

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA, ON TUESDAY 4 OCTOBER 2022, COMMENCING AT 1PM.

PRESENT

Mayor D Gordon (Chairperson), Deputy Mayor N Atkinson, Councillors A Blackie, K Barnett, R Brine, W Doody, N Mealings, P Redmond, S Stewart, J Ward and P Williams.

IN ATTENDANCE

J Millward (Acting Chief Executive), S Salthouse (General Manager Organisational Development and Human Resources) S Markham (Manager Strategic Projects), S Hart (Strategy and Business Manager), K Simpson (3 Waters Manager), S Nichols (Governance Manager), J McBride (Roading and Transport Manager), C Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager), K Waghorn (Solid Waste Asset Manager), K Blake (Health, Safety and Wellbeing Manager), D Lewis (Land Drainage Engineer), A Mace-Cochrane (Project Engineer), L Murchison (Lead Advisor – Sustainable Development) and T Kunkel (Governance Team Leader).

1. APOLOGIES

There were no apologies.

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

No conflicts of interest were declared.

3. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

- The Council officially acknowledged the passing of Queen Elizabeth on 8 September 2022. Her Majesty would be remembered for her remarkable service and devotion. She had a strong sense of duty and dedicated her whole life to her throne and the service of her people and the Commonwealth.
- The Mayor also acknowledged the passing of L G Roberts, a long-time resident of Kaiapoi and D Graham, who was a long-time business owner in Rangiora.
- The Mayor extended the Council's condolences to the family of the late Roger Blair, who served on the Kaiapoi Community Board before serving as a District Councillor from 2007 to 2013. R Blair also served as a Kaiapoi and Kaiapoi-Tuahivi Community Board member from 2013 to 2019. He was a highly valued colleague who contributed considerably to Waimakariri District Council and strongly advocated for the Kaiapoi community.

The Mayor called for a minute of silence to be observed in recognition of those who passed.

4. **CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**

4.1 **Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on 6 September 2022**

Moved: Councillor Blackie

Seconded: Councillor Brine

THAT the Council:

- (a) **Confirms**, as a true and correct record, the circulated Minutes of the Waimakariri District Council meeting held on 6 September 2022.

CARRIED

MATTERS ARISING (FROM MINUTES)

There were no matters arising.

PUBLIC EXCLUDED MINUTES

(These Minutes were considered in the public excluded portion of the meeting)

4.2 **Minutes of the public excluded portion of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on 6 September 2022**

TABELING OF ADDITIONAL ITEM

8.3 **Proposed closure of Stockwater Race R4-2 – D Lewis (Land Drainage Engineer)**

The Mayor advised that the Council had been requested to consider the report omitted erroneously from the Agenda. The report was discussed at the Utilities and Roading Committee meeting on 27 September 2022.

Moved: Councillor Brine

Seconded: Councillor Stewart

THAT the Council:

- (a) **Agrees** to consider the report on the Proposed closure of Stockwater Race R4-2.

CARRIED

5. **DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS**

5.1 **Joe Holland**

Mr Holland could not attend the Council meeting due to work commitments, his deputation on climate change would therefore be postponed.

5.2 **Swannanoa School Representatives**

Student representatives Rosie Tapp and Eva Dingel shared their views on the Council's proposed Adoption of the Walking and Cycling Network Plan. E Dingel explained the need for children to be independent and not reliant on their parents to take them places because there were no alternatives. The development of walking and cycling pathways in their community would facilitate independence by enabling children to cycle and walk to school, sports grounds and friends. She highlighted the environmental benefits of developing walking and cycling pathways, such as reducing carbon footprints, thereby reducing global warming.

R Tapp advised that the Swannanoa community needed walking and cycling pathways to ensure the safety of pedestrians and cyclists. Swannanoa School was situated on the very busy Tram Road, and parents needed a guarantee that their children could travel safely to and from school. She noted that walking and cycling pathways would connect the Swannanoa community and could be used by young and old, who could cycle, run and walk without being concerned about the busy roads. Being connected as a community was good for mental and physical health and made everyone feel supported, safe and strong.

R Tapp explained that currently, there was a pathway along Tram Road from Swannanoa School to No 10 Road. It was recommended that this pathway be extended to the Mandeville Shopping Centre and Sports Club to allow a safe route for students to the shops and their sports activities. It was also recommended that pathways be developed within the 3.2-kilometre bus exclusion zone. Currently, students who lived within this zone had to be dropped off and collected from school as there was no public transport or other safe alternatives. She urged the Council to effect these changes within the semi-rural communities.

Oxford-Ohoka Community Board member Sarah Barkle reiterated that the extension of the current pathway from No 10 Road to the Mandeville Shopping Centre and then to the Mandeville Sports Club would connect the Swannanoa and Mandeville communities. Residents had been asking for pathways to connect the Ohoka, Mandeville, and Oxford communities for a long time. She noted that there used to be a perception that Mandeville / Swannanoa areas did not need cycleways due to their rural character. However, these areas had changed and became more populated due to the various subdivisions in the area. The Council, therefore, needed to consider developing pedestrian pathways in these communities, even if it meant future targeted rating.

The Mayor thanked R Tapp and E Dingel for their excellent and clear presentation.

5.3 **Loburn School Representatives**

Student representative Keva Woolford requested the Council to consider developing a walking and cycling pathway from Leigh's Camp to Loburn School. Fishers Road, where the school was located, was very busy as it was a main thoroughfare to Oxford. Many heavy vehicles used the road, making it unsafe for students to cycle and walk along. She highlighted that the benefits of walking and cycling pathways would outweigh the initial development cost. The pathways would lessen the need for parents to drop off and collect their children at school, thereby reducing the school's carbon footprint.

K Woolford noted that there was sufficient space along Fishers Road to build a walking and cycling pathway. Parents would be more comfortable allowing their children to walk and cycle to and from school if there was a safe alternative to the busy road. In addition, the pathways would benefit the whole community as pathways that made physical exercise possible would lead to better mental and physical health. She pointed out the gains of other walking and cycling pathways in the Waimakariri District.

Councillor Ward questioned the speed limit of the road between Leigh's Camp and Loburn School. K Woolford confirmed that it was 80 km/ph.

Councillor Barnett enquired how far the proposed pathway should extend from Loburn School towards Oxford. K Woolford noted that there was no need to develop the path much further as there was already a pathway from Loburn to Tawhai Drive.

Mayor Gordon thanked K Woolford for the outstanding presentation.

At this time Item 7.1 was taken, however, the Minutes have been recorded in the order of the Agenda.

6. ADJOURNED BUSINESS

6.1 Gambling Policy Reviews 2022 – L Beckingsale (Policy Analyst) and T Tierney (General Manager Planning, Regulation and Environment) on behalf of the Gambling Policy Review Hearing Panel: Councillors W Doody (Chair), P Williams and P Redmond

S Hart advised that the Council reviewed the two policies that assisted with minimising gambling-related harm, the Gambling Venue Policy and the Board Venue Policy. The first of these policies was developed under the Gambling Act 2003, and the second under the Racing Industry Act 2020. The legislation required the Council to review these policies every three years. In addition, the Board Venue Policy must also be updated to align with the Racing Industry Act 2020.

S Hart explained that public consultation took place from 10 June to 11 July 2022, and 38 submissions were received. Six submitters took the opportunity to present their views in person and shared a broad range of opinions with the hearing panel. He highlighted the various amendments to the policies recommended by the hearing panel. S Hart noted an error in the recommendation in the report regarding the 'cap machine numbers', which should be at a ratio of 1:260.

As the Chairperson of the hearing panel, Council Doody noted that 'cap machine numbers' should be at a ratio of 1:265. The Mayor conferred with S Nichols, the Governance Manager, who agreed that the panel decision was to cap machine numbers at a ratio of 1:265.

Councillor Redmond advised that the policy's objectives were to control the growth of gambling; prevent and minimise the harm to the community caused by gambling; control the increase in crime, and allow those who wish to participate in machine gambling safely and responsibly. The hearing panel heard various views on proposed policy amendments and the harm gambling could do to families and communities. However, it was difficult to determine if an increase in gambling machines would lead to a rise in gambling. Nationally the number of gambling machines had decreased by 25%, however, the money spent on gambling had not likewise reduced.

Councillor Redmond explained that the hearing panel did not support a reduction in the number of gambling machines, nor did they support a cap on the number of gambling machines. Hence the hearing panel supported keeping the same proportion of machines to population the policy provided for. It was believed that the hearing panel took a sensible view on the proposed amendments to the policy by trying to balance the rights of individuals and businesses with the harm that gambling may cause.

Councillor Williams noted that he had not favoured clause seven, as it did not allow for growth in the district. New establishments in the community would be disadvantaged as they would not be allowed to have gambling machines under the proposed ratio. He expressed concern about the rise in online gambling, which could not be controlled, nor did it hold any benefits to communities. Gambling machines at approved sites were, therefore, a better option.

