traffic count survey found the Average Daily Traffic (ADT) to be 996 vehicles per day for Lees Road. The traffic count survey also found that the mean speed of vehicles traveling down Lees Road 62.5km/h with an 85th percentile speed of 72.98km.h. It is expected that vehicle numbers on Lees Road will increase significantly as the northern end of Sovereign Palms develops.

3.5. Using the NZ Speed Management Guide the indicated safe and appropriate speed is assessed to be <80km/h.
3.6. A speed limit of 60km/h is proposed on both Lees Road from the assessment results above. Barkers Road has a very similar road environment and when assessed using the Speed Management Guide the same result is derived. It is proposed a 60km/h speed limit is considered for Barkers Road to better reflect the road environment and to remain consistent with speed limits within the area. This proposed speed aligns with the Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits 2017 section 4.4, which states that the Road Controlling Authority is to aim to achieve mean operating speeds less than 10% above the speed limit.

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

4. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

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

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

4.2. It is proposed to seek community views through the Council’s website, social media, notice in the local newspapers and letters to all property owners adjoining the roads being changed.

5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

5.1. The total cost to council will be able to be met through existing budgets.

5.2. There is no significant risk to Council.

6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. **Policy**

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

6.2. **Legislation**

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

The Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits Rule (54001/1) requires that permanent speed limits be set by bylaw.

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

6.3. **Community Outcomes**

(a) There is a safe environment for all:

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

(b) Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable, affordable and sustainable
• The standard of our District’s roads is keeping pace with increasing traffic numbers
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset:</th>
<th>[0372ASP] LEES RD 400m east of Main North Rd &lt;80&gt; OS# 269</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attribute:</td>
<td>[-43.354513 +172.667383]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction:</td>
<td>7 - North bound A&gt;B, South bound B&gt;A. Lane: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Duration:</td>
<td>9:57 Monday, 18 September 2017 =&gt; 13:16 Wednesday, 27 September 2017,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File:</td>
<td>0372ASP 0 2017-09-27 1416.EC1 (Plus )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifier:</td>
<td>W085X6J8 MC56-L5 [MC55] (c)Microcom 19Oct04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algorithm:</td>
<td>Factory default axle (v4.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data type:</td>
<td>Axle sensors - Paired (Class/Speed/Count)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profile:</td>
<td>9:58 Monday, 18 September 2017 =&gt; 13:16 Wednesday, 27 September 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9.13786)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Included classes:</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed range:</td>
<td>10 - 160 km/h.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction:</td>
<td>North, East, South, West (bound), P = North, Lane = 0-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separation:</td>
<td>Headway &gt; 0 sec, Span 0 - 100 metre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Default Profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme:</td>
<td>Vehicle classification (NZTA2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units:</td>
<td>Metric (metre, kilometre, m/s, km/h, kg, tonne)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In profile:</td>
<td>Vehicles = 8916 / 8916 (100.00%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Speed Statistics by Hour

**SpeedStatHour-25**

**Site:** 0372ASP.1.2NS

**Description:** LEES RD 400m east of Main North Rd <80> OS# 269

**Filter time:** 9:58 Monday, 18 September 2017 => 13:16 Wednesday, 27 September 2017

**Scheme:** Vehicle classification (NZTA2011)

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

**Vehicles** = 8916

**Posted speed limit** = 80 km/h, Exceeding = 482 (5.41%), Mean Exceeding = 86.78 km/h

**Maximum** = 130.5 km/h, **Minimum** = 11.1 km/h, **Mean** = 62.5 km/h

**85% Speed** = 72.98 km/h, **95% Speed** = 80.31 km/h, **Median** = 62.37 km/h

**20 km/h Pace** = 53 - 73, **Number in Pace** = 6051 (67.87%)

**Variance** = 133.95, **Standard Deviation** = 11.57 km/h

**Hour Bins (Partial days)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Bin</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>85%</th>
<th>95%</th>
<th>&gt;PSL</th>
<th>80 km/h</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0000</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0100</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0200</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>121.6</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>107.2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0300</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0400</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0500</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>85.4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0600</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>109.1</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0700</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>90.3</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0800</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0900</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>99.0</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>96.1</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>116.2</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>103.6</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>101.8</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>119.3</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>100.2</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>130.5</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>115.0</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>117.0</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>100.4</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2100</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>123.2</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2200</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>101.5</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>8916</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>130.5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT

FILE NO and TRIM NO: CPR-04-30-10/ 171102118813

REPORT TO: Kaiapoi / Tuahiwi Community Board

DATE OF MEETING: 20 November 2017

FROM: Chris Brown, Community Green Space Manager

SUBJECT: Licence to Occupy to ESR for Denitrification Wall

1. SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to provide the Board with information to allow a decision regarding the issue of a Licence to Occupy allowing the Institute of Environmental Science and Research Limited (ESR) to build a Denitrification Wall within the western side of Silverstream Reserve.

Attachments:

i. Report from MKT identifying the proposal and the response from Rununga (Trim 171114123617)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Kaiapoi / Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 171102118813

(b) Approves a Licence to Occupy for an area of land in the Western end of Silverstream Reserve to ESR for the Purpose of installing a Denitrification Wall with standard conditions as well as the following:

i. Licence to Occupy for a period of 5 years.

ii. Resource Consent approved and issued by Environment Canterbury

iii. WDC is notified immediately if any conditions of the licence are breached

iv. All conditions set down by Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga are adhered to, in particular:

- Close monitoring be undertaken to detect any unexpected levels of contamination in groundwater downstream of the PRB

- That the Accidental Discovery Protocol of the Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan be included in the consent conditions to ensure correct procedure is followed should there be any archaeological discoveries during the course of earthworks

- That a copy of the monitoring data be supplied to Mahaanui Kurataio Ltd
3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

3.1. ESR approached the Council in late 2016 seeking permission to trial a proposed new groundwater treatment method known as a Denitrifying Permeable Reactive Barrier (or PRB) on Council Land. Preliminary investigations had identified that Silverstream Reserve was a desirable site for an accurate trial.

3.2. Permission was sought from Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga to undertake the research and was granted subject to the following conditions:

- Close monitoring be undertaken to detect any unexpected levels of contamination in groundwater downstream of the PRB
- That the Accidental Discovery Protocol of the Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan be included in the consent conditions to ensure correct procedure is followed should there be any archaeological discoveries during the course of earthworks
- That a copy of the monitoring data be supplied to Mahaanui Kurataio Ltd

3.3. A Permeable Reactive Barrier (or PRB) works like a groundwater filter through entrenching porous reactive substrate (such as woodchip) into an aquifer across across the flow path. The substrate fosters colonies of de-nitrifying microorganisms that respire nitrate in lieu of oxygen, meaning any nitrate passing through the barrier is taken out of the ground water by being converted to innocuous di-nitrogen gas.

