Council Agenda

Tuesday 1 August 2017

Commencing at 1.00pm

Waimakariri District Council Chambers
215 High Street
Rangiora

Members:

Mayor David Ayers
Deputy Mayor Kevin Felstead
Councillor Peter Allen
Councillor Neville Atkinson
Councillor Al Blackie
Councillor Robbie Brine
Councillor Wendy Doody
Councillor Dan Gordon
Councillor John Meyer
Councillor Sandra Stewart
Councillor Paul Williams
1. APOLOGIES

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

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

3. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

3.1. Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Tuesday 4 July 2017

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Confirms as a true and correct record the circulated minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Tuesday 4 July 2017.

3.2. Minutes of the public excluded portion of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Tuesday 4 July 2017

(see blue Public Excluded Agenda papers)

4. DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

5. ADJOURNED BUSINESS

Nil.

6. REGENERATION REPORTS

Nil.
7. REPORTS


**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 170721076345.

(b) **Approves** including in the draft 2018/28 Long Term Plan a proposal to carry out a comprehensive public engagement process regarding an alternative 3 Waters rating structure, that is based on:

i. A common sewer rate for all connected properties in the district

ii. A common water supply rate for all properties connected to an urban supply, and a separate common rate for those connected to a restricted water supply, and

iii. A common drainage rate for all properties within existing urban drainage rating areas, and a separate common rate for those in rural drainage rating areas

(c) **Notes** that this engagement process is proposed to commence in the first half of 2019, and that Council staff will seek approval from Council before commencing consultation.

(d) **Requires** that staff bring back a recommendation to Council in January 2018 for the inclusion of an additional $6 per property to the flood rate in the draft 2018/2028 LTP.

(e) **Thanks** the Working Party for the time and effort they have put into considering this issue.

7.2. **Adoption of the draft Waimakariri Accessibility Strategy for consultation – Lynley Beckingsale (Policy Analyst) and Tessa Sturley (Community Team Leader)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 170718074667.

(b) **Approves** “Towards and Inclusive Environment” the draft Waimakariri Accessibility Strategy 2017 – 2023 for consultation including targeted consultation with a number of key groups and organisations as outlined in paragraph 4.3.

(c) **Notes** that some images used in the attached draft strategy will be updated for publication.

(d) **Notes** that representatives from disability groups, key disability service providers, Council staff and elected members form a Disability Reference Group which has assisted with the development of the draft strategy and will lead the targeted consultation.
(e) **Notes** that the final “Towards and Inclusive Environment” the Waimakariri Accessibility Strategy will be reported to Council and recommended for adoption at its meeting in November 2017.

(f) **Notes** that an associated Action Plan is being developed in parallel which will be discussed with the reference group for their endorsement as a continuing part of the policy development process.

7.3. **Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 Implementation Plan Consultation – Veronica Spittal (Senior Policy Analyst) for the Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 Implementation Plan Working Party**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 170713072738.

(b) **Approves** initiating the consultation process on the draft Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 Implementation Plan from 7 August to 22 August 2017.

(c) **Approves** the attached draft Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 Implementation Plan for release for public consultation.

(d) **Mandates** the Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 Implementation Plan Working Party to consider public submissions received on the implementation plan and recommend any necessary changes to Council.

(e) **Agrees** that it is not necessary to instigate a special consultative procedure for the Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 Implementation Plan consultation process.

7.4. **Rangiora Speed Limit Changes – Ken Stevenson (Roading Manager) Harriette Davies (Roading Projects Engineer) and Chris Sexton (Intern Engineer)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 170719074969.

(b) **Approves** the speed limit change on Kippenberger Avenue, Northbrook Road, Lehmans Road and River Road, as outlined in the table below, and shown on the attached plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Proposed Limit</th>
<th>Existing Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kippenberger Avenue</td>
<td>From Watkins Place to east of Devlin Place</td>
<td>50km/h</td>
<td>70km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbrook Road</td>
<td>From Papawai Drive to east of Goodwin Street</td>
<td>50km/h</td>
<td>100km/h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kippenberger Avenue / Rangiora Woodend Road  | From the proposed 50km/h change point to 500m east of Golf Links Road | 80km/h | 70-100km/h  
Lehmans Road  | From Oxford Road to River Road | 80km/h | 100km/h  
River Road  | From Lehmans Road to West Belt | 80km/h | 100km/h

(c) **Notes** that the Register of Speed Limits will be updated to include these changed speed limits.

(d) **Notes** that the Speed Limits Bylaw 2009 allows speed limits to be changed by Council resolution following consultation as required by the Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits.

(e) **Notes** that the submissions on this proposal have been distributed to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board for their information.

(f) **Circulates** this report to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board.

7.5. **Changes to Mandeville Speed Limits**– Ken Stevenson (Roading Manager)  
Bill Rice (Senior Transport Engineer), and Harriette Davies (Roading Projects Engineer)

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No 170713072773

(b) **Approves** the speed limit change on roads within the Mandeville area, as outlined below, and as shown on the attached plan (TRIM 170519050890).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Section</th>
<th>Proposed Limit</th>
<th>Existing Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wards Road</td>
<td>From Bradleys Road to the boundary of the Millfield Subdivision</td>
<td>80km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawsons Road</td>
<td>From Wards Road for 800m</td>
<td>80km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradleys Road</td>
<td>From Tram Road to 400m north of Modena Place</td>
<td>80km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Cul-de-sacs and Access Roads with the Mandeville Community</td>
<td>Full length</td>
<td>50km/h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) **Notes** that the Register of Speed Limits will be updated to include these changed speed limits.

(d) **Notes** that the Speed Limits Bylaw 2009 allows speed limits to be changed by Council resolution following consultation as required by the Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits.

(e) **Notes** that the submissions on this proposal have been distributed to the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board for their information.

(f) **Circulates** this report to the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board.
7.6. **Adopt Private Plan Change P028, P G Harris, McHughs Road, Mandeville North – Victoria Caseley (District Plan Manager)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 17071001503

(b) **Adopts** Private Plan Change P028, to retain the existing Rural Zoning of the area comprising the former gravel pit known as 148 McHughs Road, and to rezone 116 and 136 McHughs Road from Rural to Residential 4A.

(c) **Determines** that the operative date for adoption shall be 14 August 2017.

7.7. **Delegated Authority to Accept a Tender for Contract 17/18 Rangiora to Kaiapoi Cycleway – Dan Lewis (Project Manager) and Ken Stevenson (Roading Manager)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report no. 17071975041

(b) **Delegates** authority to the Chief Executive to accept a tender to construct the Rangiora to Kaiapoi Cycleway provided the tender price is within the approved budget.

7.8. **Waimakariri District Council Submission to Stage 2 of the Government Inquiry into Havelock North Drinking Water – Colin Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 17071907474.

(b) **Endorses** (retrospectively) the Council submission to Stage 2 of the Government Inquiry into Havelock North Drinking Water, including the response to Water New Zealand’s Fact Sheet for Stage Two of the Government Inquiry into Havelock North Drinking Water – Overarching Position.

(c) **Endorses** (retrospectively) the proposed Canterbury Drinking Water Reference Group submission to Stage 2 of the Government Inquiry into Havelock North Drinking Water.

(d) **Notes** that with the submission deadline of 21 July 2017 it was not possible for the submission to go through Council prior to being submitted, however staff considered it appropriate for Council to retrospectively endorse the submissions.
RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 170724077259.

(b) Approves the first Greater Christchurch Urban Development Indicators quarterly monitoring report and the monitoring indicators used in the report.

(c) Agrees that the collaborative framework established for the first Urban Development Indicators quarterly monitoring report shall form the basis for future reports, with staff and the Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee approved to make adjustments to the report as appropriate unless Council directs or decides otherwise.

(d) Delegates to the Manager, Strategy and Engagement the decision to publish future Quarterly Monitoring Reports following endorsement by the Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee.

(e) Agrees that the quarterly monitoring reports will be published on the Greater Christchurch and Waimakariri District Council websites.

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 170724077350.

(b) Appoints Councillor ................. as an Acting Mayor of Waimakariri from 20 September to 16 October 2017 inclusive to undertake essential Mayoral duties, in conjunction with advice from the Chief Executive.

(c) Notes the temporary appointment of Mayor of Waimakariri is to cover essential duties such as declaring any state of emergency (should it be required), representing the interests of the Council and chairing the Council meeting on 3 October 2017.
8. MATTER REFERRED FROM THE AUDIT AND RISK COMMITTEE MEETING OF 18 JULY 2017

8.1. Enterprise North Canterbury 2017/18 Statement of Intent and Business Plan and District Promotions Plan – Simon Markham (Manager Strategy and Engagement)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) **Adopts** Enterprise North Canterbury's (ENC) proposed Statement of Intent (SOI) for the 2017/18 year

(b) **Receives** Enterprise North Canterbury’s 2017/18 Business Plan

(c) **Adopts** Enterprise North Canterbury’s proposed District Promotions Business Plan for 2017/18

9. MATTER REFERRED FROM REGENERATION STEERING GROUP MEETING OF 3 JULY 2017

9.1. District Regeneration Budgets – Duncan Roxborough (Implementation Project Manager – District Regeneration)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No.170615061135.