Councillor Doody advised that it was a challenging hearing due to the complexity of the issues to be considered. She noted that the RSA club were cautious in monitoring people gambling at the machines to guard against gambling harm. However, the club still received substantial income from gambling machines, which was needed to run the club successfully.

S Hart explained that taking into account the estimated current population, if the number of gambling machines was capped at a ratio of 1:265, the permitted number of machines in the district would be 162. This was less than the current number of gambling machines in the district, meaning that the district was currently over-allocated. He therefore still questioned the hearing panel's decision to cap the gambling machines at a ratio of 1:265.

J Millward, however, confirmed that considering the annual population growth in the Waimakariri District, a ratio of 1:265 would allow for future growth.

Mayor Gordon deferred further discussion on the matter to enable staff to clarify if the actual recommendation by the Hearing Panel was 1:265 or 1:260.

The Council adjourned for refreshments from 3.05pm to 3.20pm at which time consideration of Item 6.1 proceeded.

S Hart advised that staff had listened to the recording of the Hearing Panel discussion and could confirm that the Hearing Panel recommendation was to cap machine numbers at a ratio of 1:260.

In response to a question from Councillor Atkinson, S Hart explained that using the growth ratio of previous years, an additional 15 to 20 gambling machines could be allowed in the district, with a cap on machine numbers at a ratio of 1:260.

Moved: Councillor Doody

Seconded: Councillor Redmond

THAT the Council:

- (a) **Receives** Report No. 220922164406.
- (b) **Adopts** the Gambling (Class 4) Venue Policy with changes as follows:
Clauses 1 to 6 – no change.

Clause 7 – Option 3– cap machine numbers at a ratio of 1:260.

Clause 12 – Relocation policy - Relocation of machines was allowed where the venue was intended to replace an existing venue (within the district) to which a Class 4 venue licence applies.

- (c) **Adopts** the TAB (Totalisator Agency Board) Venue Policy with changes as follows:

"The TAB Venue Policy terminology had been updated in accordance with the new Racing Industry Act 2020. No changes to the policy elements."

CARRIED

Against: Councillors Barnett and Williams

Councillor Doody commented that the hearing panel worked hard on an acceptable solution for all parties without slowing down the growth in the Waimakariri District. She noted that the Gambling Policy would again be reviewed in three years when more accurate information would hopefully be available.

Councillor Redmond noted that the hearing panel weighed the various submissions received. He believed that the panel had been faithful to the objectives of the Gambling Policy by capping the machine numbers at a ratio of 1:260.

Amendment

Moved: Councillor Barnet

Seconded: -

THAT the Council:

- (2) **Adopts** the Gambling (Class 4) Venue Policy with changes as follows:

Clauses 1 to 6 – no change.

Clause 7 – Option 3– cap machine numbers at a ratio of 1:200.

Clause 12 – Relocation policy - Relocation of machines was allowed where the venue was intended to replace an existing venue (within the district) to which a Class 4 venue licence applies.

LAPSED

The original motion remained the substantive motion.

Mayor Gordon acknowledged people's right to gamble and therefore supported the recommendation of the hearing plan as he believed they had taken a balanced decision based on the submissions.

Councillor Williams noted that in ten-years, there had been only two reported 'problem gamblers' in the Waimakariri District, which was very low. He commented that there would always be people addicted to gambling, however, he doubted that capping the number of gambling machines would deter problem gamblers. Councillor Williams believed that new businesses needed to be able to compete by having the same access to gambling machines as existing businesses. He further noted that many community organisations benefited from funding derived from gambling. Therefore, if offshore gambling were promoted by limiting the number of gambling machines, these community organisations would lose funding.

Councillor Atkinson supported the motion because an additional 15 to 20 gambling machines would be allowed in the district, with a cap on machine numbers at a ratio of 1:260. Hence, there was equal opportunity for new business. He sympathised with people who struggled with problem gambling, however, gambling was legal in New Zealand.

Councillor Barnett advised that she would not support capping the number of gambling machines at a ratio of 1:260, as it limited the number of machines available to new applicants, potentially stopping businesses from investing in Waimakariri District. She reiterated that gambling harm was regrettable, however, gambling was legal for people to do responsibly. It was the Council's responsibility to minimise harm, and she did not believe that there was sufficient evidence that capping the number of gambling machines would alleviate gambling harm.

6.2 **Proposed Policy – Briefings and Workshops – S Nichols (Governance Manager)**

S Nichols advised that the proposed Policy provided clearer guidance for elected members and staff on the process, expectations and transparency of briefings and workshops. She noted that the adoption of the policy was laid on the table at the September 2022 Council meeting to allow for the Community Boards to be consulted. She confirmed that all the Community

Boards had been consulted and the policy had been well received. Three Community Boards agreed to an overarching Council policy to mitigate confusion for members when attending different levels of meetings and ensuring consistency. However, the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board, although in favour of the policy, preferred a separate policy because Boards were separate entities.

In conclusion, S Nichols advised that the policy had been tweaked to clarify the approval process of what topics would be included in workshop and briefing agendas.

In response to a question by Councillor Williams, J Millward explained that the Council could still deliberate on the matters to be considered with the public excluded and could question the specific grounds under section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987. The proposed Policy on Briefings and Workshops was to serve as a guide to staff on the process of requesting briefings and workshops.

Moved: Councillor Doody

Seconded: Councillor Brine

THAT the Council:

- (a) **Receives** Report No. 220928167654.
- (b) **Adopts** the Policy on Briefings and workshops (Trim 220603094363), effective immediately.
- (c) **Notes** the Policy was inclusive of Council, Committees and Community Boards with wording clarified from previously tabled proposed policy.
- (d) **Notes** this Policy would be conveyed to the new term elected members through the induction process.
- (e) **Notes** that all the Community Boards had been consulted and the Rangiora-Ashley, Kaiapoi-Tuahiwī and Woodend- Sefton Community Board had indicated that they would be prepared to adopt an overarching Council policy. The Oxford-Ohoka Community Board have indicated that they wished to adopt its own policy.

CARRIED

Councillor Brine commented that he was not a supporter of workshops and briefings when they were first introduced. However, they were a forum for staff to provide information and receive feedback from Councillors. It was, therefore, important that staff was knowledgeable when requesting briefings and workshops.

Councillor Barnett thanked staff for consulting the Community Boards regarding this policy, which would also impact their briefings and workshops.

7. REPORTS

7.1 Adoption of the Walking and Cycling Network Plan, and Infrastructure Prioritisation Programme – D Young (Senior Engineering Advisor) and A Mace-Cochrane (Project Engineer)

A Mace-Cochrane thanked the representatives from Loburn and Swannanoa Schools and the Woodend-Sefton Community Board for presenting the Walking and Cycling Network Plan (the plan). She explained that the pathway along Tram Road from Mandeville Village Shopping Precinct to No. 10 Road, as suggested by Swannanoa School, had been included as a Priority One project in the plan. A pathway along McHugh's Road / Mandeville Road to the Mandeville Sports Club had also been included as a Priority One project. The

development of these pathways was also included as part of the Council's application for Climate Emergency Response Funding (CERF). A Mace-Cochrane also highlighted the revisions made to the plan, in the Swannanoa area, as a consequence of the feedback received during public consultation.

Concerning Loburn, A Mace-Cochrane advised that provision had been made for developing a gravel shared pathway from the Leigh Holiday Park corner to Loburn School. Provision had also been made for the Pegasus to Woodend and Woodend Beach to Kaiapoi shared pathways. She noted that all the pathways mentioned above were included in the plan as Priority One projects. The Pegasus to Kaiapoi paths had also been included in the Council's CERF and Better-off Funding applications. A Mace-Cochrane explained that the Council would undertake preliminary design works for the Pegasus to Woodend link, however, detailed design work or construction would not take place until Waka Kotahi had finalised its design for the safety improvements along State Highway One between Woodend and Pegasus. She elaborated on the amendments made to the plan since the previous Council workshop on this matter.

Councillor Brine enquired if the Council had applied to CERF to fund the proposed pathways in Loburn. J McBride explained that Loburn was not part of the original list for CERF funding application, however, as this was a high priority, the Council could discuss the project's funding with Waka Kotahi.

Councillor Blackie questioned why developing a pathway along Sandhill Road would be considered a Priority One project. A Mace-Cochrane advised that Sandhill Road formed part of an unformed road corridor, which would be used to develop the Woodend to Kaiapoi link.

Councillor Barnett noted that the Council had several submissions from the Cust community, including Cust School, on how unsafe Cust Road was. She enquired why Cust Road was only considered a Priority Three project. J McBride explained that although the Council wished it could address the concerns of all the schools in the district, staff had to prioritise projects due to funding restraints. The pathways around Loburn and Swannanoa Schools were considered Priority One, as there were currently no amenities in these areas.