3.4. Denitrification walls are passive treatment systems in the sense that once in the ground they require no on-going maintenance and passage of groundwater through the system is driven by natural hydraulic gradients. Prognosis from existing case-studies that have been undertaken in sandy (not gravel) aquifer systems is that woodchip denitrifying PRB’s maintain functionality for 30 years or more. A revised assessment of this prognosis for gravel aquifers is an objective of our field pilot study. Being subterranean structures, no land need necessarily be taken out of production to host a PRB.

3.5. Denitrification walls are a tried and tested concept in slow moving sandy aquifer systems where they have proven effective at treating nitrate from point pollution sources. There are no examples however of these remediation systems having been installed in gravel aquifers. In this regard, our PRB pilot study represents a world-first.

3.6. The proposal is to establish a PRB at Silverstream Reserve, in an area of currently disused land near the reserve car park. The PRB would be implemented in the following stages:

- **Site characterisation/field investigation**
  To confirm suitability as a field site, the prospective field site will be subject to some preliminary field investigation. This will be a survey using non-invasive ground penetrating radar geophysical methods to verify the ground conditions and measure depth to groundwater, also investigation of local water quality (nitrate concentrations) from sampling of any pre-existing wells nearby. Subject to findings, a more rigorous site investigation will follow and a significant investment will be made instrumenting the site for continued study covering an area circa. 100 x 200 m. Through a drilling program, numerous shallow monitoring wells will be installed across the site to
enable high resolution geological logging and groundwater quality monitoring. Geo-electrodes will be entrenched below the ground across the site to permit ongoing hydro-geophysical study. Aquifer tests, salt tracing experiments and time-lapse geophysical methods will be applied to:

i) Determine groundwater flow direction;

ii) Map preferential flow zones in the aquifer, and

iii) Determine real groundwater velocities – information that will inform PRB design. Through the network of wells installed at the site we will also make a comprehensive study of the groundwater ecology.

- **Design the PRB.**

  The PRB will be tailor-designed to the site conditions, as they are discovered from Stage 2. The precise physical structure and modes for how woodchip and gravel will be emplaced will be informed by results from other facets of work being completed under the same research programme.

- **Stage 4: Install the PRB**

  Subject to gaining resource consent, the PRB will be installed within the midst of the monitoring well array. At this stage it is estimated the major ground works will take around 2 months to complete. This will involve entrenching a mixture of gravel and wood chip below the water table to a depth no less than 2 m below the water table. Tentative dimensions are 60 m long x 10 m wide x 4 m deep. Works will be conducted by a civil engineering company, instructed by ESR. We envisage that a free-feed gravel situation will be operated. That is aquifer sediments removed during the entrenching works will be processed of fines on site. The coarse (gravel) fraction will be mixed with woodchip and used to construct the PRB. The excavation will be reinstated to ground level. The only extrusive component of the PRB system once installed will be the headworks of the monitoring wells that will protrude from the ground, although an option is to finish headworks flush with ground level if this is required.

- **Stage 5: On-going monitoring**

  Following PRB installation, tracing tests complemented by hydro-geophysics will be repeated to examine the hydraulic integrity of the PRB and evaluate how the structure affects the local groundwater flow pattern. A steady decline in the nitrate treatment performance of the PRB is inevitable owing to gradual degradation of the woodchip both in terms of its reactivity and permeability. A research objective is to continually monitor these changes over the long-term. Presently ESR has research funding secured until June 2019 to do this, although we would anticipate some form of periodic monitoring to go on long after this, to accrue a long-term scientific dataset. Groundwater quality; groundwater ecology; geotechnical properties of the PRB structure and quantification of any (N2O) gas emissions from the PRB are variables that will be monitored periodically.

3.7. Risks associated with the trial have been considered along with techniques for managing them;
Adverse pollution swapping

Although the aim of a denitrifying PRB is to clean groundwater of nitrate, there is a small chance adverse pollution swapping phenomenon will occur. A PRB operates by inducing anoxic conditions in the groundwater. Anoxic conditions can promote mobilisation of metals such as iron, manganese and arsenic that are associated with greywacke gravel aquifers.

Leaching tests conducted in the lab to examine the likelihood of this occurring have so far not highlighted any obvious concerns. The magnitude at which these phenomena will occur will be evaluated by the field tests.

The PRB will leach some dissolved organic carbon (from the woodchip), especially in the initial phases of operation. The biochemical oxygen demand (BOD) of such leachate might pose a hazard to aquatic ecology. Locating the PRB distant from any sensitive surface water mitigates this problem.

Ground subsidence

Over time the woodchip in the PRB will decompose and as a consequence, density changes of the wall structure are anticipated. Although never reported as an issue in historic case studies, these changes may manifest themselves as some gradual settlement of the PRB structure.

Any subsidence effects, should they occur, will be minor and can be remedied by simply infilling any hollows with top soil. There can be no catastrophic collapse of the PRB, since the gravel support matrix will prevent this. Measurement of how the geotechnical properties of the PRB might change over time constitutes a research objective.

3.8. As part of the research a Ground water Salt Tracer will be used assist to characterise groundwater direction and flow at the site and assess the hydraulic performance of a permeable reactive barrier during the course of the study. The type of tracer used will be sodium chloride (conventional salt) and is permitted under the Land & Water Regional Plan Rule 5.101 (e)

3.9. Policy 5 of the Silverstream Reserve Management Plan identifies that "No earthworks shall be undertaken in sites that are considered to have Maori or any other cultural heritage values until approved by Council". This has been addressed through both consultation with Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga and the consenting process from Ecan.

3.10. Policy 6 of the Silverstream Reserve Management Plan specifies to "where possible accommodate surveys and research of the flora & fauna of the reserve". While this work is not strictly focussed on flora or fauna the research has the potential to provide information to conserve and protect the bio-diversity & eco-systems of the area, as well as having national significance.

3.11. Should any of the conditions of the consent or features of legislation, or any of the conditions of the Runanga be breached in the course of the project, the Council reserves the right to terminate the License to Occupy with immediate effect.