(b) **Notes** that the existing budget provision is not sufficient to implement all of the land uses and activities within the Recovery Plan

(c) **Notes** the proposed initial division of scope and budgets between the allied work programmes identified within section 5 this report

(d) **Notes** that a further report will be provided as part of the LTP process with further refinement of individual project estimates and a more definitive total programme cost, seeking Steering Group recommendation to Council for approval of further budget provision to allow for full Recovery Plan implementation.

9.2. Approval to install parking restrictions in Denchs Road at New Life School and in Seddon Street at Ashgrove School – Ken Stevenson (Roading Manager) and Kathy Graham (Journey Planner)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 170628066782
(b) **Adopts** the attached Amended Second Schedule – Parking Restrictions to the Parking Bylaw 2007 (Doc 170629067290)

(c) **Notes** that the amendments to the Parking Bylaw 2007 include changes in Denchs Road as shown on Doc 170628066940 and in Seddon Street as shown on Doc 170628066936.

10. **HEALTH AND SAFETY**

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

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 170721076343.

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

11.1. **Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee held on 19 June 2017**

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the information in Item 11.1 be received.

12. **COMMUNITY BOARD MINUTES FOR INFORMATION**

12.1. **Minutes of a meeting of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board held on 6 July 2017**

12.2. **Minutes of a meeting of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board held on 17 July 2017**

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the information in Items 12.1 to 12.2 be received.

13. **CORRESPONDENCE**

14. **MAYOR’S DIARY**

14.1. **Mayor’s Diary 27 June – 25 July 2017**

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report no.170725077614.
15. COUNCIL PORTFOLIO UPDATES

15.1. Iwi Relationships
15.2. Canterbury Water Management Strategy
15.3. International Relationships

16. QUESTIONS
(under Standing Orders)

17. URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS
(under Standing Orders)

18. MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting.

The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter and the specific grounds under section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution, are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Minutes/Report of:</th>
<th>General subject of each matter to be considered</th>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>Minutes of the public excluded portion of Council meeting of 4 July 2017</td>
<td>Confirmation of minutes</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MATTER REFERRED FROM REGENERATION STEERING GROUP MEETING OF 31 JULY 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Minutes/Report of:</th>
<th>General subject of each matter to be considered</th>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>Report of Duncan Roxborough (Implementation Project Manager – District Regeneration)</td>
<td>Riverview Pontoon Feasibility Study and Preferred Option</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This resolution is made in reliance on section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, and the particular interest or interests protected by section 6 or section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public are as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Reason for protection of interests</th>
<th>Ref NZS 9202:2003 Appendix A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.1 – 18.2</td>
<td>Protection of privacy of natural persons To carry out commercial activities without prejudice</td>
<td>A2(a) A2(b)ii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CLOSED MEETING**

See Public Excluded Agenda (blue papers)

**OPEN MEETING**

19. **NEXT MEETING**

The next scheduled meeting of the Council is on Tuesday 5 September 2017 commencing at 1.00pm.

**Briefing (Public Excluded)**

At the conclusion of the Council’s meeting, a staff briefing will be held on:

**Waimakariri Water Zone Implementation Plan Addendum (ZIPA) Development - Update**

Jill Atkinson, Strategy Manager and Tim Davie, Chief Scientist at Environment Canterbury will attend to brief the Council on progress with investigations and the programme for development of the ZIPA.
MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA ON TUESDAY 4 JULY 2017 AT 1.00PM.

PRESENT:
Mayor D Ayers (Chair), Deputy Mayor K Felstead, Councillors N Atkinson (arrived during item 16.3 at 2.16pm), A Blackie, R Brine, W Doody, D Gordon, J Meyer, S Stewart and P Williams.

IN ATTENDANCE:
J Palmer (Chief Executive), J Millward (Manger, Finance & Business Support), G Cleary (Manager, Utilities & Roading), C Sargison (Manager, Community & Recreation), M Harris (Customer Service Manager), and S Nichols (Governance Manager).

Meeting adjourned at 2.18pm for refreshments and reconvened at 2.41pm.

1. APOLOGIES
Moved Mayor Ayers seconded: Councillor Felstead
An apology for lateness was received and sustained from Councillor Atkinson.
An apology for absence was received and sustained from Councillor Allen.

CARRIED

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
Mayor Ayers – Item 7.4, as an appointed panel member.

3. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
3.1. Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on 6 June 2017
Moved Councillor Brine seconded Councillor Williams

THAT the Council:
(a) Confirms as a true and correct record the circulated minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Tuesday 6 June 2017.

CARRIED

3.2. Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on 20 June 2017
Moved Councillor Blackie seconded Councillor Meyer

THAT the Council:
(a) Confirms as a true and correct record the circulated minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Tuesday 20 June 2017.

CARRIED

3.3. Minutes of the public excluded portion of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Tuesday 6 June 2017
Referred to the Public Excluded portion of the meeting.

3.4. Minutes of the public excluded portion of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Tuesday 20 June 2017
Referred to the Public Excluded portion of the meeting.
4. **DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS**

Nil.

5. **ADJOURNED BUSINESS**

Nil.

6. **REGENERATION REPORTS**

Nil.

7. **REPORTS**

7.1. **Barkers Road (Loburn) Sealing Statement of Proposal for Special Consultative Procedure for Targeted Rate – K Stevenson (Roading Manager)**

K Stevenson spoke to the report.

Councillor Felstead queried recommendation (e) and sought clarity on the legalities. K Stevenson clarified the resolution enabled fairness of targeted rates collected.

Moved Councillor Doody seconded Councillor Brine

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No 170522051735.

(b) **Approves** the Statement of Proposal for a Targeted Rate for Barkers Road (Loburn) property owners for their contribution for sealing Barkers Road adjacent to their properties (Doc 170220015597).

(c) **Appoints** Councillors Meyer (Chair) and Williams and Doody to the Barkers Road Sealing Targeted Rate Hearing Panel.

(d) **Circulates** this report to the Utilities and Roading Committee and the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board.

(e) **Notes** that any future subdivided properties will be required to contribute to the outstanding balance at that time.

(f) **Notes** the Hearing is scheduled for 22 August 2017.

CARRIED

Councillor Doody stated she was pleased to see this matter progress and it was a fair way for road sealing to occur.

7.2. **Waimakariri District Rural Fire assets and functions transfer to FENZ – J Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support)**

J Millward spoke to the report, explaining the report summarised the current situation. He noted recommendation (c) asset transfer, that there was a minor change with Fire Emergency New Zealand (FENZ) requesting leasing assets until they work through due diligence. The Council is classed as region four and J Millward explained the area involved including the Hurunui District.

Councillor Williams queried the cost of the assets and whether they were gifted to FENZ. J Millward explained the transfer of assets process including $200,000 of loans against some of the assets which the Council will recover back from FENZ. All liability transfers to FENZ, along with assets to support the Fire function, which ultimately creates a neutral position.

Councillor Williams queried some councils seeking payment for assets. J Millward commented that FENZ would only paying for assets that have loans against them, outlining the proposed lease arrangements.
Councillor Felstead, queried the omission of the Oxford tanker shed, and if staff were aware the Council lease the tanker from a third party. Staff noted the information advising they would recheck the assets against the full register as the report was a summary only. All current arrangements will be transferred across to FENZ.

Councillor Brine enquired if the Council is transferring land to FENZ. Staff advised that land would be a lease arrangement. FENZ were likely to take over the buildings but not the land, as long as the purpose is retained for fire associated purposes.

Moved Councillor Brine seconded Councillor Meyer

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No 170619062744.

(b) Acknowledges that any Rural fire assets are transferred to Fire Emergency New Zealand (FENZ) for Rural Fire functions and responsibilities as legislated under the Fire Emergency New Zealand Act 2017;

(c) Notes the principles established for the transfer of assets to FENZ. That is, the transfer of assets to FENZ is on the basis that FENZ will assume responsibility for any debt outstanding and any future maintenance associated with the assets;

(d) Acknowledges the Waimakariri District Principal Rural Fire Officer, Tim Sheppard, the Volunteer Rural Fire Forces and Volunteers for their dedicated service and efforts with the Rural Fire functions;

(e) Circulates this report to the Community Boards for information.

CARRIED

Councillor Brine commented that it was a sensible move forward and hoped the change would achieve the proposed outcomes.

7.3. Carryover of the Community Boards’ Discretionary Fund from 2016/17 to 2017/2018 – E Cordwell (Governance Advisor)

J Millward spoke to the report explaining it has no effect on rates however acknowledged the matter should have come to the Council earlier. He explained the impact on community board funding. Staff intend to increase advertising of the grants to increase public awareness of the fund.

J Palmer commented on the recent decisions of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board to distribute their remaining funding.

Moved Councillor Felstead seconded Councillor Doody

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 170620062842.

(b) Approves the carryovers of:

- $633.25 for the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board
- $3,054.04 for the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board and
- $200.00 for Woodend-Sefton Community Board

(c) Notes sufficient funding exists from the 2017/18 financial year without causing an increase in rates.

CARRIED
Councillor Felstead commented on the good outcome and was pleased to see this particular report.

Mayor Ayers commented that carry-overs were not sustainable, and encouraged the Community Boards to review their balances regularly to ensure funds were spent in the financial year. He cited previous examples of gifting funds to community groups. He encouraged the community boards to spread the word among their networks and organisations.