Councillor Barnett further noted that staff had undertaken to bring a report to Council if a community group obtained funding, or circumstances changed on a roading network. She asked if staff would undertake to review the plan if additional funding becomes available. J McBride confirmed that staff would reconsider the plan's priorities if additional funding becomes available.

In response to a question from Councillor Mealings, A Mace-Cochrane advised that it was envisaged that a bridge would be installed over the Cust River on Easterbrook Road.

Moved: Mayor Gordon

Seconded: Councillor Redmond

THAT the Council:

- (a) **Receives** Report No. 220817141624.
- (b) **Adopts** the recommended Walking and Cycling Network Plan (refer to TRIM No. 220725126302).
- (c) **Approves** the following links being included in the prioritisation programme as Priority One:
 - a. **Tram Road** (Mandeville Village shopping precinct to No. 10 Road) – Gravel shared path.

- b. **McHughs Road / Mandeville Road** (Tram Road to the Mandeville Sports Ground) – Gravel shared path.
 - c. **Ashley Street/Ivory Street/Percival Street** – On-road cycle lanes (connecting existing).
 - d. **Railway Road/Torlesse Street/Coronation Street/Ellis Road** – Separated path or shared path (dependent on scheme design) and neighbourhood greenway.
 - e. **Pegasus to Woodend** (State Highway 1 – Pegasus roundabout to 130A Main North Road) – Gravel shared path.
 - f. **Dixons Road/Loburn Whiterock Road/Hodgsons Road** (Rangiora Leigh Holiday Park to Loburn School) – Gravel shared path (Note, the Dixons Road Bridge will remain a deficiency in this link until budget to construct a clip-on becomes available in the future).
 - g. **Sandhill Road** (Williams Street to Woodend Beach Road) – Shared path.
 - h. **Old North Road/Ranfurlly Street/Walker Street/Bridge Street OR Lower Camside Road/Bridge Street** – Shared path/neighbourhood greenway.
- (d) **Approves** the following links being included in the prioritisation programme as Priority Two:
- a. **Harewood Road, Oxford** (High Street to Main Street) – Gravel/sealed shared path.
 - b. **High Street, Oxford** (Main Street to Harewood Road) – Gravel/sealed shared path.
 - c. **Earlys Road** (end of existing facility to Springbank Road) – Gravel share path.
 - d. **Williams Street** (north of town centre) – On-road cycle lanes (connecting existing)
- (e) **Approves** the following links being included in the prioritisation programme as Priority Three:
- a. **Main Street** (Oxford urban limits) – On-road cycle lane.
 - b. **Cust Road** (Cust urban speed zone) - Protected cycle lane.
- (f) **Notes** the following additions had been made to the Walking and Cycling Network Plan based on staffs' assessment of the community and Community Board submissions:
- a. **North Eyre Road** (between No. 10 Road and Earlys Road).
 - b. **North Eyre Road** (between Poyntzs Road and Tram Road).
 - c. **Two Chain Road** (between Pattersons Road and North Eyre Road).
 - d. **Pattersons Road** (between Two Chain Road and Wards Road).
 - e. **Wards Road** (between Makybe Drive and Pattersons Road).
 - f. **Whites Road** (between Mill Road, Ohoka, and Tram Road).
 - g. **Tram Road** (upgrade of level of service between Whites Road and Mandeville Town).
 - h. **Easterbrook Road** (from Cust River – bridge from Bradleys Road to Fernside Road).
 - i. **Fernside Road** (between Easterbrook Road and Townsend Road).
 - j. **Townsend Road** (upgrade of level of service between Fernside Road and the South Brook).

- k. **Mill Road, Ohoka** (between Threlkelds Road and Christmas Road).
 - l. **Christmas Road** (between Mill Road, Ohoka, and Butchers Road).
 - m. **Butchers Road** (between Christmas Road and Ohoka Road).
 - n. **Bramleys Road** (between Tuahiwi Road and Lineside Road).
 - o. **Greens Road** (between Tuahiwi Road and Church Bush Road).
 - p. **Church Bush Road** (between Greens Road and Tuahiwi Road).
 - q. **Te Pouapatuki Road** (between Greens Road and Rangiora Woodend Road).
 - r. **State Highway One** (between Gressons Road and Pegasus Boulevard).
 - s. **Bridge Street** (between Reserve Road and the beach access);
 - t. **Domain Terrace** (between Park Terrace and the campground access).
 - u. **Waikuku Beach Domain** (between Domain Terrace and Reserve Road).
 - v. **Cones Road** (between Dixons Road and Carrs Road).
 - w. **Carrs Road** (between Cones Road and Station Road).
 - x. **Station Road** (between Carrs Road and Loburn Whiterock Road).
 - y. **Hodgsons Road** (between Swamp Road and 110 Hodgsons Road).
 - z. **Loburn Whiterock Road** (upgrade level of service between Loburn Domain and Dixons Road).
- (g) **Notes** staff had made the following changes to the prioritisation programme:
- a. **Pegasus to Woodend** – moved from Priority Three to Priority One (community/Community Board feedback)
 - b. **Dixons Road/Loburn Whiterock Road/Hodgsons Road** – moved from no priority to Priority One (community feedback);
 - c. **Sandhill Road** – moved from Priority Two to Priority One (community/Community Board feedback).
 - d. **Old North Road/Ranfurly Street/Walker Street/Bridge Street OR Lower Camside Road/Bridge Street** – moved from Priority Three to Priority One (community/Community Board feedback);
 - e. **Tuahiwi Road** (Tuahiwi Village limits) – moved from Priority Two to outside of the priority list (staff to revisit which Grade 2 facility is required).
 - f. **McHughs Road / Mandeville Road** – moved from Priority Two to Priority One (part of the Climate Emergency Response Fund application).
- (h) **Notes** that options to fund the expected shortfall between the updated estimates for the Priority One projects, and the expected funding streams (i.e. existing Council funding, Better off funding, and Climate Emergency Response Fund (CERF) would be brought to the Council's Annual Plan deliberations.
- (i) **Notes** that there was a budget of \$490,000 within PJ101229.000.5135 for the 2022/23 financial year, of which, \$40,000 was allocated towards improving estimates for all Priority One routes, and the advancement of the scheme design for the Woodend to Pegasus, Kaiapoi to Woodend, and Railway Road/Torlesse Street/Coronation Street/Ellis Road links, as well as Ashley Street (reseal planned for January), and \$450,000 towards the construction of a footpath in Tuahiwi (noting that this was

already budgeted within the Low Cost Low Risk programme of this NLTP, which Council had previously approved).

- (j) **Notes** that staff could undertake preliminary design works for the Pegasus to Woodend link initially; however, were unable to undertake detailed design or construction until Waka Kotahi had finalised their design for the safety improvements along State Highway One (between Woodend and Pegasus/Ravenswood).
- (k) **Notes** that there was a Council funded (i.e., no Waka Kotahi funding at this stage) budget of \$660,000 within PJ101229.000.5135 for construction of walking and cycling infrastructure in the 2023/24 financial year, which would be the subject of a future report before any commitment to expenditure was made.
- (l) **Notes** that additional funding was being sought through the 'Better Off' funding stream (Three Waters Reform) and the CERF (Waka Kotahi) for the following links:
 - a. **Pegasus to Woodend.**
 - b. **Kaiapoi to Woodend:** Sandhill Road.
 - c. **Kaiapoi to Woodend Road:** Old North Road/Ranfurlly Street/Walker Street/Bridge Street OR Lower Camside Road/Bridge Street.
 - d. **Railway Road/Torlesse Street/Coronation Street/Ellis Road/Country Lane.**
 - e. **Ashley Street/Ivory Street/Percival Street.**
 - f. **Tram Road** (School path).
 - g. **McHughs Road/Mandeville Road** (Sportsground path).
- (m) **Notes** that both Courtenay Drive (southern side, between Williams Street and Stone Street) and Charles Street (between Williams Street and Jones Street) would be considered as an off-road Grade Two link only.
- (n) **Recommends** to staff that they re-instate the Walking and Cycling Reference Group under new Terms of Reference, to review and consider the priorities as required and report back to the Community Boards for consideration, which staff would draft and bring back to the Council in a separate report.
- (o) **Recommends** to staff that they include investigations into way-finding and other signage deficiencies across the network within the yearly budget allocation for design and construction.
- (p) **Notes** that the Walking and Cycling Network Plan sets a strategic framework, and would require further costing and prioritisation through the Long Term Plan process.
- (q) **Notes** that consultation for the two options in Kaiapoi, completing the Kaiapoi to Woodend link, would be consulted on during the design phase of the Sandhill Road portion.
- (r) **Notes** that staff would engage with all rural schools, prior to the next review of the Walking and Cycling Network Plan, to determine their demand areas for walking and cycling.