3.12. Final approval to proceed with the project is subject to the issuing of a Resource Consent by Environment Canterbury

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

4.1. The Silverstream Reserve Advisory Group discussed the proposal to conduct PRB testing in the reserve at their meeting held on February 21st 2017. The position of the group was that Council Green Space be asked to support the application from ESR Ltd to advance the denitrification project. This was moved and seconded. One member was neutral on the topic but said they felt they would be more supportive if they could see a more tangible incentive or advantage for the group.

4.2. Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga were consulted by way of a report presented to them by Mahaanui Kurataio. This report included a brief overview of the proposal, reference to relevant Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan policies, and advice of Runanga concerns and their feedback. Their main concerns were:

- The committee questioned the potential effect of the use of woodchips on groundwater. It was confirmed that the risk of contaminants leaching from woodchips has been considered and there were no real anticipated effects on Silverstream. Monitoring will also occur on groundwater downstream of the barrier.
- No concerns were raised regarding the salt tracing aspect of the proposal.
- The committee confirmed that the accidental discovery protocol in the Mahaanui Iwi management plan (IMP) should be included in the consent conditions.
- It was supported that a copy of the monitoring data be supplied to Mahaanui Kurataio Ltd.

5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

5.1. The Licence to Occupy will be granted for a fee of 1$ per annum if demanded.

6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. **Policy**

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

6.2. **Legislation**

   Reserves Act 1977

6.3. **Community Outcomes**

   There is sufficient clean water to meet the needs of communities and ecosystems.

   Public spaces are plentiful, accessible and high quality.
Resource Consent Application - Permeable Reactive Barrier Experiment at Silverstream Reserve

Manawhenua Statement

Ngāi Tahu are tangata whenua of the Canterbury region, and hold ancestral and contemporary relationships with Canterbury. The contemporary structure of Ngāi Tahu is set down through the Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu Act 1996 (TRoNT Act) and, through this structure and this Act, sets the requirements for recognition of tangata whenua in Canterbury.

Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga hold manawhenua over the proposed location, as it is within their takiwā. As defined in the TRoNT Act, the takiwā of Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga centres on Tuahiwi and extends from the Hurunui to Hakatere, sharing an interest with Arowhenua Runanga northwards to Rakata, and hence inland to the Main Divide.

The natural resources — water (waterways, waipuna (springs), groundwater, wetlands); mahinga kai; indigenous flora and fauna; cultural landscapes and land - are taonga to manawhenua and they have concerns for activities potentially adversely affecting these taonga. Those taonga are integral to the cultural identity of ngā rūnanga manawhenua and they have a kaitiaki responsibility to protect them. The policies for protection of taonga that are of high cultural significance to ngā rūnanga manawhenua are articulated in the Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan (IMP).

This report contains the following;
  
  - A brief overview of the proposal,
  - Relevant IMP policies,
  - Advice of rūnanga concerns and their feedback.
Assessment of Proposal

This section sets out our understanding of the key features of the proposal as described by the applicant in its resource consent documentation.

ESR are seeking resource consents for their groundwater de-nitrification research. The research involves the installation at Silverstream Reserve of an underground de-nitrification wall or Permeable Reactive Barrier (PRB). The PRB is designed to reduce nitrate concentrations within gravel aquifer systems. This is achieved by adding wood chip to the Barrier which has the effect of stimulating microbial activity. This in turn will lead to the removal of nitrate from any groundwater passing through the wall. For the purpose of this research, the PRB will be installed and a salt tracer will be discharged into the groundwater to track its velocity and direction through the PRB.

Resource consent is required for the earthworks associated with the installation of the PRB and for the use of a salt tracer during the experiment.

A summary of monitoring data will be provided to Environment Canterbury every 3 months for the first year then every 6 months. The report will also be provided to Mahaanui Kurataiao Ltd and Waimakariri District Council.

Methods

Installation of the PRB will involve excavating a trench, screening excavated gravels to remove the fine material and replacing the coarse gravel and wood chip back into the trench.

The PRB will be installed using a continuous trenching method. The trench will be 60m long, up to 10m wide and 2m below the groundwater table. The trenching will take around 2-3 weeks. ESR have confirmed that there will be no refuelling of machinery within 20m of water.

Trench depth will be approximately 2m below the groundwater table and the PRB would be very permeable to allow groundwater to naturally flow through and be treated. Once installed there is no ongoing maintenance required for the PRB.

Potential Effects

The woodchips will leach dissolved organic carbon (DOC) which will stimulate the natural bacteria to consume nitrate. There is a chance that there will be increased mobilization of phosphorus, iron, manganese and arsenic when the woodchip is fresh and most reactive. Modelling has showed that the mobilized compounds will significantly decrease within 50m of the PRB, and groundwater will flow 500-810m before reaching Silverstream. ESR will be monitoring groundwater downstream from the PRB to assess any pollution and de-nitrification.

The PRB is considered to be sited sufficiently far from surface water and potable groundwater wells to minimise risks of environmental contamination arising from the research. Nitrate nitrogen and DOC will be monitored continuously.
As ESR will be monitoring the groundwater ecosystem as part of the research there can be a high degree of confidence that any adverse changes in the groundwater system will be identified quickly. The ecosystem includes microorganisms, protozoa and stygofauna. There is no data available to assess effects on the groundwater systems because there has been very little research to date.

It is anticipated that there will be a decrease in groundwater nitrate levels that should improve nitrate levels in Silverstream.

Mitigation

ESR have set trigger levels for parameters that are potentially of concern for drinking water standards. If trigger levels are exceeded, there is a selection of processes to be followed to return the concentrations to below the trigger levels. Whilst ESR is confident that trigger levels will not be exceeded, mitigation has been put in place.

ESR will have a management plan for the experiment that includes monitoring sites and frequency.

Sampling frequency will be initially weekly (for about 3 months) then decrease to monthly when data variability indicates that it is appropriate.

Evaluation in relation to Waikato iwi Management Plan (MIMP)

Set out below, we identify and provide a preliminary comment on the relevant policies contained in the MIMP. The following policies are relevant to this application;

WM6.8 To continue to oppose the discharge of contaminants to water, and to land where contaminants may enter water.

Comment: A salt tracer will be discharged into the groundwater to track its velocity and direction. There may also be discharge of contaminants from the wood chips however, there are trigger levels and mitigation measures in place to prevent adverse effects.

P11.1 To assess proposals for earthworks with particular regard to:
(a) Potential effects on wāhi tapu and wāhi taonga, known and unknown;
(b) Potential effects on waterways, wetlands and wapuna;
(c) Potential effects on indigenous biodiversity;
(d) Potential effects on natural landforms and features, including ridge lines;
(e) Proposed erosion and sediment control measures; and
(f) Rehabilitation and remediation plans following earthworks.