7.4. **Draft Submission to the Canterbury Regional Transport Committee on the proposal to vary the Regional Land Transport Plan – G Meadows (Policy Manager)**

Having declared a conflict of interest, Mayor Ayers left the room at 1.20pm. Deputy Mayor Felstead assumed the Chair.

J Palmer spoke briefly to the report, outlining the background.

Councillor Blackie queried the role of the journey planner. K Stevenson explained the role of Cathy Graham citing examples of involvement with walk/cycle, park and ride, working with ECAn, and other Council partners to assist changing behaviours relating to travel.

Moved Councillor Meyer seconed Councillor Williams

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report no. 170620063196.

(b) **Approves** the submission to the Regional Land Transport Committee (TRIM 170620063194);

(c) **Approves** the distribution of the submission to Community Boards for their information.

**CARRIED**

Councillor Meyer commented this step is necessary and hoped common sense prevails.

Councillor Doody commented on a recent presentation by the WDC Journey Planner regarding Oxford Main Street issues; impressed with the process and quality of presentation.

*Mayor Ayers returned to the Chambers at 1.25pm to continue chairing.*


J Palmer spoke to the report, providing background.

Moved Councillor Felstead seconed Councillor Blackie

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 170621063690.

(b) **Notes** the project plan to review: “Towards an Inclusive Environment” - the Waimakariri Disability Strategy 2011.

(c) **Nominates** Councillor Doody to represent the Council on the Reference Group for this review.

**CARRIED**

Mayor Ayers commented on the strategy and its increasing importance.
8. **MATTER REFERRED FROM DISTRICT PLANNING AND REGULATION COMMITTEE MEETING OF 20 JUNE 2017**

8.1. **Amendments To Contestable Fund Allocation – M Bacon (Team Leader Resource Consents)** *(Refer to TRIM No. 170531055320)*

M Bacon outlined the purpose of the report, explaining the criteria. He suggested a potential workshop with the District Planning and Regulation Committee be held in the future.

Councillor Gordon referred to para 6, commenting on wording to provide flexibility to the grant.

Moved Councillor Gordon   seconded Councillor Williams

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No 170531055320.

(b) **Amends** the operational guidelines for the Contestable Fund to operate as a discretionary fund utilising the funding criteria set out in Appendix 1, including point six to enable all grants to be at the discretion of the Committee.

(c) **Confirms** the funding criteria for the contestable fund utilising the criteria set out in Appendix 1

(d) **Notes** that the current amount available within the fund for allocation is $124,299, which includes the allocated grants from the 2005 and 2008 funding rounds that were not uplifted.

**CARRIED**

Councillor Gordon reflected on the good discussion held, and an opportunity to enable greater flexibility to applicants. He looked forward to allocating grants in the near future.

Councillor Williams concurred with his colleagues comments.

Mayor Ayers was supportive of the motion, reflecting on community conversations regarding buildings on the plan list. Building owners give some rights away for protecting a heritage building he believes.

9. **MATTER REFERRED FROM WOODEND-SEFTON COMMUNITY BOARD MEETING OF 12 JUNE 2017**

9.1. **Pegasus to Waikuku Beach Link – K Stevenson (Roading Manager)** *(Refer to TRIM No. 170526054014)*

K Stevenson spoke briefly to the report, providing background context.

Councillor Felstead enquired if staff had discussed the matter with the Runanga.

K Stevenson advised staff had worked through a normal process to date but were yet to discuss the matter with the Runanga or Ngai Tahu. He confirmed there were no silent files involved. This project is upgrading the path and does not change the usage. J Palmer advised staff will confirm matters at the next Runanga meeting, and prior to any work commencing.

Mayor Ayers queried the budget costs for upgrade of road and building the cycleway. K Stevenson advised work will include refinement of the project.

Councillor Doody enquired how long the track is. Staff advised it was 2.5km in length.
Councillor Williams queried impact of truck movements with the forest harvesting. Staff advised they would coordinate the two projects.

Moved Councillor Blackie    seconded Councillor Meyer

THAT the Council:

(a) **Reallocates** the 2017/18 budget allocation for Kaipoi Pa Road to the upgrading of the existing Te Kōhaka O Tūhaitara Trust walkway/cycleway between Reserve Road in Waikuku Beach and Tiritiri Moana Drive in Pegasus and the upgrading of the existing path in Tiritiri Moana Drive.

CARRIED

Councillor Blackie commented he considered this was good use of budget and the Community Board were keen to see the project progress.

Mayor Ayers commented the walkway was already there, and used for a number of events including the Pegasus annual fun run.

10. **MATTER REFERRED FROM KAIPOI-TUAHIWI COMMUNITY BOARD MEETING OF 19 JUNE 2017**

10.1. **The future of the Silver Birch Street trees in McDougall Place, Kaipoi – G Barnard (Parks Community Assets Officer)**

*(Referred to document Trim No. 170531055473)*

J Palmer spoke to the report, reflecting on the Community Board discussions.

It was indicated that a report could come back to the Community & Recreation Committee to include information relating to quantity of trees involved, nature, extent and implications of such a policy, and would require future discussion. It was advised that the implementation of actions may take some time.

Moved Councillor Meyer    seconded Councillor Blackie

THAT the Council:

(a) **Develops** a district wide policy for the planting and removal of Silver Birch trees on Council owned land.

CARRIED

Councillor Meyer, whilst neutral on whether Silver Birch trees should be removed, commented that a policy could assist moving forward for the betterment of the district and it would assist with future decision making.

Councillor Blackie looked forward to future debate, reflecting on the report, the Board situation of balancing advice, policy and public requests along with research relating to allergic aspects associated with Silver Birch trees.

Mayor Ayers reflected on personal experiences with Silver Birches and cross-allergies.

Councillor Meyer remarked Silver Birches often evoked public comment.
11. **HEALTH AND SAFETY**


J Palmer spoke to the report, explaining three incidents involving emergency services. Events were personal well-being related. A report summarising the years activity and proposed activity for the following year would be considered at the upcoming Audit & Risk Committee.

Councillor Blackie queried the cooling system for the battery incident. J Palmer explained it involved an older style battery, with the majority of battery backup systems having self-monitoring aspects so it was not expected to be reoccurring event.

Moved Councillor Doody seconded Mayor Ayers

THAT the Council:

(a) *Receives* report No. 170627065799.

**CARRIED**

12. **COMMITTEE/WORKING PARTY/Joint Committee Minutes for Information**

12.1. **Minutes of a meeting of the District Planning and Regulation Committee held on Tuesday 20 June 2017**

12.2. **Minutes of a meeting of the Utilities and Roading Committee held on Tuesday 20 June 2017**

Moved Councillor Meyer seconded Councillor Felstead

THAT the information in Items 12.2 be received.

**CARRIED**

13. **Community Board Minutes for Information**

13.1. **Minutes of a meeting of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board held on 4 May 2017**

13.2. **Minutes of a meeting of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board held on 8 May 2017**

13.3. **Minutes of a meeting of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board held on 8 June 2017**

13.4. **Minutes of a meeting of the Rangiora-Ashley Road and Reserve Naming Committee held on 13 June 2017**

13.5. **Minutes of a meeting of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board held on 14 June 2017**

13.6. **Minutes of a meeting of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board held on 19 June 2017**

Moved Councillor Felstead seconded Councillor Gordon

a) THAT the information in Items 13.1 to 13.6 be received.

**CARRIED**

Councillor Felstead was appreciative of residents that had previously expressed concerns at a quarry operation, returned to the Oxford-Ohoka
Community Board to thank them for their assistance with negotiating for the quarry operation to be moved to a less sensitive area.

Councillor Meyer commented positively on the first meeting held in the Pegasus Community Centre.

14. **CORRESPONDENCE**

   Nil.

15. **MAYOR’S DIARY**

15.1. **Mayor’s Diary 31 May to 26 June 2017**

   Moved Councillor Blackie seconded Councillor Williams

   THAT the Council:

   (a) **Receives** report no. 170626065458.

      CARRIED

16. **COUNCIL PORTFOLIO UPDATES**

16.1. **Iwi Relationships**

   Mayor Ayers commented on an agreement to form a Taranaki Reserve Advisory Group.

   Staff discussion had occurred regarding co-governance matters.

   Councillor Blackie reflected on the lack of attendance by a Runanga representative in relation to the Regeneration Steering Group.

16.2. **Canterbury Water Management Strategy**

   Councillor Stewart commented on a positive meeting held with Cam River Irrigator users.

   Councillor Stewart reflected on a recent all day workshop and subsequent CWMS meeting. The Water Zone meeting included a deputation on the salmon smolt operation at Silverstream.

   Councillor Stewart commented on current irrigation and nitrogen leachate information and upcoming discussions in relation to Dr Hudson’s information.

16.3. **International Relationships**

   Councillor Felstead commented on the September exhibition of ‘Belgium, Not Forgotten’ occurring in the Council Chambers prior to a Council delegation attending the 100th year Commemorations for the Battle of Passchendaele in Belgium.

   A visit from Freddy Declerk of Belgium at the time of the exhibition would also involve a sod turning ceremony for the Passchendaele Memorial walkway.

   **Councillor Atkinson arrived at 2.16pm.**

17. **QUESTIONS (UNDER STANDING ORDERS)**

   Nil.
18. **URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS (UNDER STANDING ORDERS)**

Nil.