- (s) **Notes** that staff would bring a report to the relevant Community Board and the Council if a community group obtains funding, or circumstances change on a roading network or as part of a project where it made sense to construct walking and cycling infrastructure, which was not within the current prioritisation programme, but was on the Walking and Cycling Network Plan.
- (t) **Notes** that staff would report on the three-year prioritisation programme annually, as part of the Roothing Capital Works Programme report, prior to finalising the Walking and Cycling Infrastructure Programme for that year.
- (u) **Notes** that the Walking and Cycling Network Plan, excluding the prioritisation programme, would be reviewed internally (in conjunction with the Community Boards' and the Council) every three years and publicly consulted upon every six years.

CARRIED

Mayor Gordon acknowledged the large volume of work the Roothing Team required in drafting the plan. He expressed the Council's frustration in not receiving the expected funding for cycling and walking pathways from Waka Kotahi. However, the Council decided to proceed with the project so that it would be in the best position to source Central Government investment. He noted that walking and cycling were important in the Waimakariri District to ensure communities were connected and deficiencies addressed. He, therefore, hoped that the Council could source the required funding via CERF and Better-off funding to deliver some of the projects.

Mayor Gordon again expressed the Council's appreciation to the Swannanoa and Loburn Schools representatives, who highlighted the priorities for their respective schools and communities.

Councillor Redmond supported the motion, noting that he was pleased that staff had listened to the feedback from schools and Community Boards and had revised the plan accordingly. He was also pleased that the Pegasus to Kaiapoi link was included as a Priority One project. Councillor Redmond believed that the projects included in the plan would ensure the safety of cyclists and pedestrians. He also thanked the Roothing Team for making a complex issue easier to understand.

Councillor Doody congratulate the representatives from Swannanoa and Loburn Schools on their detailed presentations. She was pleased about the proposed development of pathways in rural areas. It was important to develop pathways within the 3.2 kilometre bus exclusion zone, as there were no safe alternative options for children.

Councillor Barnett thanked staff for listening to the Community Boards and revising the plan accordingly. She was pleased about the reinstatement of the Walking and Cycling Reference Group which could monitor the priorities in a changing environment. She noted that although the speed limit on Cust Road had been reduced to 50 km/h, the road still needed treatment. There was no road shoulder on one side of Cust Road in the town centre, despite being an urban area. Councillor Barnett advised that the development occurring on the fringes of towns was extending the urban areas. These communities should be connected to the towns via a walking and cycling network.

Councillor Mealings commented that it had taken a long time to develop the plan to this stage. However, the wishes of people and communities were clear from the approximately 117 submissions received during consultation on the plan. She was disappointed that the Council had not received the expected funding for cycling and walking pathways from Waka Kotahi. However, she was delighted that the development of pathways around rural schools was considered Priority One projects, as children within the 3.2-kilometre bus exclusion zone did not have access to school buses. The Pegasus to Kaiapoi link would allow high school students to cycle to school. Also, the pathways would benefit the whole community's mental and physical health. Councillor Mealings, therefore, supported the motion.

Councillor Williams noted that usually, he was against pathways that removed car parks. However, he was in favour of keeping children off busy roads. He, therefore, supported the motion, as the plan created a safe environment for children to walk and cycle to and from school.

Councillor Stewart concurred with the previous comments, commenting that most of the rural intensification that would take place in the future would be on the fringe of existing urban areas. Therefore, she believed that shared pathways should be included as part of the infrastructure in planning all new developments to ensure that communities were connected. Councillor Stewart commended the Roding Team for the drafting and compilation of the plan.

Councillor Atkinson commented that he supported the plan, which resulted from an extended process. However, he observed that the inclusion of shared pathways as a right in new developments meant an increase in the Council's level of service, which would require funding through rates. Nevertheless, he believed that the implementation of the plan would result in the walking and cycling network needed in the district. Thereby providing all communities access to safe walking and cycling options.

In his right of reply, Mayor Gordon noted that there had been civility in this process and that the Council had listened to the Community Boards and students. The extensive work done by staff resulted in the Council being able to unanimously approve the plan.

7.2 **Approval of the Transportation Procurement Strategy – J McBride (Roding and Transport Manager)**

J McBride noted that the approval of the Transportation Procurement Strategy 2022 was being sought. To meet Waka Kotahi requirements, the Council must have a procurement strategy that the agency had endorsed. The Council's current Procurement Strategy was endorsed by Waka Kotahi in December 2019 and was valid for three years. Thus, the strategy needed to be reviewed and endorsed by Waka Kotahi by 20 December 2022.

J McBride further noted that there was a strong construction market in Canterbury, which provided a good base for Council procurement. Therefore, she did not believe there would be value in long-term contracts. However, staff had looked at how the Procurement Strategy could provide for broader outcomes for the community. Health and safety practices had also been updated to ensure the Council met its obligations and Health and Safety at Work Act, 2015. The Council was seeking feedback from the construction industry, which would be included in the final document. The General Manager Utilities and Roding would approve any changes suggested by Waka Kotahi, and any significant amendments would be reported to Council.

Moved: Councillor Williams

Seconded: Mayor Gordon

THAT the Council:

- (a) **Receives** Report No. 220922165111.
- (b) **Approves** the Draft Transportation Procurement Strategy 2022 (TRIM No. 220923165338).
- (c) **Notes** that shared services were considered and implemented with neighbouring local authorities where applicable.
- (d) **Notes** that should any changes be required following review by Waka Kotahi and prior to endorsement, that these would be progressed subject to approval by the General Manager Utilities and Roading and the Acting Chief Executive.
- (e) **Notes** that any major changes would be reported back to the Council.
- (f) **Circulates** this report to the Community Boards for information.

CARRIED

7.3 **Changes to Sampling Budgets to Reflect New Drinking Water Rules – C Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager)**

C Roxburgh explained that on 25 July 2022, the new Drinking Water Quality Assurance Rules (Rules) were published by Taumata Arowai. The Rules outlined the different treatment and sampling requirements for all drinking water supply types and each element of the supply. Previously the Drinking Water Standards for New Zealand (DWSNZ) included a large amount of E.coli testing as the primary mechanism to prove compliance of each supply. The new Rules had a much more comprehensive range of parameters that needed sampling.

C Roxburgh advised that it was anticipated that an \$82,000 budget increase for the 2022/23 financial year would be required to cater for the broader range of sampling required. It was envisaged that sampling would cost approximately \$350,000 per annum, which was nearly double the current annual allowance. The Council's preliminary estimate was that the increase would have an average rating impact across the district's water supplies of two present per annum. It was suggested that the sampling budgets be apportioned evenly across all properties with a water connection via the District Wide UV rate rather than on a scheme-by-scheme basis.

Councillor Stewart noted that the report indicated separate budgets for the various portions of the West Eyreton, Summerhill and Poyntz Water Supply. C Roxburgh confirmed that although this was one amalgamated water supply, the budgeting was still done separately.

Councillor Stewart sought clarity on the sampling budgets being apportioned evenly across all water supplies. C Roxburgh explained that it was proposed that the water sampling budgets be included as part of the District Ultraviolet (UV) rate to ensure that these charges were applied evenly across all the District's water supplies rather than some schemes being disproportionately impacted relative to others.

Councillor Mealings questioned the variation of the amounts budgeted for sampling the various water supplies. C Roxburgh advised that some water supplies would require source water sampling, whereas others would only require articulation sampling.

In response to a question by Councillor Doody, C Roxburgh noted that the communities would be consulted on the proposed increase in the sampling budgets via the 2023/24 Annual Plan process. The public would also be advised about the average rating impact and that these charges would be applied evenly across all the district's water supplies.

Councillor Barnett questioned the substantial increase in some of the water supplies' sampling budgets. C Roxburgh confirmed that the increase in the budgets were solely due to the change in treatment and sampling requirements for all drinking water supplies that required more frequent sampling.

Councillor Blackie asked if Taumata Arowai had indicated any future involvement with the testing of private water supplies. C Roxburgh advised that individual private dwellings were exempt under the Water Services Act, 2021.

Councillor Williams enquired if sampling would be done by Council staff. C Roxburgh noted that some parameters would be tested in-house, however, outside laboratories would do the majority. The Council had therefore sourced prices from the two leading laboratories in Christchurch specialising in water sampling. C Roxburgh further noted that the Council had yet to decide if the water sampling and testing contract would be tendered.

Councillor Stewart enquired if the domestic self-supplies were exempt under the Water Services Act, 2021. However, water sub-suppliers who supply to two or more properties would be subject to the new Drinking Water Quality Assurance Rules (Rules). C Roxburgh confirmed that this was correct.