Comment: Earthworks are required for the trench. ESR have proposed an Accidental Discovery Protocol and that machinery will not be refuelled within 70m of waterway.
The proposal was considered by the Kaitiaki Portfolio Committee of Te Ngāi Tūhuriri Rūnanga on the 21st September 2017. They have made the following feedback;

- The Committee questioned the potential effects of the use of wood chips on ground water. It was confirmed that the risk of contaminants leaching from wood chips has been considered by ESR and there are no real anticipated effects on Silverstream. Monitoring will also occur on groundwater downstream from the wall.
- No concerns were raised regarding the salt tracing aspect of the proposal.
- The Committee confirmed that the Accidental Discovery Protocol in the Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan should be included in consent conditions (attached)
- It is supported that a copy of the monitoring data will be supplied to Mahaanui Kurataiao Ltd.

Mahaanui Kurataiao and its staff are available to discuss this report further, or assist in direct engagement with rūnanga if desired.

Report Prepared by:
Lizzie Thomson
Environmental Advisor

Reviewed and Approved For Release By:
Nicola Rykers
Senior Environmental Advisor
Attachment ii: Overview of the research project from ESR Ltd
Denitrification wall: overview of ESR’s field pilot study

Contact: Lee Burbery, ESR Christchurch, lee.burberry@esr.cri.nz, DDI: 03 351 0087

1. Background

Nitrate is an elusive water pollutant associated with intensified land use, and agriculture. Being a nutrient, it is a reagent in eutrophication of freshwater systems and poses a toxicological hazard to freshwater ecology. It also poses a hazard to human health in drinking water. Under a raft of recent freshwater reforms, such as those documented within the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management there is a mandate for Regional Council’s to set water quality limits within catchments. To enact this, an integrated land-use and freshwater management approach is being adopted. Underpinning this is the ideology of ‘farming within water quality limits’.

The Institute of Environmental Science & Research (ESR) is a Crown Research Institute, wholly owned by the NZ Government. One of the Institute’s undertakings is scientific research aimed at improving the safety of freshwater and groundwater resources. Examining the fate and transport of nitrate in NZ groundwater systems has been a key topic of ESR’s groundwater research over the last decade. We have found that NZ’s alluvial gravel aquifers have negligible ability to naturally attenuate nitrate and, in many locations, groundwater systems have reached the capacity at which they can effectively mitigate nitrate pollution through natural dilution processes. To remedy this and provide potential means for farming within water quality limits, ESR is conducting R&D on denitrification walls tailored to gravel aquifer systems. The intention is to make a reliable assessment of whether such technologies represent a viable nitrate mitigation option. We have reached a stage where the next progressive step in our scientific assessment is to conduct a field-scale pilot study whereby we will construct a denitrification wall and make direct long-term study of it under field conditions.

2. What is a denitrification wall?

A denitrification wall, also known as a denitrifying permeable reactive barrier (PRB) works like a groundwater filter. The concept entails entrenching some porous reactive substrate into an aquifer, across the path of a migratory shallow groundwater nitrate plume. The role of the substrate is to fuel microbiologically-mediated denitrification reactions that reduce any aqueous nitrate (NO₃⁻) permeating through the wall to innocuous di-nitrogen gas (N₂) (Figure 1).

![Figure 1: Concept of a denitrification wall. Carbon substrate within the wall provides a food source for denitrifying microorganisms that respire nitrate (NO₃⁻) in lieu of oxygen. Any nitrate in groundwater passing through the wall is converted to innocuous di-nitrogen gas (N₂).](image-url)
In our study we intend to use woodchip as the reactive porous substrate, which will be mixed with gravel aggregate (Figure 2). Aggregate is required to provide both structural support to the PRB and maintain its hydraulic integrity.

Denitrification walls are passive treatment systems in the sense that once in the ground they require no on-going maintenance and passage of groundwater through the system is driven by natural hydraulic gradients. Prognosis from existing case-studies that have been undertaken in sandy (not gravel) aquifer systems is that woodchip denitrifying PRB’s maintain functionality for 30 years or more. A revised assessment of this prognosis for gravel aquifers is an objective of our field pilot study. Being subterranean structures, no land need necessarily be taken out of production to host a PRB.

Figure 2: Woodchip/gravel mixture that constitutes the fill material of a denitrification wall. ESR have conducted experiments to identify such a mixture with hydraulic properties suitable for use in Canterbury’s alluvial gravel aquifers.

3. Challenges

Denitrification walls are a tried and tested concept in slow moving sandy aquifer systems where they have proven effective at treating nitrate from point pollution sources. There are no examples however of these remediation systems having been installed in gravel aquifers. In this regard, our PRB pilot study represents a world-first.

Gravel aquifers present their own unique set of challenges. For example, they are: i) inherently heterogeneous; ii) fast-flowing, and iii) aerobic. These scientific aspects form part of our R&D. Technical considerations we are addressing include: i) making sure the hydraulic properties of PRB are commensurate with those of the host aquifer; ii) positioning of the PRB for maximum interception of groundwater flow; iii) sizing of the PRB to ensure sufficient residence time that will facilitate complete denitrification of nitrate. An engineering challenge affecting the project, we aim to work through is how to emplace uniform mixtures of woodchip and gravel below the water table in a cost-effective way and without jeopardising the hydraulic function of the host aquifer system.

There are socio-political challenges we are addressing in our project too. Namely, issues around resource consenting and the case of cultural acceptability. In particular, the matter of deliberately altering the chemical state of the groundwater system.

4. Scope of fieldworks proposed in this research project

Our pilot project can be broken down into 5 stages:

Stage 1: Preliminary site selection (late 2016/early 2017)

This mainly involves a desk top review and liaison with landowners to identify potential sites where a PRB pilot could be hosted. Requisites are: 1) shallow gravel aquifer impacted with nitrate; 2) unrestricted site access; 3) close proximity to Christchurch city (to mitigate travel costs).

Note: A field site within the Ashley-Waimakariri (A-W) zone is favoured for the following reasons: i) nitrate contamination of shallow groundwater is a well-reported issue, especially in the groundwater-fed Silverstream/Kaipoi River catchment; ii) ESR are already conducting research on nitrate transport in this catchment; iii) the A-W zone is subject to a plan change, hence there
is active stakeholder interest in identifying practicable solutions for mitigating nitrate; iv) It is within commuting distance of ESR’s offices in Christchurch.

