MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF THE RANGIORA-ASHLEY COMMUNITY BOARD
HELD IN THE WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL CHAMBERS, RANGIORA SERVICE CENTRE, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA ON WEDNESDAY 16 MAY 2018 AT 7PM.

PRESENT
J Gerard QSO (Chair), D Lundy (Deputy Chair), M Clarke, K Galloway, D Gordon, J Hoult, S Lewis, G Miller, C Prickett and P Williams.

IN ATTENDANCE
J Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support), Gerard Cleary (Manager Utilities and Roading), C Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager), Owen Davies (Drainage Asset Manager) and E Stubbs (Minute Secretary).

The meeting adjourned for a Workshop from 7.52pm to 8.00pm and a Briefing from 8.04pm to 8.22pm.

1 APOLOGIES
Apologies were received and sustained from K Barnett and R Brine.

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
Nil.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board – 11 April 2018
Moved M Clarke seconded P Williams
THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:
(a) Confirms the circulated minutes of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting, held on 11 April 2018, as a true and accurate record.
(b) Receives the circulated minutes of the Rangiora-Ashley Road and Reserve naming Committee, held on 4 April 2018.
CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
J Gerard advised that following the presentation to the 11 April meeting regarding the proposed stopbank work around the Ashley River a small working party had been set up to work with ECan. J Gerard had authorised three members: D Gordon, D Lundy and C Prickett to be on the group as they lived on the opposite side of the Ashley Bridge and would be most affected by the works.

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS
Nil.

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS
Nil.
7 REPORTS

7.1 Garrymere Water Supply Upgrade - Feedback from Community Consultation– Colin Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager) and Gary Boot (Senior Engineering Advisor)

C Roxburgh noted that recommendation (g) in the report was specific on members for the Water Supply Advisory Group however staff were open to edits for example in the number of board member representatives. The report covered the consultation feedback from the community on the proposed upgrade to the Garrymere Scheme. C Roxburgh noted this feedback was generally negative. The cost to ratepayers was significant. It was difficult to satisfy three important factors,

- The Health Act requiring the Council to ‘take all practicable steps’ to comply with the Drinking Water Standards.
- The targeted rates policy.
- Completing the work in a timely and affordable matter.

It was difficult to meet those constraints and find a compromise. The Council would be criticised for providing a solution that was not affordable or criticised for deferring and not complying in a timely manner.

In terms of the submissions received, one group claiming to represent over 50% of the scheme members suggested the project be delayed twelve months so an advisory group could work with staff. This may allow some way to optimise a solution however, it would not get around the core issue.

G Miller asked by deferring for twelve months whether staff believe they would come up with the same solution anyway. C Roxburgh commented that they may be able to refine cost estimates and costs may come down. However, it was difficult to think of a different solution to that proposed.

G Miller asked what was the risk of waiting another twelve months. G Cleary commented that a future government enquiry would not look at the individual rating schemes as a reason for the project to be unaffordable, as they would look at affordability from a district level. He referred to a Cabinet paper on that issue. He noted Council had turned its mind to that issue.

D Gordon asked if there had been a response from the Minister following the request for advice on potential government funding options. G Cleary replied they were not aware of any response.

K Galloway asked if the Garrymere plan had been under consideration for some time. C Roxburgh noted it was not a new issue, it had been identified for 8-9 years and had been considered in more detail over the last couple of years.

K Galloway asked how likely it would be that the Advisory Group would change the recommendation. C Roxburgh advised that the preferred solution of treating the existing source was the only one that was remotely financially viable. The exact specifications could be tweaked in the detail however he could not see a completely new solution.

K Galloway asked if the residents had already taken part in consultation. G Cleary that feedback from the community was that they believed costs had been ‘sprung’ on them, which indicated that engagement had not been adequate.

M Clarke asked if the Council could afford to do anything but comply with the New Zealand drinking water standards. C Roxburgh noted that guidance was that the Council needed to take all practicable steps and that affordability should not be a barrier.
J Gerard referred to rating changes and G Cleary advised that the Council had already made the decision that it did not propose to do that until 2022. There had been a lengthy process the previous year to explore a series of options. C Roxburgh noted that if the project were deferred by twelve months the high rate spike would be closer to 2022 when there was the opportunity to share cost. C Prickett asked that when rating changes were discussed had this scenario been presented as a reason for advantage and G Cleary replied yes, schemes such as this had been presented.