Moved: Councillor Williams

Seconded: Councillor Redmond

THAT the Council:

- (a) **Receives** Report No. 220919161951.
- (b) **Notes** that on 25 July 2022 new Drinking Water Quality Assurance Rules were released by Taumata Arowai to come into effect on 14 November 2022, and that these Rules contained new requirements for testing and sampling of drinking water.
- (c) **Approves** that the following water supply sampling budgets be increased for the 2022/23 financial year to reflect new requirements in accordance with the table below:

Scheme	2022/23 Budget (Current)	2022/23 Budget (Proposed)	2022/23 Increase Required
Cust	6,170	11,870	5,700
Garrymere	7,720	9,820	2,100
Kaiapoi	28,300	43,900	15,600
Mandeville	17,940	20,940	3,000
Ohoka	5,150	10,650	5,500
Oxford Rural No.1	14,410	22,410	8,000
Oxford Urban	20,500	20,500	-
Oxford Rural No.2	11,320	11,320	-
Pegasus-Woodend	33,960	43,260	9,300
Rangiora	28,160	32,260	4,100
Waikuku	21,090	29,590	8,500
West Eyreton	4,260	9,990	5,730
Summerhill	1,410	10,000	8,590
Poyntzs	4,120	10,000	5,880
Total	204,510	286,510	82,000

- (d) **Notes** that the sampling budget increases would result in an average of a 2% rating increase across the District's water supplies, and that these rating increases would take effect from 2023/24 onwards.
- (e) **Approves** that the sampling budgets be apportioned evenly across all properties with a water connection via the District Wide UV rate rather than on a scheme by scheme basis.
- (f) **Notes** that the required budget and rating impacts for future years would be addressed via the 2023/24 Annual Plan process.

CARRIED

Councillor Williams commented that although it was good that the additional testing would ensure better water quality, the additional costs were high, especially in light of the fact that there had been no previous concerns about the water quality in the Waimakariri District.

Councillor Redmond concurred that the additional testing would guarantee better water quality for consumers. However, he noted that the Council had no choice, as it had to comply with the new Drinking Water Quality Assurance Rules. Councillor Atkinson agreed with the comments made by Councillor Redmond.

7.4 **July 2022 Flood Response – Forecast Costs and Funding Sources – R Kerr (Delivery Manager – Stimulus and Funding)**

K Simpson advised that the report's purpose was to provide the Council with an update on the expected expenditure for the flood response work and highlight the preliminary funding allocated to the various asset areas. He noted that the estimate to complete the Emergency and Immediate Works had increased from the previously reported \$3.15 million to \$3.82 million. Generally, the principles for allocation of funding were related to the source of flood waters, i.e. costs would be recovered against the urban or rural drainage scheme where the source of flood water was from the urban area. Costs would

be recovered from District Wide Flood Recovery funding where flood waters were derived from non-rated drainage catchments.

K Simpson explained that the flood response work would be debt funded in the 2022/23 financial year and then loan-funded over 25 years, with the charge being on the 2023/24 rates. However, further work was required to confirm the actual rating impact on individual schemes, and this would be addressed in the 2023/24 Annual Plan process.

J McBride noted that the Council may qualify for 71% co-funding by Waka Kotahi for some of the emergency roading works. Hence the cost to the Council may be slightly lower.

Councillor Stewart requested additional information on the headwall repairs and pipe reinstatement in conjunction with ECan on Giles Road, Silverstream. J McBride believed it was close to Neeves Road, where the riverbank had been severely eroded.

Moved: Councillor Williams

Seconded: Councillor Ward

THAT the Council:

- (a) **Receives** Report No. 220923165375.
- (b) **Approves** budget of \$3.82 million in responding to the flood event and recovery from the flood damages, with preliminary funding allocated as follows:

Asset Area	Estimate	Preliminary Funding source
Roading	\$1,940,000	Roading with NTLF FAR
Stormwater	\$615,000	Relevant Urban Drainage account
Land Drainage	\$400,000	District Drainage account
Rivers	\$25,000	District Drainage account
Wastewater	\$340,000	Eastern Districts Sewerage Scheme account
Flood Response investigations	\$500,000	Drainage Operations account
TOTAL	\$3,820,000	

- (c) **Agrees** the flood response work be debt funded in 2022/23 and then loan funded with the charge being on the 2023/24 rate.
- (d) **Notes** that co-funding by Waka Kotahi is estimated at \$989,410 (subject to approval) with the Funding Assistance Rate anticipated to be 51% for Emergency Works.
- (e) **Notes** that the total rating impact from this additional budget, less the Waka Kotahi co-funding, was as follows:

Rating Area	Rating Implication
Roading	Increase by approximately \$5.55 or 1.2%
District Drainage	Increase by approximately \$1.30 or 6.5%.
Kaiapoi Urban	Increase by approximately \$7.54 or 2.0%.
Rangiora Urban	Increase by approximately \$1.00 or 0.3%.
Coastal Urban	Increase by approximately \$0.54 or 0.3%.
Pegasus Urban	Increase by approximately \$1.98 or 0.8%.
Oxford Urban	Increase by approximately \$4.91 or 3.1%.
Eastern Districts Sewer	Increase by approximately \$1.59 or 0.3%.

- (f) **Notes** that staff were continuing to work with Waka Kotahi, insurers and other external parties to secure funding for the works where available.
- (g) **Note** that 2023/24 maintenance budgets would be reviewed in light of the additional information and may need to be revised.
- (h) **Note** that some investigations would identify work that was able to be completed in this financial year while others would be included in the draft Annual Plan process.
- (i) **Circulates** this report to all the Community Boards for information.

CARRIED

Councillor Williams expressed a concern that the unbudgeted expenditure would have to be funded by increased rates. However, the work needed to be done, hence the funding would need to be spent. He urged staff to find some efficiency gains and possible saving to cover some of the unbudgeted expenditure, thereby keeping rates increases lower.

Councillor Ward noted that it was unfortunate that the flooding happened, but the Council had no choice but to complete the Emergency and Immediate Works.

Councillor Atkinson hoped that the incoming Council would question the amount of funding spent on flooding prevention in various areas, especially in the Kaiapoi urban area, which was a receiving area that was three times more likely to flood than other urban areas. He suggested that the Council should ensure that the receiving areas paid a fair proportion of the drainage expenditure. Mayor Gordon agreed with the comments made by previous speakers.

7.5 **46 Main North Road (Kaiapoi) – Reserve Classification – C Brown**
(General Manager Community and Recreation)

J Millward took the report as read, and there were no questions from Councillors.

Moved: Councillor Stewart

Seconded: Councillor Mealings

THAT the Council:

- (a) **Receives** Report No. 220808135614.
- (b) **Approves** the proposal for the classification of 46 Main North Road as a Local Purpose Amenity Linkage Reserve under the Reserves Act 1977.
- (c) **Notes** the cost of classifying the land under the Reserve Act 1977 as approximately \$8,000, which would be covered by existing Arohatia te Awa budget provision.
- (d) **Circulates** the report to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board for information.

CARRIED

Councillor Stewart noted that the Arohatia te Awa Working Group had identified 46 Main North Road as a valuable parcel of land towards the group's aim of creating a network of river and stream-side pathways connecting communities across the district and as a key entrance to Kaiapoi.

Councillor Mealings concurred with the comments made by Councillor Stewart, noting that developing the property as a reserve would enhance the entrance to Kaiapoi.

7.6 **132 Percival Street Temporary Carpark – S Hart (General Manager Strategy, Engagement and Economic Development)**

S Hart advised that Council approval was sought to establish a temporary carpark at 132 Percival Street (the old Freemasons Site) to extend the existing public carpark at 136 Percival Street. The Council recently purchased 132 Percival Street as a strategic acquisition to ensure future short to medium-term parking and longer-term opportunities to influence the broader development and intensification of the South of High area. S Hart commented that the proposed short-term car parking improvements would be similar to those at the Durham Street Carpark in that it would be a low-cost option. Staff would report to the Council about the long-term options for the property and the surrounding area at a later stage.

S Hart noted that the temporary carpark at 132 Percival Street would provide an immediate short-term increase in car parking leading into the busy Christmas and summer period. It was anticipated that approximately 30 carparks could be accommodated on the site, and P120 parking would be extended across the new parking areas.

Councillor Williams enquired if it was advisable to spend money on a short-term temporary carpark, considering that the property would soon be redeveloped and could be used as is. S Hart explained that staff were concerned that the surface on the property would not be able to cope with the additional traffic and expected increase in rainfall. Also, delineated parking spaces would allow more vehicles to be parked on-site. He anticipated that the temporary carpark could be used for 18 months to two years.