*The meeting adjourned at 2.18pm for refreshments and reconvened at 2.41pm.*

19. **MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED**

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

Moved Mayor Ayers seconded Councillor Atkinson

**THAT** the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting.

The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter and the specific grounds under section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution, are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Minutes/Report of:</th>
<th>General subject of each matter to be considered</th>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>Minutes of the public excluded portion of Council meeting of 6 June 2017</td>
<td>Confirmation of minutes</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>Minutes of the public excluded portion of Council meeting of 20 June 2017</td>
<td>Confirmation of minutes</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>Report of Craig Sargison (Manager Community and Recreation)</td>
<td>Variation to Lease terms – Rangiora Town Hall</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>Report of Craig Sargison (Manager Community and Recreation)</td>
<td>Regeneration Area Lease</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>Report of Rob Hawthorne (Property Manager)</td>
<td>Silverstream Boulevard / Adderley Terrace Land Acquisitions, Kaitaipoi</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>Report of Gary Boot (Senior Engineering Advisor), Ken Stevenson (Roads Manager) and Kalley Simpson (3 Waters Manager)</td>
<td>Request for Approval to Continue to Engage Consultants to Carry Out Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery Works</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>Report of Jim Palmer (Chief Executive)</td>
<td>Reappointment of Waimakariri Irrigation Limited (WIL) Director</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This resolution is made in reliance on section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, and the particular interest or interests protected by section 6 or section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Reason for protection of interests</th>
<th>Ref NZS 9202:2003 Appendix A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19.1-19.7</td>
<td>Protection of privacy of natural persons To carry out commercial activities without prejudice</td>
<td>A2(a) A2(b)ii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CARRIED

CLOSED MEETING

The public excluded portion of the meeting occurred from 2.42pm until 3.39pm.

20. NEXT MEETING

The next scheduled meeting of the Council is on Tuesday 1 August 2017 commencing at 1.00pm.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 3.40PM.

CONFIRMED

______________________________
Chairperson

______________________________
Date

Briefing (Public Excluded)
At the conclusion of the Council's meeting, a staff briefing was held in relation to Town Centre Developments.
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT

FILE NO and TRIM NO: RAT-06/ 170721076345

REPORT TO: Council

DATE OF MEETING: 1 August 2017

FROM: Simon Collin, Infrastructure Strategy Manager, on behalf of the 3 Waters Rating Working Party

SUBJECT: 3 Waters Alternative Rating Structure

SIGN BY:

Signed: Department Manager, Chief Executive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(for Reports to Council or Committees)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to provide Council with the outcomes from the 3 Waters Rating Working Party meetings, and to seek Council approval on the elements proposed to be included be included in the draft 2018 – 2028 Long Term Plan.

1.2. The 3 Waters Rating Working Party was established following a 7 March 2017 report (TRIM 170223017410 – Attachment i) that noted Council was facing some challenges from forecast substantial increases in rates for some water and wastewater schemes, and that there was some public concern about the equity of the drainage rating structure.

1.3. After considering a number of different options at a high level the working party examined in detail the effect on rates of:

   i. A common sewer rate for all connected properties in the district

   ii. A common water supply rate for all properties connected to an urban supply, and a separate common rate for those connected to a restricted water supply

   iii. A common drainage rate for all properties within existing urban drainage rating areas, and a separate common rate for those in rural drainage rating areas

   iv. Increasing the flood rate that is currently part of the general rate

1.4. The Working Party concluded that there would be some merit in publicly consulting on the options described by items i, ii, and iii above, but that consultation would be better delayed until after the next LTP has been finalised in 2018.

1.5. The Working Party felt that the proposal to increase the flood rate, by a suggested $6 per property, would not need to be delayed, and could be included as a proposal in the draft 2018/2028 Long Term Plan.

1.6. Notwithstanding, those views, it is recommended that final consideration of the inclusion of a small increase in the flood rate, would best be made at the same time that the whole of the draft 2018/2028 is being finalised early in 2018.
Attachments:


ii. Graph illustrating the introduction of a new rating structure over a ten year period for urban water supplies (Trim No. 170717073924)

iii. Graph illustrating the capped option for introducing a common rating structure. (Trim No. 170717074012)

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 170721076345.

(b) **Approves** including in the draft 2018/28 Long Term Plan a proposal to carry out a comprehensive public engagement process regarding an alternative 3 Waters rating structure, that is based on:

   i. A common sewer rate for all connected properties in the district

   ii. A common water supply rate for all properties connected to an urban supply, and a separate common rate for those connected to a restricted water supply, and

   iii. A common drainage rate for all properties within existing urban drainage rating areas, and a separate common rate for those in rural drainage rating areas

(c) **Notes** that this engagement process is proposed to commence in the first half of 2019, and that Council staff will seek approval from Council before commencing consultation.

(d) **Requires** that staff bring back a recommendation to Council in January 2018 for the inclusion of an additional $6 per property to the flood rate in the draft 2018/2028 LTP.

(e) **Thanks** the Working Party for the time and effort they have put into considering this issue.

3. **THE ISSUE**

3.1. A 3 Waters Rating Working Party was established following a 7 March 2017 report that noted Council was facing some challenges from forecast substantial increases in rates for some water and wastewater schemes, and that there was some public concern about the equity of the drainage rating structure.

3.2. That report, which includes the Terms of Reference of the Working Party, is included in this report as Attachment i.

3.3. In particular, Fernside sewer, and Garrimere, Poyntzs Road, Oxford Rural No1 and Ohoka water supply rates are facing increases of between $250 and $3,700 per property over the next few years.

3.4. Excluded from the Working Party scope were stock water, unconnected properties, private water supply and sewer schemes, the Ashley Rural Water Scheme and water metering as a charging mechanism. They would either not be affected by any change in rating structure, or were considered to be matters that may need to be addressed separately from the 3 Waters rating structure review.
3.5. It is expected that the sorts of funding challenges facing Garrymere, Fernside etc, will arise for other small schemes in the future, driven by:

- More stringent consent conditions upon renewal
- Increasing public expectations about waterway health
- Public health issues – e.g. Drinking Water Standards
- Potential groundwater contamination leading to pressure to extend serviced areas
- New legislation e.g. potential outcome from the Havelock North water supply contamination, or waterway standards

4. OPTIONS

4.1. The Working Party (WP) first considered the principle underlying the current rating structure, and the alternative principle that would need to be supported if any changes were to be made. Currently, 3 Waters rates are structured around the cost of running the service being shared amongst the users of each scheme. The alternative approach is for property owners to pay the same rate for the same level of service, regardless of the location of the property, or scheme they are connected to.

4.2. A brief recap of the current rating system complexities was also undertaken. For example there are currently 5 different drainage rating structures, ranging from a simple land value basis, through to fixed plus variable structures, based on either land value, or land area.

4.3. The initial suite of options that the WP selected as having potential to mitigate the effect on rates that meeting regulatory standards would impose on small water/wastewater schemes were:

a) Wastewater
   - A single sewer rate for all connected properties in the district.
   - A single sewer rate for all connected properties in the district with the exception of Oxford.

b) Water supply
   - A single water supply for all connected properties in the district.
   - Two separate rates. One common rate for all urban supplies and one common rate for the restricted water supplies.

c) Drainage
   - One common rate for all urban drainage areas and one common rate for all current rural drainage rated areas.
   - One common rate for all drainage areas in the district (urban and rural).

d) Flooding
   - As an optional additional proposal, separate from the other change of structure proposals, increase the existing district wide flood rate to deal with areas that are not currently in a drainage rated area that contribute to downstream issues in a flood event.

4.4. The flood rate proposal in (d) above was driven by two factors. Firstly public concern in some quarters that the current drainage rating structure is inequitable, because current drainage rated areas have to deal with water coming from non-drainage rated areas.
Secondly the lack of any current funding to deal with a low level but consistent demand for Council to address flooding issues within the wider district. A demand which is not being met.

A small rate applied to every property in the district and able to be applied anywhere in the district would enable to staff to respond to customer requests for Council action on flooding issues. It would also potentially help with the equity concern because the funds could also be used in those drainage rated areas where this concern exists.

4.5. Tables showing the average rate changes for options 4.3 (a)-(d) were examined, including tables that added together the effects of rates changes for all three waters. Where relevant the range of the rates changes were also considered, so that the WP members had an understanding of the largest rates reductions that would arise from the options under consideration, as well as the largest increases that would occur.

4.6. On the basis of this information the WP selected the option set out below for further examination.

i. A common sewer rate for all connected properties in the district

ii. A common water supply rate for all properties connected to an urban supply, and a separate common rate for those connected to a restricted water supply

iii. A common drainage rate for all properties within existing urban drainage rating areas, and a separate common rate for those in rural drainage rating areas

iv. Increasing the district wide flood rate that is currently part of the general rate

In addition more detail was requested on the effect on Oxford sewer rates of moving to a pan based rate. The WP also wished to have an understanding of the current debt held by each scheme.

4.7. A key aspect of this rating structure is that it avoids the prospect of urban properties subsidising water and drainage services for those living on lifestyle block rural properties.