Moved J Gerard  seconded P Williams

THAT the Rangiora–Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180504048871.

(b) Notes that the Garrymere community have been consulted on the upgrading options and, the community has expressed strong concern over the affordability of the upgrade. Of those that selected a preferred upgrade option, 5 out of 6 favoured Option A, the lowest cost option.

(c) Notes that, at this time, there are no known external alternative funding sources for the upgrade.

(d) Notes that a submission from the Garrymere Landcare Group, claiming to represent over half the scheme members, has recommended deferring the project by 12 months to allow the establishment of a Garrymere Water Supply Advisor Group to work through the issues and options, and that staff support this approach,

(e) Recommends to the Council that it delays the upgrade by up to 12 months while a Garrymere Water Supply Advisory Group is established to consider and recommend a preferred approach to the upgrade that provides a safe and affordable water supply, and meets the Council’s legislative requirements.

(f) Recommends to the Council that the Water Supply Advisory Group comprises:
   - 4-6 Volunteer representatives from the Garrymere water supply (noting that there should be an appropriate balance of representatives from the Landcare group and those that were not part of the group)
   - 3 members of the Rangiora Ashley Community Board – D Lundy, D Gordon and C Prickett.
   - Councillor Williams as portfolio holder for water and wastewater
   - Council’s Water Asset Manager and 3 Waters Manager (or Manager Utilities & Roading)
   - 1 representative from the CDHB (Drinking Water Assessor), if agreeable,
   - And that the Advisory Group be directed to report its recommendations to Council in by June 2019.

(g) Recommends to the Council that they leave provision in the Long Term Plan budget for the Garrymere water supply upgrade, based on upgrade Option A, but that it be deferred to reflect the additional 12 month delay while the Advisory Group considers issues and options and reports back to Council, meaning that the budget would be required to be split over the 2018/19 and 2019/20 financial years.
Notes that the current programme is based on the project being funded entirely from the Garrymere water supply scheme members.

CARRIED

J Gerard believed that it was best to have the three residents close to that community on the Advisory Group. Those named had attended all or many of the meetings. He did support a twelve-month delay. He referred to the Cust Summerhill Scheme where the community had been given some ownership and commented that the Advisory Group would give the community, that felt ‘battered and bruised’, some ownership into processes.

P Williams commented that those in the area believed that they hadn’t been consulted with properly and had come up with some good alternative ideas. The community needed to be listened to first.

G Miller commented that the Garrymere Landcare Group (GLG) needed to be transparent about who they represented and that their representatives be elected by their community. The broader issue in the district was the large number of lifestyle block ownerships.

D Lundy supported the motion. It was important to give ownership to the community and participate in a wide discussion around the table. His biggest fear was that in twelve months they would come back with no solution. However, the core rule was to consult with constituents and he believed that the option would not have been recommended by staff if they did not think they could fine tune options. It was inevitable that the community would need to pay more. He understood that the GLG did not represent everyone.

C Prickett commented that an indication of the limited effectiveness of the consultation was that all people were concerned about was the cost. Water quality did not come up in conversations and so they had not reached a position where they could make a decision. With respect to the group they were representing he believed it was important to include members with different types of connections. The only acceptable way forward was to readdress district wide rating. J Gerard noted that the Board’s submission to the Annual Plan was that they did not support district wide rating, they had suggested investigating amalgamation of smaller water schemes.

7.2 Crayfish (Koura) Creek Pedestrian Footbridge – Owen Davies (Drainage Asset Manager)

O Davies briefly spoke to the report. The report was to bring the Board up to speed on where they were at with regard to installing a bridge near Spark Lane on Northbrook Road which was a high traffic pedestrian area, and to seek approval for the design and location of the bridge.

J Gerard asked for clarification of which bridge was being recommended and O Davies noted that on the recommended bridge the western end was curved and the eastern end was straight.