Councillor Ward questioned if the funding would not be better spent by providing a pathway to the carparks on Percival Street and Victoria Park. S Hart advised that staff were developing designs to ensure pedestrian safety in this area, which included pathways from the Bunnings site to Percival and Alfred Streets. However, the designs were contingent on various issues, including the properties' realignment and the Bunnings site's future use. The possible development of pathways in this area would therefore be brought to the Council for consideration.

In response to a question by Councillor Doody, S Hart confirmed that the surface of the temporary carpark would be pedestrian friendly.

Moved: Councillor Doody

Seconded: Councillor Atkinson

THAT the Council:

- (a) **Receives** Report No. 220922164255.
- (b) **Approves** the establishment of a temporary unsealed public carpark at 132 Percival Street noting that a further report providing options for more permanent treatment of this site would come back to the Council for their consideration early in 2023.

- (c) **Notes** that a future report early in 2023 would also consider any update on the Bunnings Site and what influence that might have.
- (d) **Notes** that between 20-30 parks would be temporarily secured within the new site with a P120 restriction applied consistent with the public carpark at 136 Percival Street.
- (e) **Notes** that the new P120 restrictions for the temporary car parks at 136 Percival Street would be retrospectively added to the Parking Bylaw Schedule, and that enforcement of the restrictions could not occur until those changes had been adopted.
- (f) **Approves** funding to be brought forward and reallocated from currently unassigned parking budget in the 2023/24 financial year for the temporary parking improvements, estimated at \$27,200 including contingency.

CARRIED

Against: Councillors Ward and Williams

Councillor Doody supported using the property as a temporary unsealed public carpark until the Council was ready to redevelop the site. She was happy that gravel would be used to make the temporary carpark more accessible for pedestrians.

Councillor Atkinson also supported the motion, and he believed that it was sensible to spend money to ensure that the temporary carpark was accessible safely.

Councillor Mealings concurred with the previous speakers and commented on the importance of delineated parking spaces to allow the maximum number of vehicles to be parked on the site. She noted that considering the value of parking in Rangiora, spending \$27,200 for approximately 30 carparks for a period of two years was good value for money..

Councillor Williams commented that the current surface of 132 Percival Street was better than many of the carparks in Christchurch. Therefore, he did not feel it was necessary to spend \$27,200 on a temporary public carpark. Councillor Ward agreed with Councillor Williams and consequently did not support the motion.

Mayor Gordon supported the motion, noting that the \$27,200 was an estimated budget that allowed additional metalcourse to be added and levelling to occur if required. If not needed, the cost of the work could be reduced. He urged staff to keep costs as low as possible in light of the short-term use of the property. However, Mayor Gordon noted that additional car parking during the Christmas and summer periods would be welcomed. Councillor Barnett agreed that additional car parking was needed in this area however the cost of providing the carpark should be limited.

7.7 Discussion Draft – Council Housing Policy Statement 2022 – S Markham (Manager Strategic Projects)

S Markham advised that the report requested that the Council forward, to the incoming Council, its consideration of a 'discussion draft' Housing Policy Statement 2022 developed by the Housing Working Group (HWG). He noted that the 'discussion draft' was subject to active engagement with Ngāi Tūāhuriri hapū. The HWG had been progressing the 'discussion draft' for consideration in response to the Council's decision to put in place a 'statement of intent' to guide both the Council and other parties on the scope of how the Council intended to give effect to its stated housing outcomes.

Councillor Atkinson commended the comprehensive report that reflected what the HWG had been working through. He hoped that the guidelines contained in the report would enable the Council to move forward with this matter.

Councillor Barnett noted that the 'discussion draft' suggested that the Council provide more social housing, which would have funding implications. She questioned how the funding of additional social housing had been discussed with communities. S Markham advised that the Council currently had \$2.5 million in reserve, which were proceeds from the sale of community housing. As discussed in public previously, the Council was expected to reinvest the funding back into social housing. S Markham commented that currently the main discussion was focused on the provision of pensioner housing due to the known needs of an ageing population.

In response to a further question from Councillor Barnett, J Millward confirmed that the properties had only been divested in the last two years, so the \$2.5 million had been in reserve for approximately two years.

Councillor Barnett observed that the Council had been approached by various social housing providers and asked why the HWG had yet to make the funds kept in reserve available to these providers. S Markham explained that the social housing providers, which had approached the Council for partnership opportunities, were seeking suitable land for development rather than funding.

Councillor Williams sought clarity on the difference between social housing and pensioner housing. S Markham noted that there was a spectrum of public housing, which included transitional, emergency social and pensioner housing. Social housing ensured that less fortunate people were housed continuously on an adequate basis. Social housing in New Zealand was predominantly provided by Kāinga Ora, which had approximately 66,000 units. Pensioner housing focused mainly on the provision of sufficient housing for the elderly to which Councils collectively contributed 11,000 units.

Councillor Ward questioned if the possibility of purchasing larger derelict properties and developing social housing on them had been considered. S Markham commented that the densification of existing rural areas was controversial. However, social housing developers would have to decide if it would be financially viable to develop housing on higher-costing land.

Moved: Councillor Atkinson

Seconded: Councillor Doody

THAT the Council:

- (a) **Receives** Report No. 220920162485.
- (b) **Adopts** the recommendation of the Housing Working Group to provide to the incoming Council, following the October elections, for its consideration, a 'discussion draft' Housing Policy Statement 2022 (220920162483).
- (c) **Notes** that engagement with Ngāi Tūāhuriri hapū on the draft Housing Policy Statement was not yet advanced and that engagement was interrelated with development of a Kāinga Nohoanga Strategy under the auspice of the Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee (GCP).

CARRIED

Against: Councillor Barnett

Councillor Atkinson noted that the provision of social housing was a very complex issue, due to the unreliable information available about communities' housing needs. The HWG had liaised with various role-players in the social housing delivery chain to ascertain communities' housing needs. He believed that the incoming Council would focus mainly on elderly housing, due to the ageing population's needs in the Waimakariri District. Also, the Council would probably support the development of social housing in the district in various ways. Councillor Atkinson commented that housing was a human right and people were entitled to live where they wished. He, therefore, believed that the 'discussion draft' was an important step to ensure that the Council achieved the right results in social housing for the ratepayers and public money.

Councillor Doody agreed that the development of a 'discussion draft' had been challenging. She raised a concern regarding the lack of elderly housing in the Waimakariri District and urged the incoming Council to consider the development of social housing in the district carefully.

Councillor Williams supported the motion, as the Council had land available to develop social housing. However, there was not much vacant land available near town centres and amenities, and he, therefore, believed that the Council should use this land to develop its housing needs, such as pensioner housing. Any surplus vacant land could be made available to external social housing developers.

Mayor Gordon commended the Chairperson of the HWG, Councillor Atkinson, for the work done in considering a broad, balanced approach and identifying possible private/public partnerships. He had been advised that the Rātā Foundation would be considering funding applications for the provision of social housing. Mayor Gordon agreed that the provision of elderly housing was essential, however, it was also important to consider other social housing opportunities that could benefit Waimakariri communities. He noted that there was a genuine housing need in the district, which the Council could play a role in alleviating.

Councillor Redmond expressed support for the motion and thanked the HWG and staff for the work done on this matter. Councillor Mealings concurred and especially commended S Markham for this knowledge and experience during the process of drafting the 'discussion draft'. She believed that the HWG had thoroughly considered all the information while preparing the 'discussion draft', which should enable the incoming Council to make informed decisions.

Councillor Blackie supported the motion and urged the Council to partner with social housing developers ready to develop housing in the Waimakariri district.

Councillor Barnett noted that it was premature to adopt the recommendation of the HWG. She did not dispute the importance of the work done by the HWG, as there was a real housing need within the district. However, there needed to be a clear indication of the funding of the proposed social housing. Councillor Barnett believed that housing provision was the central government's responsibility. She was not convinced that ratepayers, who were struggling to pay rates, wanted the Council to spend money on social housing. She also observed that the Waimakariri did not have access to the wraparound services needed for social housing, such as good public transport, policing and extensive health care.

In his right of reply, Councillor Atkinson clarified that the HWG did not recommend that the Council develop social housing itself, it was recommending that the development of social housing be encouraged via various means and partnerships.

7.8 **Submissions: Water Services Entity Bill, Proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity, and ME 1669 Discussion Document: Managing Wetlands in the CMA – S Hart (General Manager Strategy, Engagement and Economic Development), L Murchison (Lead Advisor – Sustainable Development)**

S Hart explained that the current environment for submissions to Central Government on policy issues was challenging. The Central Government was undertaking major reform across a variety of sectors, with approximately 21 policy documents open for submission until mid-December 2022, many of which only allow six weeks for comments. It was therefore challenging for staff to study the proposed policies, draft a proposed submission, and consult with the Council and the public before submitting it to Central Government. Staff were therefore developing a process for evaluating the consultation documents received from Central Government and prioritising the Council's need to respond.