4.8. Drainage Advisory Groups and the public have expressed the view that the current drainage rates structure is inequitable. As noted in 4.4. inclusion of the proposal to increase the district wide flood rate has the potential to address this particular concern which the proposed common urban and rural drainage rate proposal does not.

4.9. Subsequent WP meetings considered not only the effect on rates of the chosen option, but also ways that any changes could be introduced. The WP felt that introduction in a single year was problematic and looked at “smoothing” the introduction over a ten year period. This is illustrated graphically for urban water supplies in Attachment ii.

4.10. There was also a view that the potential reduction in rates for some of the smaller rural schemes was unacceptable. Information was therefore requested on a sub option that fixed the rates of these schemes (capped) at the value that they are currently paying. The concept here being that as the rates of other non- capped schemes slowly rose over time they would “catch up” with the rates that the capped schemes were paying. At this point they would join together paying a single common rate. This is illustrated graphically in Attachment iii.

This methodology would eventually achieve the outcome of common rates, but the timeframe is very long, typically 50 to 90 years depending on the scheme.
4.11. Finally, a suite of graphs was prepared for study by the WP that showed for each scheme the effect on rates over a ten year time frame. The graphs also show the current projected rates over the same time period, and the difference between those projections and projections if a changed structure was introduced. These graphs were based on implementing the changes over a ten year period, and included adding the effect from each of the three waters. This was called the smoothed option.

4.12. The graphs have been summarised in Table 1 below which shows the average annual rate change (increase or decrease), by scheme, that would arise from introducing the alternative rates structure over either a ten year or twenty year period.

4.13. The figures are calculated from average land values (for the land drainage component) and include the use of two units of water for the rural restricted water supply schemes. The figures are therefore representative of the effect of the majority of ratepayers, but there will be considerable variation of these numbers for “non average” properties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Water Supply Service</th>
<th>Wastewater Service</th>
<th>Drainage Service</th>
<th>Average annual rate increase/decrease due to new structure introduced over 10 years</th>
<th>Average annual rate increase/decrease due to new structure introduced over 20 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cust</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-$69</td>
<td>-$34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-$7</td>
<td>-$4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pines/Kairaki</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$28</td>
<td>$14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi restricted +</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi drainage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi restricted +</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>$2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarkville drainage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Urban</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-$49</td>
<td>-$25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$14</td>
<td>$7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-$4</td>
<td>-$2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikuku Beach</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$7</td>
<td>$4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$7</td>
<td>$4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural (2 units of water)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend - Tuahiwi</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4</td>
<td>$2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernside</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-$152</td>
<td>-$76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Check</td>
<td>Check</td>
<td>Check</td>
<td>Check</td>
<td>Check</td>
<td>Check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrymere</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-$139</td>
<td>-$69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$29</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-$3</td>
<td>-$2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Rural No.1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-$24</td>
<td>-$12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Rural No.2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-$7</td>
<td>-$4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poyntz Road</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-$36</td>
<td>-$18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summerhill</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-$70</td>
<td>-$35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Eyreton</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-$14</td>
<td>-$7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loburn Lea</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-$177</td>
<td>-$89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Excludes optional additional flood rate of $6/property

4.14. It should be noted that the boundaries for water supply, wastewater schemes and drainage areas do not coincide. This factor, as well as variations caused by different water consumption by those connected to restricted schemes will also change the effect for individual households.

4.15. **Advantages of a change to the 3 Waters rating structure**

The preferred option of the WP is the smoothed introduction of the new rates structure over a 10 year or potentially a 20 year period. This option has the potential to be regarded as equitable by the wider community and has the following additional advantages:

- Resolves the current issues of Drinking Water Standards and consent affordability
- Provides flexibility for when funding/affordability issues arise again in the future
- Allows a focus on the technical solutions rather than the complex funding issues which can arise under the current structure
- Would be welcomed by the Drainage Advisory Groups who think the current system is inequitable
- Is administratively simpler

4.16. **Disadvantages of a change to the 3 waters rating structure**

The preferred option has the following disadvantages:

- The rating system would be less transparent. The true costs of providing services to small communities is masked (although still available to Council)
- The public have little knowledge about how rates are made up, and consequently public debate on the issue would be a challenge, particularly for the non-average properties such as high water users, or high land value properties
- The only public demand for a change at this point, is concern that the current drainage rating structure is inequitable

4.17. **Timeframe**
The timeframe leading into the LTP is now short, and gaining public understanding in the timeframe available would be difficult. The WP also had concerns that the other significant issues being consulted upon currently (solid waste services and the District Development Strategy), would add to the difficulties of engaging with the public on a rates restructure at this time.

4.18. While there is merit in seeking the communities’ views on the matter, trying to carry out that engagement before the next LTP is not recommended.

4.19. The LTP process does, however, provide an opportunity to raise the issue, to gauge if there is sufficient interest from the public to warrant consulting in the early period of the 2018/2028 LTP. It is therefore recommended that

   a) The issue is signalled in the LTP
   b) The increase in the district wide flood rate is included in the LTP

4.20. The Management Team/CEO has reviewed this report and supports the recommendations.

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. Community views would need to be sought before a proposal to change the 3 waters structure was included into a draft Council Long Term Plan.

5.2. Given the complexity of the issue, and the challenges that engaging with the community may present, it is proposed that the issue be raised in the draft 2018/2028 LTP as a topic that will be consulted upon early during the term of the 2018/2028 LTP.

5.3. Following feedback on this proposal, the Council would decide whether to include it in the final 2018/2028 LTP during its deliberations.

5.4. If the decision was to comprehensively consult on the topic in the term of the 2018/2028 LTP, it is suggested that the appropriate timing would be early in the 2019 calendar year.

6. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. With the exception of the proposal to increase the flood rate by a modest $6 per property, the changed rating structure option preferred by the WP does not propose to increase the overall rates take, but it would affect the rates of individual property owners, in some cases substantially.

6.2. There are no perceived risks from the proposed recommendations in this report, although the funding challenges facing Garrymere, Fernside etc and potentially other smaller communities will remain

6.3. However, should the concept of an alternative rating structure for 3 Waters eventually be implemented, there is a risk that should be noted at this time. The risk is that the comprehensive engagement process suggested for early in 2019, would fail to elicit an adequate response, or even awareness from potentially affected householders. If this occurred, and Council subsequently made a decision to proceed with the proposal, there is the potential for some push back from affected households when they receive their first rates demand under the new structure. This risk would be mitigated, if any changes were to be implemented over a long period of time (10 or even 20 years)
7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**
This matter is a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance Policy.

7.2. **Legislation**
Any changes to the rating structure would need to comply with the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002. Consultation process would need to comply with the Local Government Act 2002.

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

- Core utility services are provided in a timely, sustainable and affordable manner.
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FROM: Simon Collin, Infrastructure Strategy Manager

SUBJECT: Alternative 3 Waters Rating Structures

SGNED BY: (for Reports to Council or Committees)

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to gain approval for the formation of a Council Working Party to consider potential options for alternative rating structures for water supply, wastewater and land drainage/stormwater, and to appoint Councillors to that Working Party.

1.2. Council faces some challenges with respect to forecast substantial increases in rates for some water and wastewater schemes, arising from the need to meet regulatory standards. For drainage, some public concern has been expressed about the equity of current rating structures.

1.3. These challenges present an opportunity to consider alternative rating structures as a way of dealing with the issues.

1.4. The issues and potential options are complex, and establishing a working party is recommended as the most practical way to consider them.

Attachments:

i. Draft Terms of Reference

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council

(a) Receives report No. 170223017410.

(b) Approves the formation of a 3 Waters Rating Working Party to consider the issues and options relating to the equity of current 3 waters rating structures and the challenge presented by forecast increasing rates for some schemes.

(c) Appoints Cr Felstead, as the Portfolio holder for Finance and the LTP, to the chair of the 3 Waters Rating Working Party.
(d) **Appoints** Cr Williams, as the Portfolio holder for Utilities as a member of the 3 Waters Rating Working Party

(e) **Appoints** Cr Stewart, as the Portfolio holder for Drainage and Stockwater as a member of the 3 Waters Rating Working Party

(f) **Notes** that the Mayor, is an ex officio member of the 3 Waters Rating Working Party

(g) **Appoints** two further Councillors ........, ........ as members of the 3 Waters Rating Working Party, to make up a total of 6 members.

(h) **Adopts** the draft Terms of Reference shown in Attachment (i) as the 3 Waters Rating Working Party Terms of Reference.

3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

3.1. **Background**

3.1.1. In both the water and wastewater activity areas Council faces an issue of significantly rising rate costs for some individual water and sewer schemes, that require substantial capital expenditure in order to meet regulatory standards. For water supplies, meeting the NZ Drinking Water Standards is the challenge, and for wastewater schemes, meeting consent conditions.

3.1.2. For land drainage, in the context of the expansion of the Ohoka and Kaiapoi drainage rated areas last year, concern has been expressed by ratepayers within drainage rated areas that it is inequitable for properties upstream of drainage rated areas to not be paying any drainage rates, when water draining off their land is contributing to the drainage problems lower in the catchment.

3.1.3. Following those concerns being raised, Council noted that “Council staff will undertake a review of drainage rating throughout the rest of the district and report back to Council with options for consideration during the 2016/17 FY”.