J Gerard asked what were the costs of other bridges. O Davies replied the cheapest option was the Hegan Reserve design at $15,000, although it was not guaranteed they could get that price again as it was a one off bridge. At the other end of the scale were the cycle way bridges which ranged from $50,000-$100,000.

J Hoult asked if the alternative location would have the advantage of being able to connect more easily to Northbrook Waters Walkways. O Davies replied there would be no advantage. From an aesthetic point of view the weir looked like a nicer location, however Greenspace preferred the proposed location and this had also been supported by the developer.
J Hoult asked about replanting on the eastern side. O Davies replied that around the spring head where the willows were removed there would be more planting. It was a work in progress.

M Clarke asked if the bridge were purely for pedestrians or would it take heavy lawn mowing machinery. G Clearly advised it was for pedestrian, cyclists and pram type of traffic.

C Prickett asked if both designs (Hegan and the proposed) had 250 bearers. O Davies said he believed both designs were similar. C Prickett asked about the strength of the design without a railing top. O Davies commented it had BSI certification and was fit for purpose. He took the point that a top railing provided extra strength. C Prickett asked if elderly residents would prefer a handrail. O Davies commented that while a handrail would take away from the aesthetics it could be added to the design.

C Prickett asked about debris wash and whether the design with railings below the surface would catch debris and create an issue. O Davies noted that Crayfish Creek was spring fed so did not have large height fluctuations. The design provided a freeboard above water level and there should be plenty of separation.

D Gordon asked how accurate were the costings? It was a large jump from $15,000 to $56,000 to be aesthetically pleasing. Why could the Hegan Reserve option not be considered to save ratepayers’ dollars? O Davies commented that it was difficult to estimate costings, it depended on the market at the time. They had been encouraged to look at a high specification bridge in keeping with the nature of the reserve. The type of timber was an expensive option. It was an estimated price and may be cheaper. The choice was up to the Board and they could look at other options.

D Gordon asked who had encouraged a high specification bridge. G Cleary noted that on a number of occasions where bridges or other features had been built, staff had been criticised on the utilitarian design and had been asked to provide options with best indication of price. There was not much certainty of the price of either design. The design was a response to requests from the public and elected members. It was suggested there was a possibility for staff to tender on the basis of both designs and leave staff to make a decision or bring back to the Board after the tender process.

J Gerard commented that if the heavy railing was taken off the Hegan Reserve bridge it would be more aligned to the proposed design. O Davies commented that the Hegan Reserve Bridge had not been in place at the time of the proposed design.

J Gerard asked if O Davies considered the curve to be difficult for cyclists in particular without the hand railing. O Davies commented that the upright poles were large and chunky. The idea for the curve was the ninety degree turn at the end of the bridge. Safety aspects had been considered and the curve had been installed at other places without too much of a problem for cyclists.

P Williams asked why staff would consider a bridge that was three times more expensive when there was such a large rate rise. He asked how much had been spent on the consultants for the design already. G Cleary commented that staff were genuinely looking for guidance from the Board as they were aware of public criticism of some structures. It was not their place to decide. O Davies advised that $11,000 had been spent on the design and consenting process. The consenting process was expensive.

C Prickett asked with the proximity of the curve, was it possible for the path to be widened at that point. O Davies noted the swale was part of the storm water management area. Widening of the path had not been contemplated as the swale would require shifting.
D Gordon noted that the community had views on bridge design however questioned that prior to embarking on an $11,000 design and consent process should the Board not have been consulted? G Clearly commented that some costs are unavoidable including the building consent and resource consent for building over a watercourse. Environmental issues and structural design had to be addressed. Had they come to the Board prior to design they would not have something to show the Board. He acknowledged that the process could have been better, a consultant could have done a concept design but there would not have been costings. To put a bridge over a watercourse did require a consent.

D Lundy asked if there could be clarity around the $11,000, how much was for the consents and how much for the design. O Davies did not have those figures with him.