Stage 2: Site characterisation/field investigation (early-mid 2017)
To confirm suitability as a field site, the prospective field site identified in Stage 1 will be subject to some preliminary field investigation. This will be a survey using non-invasive ground penetrating radar geophysical methods to verify the ground conditions and measure depth to groundwater, also investigation of local water quality (nitrate concentrations) from sampling of any pre-existing wells nearby.

Subject to findings, a more rigorous site investigation will follow and a significant investment will be made instrumenting the site for continued study covering an area circa. 100 x 200 m. Through a drilling program, numerous shallow monitoring wells will be installed across the site to enable high resolution geological logging and groundwater quality monitoring. Geo-electrodes will be entrenched below the ground across the site to permit ongoing hydrogeophysical study. Aquifer tests, soil (tracing experiments and time-lapse geophysical methods will be applied to: i) determine groundwater flow direction; ii) map preferential flow zones in the aquifer, and iii) determine real groundwater velocities — Information that will inform PRB design. Through the network of wells installed at the site we will also make a comprehensive study of the groundwater ecology.

Stage 3: Design the PRB (mid-late 2017).
The PRB will be tailor-designed to the site conditions, as they are discovered from Stage 2. The precise physical structure and modes for how woodchip and gravel will be emplaced will be informed by results from other facets of work we are completing under the same research programme.

Stage 4: Install the PRB (late 2017)
Subject to gaining resource consent, the PRB will be installed within the midst of the monitoring well array. At this stage it is estimated the major ground works will take around 2 months to complete. This will involve entrenching a mixture of gravel and woodchip below the water table to a depth no less than 2 m below the water table (Figure 3). Tentative dimensions are 60 m long x 10 m wide x 4 m deep. Works will be conducted by a civil engineering company, instructed by ESR. We envisage that a free-feed gravel situation will be operated. That is aquifer sediments removed during the entrenching works will be processed of fines on site. The coarse (gravel) fraction will be mixed with woodchip and used to construct the PRB. The excavation will be reinstated to ground level. The only extrusive component of the PRB system once installed will be the headworks of the monitoring walls that will protrude from the ground (e.g. Figure 4), although an option is to finish headworks flush with ground level if this is required.

Stage 5: On-going monitoring (late 2017-mid 2019 and beyond)
Following PRB installation, tracing tests complemented by hydrogeophysics will be repeated to examine the hydraulic integrity of the PRB and evaluate how the structure affects the local groundwater flow pattern. A steady decline in the nitrate treatment performance of the PRB is inevitable owing to gradual degradation of the woodchip both in terms of its reactivity and permeability. A research objective is to continually monitor these changes over the long-term. Presently ESR has research funding secured until June 2019 to do this, although we would anticipate some form of periodic monitoring to go on long after this, to accrue a long-term scientific dataset, Groundwater quality; groundwater ecology; geotechnical properties of the PRB structure and quantification of any (N₂O) gas emissions from the PRB are variables that will be monitored periodically.
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5. Risks to the project and how these can be mitigated

5.1. Resource consent

Execution of the pilot study pending on gaining resource consent to build a PRB. ESR are continuing to work through the consenting process with Environment Canterbury. A robust assessment of environmental effects can only be made once the local hydrogeological conditions have been characterised at the preferred field site (as in Stage 2). Having a field site located distant from surface waters and potable supply wells is beneficial for obtaining resource consent.

5.2. Adverse pollution swapping outcomes

Although the aim of a denitrifying PRB is to clean groundwater of nitrate, there is a small chance adverse pollution swapping phenomenon will occur. A PRB operates by inducing anoxic conditions in the groundwater. Anoxic conditions can promote mobilisation of metals such as iron, manganese and arsenic that are associated with greywacke gravel aquifers. Leaching tests conducted in the lab to examine the likelihood of this occurring have so far not highlighted any obvious concerns. The magnitude at which these phenomena will occur will be evaluated by the field tests.

The PRB will leach some dissolved organic carbon (from the woodchip), especially in the initial phases of operation. The biochemical oxygen demand (BOD) of such leachate might pose a hazard to aquatic ecology. Locating the PRB distant from any sensitive surface water mitigates this problem. Evaluating how such induced chemical changes impact on groundwater fauna constitutes a research objective.
5.3. Ground subsidence

Over time the woodchip in the PRB will decompose and as a consequence, density changes of the wall structure are anticipated. Although never reported as an issue in historic case studies, these changes may manifest themselves as some gradual settlement of the PRB structure. Any subsidence effects, should they occur, will be minor and can be remedied by simply infilling any hollows with top soil. There can be no catastrophic collapse of the PRB, since the gravel support matrix will prevent this. Measurement of how the geotechnical properties of the PRB might change over time constitutes a research objective.

5.4. Site accessibility

Our current research project has guaranteed funding until June 2019, however we envisage the PRB will be a permanent structure. There is scientific value in monitoring its performance indefinitely. Because of the high resolution site investigation we intend to do, there is a prospect the site will be the most rigorously studied portion of gravel aquifer in the region. Having on-going access to the site to enable long-term monitoring is beneficial to our research goals. The degree of success for the PRB pilot study partly rests with finding an accommodating land owner who is willing to provide on-going long-term access to the site, beyond 2019.

![Figure 4: Photo of field site at Hautapu, Waikato region, where Louis Schipper installed another experimental denitrification wall in the mid 1980's. A rough outline of the buried PRB structure, which measures 35 x 1.5 x 1.5 m is marked on the image in orange. The array of monitoring wells (outlined with black dotted line) used to monitor groundwater quality at the site are the only physical indication of the wall's existence (image provided by Louis Schipper, University of Waikato).](image)

6. Silverstream Reserve

In terms of geographic properties, Waimakariri District Council’s (WDC) Silverstream Reserve represents two prospective field sites for locating the PRB pilot trial (Figures 5 and 6) – either at Woodfield or Heywards Road. Whether WDC might grant permission to occupy one of the sites has yet to be determined. A refined assessment of shallow groundwater nitrate concentrations in the immediate vicinity of the sites also needs to be made.
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Figure 5: Topo map showing location of Silverstream reserve at Woodfield and groundwater nitrate concentrations, as recorded by Environment Canterbury (top); aerial photo of the same area (middle); photograph of prospective site for a PRB within the reserve taken November 2016 (bottom).
Figure 6: Topo map showing location of Silverstream reserve at Heywards Road and groundwater nitrate concentrations, as recorded by Environment Canterbury (top); aerial photo of the same area (middle); photograph of prospective site for a PRB within the reserve taken December 2016 (bottom).
Attachment iii: Map showing the area of land

Legend
- RED field site
- white >30 m
- stream
- brown - riparian soil
- green - conserved Activities - Effluent Human Discharge
- blue - conserved Activities - Effluent Human Discharge Area

photo of parcel of land - part of WDC's Silverstream Reserve - that ESR Intend to conduct a groundwater investigation on (photo taken facing East).