3.1.4. Generally the philosophy behind the 3 Waters current rating structures is that the individual community pays the full costs of running the infrastructure that supplies them with the service. This results in widely disparate costs for similar levels of service. For example Mandeville water supply costs $379 for two units of water, while Garrymere costs $1121 for two units of water. Furthermore, the Garrymere supply is not compliant with the drinking water standard, and if the Garrymere community is to shoulder the full costs of the necessary upgrade, their water rates will rise by approximately a further $900 p.a.

3.1.5. If the Council is to consider moving to alternative 3 Waters rating structures, it needs to be in a position to advocate for the principles that will support any proposed changes during consultation.

3.1.6. Understanding the effects of different potential options can be quite complex as (i) there is a large number of current different rating structures (22 for water, 4 for sewer and 13 for land drainage), and (ii) the boundaries of the various different schemes rarely coincide.

3.1.7. It is therefore considered that establishing a working party to enable a subset of Councillors to work through the principles and options arising from the application of those principles is the most practical way for Councillors to be in a position to make an informed decision about whether to proceed to consultation with district wide rating options or not.
3.1.8. Because of the potential time commitment that the working party will entail, and the need for the Working Party to make its recommendations back to Council in early July it is recommended that the Working Party be made up of 6 members.

3.1.9. Draft Terms of Reference are included in Attachment (i). It is proposed that staff members from Finance, Rates and 3 Waters should provide support to the 3 Waters Rating Working Party.

3.1.10. It is estimated that a minimum of four two hour meetings will be needed between 7 March and early June, in order to properly consider the principles and options.

3.1.11. It is suggested that since Tuesday’s are Council days, Tuesday’s from 10.00 to 12.00 may be a suitable time for the meetings to be held. Possible alternatives are Wednesdays between 5 and 7, or Thursdays 5 to 6.30 (as Oxford Community Board starts at 7.00).

3.2. The Management Team/CEO has reviewed this report and supports the recommendations.

4. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

4.1. Community views would be sought as part of a Special Consultative Process, after the Working Party has considered the issues and made its recommendations to Council.

5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

5.1. There are no financial implications, or risks from setting up a Working Party to consider the issues and options.

6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. **Policy**

While implementation of alternative 3 Waters rating structures would be a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance Policy, the formation of a Working Party to consider the options is not.

6.2. **Legislation**

N/A

6.3. **Community Outcomes**

This report relates to the following community outcomes:

- Core utility services are provided in a timely, sustainable and affordable manner.
3 Waters Rating Working Party - Draft

1. Membership

The Working Party will comprise of total of 6:

Chair: Cr Felstead

*ex officio:* The Mayor

Members: Crs Williams, Stewart, ..................

2. Quorum

4 members.

3. Scope

3.1 The Working Party will investigate alternative rating structures for the 3 Waters activities to resolve cost and equity issues arising from the current rating structures.

3.2 The Working Party will report back to Council recommending:

a) the options for alternative rating structures that the Working Party considers best meets the objectives set out below and,
b) whether Council should proceed to consultation on those options.

3.3 The Working Party will lead the consultation and engagement process, in the event of Council deciding to progress the concept of alternative rating structures, and seek community views.

4. Objectives

4.1 To consider and agree on the principles that would support any change to the rating structures for 3 Waters

4.2 To consider and evaluate alternative rating structures that will:

a) mitigate the potential effect on rates that meeting regulatory standards will impose on some small water/wastewater schemes
b) be consistent with the principles from 4.1
c) have the potential to be regarded as equitable by the wider community

4.3 To consider ways in which phasing in the changes to rating structures might make the changes more acceptable.
5. **Meeting Frequency**

As required.

6. **Staff Executive**

Project Lead : Simon Collin  
Finance : Jeff Millward  
Rating : Maree Harris  
Utilities & Roading : Gerard Cleary  
3 Waters : Kailey Simpson
Alternative 3 Waters Rating Structure Report

Water Supply - Urban: 10 yr implementation

Illustration of effect on rates of introducing a common urban water supply rate over a ten year period. The graph below shows the effect if the change is made in one year.
Alternative 3 Waters Rating Structure Report

Illustration of the concept of capping existing rates and not allowing them to decrease until the other scheme rates in the group increase with time and “catch up” with the capped rates. In this graph the rate of increase for the Kaiapoi line beyond year 10 has been made up for the purposes of demonstrating the effect.
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1. The purpose of this report is to seek Council adoption of the Draft Waimakariri Accessibility Strategy 2017-2023 (attached) for consultation.

1.2. This draft is the result of the review of the 2011 Waimakariri Disability Strategy and provides a slightly wider framework for how the Council, through its own actions, will contribute towards ensuring the local environment is accessible and inclusive for all people, including those with impairments.

1.3. The strategy sets out a vision for a society where all people can engage in personal, community and civic life with independence. It defines key goals and objectives for the Council which will contribute towards achieving the vision and outlines a number of high level priority areas and actions.

1.4. More detailed implementation planning will be set out in a separate Action Plan which sits alongside this strategy.

**Attachments:**


2. **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 170718074667.

(b) **Approves** “Towards and Inclusive Environment” the draft Waimakariri Accessibility Strategy 2017 – 2023 for consultation including targeted consultation with a number of key groups and organisations as outlined in paragraph 4.3.

(c) **Notes** that some images used in the attached draft strategy will be updated for publication.
Notes that representatives from disability groups, key disability service providers, Council staff and elected members form a Disability Reference Group which has assisted with the development of the draft strategy and will lead the targeted consultation.

Notes that the final “Towards and Inclusive Environment” the Waimakariri Accessibility Strategy will be reported to Council and recommended for adoption at its meeting in November 2017.

Notes that an associated Action Plan is being developed in parallel which will be discussed with the reference group for their endorsement as a continuing part of the policy development process.

3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. The review of the 2011 Waimakariri Disability Strategy has been undertaken with the assistance of the Waimakariri Access Group, Council staff and co-ordinated by a steering group made up of Council staff (Lynley Beckingsale and Tessa Sturley) assisted by Jill Waldron, specialist advisor.

3.2. The review has been a two way process with the Council reporting to the Waimakariri Access Group the progress it has made towards implementing the Strategy and the Access Group reporting back to Council about whether the goals of the Strategy had been achieved since its adoption in 2011. An Easy-Read document was developed to ensure all members of the Waimakariri Access Group had the opportunity to provide feedback on the Action Plan.

3.3. On discussion with the Waimakariri Access Group it was decided to widen the scope of the ‘disability’ strategy and further develop it as an ‘accessibility’ strategy. Accessibility is the general term used to describe the degree to which a product, service or environment is available to as many people as possible. In the context of this strategy, it refers to the removal of barriers that prevent people participating fully in personal, community and civic life. Accessible design benefits everyone, which includes families with young children as well as people with impairments and age-related disability.

3.4. The ‘Be Accessible’ organisation leads a social change initiative and holistic framework for accessibility with a mission to create a truly accessible country for us all. The philosophy of this organisation is about ‘accessibility’ rather than ‘disability’, ‘possibility’ rather than ‘limitation’, ‘innovation’ rather than ‘status-quo’. This philosophy aligns with the Waimakariri Accessibility Strategy vision “all people, including those with impairments, can engage in personal, community, and civic life without barriers”.

3.5. In 2016, the New Zealand Disability Strategy 2016-26 was developed. This encompassed a review of the 2001 strategy and guides the work of government agencies on disability issues from 2016 to 2026. Associated with this national strategy is the “Inclusive Communities” document from the Disabled Persons Assembly (New Zealand) Inc 2010, which outlines what New Zealand Local Authorities and District Health Boards need to know about the rights of people with impairments. These two documents guided the review of the Waimakariri District Council’s Disability Strategy. By developing and implementing an Accessibility Strategy for the Waimakariri District and with complementing goals and actions, the Council can contribute towards the achievement of the New Zealand Disability Strategy vision at a local level.

3.6. There are approximately 12,890 people with impairments living in the Waimakariri District (25.8% of a total population of 49,989 usual residents 2013 Census). The number of people with impairments increases with age with over half (53%) of District
residents aged 65 years and over have an impairment. The proportion is likely to be much higher when looking at those aged over 80 years.

3.7. Many of the Council’s responsibilities have a direct impact on accessibility and the lives of people with young children, people with impairments and people with age related disability. These responsibilities include urban planning and regulation, roading, parks and recreation facilities, community facilities and information services.

3.8. In May 2017 a Reference Group was established made up of representatives of disability groups, key disability service providers, elected members and Council staff. This group has assisted with the review of the 2011 Implementation/Action Plan and the strategic document. An updated implementation/action plan is being developed in parallel and will be discussed with the Reference Group for their endorsement as a continuing part of the policy development process.

3.9. A high level schedule of Council actions within the strategy identifies priority areas and actions which build on existing good practice or are new initiatives to assist in achieving the vision of an inclusive community. A separate, detailed Action Plan is being developed which will further identify how the strategy will be implemented and monitored.

3.10. Upon adoption of the draft strategy for consultation, staff will undertake targeted consultation during August/September 2017 with a number of key groups and organisations as outlined in paragraph 4.3.

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

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. The Accessibility Strategy Reference Group has participated in the development of this Accessibility Strategy for the Waimakariri District. The strategy has been reviewed using information from a variety of sources including the Disabled Persons Assembly, the Minister for Disability Services, Statistics New Zealand, Human Rights Commission, the Ministry of Health and the Be. Accessible organisation.