L Murchison noted that the submissions on the Water Services Entity Bill and the proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity (NPSIB) were directed by Council and signed by the Mayor and Councillors. However, the timeframes for responding did not allow those completed submissions to be formally received by Council before lodgement. She also highlighted the error which occurred during the drafting of ME 1669 Managing Wetlands in the Coastal Marine Area.

There were no questions by Councillors.

Moved: Mayor Gordon

Seconded: Councillor Blackie

THAT the Council:

- (a) **Receives** the report No 220923165233.
- (b) **Receives** the attached submissions (Trim No 220722125323, 220721124432 and 220921163332) on Water Services Bill #1, the Proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity, and the Discussion Document ME 1669 Managing Wetlands in the Coastal Area.
- (c) **Circulates** the report and submissions to the Community Boards for their information.

CARRIED

7.9 **Recommendations to Incoming Council – J Millward (Acting Chief Executive)**

J Millward noted that it was standard practice for the outgoing Council to make recommendations to the incoming Council regarding matters such as its form in the new term. However, it would be up to the incoming Council to make the decisions.

In response to a question from Councillor Stewart, J Millward confirmed that the Canterbury Water Management Strategy Waimakariri Water Zone Committee was not discharged, and she, therefore, needed to attend the meetings until the inauguration of the incoming Council.

Councillor Williams questioned the need for retaining the Land and Water Committee. Mayor Gordon noted that it was a matter for the incoming Council to consider.

Moved: Councillor Atkinson

Seconded: Councillor Blackie

THAT the Council:

- (a) **Receives** report No 220801130418.
- (b) **Authorises** the (Acting) Chief Executive, subject to the limitations set out in clause 32(1) of Schedule 7 of the Local Government Act 2002, to make decisions on behalf of the Council and Community Boards during the period between the declaration of election results and elected members being sworn into office, in respect of urgent matters and, where the Mayor-elect is known, in consultation with the Mayor-elect; and
- (c) **Resolves**, under clause 30(7) of Schedule 7 of the Local Government Act 2002 that the following Joint Committees were not discharged on the coming into office of the members of the Council elected or appointed at, or following, the October 2022 triennial local body elections, and they continue to exercise the delegations made to them:
 - (i) Canterbury Waste Joint Committee
 - (ii) Canterbury Regional Landfill Joint Committee
 - (iii) Canterbury Civil Defence and Emergency Management Joint Committee
 - (iv) Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee
 - (v) Greater Christchurch Public Transport Joint Committee
 - (vi) Canterbury Water Management Strategy Waimakariri Water Zone Committee
 - (vii) District Licensing Committee

THAT the Council recommends to the incoming Council that it:

- (d) **Retains** the following Councillor Portfolios as per the 2019-2022 term:
 - **Council:**
 - (i) Iwi Relationships
 - (ii) Greater Christchurch Partnership
 - (iii) Canterbury Water Management Strategy
 - (iv) International Relationships
 - (v) Regeneration (Kaiapoi)
 - (vi) Climate Change and Sustainability.
 - **Audit and Risk Committee:**
 - (i) Audit, Risk, Annual and Long Term Plans and the Excellence Programme
 - (ii) Customer Services
 - (iii) Communications.
 - **Community and Recreation Committee:**
 - (i) Greenspace (Parks, Reserves and Sports Grounds)
 - (ii) Community Facilities (including Aquatic Centres, Multi-use Sports Stadium, Libraries/Service Centres, Town Halls, Museums and Community Housing)
 - (iii) Community Development and Wellbeing
 - (iv) Waimakariri Arts and Culture.
 - **District Planning and Regulations Committee**
 - (i) District Planning Development
 - (ii) Regulation and Civil Defence
 - (iii) Business, Promotion and Town Centres.

- **Utilities and Roothing Committee**
 - (i) Drainage and Stockwater
 - (ii) Roothing
 - (iii) Transport
 - (iv) Utilities (Water Supplies and Sewer)
 - (v) Solid Waste.
 - **Land and Water Committee**
 - (i) Biodiversity
 - (ii) Natural, Coastal and Marine Areas.
- (e) **Notes** that further discussion and decision would occur with the incoming Council as to the final portfolio titles and arrangements to be considered in November 2022, following Mayoral discussions on Councillors interests and strengths/skills.
- (f) **Establishes** the following Committees:
- (i) Audit and Risk (Standing Committee)
 - (ii) Community and Recreation (Standing Committee)
 - (iii) District Planning and Regulation (Standing Committee)
 - (iv) Utilities and Roothing (Standing Committee)
 - (v) Mahi Tahi Joint Development Committee
 - (vi) Land and Water Committee
 - (vii) Hearings Committee
 - (viii) Chief Executive Review Committee
 - (ix) District Licensing Committee
 - (x) Code of Conduct Committee
- (g) **Notes** the incoming Council would determine the membership of each committee and its member rotation.
- (h) **Retains** the rotation of Chairperson for the Audit and Risk, Community and Recreation, District Planning and Regulation and the Utilities and Roothing Committees.
- (i) **Develops** a customised development plan for the Mayor and Councillors for the coming term.

CARRIED

8. MATTERS REFERRED FROM COMMITTEES AND COMMUNITY BOARDS

8.1 Changes to Canterbury Waste Joint Committee Constituting Agreement in Relation to Environment Canterbury Re-joining Canterbury Waste Joint Committee – K Waghorn (Solid Waste Asset Manager)

(Refer to report no. 220907154870 on the Solid and Hazardous Waste Working Party meeting Agenda of 22 September 2022)

K Waghorn advised that all member Councils' of the Canterbury Waste Joint Committee (CWJC) agreed to invite Environment Canterbury (ECan) to rejoin the CWJC on the same terms and conditions as its previous membership. Hence, the report sought approval for the Council to amend the CWJC Constituting Agreement accordingly.

Moved: Councillor Brine

Seconded: Councillor Blackie

THAT the Council:

- (a) **Receives** Report No. 220907154870.
- (b) **Supports** the proposed updates to the Canterbury Waste Joint Committee Constituting Agreement, as recommended by the Canterbury Waste Joint Committee at their meeting on 5 September 2022.
- (c) **Notes** that the Canterbury Waste Joint Committee had the delegated authority to deal with all matters relating to the volumes of solid waste sent for disposal through regional waste minimisation initiatives identified by the Committee.

CARRIED

8.2 **Flood Mapping Freeboard and Floor Level Technical Practice Note – G Cleary (General Manager Utilities and Roading) and K LaValley (Project Delivery Manager)**

(Refer report no. 220907154870 on the Utilities and Roading Committee meeting Agenda of 27 September 2022)

Moved: Mayor Gordon

Seconded: Councillor Atkinson

THAT the Council:

- (a) **Agrees** that the report on Flood Mapping Freeboard and Floor Level Technical Practice Note be withdrawn until such time as the Council was briefed on this matter.

CARRIED

8.3 **Proposed closure of Stockwater Race R4-2 – D Lewis (Land Drainage Engineer)**

(Refer report no. 220912157430 on the Utilities and Roading Committee meeting Agenda of 27 September 2022)

D Lewis spoke to the report which requested the closure of stock water race R4-2 at Carleton Road, Oxford. The application was made by JG and DA Crawford Limited, as the race was no longer required for stock water due to the development of on-farm improvements such as reticulated stockwater and irrigation. Feedback was requested from various interested parties, such as the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board, Canterbury Water Management.

Strategy Waimakariri Water Zone Committee, the Water Race Advisory Group Fire and Emergency New Zealand and the Rūnanga. The feedback received indicated that the closure of stock water race R4-2 would not negatively impact the remainder of the stock water race system.

Councillor Atkinson questioned how much of the stock water race system had been closed. D Lewis noted that, to his knowledge, approximately ten kilometres had been closed over the last few years.

Moved: Councillor Brine

Seconded: Councillor Stewart

THAT the Council:

- (a) **Receives** Report No. 220912157430.
- (b) **Approves** the closure of Stockwater Race R4-2.
- (c) **Notes** there would be no financial or performance impact from this closure on the stockwater network.
- (d) **Notes** the length of stock-water races was reported to the Utilities and Rooding Committee; and Waimakariri Water Zone Committee each year.

CARRIED

Councillor Stewart noted that the CWMS Waimakariri Zone Committee was concerned about the wider environmental impact of closing stock water races across the district. She stated that Plan Change 7 to the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan did not recognise the Council's submission that the water race network was solely for stock water and had no environmental benefits district-wide. Taking this into account, she believed that the rating of water races and the environmental advantages should be reviewed and re-evaluated by the incoming Council so that the stock race users were not the only ones paying rates for the district-wide benefits of reducing nitrates.