Land Parcel Title: none
Legal description: RES 5120
NZTMX: 1, 567,983
NZTMY: 5,193,407
Landowner: Waimakariri District Council

n.b. referred to as landscape area E4 in WDC's Silverstream Reserve Management Plan (April 2009)
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT

FILE NO and TRIM NO: GOV-26-11-06/ 171108121207

REPORT TO: Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board

DATE OF MEETING: 20 November 2017

FROM: Sarah Nichols, Governance Manager

SUBJECT: Board Meeting Dates for 2018

SIGNED BY: (for Reports to Council or Committees)

Department Manager
Chief Executive

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to adopt the meeting dates for the period from January 2018 to December 2018. The dates are based on meeting each month on the third Monday of the month. The appropriate meeting venue recommended is the Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre; however this does not preclude other venues within the community if the need arises.

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 171108121207.

(b) Resolves to hold Board meetings at the Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre, Williams Street, Kaiapoi, commencing at 4.00pm, on the following dates:

- Monday 19 February 2018
- Monday 19 March 2018
- Monday 16 April 2018
- Monday 21 May 2018
- Monday 18 June 2018
- Monday 16 July 2018
- Monday 20 August 2018
- Monday 17 September 2018
- Monday 15 October 2018
- Monday 19 November 2018
- Monday 17 December 2018

3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. All scheduled meetings are advertised and operate under the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (LGOIMA).

3.2. Since the start of the triennial term 2016-19 term the Community Board has met on the third Monday of the month at 4pm in the Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre (upstairs meeting room of the Kaiapoi Library). It is recommended that this pattern continue for 2018 as it dovetails with other Council, Committee and Community Board meetings. In past years, the Board has not met in January and this is recommended to continue.
3.3. Briefings and workshops are generally held after the Board meeting where possible, however if a significant timeframe is anticipated a separate meeting at a mutually agreed time will be scheduled.

3.4. The most appropriate facility recommended for meetings occur is the Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre, as it is central to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi community. Nonetheless occasional meetings occurring in other areas of the community, should there be topical items of interest on the agenda, are feasible and can be conducive to greater accessibility for the public to observe democracy and transparency.

3.5. In the event of insufficient business for any one month, the Board may wish to hold a workshop on topical matters, in consultation with the Chairperson. It is the responsibility of the Chairperson to cancel any meeting, in consultation with Council staff.

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

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. The established pattern of the Community Board meetings has generally worked well for members, taking into account other community commitments. Other Community Board meetings start 7.00pm.

4.2. Community views were not sought. We are not aware of any adverse comments from the public on meeting times.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. All meetings are serviced from existing Council budgets. Meeting venues are generally Council owned assets and are not charged. The remuneration payable to the Community Board members is based on an annual sum set by the Remuneration Authority.

6. CONTEXT

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

6.2. Legislation
Local Government Act 2002 schedule 7 clause 19.

6.3. Community Outcomes
There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision-making by local, regional and national organisations that affect our District.

Sarah Nichols
Governance Manager
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT

FILE NO and TRIM NO: GOV-26-08-06 / 171009108726

REPORT TO: Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board

DATE OF MEETING: 20 November 2017

FROM: Edwina Cordwell - Governance Adviser

SUBJECT: Ratification of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board’s Submission regarding the District Plan Review ‘Comments and Issues’ Phase.

SIGNED BY:
(for Reports to Council or Committees)

Department Manager

Chief Executive

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Board’s ratification of its submission regarding the Waimakariri District Council’s District Plan Review ‘Comments and Issues’ Phase.

Attachments:

i. The Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board’s Submission to the Waimakariri District Council (Trim 171005107431).

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 171009108726.

(b) Ratifies the Board’s Submission regarding the Waimakariri District Council’s District Plan Review ‘Comments and Issues’ Phase (Trim 171005107431).

3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS


3.2. Board members informally agreed to submit with a formal decision to this effect being made at the Board’s meeting of 16 October 2017.

3.3. A discussion session was held on 4 October 2017 with a draft submission circulated via email on 9 October 2017 and comments sought.

3.4. The submission was approved by the Board Chairperson in order to meet the deadline of 27 October.

3.5. The Management Team has reviewed this report.
4. COMMUNITY VIEWS


5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. Not applicable.

6. CONTEXT

6.1. Policy

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

6.2. Legislation

Not Applicable.

6.3. Community Outcomes

There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision making that affects our District.

Edwina Cordwell
Governance Advisor
Issues and Options 1 – Transport and Utilities

Issue 1: Demand for improved connections and sustainable forms of transport

The Board had much discussion on both Option 1 and 2 and felt that neither was appropriate and that a mix of the elements of both were applicable. Key comments below.

Transport Infrastructure Plan needed

Sustainable transport is an aspiration, however need to recognise the real life situation that vehicles will be here for many years to come. The number of electric vehicles will increase but needs a strategic approach to ensure that this is encouraged and made a reality – for example installation of significant numbers of charging points throughout the District and region. Needs a strategic approach and formal implementation plan if any goals are to be achieved.

The current proposals concentrate on cycling, walking and public transport but do not address the reality that cars will be a reality for many years to come and must be accommodated. Fossil fuels need to be minimized but cycling and bus travel will be impossible for a majority of the District’s population on any meaningful scale.

Should encompass Freight, Rail and other transport modes and to recognise the links to the City and airport.

Needs more than co-ordination with other agencies – needs to be a shared vision, driven and to be led.

Need for a Vision/Overarching Plan

Concerns that there does not appear to be an overarching Strategic Plan for the District as to where the main centres and satellite centres are likely to be, together with the road corridors and other infrastructure required to support a ‘vision’ for the District in 30 years time. The demographics and what might be needed, where it could be located and the implications.

For example – if it were to be determined that the population is ageing, what are the implications? Is there a need for more land to be made available near to existing small townships – Mandeville, Ohoka for retirement complexes to enable current residents to stay in the area but move to alternative and more suitable housing.