4.2. The following organisations are represented on the Accessibility Strategy Reference Group:

Waimakariri Access Group
Waimakariri Health Advisory Group
CCS Disability Action
Older Persons Health
IDEA/People First
Royal New Zealand Foundation of the Blind
Waimakariri District Council staff
Waimakariri District Councillors John Meyer, Peter Allen and Wendy Doody

4.3. Consultation on the draft strategy is proposed to commence on Friday 11 August and close on Friday 8 September. This consultation process is not subject to the Special Consultative Procedure of the Local Government Act 2002, however it is considered worthwhile to provide for comment on the draft strategy from the community, relevant disability and other groups and organisations through the submission process before it is finalised by the Council and implemented. The targeted consultation will involve the invitation of written feedback, as well as the offer to meet with groups to discuss the strategy. Groups and organisations for targeted consultation are:

Waimakariri Access Group
Waimakariri Health Advisory Group
Social Services Waimakariri
Deaf Aotearoa
Greypower
All Community Boards

4.4. Council Officers across the organisation have contributed to the review of the priority areas and actions and will continue to be consulted as the more detailed Action Plan is developed.

5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

5.1. The majority of the strategy objectives will be achieved through current budgets because they are more about attitudinal/cultural change and improving consultation and communication practices than projects that require specific funding. However, progressing changes to structures/the physical environment to improve accessibility do have cost implications. Such areas where extra funding will be required would be progressed through Annual Plan and Long Term Plan processes. The Accessibility Strategy Action Plan aims to guide which key tasks are required to be implemented to best achieve the strategy’s goals over time.

6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. **Policy**

This draft for consultation strategy document is not a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance Policy.

The draft strategy reflects the intent of the New Zealand Disability Strategy by providing a framework for how the Council will contribute towards ensuring the local environment is inclusive for all people.

6.2. **Legislation**

The strategy is consistent with, and will assist the Council to give effect to the requirements the New Zealand Government has as a signatory of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. In signing this agreement the Government bound itself to abide by it in domestic law and Local Government has a key role in ensuring mainstream services are inclusive of people with impairments and are delivered in non-discriminatory ways.

6.3. **Community Outcomes**

**Governance**

*Effect is given to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi*  
- The Council in partnership with Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga, continue to build our relationship through mutual understanding and shared responsibilities.

*There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision making that affects our District*  
- The Council makes information about its plans and activities readily available.
- The Council takes account of the views across the community including mana whenua.
- The Council makes known its views on significant proposals by others affecting the District’s wellbeing.
- Opportunities for collaboration and partnerships are actively pursued.
Environment

There is a safe environment for all

- Harm to people from natural and man-made hazards is minimised.
- Our district has the capacity and resilience to quickly recover from natural disasters and adapt to the effects of climate change.
- Crime, injury and harm from road crashes, gambling and alcohol abuse are minimised.
- Our district is well served by emergency services and volunteers are encouraged.

Places and Spaces

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

- There are wide-ranging opportunities to participate in arts and cultural activities.

Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality

- There is a wide variety of public places and spaces to meet people’s needs.
- There are wide-ranging opportunities for people to enjoy the outdoors.
- The accessibility of community and recreation facilities meets the changing needs of our community.

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

- The centres of our towns are safe, convenient and attractive places to visit and do business.

People are friendly and caring, creating a strong sense of community in our District

- There are wide-ranging opportunities for people of different ages, abilities and cultures to participate in community life and recreational activities.
“Towards an Inclusive Environment
The draft Waimakariri Accessibility Strategy
August 2017
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Mayor’s Foreword

The New Zealand Disability Strategy 2016-2026 is founded on the vision of New Zealand as a non-disabling society. The Waimakariri District Council shares this vision and this strategy has been developed in partnership with representatives from the Waimakariri Access Group, the Waimakariri Health Advisory Group, CCS Disability Action, IDEA/People First, The Kaiapoi District Senior Citizens & Friends Day Centre (the Damley Club), and Waimakariri District Council staff.

The Waimakariri District is growing steadily and, like the rest of New Zealand, the population is ageing. Consequently the proportion of people in our District experiencing impairments is also increasing, particularly because impairments are more common amongst people of older age groups.

As a Council it is important that we minimise the barriers to members of our community as they go about their everyday life. We have a vision of an enabled community where people with impairments can live independently and participate fully in all aspects of life.

I endorse this strategy as a further step towards an enabled Waimakariri community.

David Ayers
Mayor, Waimakariri District Council
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Introduction

What is the Accessibility Strategy?

The Waimakariri District Council Accessibility Strategy provides a framework for how the Council will contribute towards ensuring the local environment and facilities are inclusive for all people, including those with impairments. Impairments may be long or short term, may be physical, mental, intellectual or sensory and can often be more prevalent in people of older age groups.

Accessibility is a general term used to describe the degree to which a product, service or environment is available to as many people as possible. In this context it refers to the removal of barriers that prevent people participating fully in community and civic life. Accessible design benefits everyone, which includes families with young children as well as people with impairments and age-related disability.

The New Zealand Disability Strategy 2016 - 2026 defines “disability” as:

- Disability is something that happens when people with impairments face barriers in society that limit their movements, senses or activities.
- Disabled people are people who have long-term physical, mental, intellectual or sensory impairments which in interaction with various barriers may hinder their full and effective participation in society on an equal basis with others.

An inclusive environment for all means reducing barriers and thus reducing “disability”. This includes changing Council and community attitudes towards people with impairments and providing a plan to encourage and support the participation of people with impairments in the democratic process and community life.

In light of current issues and barriers faced by people with impairments, as well as growing demands, this strategy sets out a vision for a society where all people can engage in personal, community and civic life with independence. It identifies key goals and objectives which together contribute towards achieving the vision and outlines a number of high level priority areas and Council actions for contributing towards an inclusive environment. More detailed implementation planning will be set out in a separate Action Plan which will accompany this strategy.

“Anyone is only a drunk driver, a work accident, or a banana skin away from being disabled.”

(Source: Inclusive Communities Disabled Persons Assembly, August 2010)
Why do we need an Accessibility Strategy?

The Council wants to ensure its services, buildings and activities are accessible to everyone by working towards removing the barriers that prevent people participating fully in community and civic life.

This strategy will act as a guide to enhance people’s independence and ability to participate, engage in, and benefit from, Council services. Providing accessible services, communication channels, transport, buildings and public spaces will make the Waimakariri District more inclusive for everyone. It will enhance the diversity of the District and make it attractive to residents and visitors of any age and ability.

Council is responsible for maintaining, managing and developing key public assets (such as roads, parks and halls) and delivering services (building and resource consents, events, community development, planning and regulation) that enhance the quality of life of the communities they are responsible for. Local authorities are able to play a major part in reducing the barriers (environmental and attitudinal) that contribute to disability for people in its communities.

According to the 2013 census, 24 percent of New Zealanders have a disability. The increase from the 2001 rate (20%) is partially explained by our aging population. If people who experience temporary impairment (e.g. from injuries or illness) are included, the number of people with impairments in society is much higher. This shows that all of us are likely to experience a form of impairment at some point in our lives and it is important that our local environment is inclusive to allow and encourage full participation in all aspects of community life.

In March 2007 New Zealand, along with many other countries, signed the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. The United Nations Convention has the purpose of promoting, protecting and ensuring “...the full and equal enjoyment of all human rights and fundamental freedoms by all persons with disabilities, and to promote respect for their inherent dignity.”

The New Zealand Government is responsible for implementing the Convention and reporting back to the United Nations. By signing the agreement, the Government bound itself to abide by it in domestic law. Local Government has a key role in ensuring mainstream services are inclusive of people with impairments and are delivered in non-discriminatory ways.
How has the Disability Strategy been developed?

The 2011 Waimakariri Disability Strategy “Towards an Inclusive Environment” was developed collaboratively with representatives from disability groups, key disability service providers and the Council. A Disability Reference Group was established, and together with Council staff, this group led the development and consultation on the strategy. This is the first review of the 2011 strategy.

The review has been undertaken collaboratively beginning with a review of the associated action plan and the progress Council has made towards achieving the goals of the strategy. This has been a two way review with reference group members reporting back to Council their views on the achievements of Council since the strategy was adopted in 2011.

Consultation on the draft strategy will commence on 11 August 2017 and close on 8 September 2017. The consultation process is not subject to the Special Consultative Procedure as prescribed by the Local Government Act 2002, however it is considered worthwhile to provide an opportunity for comment on the draft strategy through a submission process before it is finalised by the Council and implemented. In addition to open public consultation key groups with an interest in disability issues will be specifically invited to comment on the draft strategy.

Feedback received through consultation will be considered and, where appropriate, will be reflected in the reviewed strategy.
Setting the Scene

National Context

People with Impairments in New Zealand

In the 2013 New Zealand Census of Population and Dwellings, an estimated 1,018,000 New Zealanders reported a disability, defined by the survey as “a health problem or condition (lasting 6 months or more) causing difficulty with, or stopping (respondents) doing: everyday activities that people your age can usually do; any other activities that people your age can usually do”.

The following graph depicts the percentage of people with a disability in New Zealand by age group over the three census years – 1996, 2001, 2006 and 2013.