Moved G Miller

THAT the Rangiora–Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180502047945.
(b) Approves the design of the proposed footbridge in the location shown in Crayfish Creek Footbridge, Site Plan 3802, for an estimated cost of $56,000 (refer attachment i).
(c) Notes that construction of the footbridge will be tendered and is currently planned to be completed before 30 June 2018.
(d) Circulates this report to the Utilities and Roading Committee for their information.

LAPSED for want of a seconder

D Gordon queried leaving the report to lie on the table as he would like to know what a Hegan Reserve style Bridge and the proposed design would cost when out to tender. C Prickett did not believe lying the report on the table achieved anything.

The meeting adjourned for a workshop from 7.52pm to 8.00pm.

Moved D Gordon seconded P Williams

THAT the Rangiora–Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180502047945.
(b) Approves the footbridge in the location shown in Crayfish Creek Footbridge, Site Plan 3802, but asks staff to come back to the Board with concept and costings for a Hegan Reserve style bridge.

CARRIED

D Gordon commented that he was concerned with costings and the process. It was likely the cost of the proposed bridge was $56,000 plus the $11,000 spent. He did not want to see the Council spend a fortune on consultants for a simple structure and he was sure builders could come up with an option and costings for a bridge similar to that at Hegan Reserve. The community would not thank the Board for approving what was recommended but for doing due diligence.

P Williams noted that there had not been a seconder for the $56,000 option. There needed to be a better, cheaper option that was more affordable for ratepayers.

S Lewis commented that she thought the recommended bridge design was super cool and that recent bridges such as that on Rangiora Woodend Road looked like ‘sheep gates’. However, she believed that the design recommended had swung too far the other way and she supported the $15,000 option.
7.3 **Ratification of the Board’s Submission to the Waimakariri District Council’s Long Term Plan 2018-2028** – Edwina Cordwell (Governance Adviser)

J Gerard noted the report was to ratify the LTP submission.

Moved J Gerard    seconded D Lundy

**THAT** the Rangiora–Ashley Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180328033649.

(b) **Retrospectively ratifies** the Board's submission to the Waimakariri District Council’s Long Term Plan 2018-2028 (Trim No.180328033661).

**CARRIED**

8 **CORRESPONDENCE**

Nil.

9 **CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT**

9.1 **Chair’s Diary for April 2018**

Moved J Gerard    seconded D Gordon

**THAT** the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180508049899.

**CARRIED**

10 **MATTERS FOR INFORMATION**

10.1 **Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting minutes – 5 April 2018** (Trim No. 180328033515).

10.2 **Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting minutes – 9 April 2018** (Trim No. 180327032677).

10.3 **Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting minutes – 19 March 2018** (Trim No. 180315027883).

10.4 **Youth Council meeting minutes – 27 March 2018**

10.5 **Submission on Environment Canterbury’s Long-Term Plan 2018-28** Report to Council 3 April 2018 (Trim No. 180321030611).


10.9 **Register of Interests Policy** Report to Council 1 May 2018 (Trim No. 180419042965).

10.10 **20 February 2018 Storm Event** Report to Council 3 April 2018 (Trim No. 180322031170).
11 MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE

11.1 G Miller
- Attended All Boards Briefing and commented on the police presentation.
- Outlined an experience at the Southbrook Recovery Centre and the prohibitive cost of recycling electronic goods. Commented that he felt that the Government did not take recycling seriously and the Community Board should take a part on addressing issues.

11.2 C Prickett
- Attended All Boards Briefing and appreciated the honest approach regarding the future of policing.
- Attended Milton Dog Park meeting and there had been an agreement on shelter placement.

11.3 D Lundy
- Represented the Board at ANZAC day services and noted the large turnout.
- Attended Civil Defence training in hazardous waste.

11.4 D Gordon
- Attended Long Term Plan (LTP) hearings over two days with 30 submissions heard out of 800 total submissions. Commented that the Chair presented the Board submission well.
- Commented on poor Council road maintenance quality. Over the last three months, there had been deterioration on many roads.
- Rural Canterbury PHO – Helen Allen was presented a painting of the late Councillor Peter Allen.
- Rotary Club in partnership with Te Kōhaka Trust were setting up a bionode in memory of Peter Allen.
- Acknowledged retirement of the Council’s Roading Manager K Stevenson commenting that he had done a superb job for the district.