Should the District support and enable a ‘village’ community approach? Do health hubs or small dental practices, shops and other amenities need to be encouraged to locate away from the main centres to enable and support ‘village’ communities (and this older demographic).

What is the youth demographic and how do we plan for its needs in locations outside of the main townships? How would public transport operate?
There is a need to have such a ‘vision’ and strategic plan in order to drive operational
decision making.

A Strategic Transport Plan is needed which identifies key road corridors, associated
infrastructure, where the electrical charging points should be located, parking needs and
public transport and how this might change over time. What are the triggers and phases that
need to be set to monitor progress towards the ‘vision’?

Practical examples of having such a vision could lead to defining a larger area of road reserve
adjacent to the identified key road corridors to permit future expansion. Residential
developments would then not be permitted to encroach and prohibit future road alterations
in key strategic corridors.

Utility installations could potentially be undertaken in ways that would permit extension
more easily and cost savings to be achieved.

Developers and businesses would be clear about where Council would prefer them to locate
and perhaps support such locations.

Landbanking for future Park and Ride and Light Rail could be considered.

Concerns that original ‘plans’/vision get forgotten. For example Kippenberger Ave was
designated as a Limited Access Route to maintain its iconic and specific nature and purpose
and to minimize the number of vehicle crossings. This ‘status’ has been allowed to lapse and
the whole appearance of the road altered as a consequence.

Concerns as to the costs falling to developers of Transport Assessments in Option 2 as
presented. The Council should undertake high level assessments as part of its Transport
Infrastructure Plan/Strategy.

Issue 2: Environmental effects of utilities need to be appropriately managed.

Option 1 should be retained with a much more strategic view of what is happening in the
District and exploiting opportunities to future proof and reduce future costs – for example
by laying in utility services in advance of actual developments.

Noted that rivers are affected by storm water and water run-off. May need more retention
ponds to mitigate these effects to achieve water quality standards.

Issue 3: the District Plan currently does not specifically provide for or promote more sustainable
utility infrastructure.

Option 2 is preferred. Solar and wind energy should be encouraged. New housing
developments should include solar as standard/pre-requisite.

Issues and Options 2 – Heritage and Open Space

Heritage Issue 1: The current District Plan’s list of heritage resources and trees is out of date.

Option 1 Status quo is preferred. The process for adding and removing items needs to be
reviewed and a way found for it to be simplified and quicker. This would of itself assist in the
list being up to date. Advice was given that this can only be given effect via a formal Plan Change.

The Board is of the opinion that there must be some way that an individual tree or property could be added or removed from the list without such a cumbersome and formal mechanism being applicable. Should this not be the case then the Board suggests that the appropriate legislative body be approached and an alteration to the requirement be requested to ensure that protection can be applied to these precious assets. If an up to date list cannot be maintained then potentially this negates having a list at all within the District Plan.

**Open Space Issue 1: Specific recognition of open space within the District Plan and its community purpose**

The Board agrees with the statements made.

**Issue 2: The current District Plan does not provide for temporary activities**

Option 2 is preferred. Agreed that there is a need to provide for and support temporary activities. The Board also believes that there is a need for a District wide strategy linked to the Vision which identifies what types of open spaces might be needed over the next 30 years and makes provision for these in its strategic planning. How many sports fields, parks and playgrounds using a formulaic approach of ratios of greenspace per head of population or other approved methodology.

**Issues and Options 3 – Rural Zone**

**Issue 1: Activities within rural areas can conflict with each other and the purpose of other zones**

Option 3 is preferred. The Board also questions whether 4Ha sections are still needed. Should section sizes be 1ha or 2Ha to suit modern needs?

Intensification of rural land on the fringes of the urban centres should be considered, for example Kaiapoi.

Intensification and subdivision of existing sections may require additional costly utility infrastructure, or put pressure on what exists. Intensification has to be managed and not be random. A challenge in as this may mean that some landowners may be able to subdivide and others not – first come first served? Experiences in the relaxation of rules and intensification in the Woodend area needs to be factored in as this has not been successful.

If rural land on the fringe is allowed to be intensified without a vision/strategic plan this could then limit the ability of the town to expand as the rural area is now fully residential. Growth has been stifled permanently.

Need to know where capacity of service/utilities exists and to manage intensification to suit. Not random.

Need to pay heed to the ‘village’ concept and whether the proposed section size/rural intensification is supportive of this concept.
Need to be much clearer on the definition of what is ‘Rural’. Too many personal interpretations at the moment.

Members commented on whether gravel extraction from the river with the accompanying volume of truck movements is a rural activity. If it is, some may not realise that and hence reverse sensitivities or challenges arise over noise and road degradation. More explicit definitions and activity descriptions including volumes/numbers/metrics are required.

**Issue 2: Rural character and amenity and the extent that it should be protected**

**Option 2** is preferred.

**Issue 3: Subdivision and housing density can affect farm production, rural character and land use**

**Option 2** is preferred.

**Issues and Options 4 – Natural Environments**

**Water Issue 1: There is opportunity for better management of activities on the surface of water**

**Option 2** is supported. The Board is concerned to ensure that the provisions of the Pegasus Bay Bylaw and the protection of the coastline are in line with, and linked to District Plan statements. The Board is supportive of the retention of the bylaw as it permits speedier enforcement action to be taken.

Cam River and tributaries need to be included within the District Plan as should Esplanade reserves.

Riparian margins are supported and stream setbacks should be retained or even extended to permit extensive plantings.

Controls need to be tighter.

**Earthworks Issue 1: The District Plan has broad standards for earthworks. These are not specific to activities that involve earthworks and could be more precise in relation to sensitive environments**

**Option 2** is supported.

**Landscapes Issue 1: Which landscapes and natural features are important to the district and need protection**

**Option 2** is preferred.

**Biodiversity Issue 1: The district is significantly modified by settlement and primary production and some remaining areas of significant indigenous biodiversity, including those within the coastal environment such as the Ashley/Rakahuri Estuary, are not identified, protected or monitored.**

**Option 2** is preferred.
Coastal Environment Issue 1: The important features of the coastal environment are accurately identified and protected

Option 2 is preferred.

Riparian Margins Issue 1: Esplanade reserves of up to 20 metres width (that can be required under the Resource Management Act 1991) have not been required consistently through resources consents for subdivision, limiting the options to provide for access and conservation.

Option 2 is preferred.

Issues and Options 5 – Retail, Commercial and Industrial Activities

The Board offers a range of comments:

The Board queried the number of existing ‘zones’ and suggests some form of simplification and rationalisation.