Councillors Blackie and Doody supported the motion, and Councillor Doody urged the Council to protect and maintain the stock water race system, which was part of the Waimakariri Council's history.

9. HEALTH, SAFETY AND WELLBEING

9.1 Health, Safety and Wellbeing Report September 2022 – J Millward (Acting Chief Executive)

J Millward introduced the new General Manager Organisational Development and Human Resources, S Salthouse, whereafter he highlighted that there were 12 incidents which occurred from mid-August to 19 September 2022, which resulted in no lost time to the organisation.

Councillor Williams noted that a Councillor previously asked for verification of the rumour of a person falling and fracturing their leg at the Butchers Road Culvert. K Blake advised that a member of the public unlawfully entered a restricted area and accidentally broke his leg. It was confirmed that the Council's contractor had all the required safety requirements in place when the accident occurred.

In response to a further question from Councillor Williams, K Blake confirmed that, if reported, similar incidents would be reported to the Council.

Moved: Councillor Ward

Seconded: Councillor Doody

THAT the Council:

- (a) **Receives** Report No 220920163133.
- (b) **Notes** that there were no notifiable incidents this month. The organisation was, so far as it was reasonably practicable, compliant with the duties of a person conducting a business or undertaking (PCBU) as required by the Health and Safety at work Act 2015.

- (c) **Notes** the appointment of the new Health, Safety and Wellbeing Manager and current recruitment of new team members.
- (d) **Circulates** this information to Community Boards for their information.

CARRIED

10. COMMITTEE MINUTES FOR INFORMATION

- 10.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Community and Recreation Committee meeting of 16 August 2022.
- 10.2 Minutes of a meeting of the Utilities and Roading Committee meeting of 23 August 2022.
- 10.3 Minutes of a meeting of the District Planning and Regulation Committee meeting of 23 August 2022.

Moved: Mayor Gordon

Seconded: Councillor Atkinson

THAT the Council:

- (a) **Receives** Items 10.1 to 10.3 for information.

CARRIED

11. COMMUNITY BOARD MINUTES FOR INFORMATION

- 11.1 Minutes of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting of 7 September 2022
- 11.2 Minutes of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting of 12 September 2022
- 11.3 Minutes of the Rangiora Ashley Community Board meeting of 14 September 2022

Moved: Councillor Blackie

Seconded: Councillor Barnett

THAT the Council:

- (a) **Receives** Items 11.1 to 11.3 for information.

CARRIED

12. MAYOR'S DIARY

- 12.1 **Mayor's Diary Wednesday 31 August to Tuesday 27 September 2022**

Moved: Mayor Gordon

Seconded: Councillor Mealings

THAT the Council:

- (a) **Receives** report no. 220831150050.

CARRIED

13. COUNCIL PORTFOLIO UPDATES

- 13.1 **Iwi Relationships – Mayor Dan Gordon**
Mayor Gordon advised that there was no current update.

13.2 Greater Christchurch Partnership Update – Mayor Dan Gordon

Mayor Gordon noted that the previous Greater Christchurch Partnership meeting mainly focused on the work to date and the recommendations to the incoming partnership.

13.3 Canterbury Water Management Strategy – Councillor Sandra Stewart

Councillor Stewart reported that last week, a rare white heron (kōtuku) was found dead from inflicted trauma at the Rakahuri estuary. The kōtuku was a sacred and revered bird which was critically endangered. The Department of Conservation would investigate the matter.

Councillor Stewart commented that concerns had been raised about the need for signage indicating the names of springs, streams and rivers in the Waimakariri District.

13.4 International Relationships – Deputy Mayor Neville Atkinson

Councillor Atkinson noted that there was no current update.

13.5 Regeneration (Kaiapoi) – Councillor Al Blackie

Councillor Blackie observed that the opening of the New Zealand Motor Caravan Association (NZMCA) camping ground in Kaiapoi had been delayed by the flooding in July 2022. However, the campground was expected to open before the end of the year.

13.6 Climate Change and Sustainability – Councillor Niki Mealings

Councillor Mealings highlighted the following:

- The Canterbury Climate Action Plan proposed by the Canterbury Climate Change Working Group (CCCWG) was endorsed by the Canterbury Climate change Steering Group (CCCSG) at their meeting on 16 September 2022, and submitted to the Canterbury Policy Forum on 30 September 2022.
- ECan was currently requesting feedback on the resourcing requirements to assist smaller Canterbury Councils in preparing their Environmental Action Plans. It was envisaged that this would assist Asset Managers with incorporating climate change evidence into Councils' long-term planning processes.
- Council finance staff would be attending a three day climate-related Financial Disclosures Course in November 2022 hosted by the Institute of Financial Professionals.
- The Council would be running a Future Coasts Research Programme with two MSc students from the University of Canterbury in January and February 2023. The case study would involve developing and testing a set of hydrological tools for the Waimakariri coastline to provide information for groundwater hazard adaptation decision-making including seawater intrusion.
- The 3 Waters risk assessment continued to progress as planned.

13.7 Business, Promotion and Town Centres – Councillor Joan Ward

Councillor Ward commented on the following:

- Electrical vehicle (EV) charges would be installed at Woodend and Oxford from 17 to 2 October 2022.
- Oxford Area School would be celebrating 150 years in October 2022.
- Kaiapoi Promotions Association would be reporting to Audit and Risk Committee in November 2022.

- The old BNZ building in Kaiapoi had been restored and the Kaiapoi Paper Plus would be moving in on 12 October 2022. Upstairs would be developed with two highly fitted-out Air BnB units.
- The groundworks had started on the construction of the new Countdown at the Waimak Junction and a new café/restaurant had also been constructed.
- A new pop-up store was coming to Rangiora – Magpie Living.
- Most of the sections at Southbrook have been sold, to mainly existing Rangiora businesses.
- Sutton Tools rebuild at Todds Road, Rangiora, was exciting.
- Enterprise North Canterbury (ENC)
 - ENC had been active in promoting various events such as Eat Locally. ENC’s social media also features 30 local cafes, restaurants, and bakeries.
 - ENC also puts out a business opinion survey every six months, to which around 100 businesses respond. This gave ENC and the Council a good understanding of local business confidence, labour market issues and other issues affecting business. This happened every April and October, so it was due to go out this month. However, the last opinion survey showed that Waimakariri was doing satisfactorily by showing positive signs of recovery +4% vs -33% nationally. However, currently there seemed to be a real mix of feeling. Some businesses were doing quite well (particularly manufacturing and construction), but some were struggling. Most businesses agreed that 2023 would be challenging due to supply issues, interest rates and general ability to do business. Business owners believed that the Waimakariri District had been insulated from the worst of the economic effects of Covid compared to the rest of the country.
 - ENC received \$300,000 from the Significant Community Fund (DIA) to upgrade recreation cycleways in Waimakariri. They would be work with ECan and the Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust to support their efforts.
 - Finally, ENC was working on a new website and resources (video, photos, case studies) for local businesses to attract staff to their jobs/organisations.

14. QUESTIONS

(under Standing Orders)

Nil.

15. URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS

(under Standing Orders)

Nil.

16. MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987.

Moved: Councillor Blackie

Seconded: Councillor Doody

THAT the Council:

- (a) **Resolves** that the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting.

CARRIED

The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public was 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:

Item No	Minutes/Report of	General subject of each matter to be considered	Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
16.1	Minutes of public excluded portion of Council meeting of 6 September 2022.	Confirmation of Minutes	Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7	Section 48(1)(a)
16.2	Receipt of Minutes of the public excluded portion of the Utilities and Roading Committee meeting of 23 August 2022	Confirmation of minutes	Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7	Section 48(1)(a)
REPORTS				
16.3	Report of D Young (Senior Engineering Advisor) and K LaValley (Project Delivery Manger)	Private Development Agreement	Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7	Section 48(1)(a)

This resolution was 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:

Item N ^o	Reason for protection of interests	LGOIMA Part 1, Section 7
16.1 to 16.3	Protection of privacy of natural persons; To carry out commercial activities without prejudice; Maintain legal professional privilege; Enable Council to continue with (commercial) negotiation without prejudice or disadvantage Prevent the disclose of information for improper gain or advantage	Section 7 2(a) Section 7 2(b)ii Section 7 (g) Section 7 2(i) Section 7 (j)

CLOSED MEETING

The public excluded portion of the meeting occurred from 5.09 pm to 5.37pm.

OPEN MEETING

17. NEXT MEETING

This is the final meeting of the Council for the 2019-2022 electoral term.

The new Council would be sworn into office late October 2022, with ordinary Council meetings resuming from November 2022. Further information would be advertised and listed on the Council's website.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING CLOSED AT 5.45PM.

CONFIRMED

Chairperson
Mayor Dan Gordon

Acting Chief Executive Officer
Jeff Millward

Date