K Galloway asked if there was an update on Rangiora High Street Lights. D Gordon replied that a consultant had met with the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi and Rangiora-Ashley Community Board Chairs and was writing a report for the Council.

11.5 P Williams
- Attended ANZAC day services and noted good turnout.
- Highlighted concerns with sewerage ponds including sludge, odours and botulism and suggested there may be serious upcoming expense for Council to address those issues.
- Commented on the requirements to bring water supplies up to government legislated quality. There was a lot of work going into the LTP related to costings. Water was becoming more expensive.
- Attended waste minimisation meeting. China was no longer taking recycling and worldwide recycling was considerably more expensive. It was an unavoidable cost.

J Millward commented on LTP costings. For targeted collection, there was an increase of $17 per property and for general waste minimisation, there was an average of $2 meaning an extra average $19 in rates. He was looking at getting it down to 4.6%, so a 0.2% across district rate increase.

J Millward advised there was a 5% hold on the Garrymere water supply. Some of the UV costs were a 250% increase on estimated. An option at the moment was potentially to put that into year 2. This would be a Council decision. It would be $12 per Rangiora ratepayer.
11.6 **K Galloway**
- Attended meeting at Milton Dog Park. Lions had agreed to provide two shelters and there would be no further cost.
- Attended Public Domain Policy meetings.
- Attended Rangiora High School ANZAC service and commented positively.
- Attended Rangiora-Ashley Road Naming Committee meeting.
- Attended All Boards Briefing.

11.7 **S Lewis**
- Attended Rangiora ANZAC day service and commented positively.
- Attended All Boards Briefing and had been inspired by the Learner Licence mentoring scheme and the difference it made in people’s lives. She had volunteered to be a mentor.
- Would be jumping again in the ‘Big Splash’ event.

11.8 **J Hoult**
- Attended Cust ANZAC day service and commented positively.
- Assisted with North Canterbury Neighbourhood Support’s submission to the Council for funding via the LTP in recognition of the valuable role in community support and in particular the Get Ready program. Noted every Board had a representative on the Committee.
- Attended All Boards Briefing and found the police presentation challenging.
- Attending Te Reo classes.
- Recommended the exhibition in the Chamber Gallery.

11.9 **M Clarke**
- Attended Waimakariri Health Advisory Group meeting. Attendees included mental health nurses, practice nurses and public health nurses. There was a new structure to their reports.
- Attended Rangiora Community Market.
- Commented he found it difficult to attend Waimakariri Access Group meetings as these were held at 11am during the working day.
- Attended consultation on speed limits.
- Appointed safety officer of the Anglican Parish Rangiora.

12 **CONSULTATION PROJECTS**

**Rangiora Woodend Road Speed Limits** –
Consultation closes Monday 28 May 2018.

13 **REGENERATION PROJECTS**

Updates on the Rangiora Town Centre projects are emailed regularly to Board members. These updates can be located using the link below:

14 **BOARD FUNDING UPDATE**

**14.1 Board Discretionary Grant**
Balance as at 16 May 2018: $6,264.04.
J Gerard noted that the Board needed to 'use it or lose it' and asked members to encourage applications.

14.2 **General Landscaping Fund**

Balance as at 16 May 2018: $1,840.

J Gerard suggested that excess General Landscaping Fund could be passed on to Keep Rangiora Beautiful.

It was asked if there were rollover options for the grants.

15 **MEDIA ITEMS**

Nil.

16 **QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**

Nil.

17 **URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**

Nil.

**NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board is scheduled for 7pm, Wednesday 13 June 2018 in the Council Chambers at the Rangiora Service Centre.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 8.49pm

CONFIRMED

________________________
Chairperson

________________________
Date

**Briefing held from – 8.04pm – 8.22pm.**

- Sparks Lane Reserve – Dan Cameron (Green Space Community Engagement Officer) discussed options for enhancing the area.

**Workshop held from – 8.49pm – 9.00pm.**

- Members Information Exchange review.
- Holiday Trading.