The ‘Village’ concept should be explored rather than just a centralization of activity in the existing town centres.

‘Big Box’ developments should be near existing towns so as not to ‘pull’ away activity and shoppers from the centres.

Is the district attractive to Big Box companies – proximity of other large scale retail outlets – e.g. Northwood. Is it economic?

Diversity and locations need to be considered to provide interesting, stimulating, varied, social and community cohesive environments.

Need to control the growth of Rangiora so that it is not the only ‘Centre’. What is an appropriate size and how should this be managed.

Issues and Options 6 – Residential Zones

Issue 1: Greater choice in house design and density

Option 2 is partially supported.

The Board supports innovative and thoughtful urban design offering a mix of section and house sizes. Pegasus and Beech Grove are examples of where lessons need to be learnt regarding placing too many houses of a similar type together and the consequence of this for the breakdown of community. Silverstream appears to be well thought out and offers a mixed development.

Design to maximize access to sunlight, greenspace is key from the outset and vitally important.

Retirement village zoning or placement needs to be considered. The current Plan has not enabled facilities to be built in or near Kaiapoi yet the population needs such facilities. People want to stay in the areas that they know and have a choice of
property to choose from. Many developments are concentrating on larger homes, which may not be ‘needed’ in the future.

**Issue 2: Business (and other non-residential activities) in residential zones**

Option 2 is supported. *The Board wonders whether Liquor Outlets could be placed on a non-permitted activity list.*

**Issue 3: Housing areas have not always been developed for sustainable design or energy efficiency**

Option 2 is preferred.

**Issue 4: The need to ensure safe and attractive residential areas**

Option 1 is preferred as the Board would not wish to be overly prescriptive although some elements of Option 2 would assist with ensuring visual amenity.

It is hoped that by having better urban design from the outset for new developments i.e. better access to sunlight, greenspaces and ‘mixed’ developments that residents may feel happier and more comfortable with their surroundings and community and fencing and other barriers may be reduced naturally as a consequence.

The Board also noted the use of restrictive covenants that can assist but do require the ongoing enforcement by the Developer.

The Board fully supports much improved urban design standards and adherence to CPTED.

Jackie Watson – Chairperson
Ref: SHW-13-05/171030116729

30 October 2017

Jackie Watson
Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board
Private Bag 1005
Rangiora 7440

Dear Jackie

Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan and Kerbside Options

On behalf of the Council I would like to thank you for your interest in, and time taken to prepare your submission on the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan. The Hearing Panel valued the opportunity to hear submissions from whose who presented their submission in person. The Panel also noted the widely divergent community opinions about rural recycling services, multiple bin collections and the collection and composting of organic waste.

The Hearing Panel has recommended to Council that Option C (four service choices for kerbside collections) be included in the draft Long Term Plan 2018-2028 for further consultation, and also recommended that residents have the choice to 'opt-in' to receive bin collection services. The Council will consider the Hearing Panel recommendation at their meeting on 7 November 2017.

The draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan will be amended to reflect the Council’s decision at their November meeting. The final Waste Management and Minimisation Plan will be presented to Council for adoption on 5 December 2017.

Thank you for your interest in, and contribution to, the development of our District’s Waste Management and Minimisation Plan.

Yours sincerely

Kitty Waghorn
Solid Waste Asset Manager
Dear Ms Watson,

OFF LICENCE APPLICATION BOTTLE-O SILVERSTREAM

The District Licensing Committee has received your objection in relation to the Bottle O off-licence application.

The Committee intends to hold a meeting in relation this application. The hearing is likely to be held on Friday 24 November ’17 however that date will be confirmed later this week.

As soon as it is confirmed I will be in touch with you with a notice of hearing.

Yours faithfully,

M. J. Johnston
ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES MANAGER
Jill Waldron  
Chairperson  
Waimakariri Access Group  
99 East Belt  
Rangiora  
7400  
Waldron.rga@xtra.co.nz  

The Chairperson  
Kaiapoi – Tuahiwi Community Board  
24 Keetly Place  
RD2 Kaiapoi  
7692  

14/10/17  

Dear Sir/ Madam  

The Waimakariri Access Group is a voluntary group of people with a high level of expertise in the area of accessibility issues in the community.  

The Waimakariri Access Group (WAG) is a group that advises the council on accessibility issues in the district.  
The purpose of the Group is to:  
Promote access to public places and facilities in the district and a barrier free environment for all people in the community by:  

1) Identifying factors in the social and physical environments in the District which restrict people from carrying out normal activities.  
2) Being a point of contact for people with concerns about mobility and/or access in public places in the district.  
4) Provide appropriate training on disability and accessibility issues  
5) Work collaboratively with the council providing expertise and experience with accessibility issues both environmental and attitudinal.  

We would like to invite a person from your board to attend our meetings so we can work together towards a fully inclusive barrier free environment for all people in the community. Our meetings are held on the second Tuesday of the Month at 11 am at the Meeting Room at the Council. Our next meeting is on November 14th.  

Yours sincerely  

Jill Waldron
7 November 2017

To whom it may concern,

Re: Kaiapoi Community Garden – Application for funding to the Rata Foundation

I am writing on behalf of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board in support of Kaiapoi Community Garden’s application to the Rata Foundation.

Kaiapoi Community Garden is a group of volunteers who have worked hard to create a community garden on school land at Kaiapoi Borough School.

Their members have created a thriving garden from which plants are distributed amongst the community, or made into preserves.

The group of volunteers provide an important aspect of community life, offering friendship and collegiality growing produce from the garden and making improvements to it.

They support local events with produce and preserve stalls to fundraise for these improvements.

Working with local schools with a Garden to Table programme they are helping to raise a new generation of gardeners and their public events and open days offer cooking demonstrations on a monthly basis.

Support from Rata Foundation would have a big impact on Kaiapoi Community Garden’s ability to function as an organisation that adds diversity and assists with community well being.

With kind regards,

Jackie Watson
Chairperson: Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board
Chair's Report for 19 October 2017 to 13 November 2017

1. SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 October</td>
<td>Chairs' meeting with Governance Staff regarding the Draft District Plan Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 October</td>
<td>Walk through the town with KTCB members Chris, Roger and Philip and Councillor Stewart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 November</td>
<td>Opening of Pines Beach Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 November</td>
<td>Kaiapoi Regeneration Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 November</td>
<td>Kaiapoi Community Watch AGM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 November</td>
<td>Northern Pegasus Bay By-Law submissions review.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 171113123446.

Jackie Watson
Chair
Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board