---

1. The disability rate is the percentage of the total population, in each age group, that was disabled. Percentages are calculated on unrounded numbers.

2. We have reweighted the data for 2001 using population estimates based on the 2006 Census. We did this to increase comparability with 2013, which we also weighted using population estimates based on the 2006 Census.

3. The child (0-14 years) screening questions were changed in the 2013 survey. Be careful when comparing figures for children from the 2013 survey with those from previous surveys.

Breaking the occurrence of a disability down by age shows a much higher probability of disability as age increases, with just under 60% of people aged 65 or over suffering from a disability.

The 2013 Disability Survey, a survey conducted by Statistics New Zealand in conjunction with the 2013 census, provides information focusing mainly on the prevalence and nature of disability. The survey also collected information on barriers that people with impairments encounter in their everyday life.
The 2013 Disability Survey identifies that:

- In 2013, 24 percent of the New Zealand population were identified as disabled, a total of 1.1 million people.
- The increase from the 2001 rate (20 percent) is partly explained by our aging population.
- People aged 65 or over were much more likely to be disabled (59 percent) than adults under 65 years (21 percent) or children under 15 years (11 percent).
- Maori and Pacific people had higher-than-average disability rates, after adjusting for differences in ethnic population age profiles.
- For adults, physical limitations were the most common type of impairment. Eighteen percent of people aged 15 or over, 64 percent of disabled adults, were physically impaired.
- For children, learning difficulty was the most common impairment type. Six percent of children, 52 percent of disabled children, had difficulty learning.
- Just over half of all disabled people (53 percent) had more than one type of impairment.
- The most common cause of disability for adults was disease or illness (42 percent). For children, the most common cause was a condition that existed at birth (49 percent).
- The Auckland regional disability rate, at 19 percent, was lower than the national average. Bay of Plenty and Manawatu-Wanganui (both 27 percent), Northland (29 percent), and Taranaki (30 percent) experienced above-average disability rates.
In addition, according to the World Health Organisation, mental illness accounts for 15% of disease in the developed world, with depression set to become the second leading cause of disability in the world by 2020. The Social Report 2016\(^1\) section on ‘Health’ reports the proportion of people with high or very high levels of psychological distress (such as anxiety, confused emotions, depression or rage), which indicates a high probability of an anxiety or depressive disorder. It is reported that “In 2013/14, an estimated 221,000 New Zealanders aged 15 years and over reported experiencing high or very high levels of psychological distress, an increase of 3,000 from 2012/13.”

**Inclusive Communities Document**

The Disabled Persons Assembly (New Zealand) Inc (DPA) document\(^2\) ‘Inclusive Communities’ provides the guiding strategic framework for this strategy. ‘Inclusive Communities’ sets out the general principles governing partnership with people with impairments and describes actions for removing barriers that prevent full inclusion in society.

The key principles set out in ‘Inclusive Communities’ for elected members and staff of Councils and District Health Boards are the same general principles that underpin the Disability Convention and include:

- Establishing a partnership of equality to ensure that in all areas of policy making and service delivery people with impairments are at the centre of decision making about their lives;
- Make immediate progress to remove existing barriers to full participation and inclusion in society;
- Acknowledging that people with impairments have the same rights as other New Zealanders to a dignified life; adequate standard of living; independence; non- discrimination; full and effective participation in society; access to the built and natural environment, information and transport, and support services; equality of opportunity, especially in education and employment; equality between men and women; and respect for their children;
- Partnership with people with impairments to achieve the above goals must include measurable outcomes, monitoring and information gathering;
- Understanding that these principles are part of international law and must be upheld.


The New Zealand Disability Strategy 2016 - 2026

The New Zealand Disability Strategy presents a long-term plan for changing New Zealand from a disabling to an inclusive society. A fully inclusive society is the vision of the strategy and it suggests that this will be achieved when people with impairments can say they live in:

“A society that highly values our lives and continually enhances our full participation.”

The strategy emphasises the importance of the decisions made by territorial authorities and non-departmental public bodies that have an impact on the lives of people with impairments and can reduce a number of key barriers faced by people with impairments.

The strategy sees territorial authorities as well as other public bodies as vital in supporting and assisting with the implementation of the strategy. By implementing an Accessibility Strategy for the Waimakariri District and including complementary key goals and actions, the Council can significantly contribute towards the achievement of the New Zealand Disability Strategy vision at a local level.

Outcomes - priorities for change

The New Zealand Disability Strategy identifies eight outcomes that will contribute towards achieving the vision of the Strategy:

Education:

- We get an excellent education and achieve our potential throughout our lives

Employment and Financial Resources:

- We have security in our economic situation and can achieve our potential.

Health and Wellbeing:

- We have the highest attainable standards of health and wellbeing.
Rights protection and justice:

- Our rights are protected; we feel safe, understood and are treated fairly and equitably by the justice system.

Accessibility:

- We access all places, services and information with ease and dignity.

Attitudes:

- We are treated with dignity and respect.

Choice and control:

- We have choice and control over our lives.

Leadership:

- We have great opportunities to demonstrate our leadership.
Local Context

People with Impairments in the Waimakariri District

The 2013 New Zealand Disability Survey is made up of two surveys: the 2013 Household Disability Survey taken on Census night and the Disability Survey of Residential Facilities. The data for the Waimakariri District is a recent release from Statistics New Zealand using a statistical model to produce estimates for areas smaller than regions.

The above graph shows that there are approximately 12,890 people with impairments living in our District, 25.8% of a total population of 49,989 (2013 Census, usually resident population). The number of people with impairments increases with age. In fact, over half (53%) of District residents aged 65 and over have an impairment. The proportion is likely to be much higher when looking at only those aged over 80.

The population of the Waimakariri District has increased steadily over the last 10 years with a 14.1% increase between 1996 and 2001, and a 16.1% increase between 2001 and 2006 and a similar increase (16.7%) between 2006 and 2013.

The greatest percentage increases were recorded for the 60-64 years age group (41.0%) and the 65 years and over age group (40.4%), signifying an ageing population. Overall, in 2013 some 23% of the District residents were aged 65 and over, a 9% increase since 2006.
A key feature of an ageing population is the decline in the percentage of children in the population. In the 10 years from 1996-2006 the number of young children in the population has dropped from 15.3% in 1996 to 12.9% in 2013.

As impairments are much more prevalent in older age, as shown in the graph, Waimakariri's increasingly ageing population may mean greater demands on health and disability services and an even greater need to ensure the local environment is inclusive for all in order to enable people with impairments to lead an independent life.

**Local Barriers to Accessibility**

The Waimakariri Access Group identified a range of local barriers for people with impairments and suggest the following:

**Communication**

Improve signage for public toilets and request the use of the international symbols of access (Department of Building and Housing, [www.dbh.govt.nz](http://www.dbh.govt.nz)).

Improve signage at Dudley Park Aquatic Centre regarding the provision of the hoist and variable height change table in the accessible changing facility.

**Consultation**

The Waimakariri Access Group requests that they are consulted early on in the planning of projects as it is difficult to make changes in later stages.
Physical Access

Request that accessibility is an integral part of traffic management plans when footpath repairs are being undertaken.

Ensure that accessible car parks are available to accommodate vans that are ‘rear loaders’ enabling safe use of ramps and hoists at the back of the vehicle.

Implementation of the Strategy

Since the adoption of the 2011 Disability Strategy the Council has addressed local barriers for people with impairments.

Council staff have continued to undertake awareness training through the Waimakariri Access Group which includes representation from CCS Disability Action and the Royal New Zealand Foundation of the Blind. This training aims to heighten awareness of disability issues so that staff members can consider the impact their work has on people with impairments ensuring plans and projects do not have a negative impact on accessibility.
There is a programme of maintenance and/or reconstruction for footpaths to ensure they remain physically accessible, comfortable and safe. Associated with this is the installation of directional and tactile pavers during upgrades of crossing points in the towns. These pavers safely direct people with vision impairments large print books for people with vision impairments.

Accessible routes to schools are prioritised which include upgrading/installing footpaths and cycle ways. Accessible parking spaces are provided, monitored and the restrictions enforced.
All accessible parking signage has been updated and incorporated into the first schedule of the Parking Bylaw.

The Council’s Customer Services department maintains a list of residents undergoing dialysis to ensure they are contacted if water services are to be interrupted.

The Council and library websites are designed using E-Govt Accessibility criteria.

The library has wheelchairs available in the Rangiora and Kaiapoi facilities and offers a book pick-up and delivery service for people who are housebound. The library catalogue includes talking and large print books for people with vision impairments. Computers with internet access (as well as WiFi within the library) are available at no charge and these are installed with enlargement software to make them user friendly for people with vision impairments.

Dudley Park Aquatic Centre has been designed with a wheelchair ramp and a wet wheelchair to enable access to the main pool for people with physical impairments. Hoist access to the spa pool is provided and a ceiling hoist and height adjustable change table has been installed in one of the accessible changing rooms.

Parks and reserves in the District are designed using Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles. The CPTED approach designs places to be, and feel, safer.

While the Council already addresses some key barriers faced by people with impairments through its current activities, it is recognised that more can be done to contribute towards an inclusive environment for all. This will in turn contribute towards achieving key community outcomes.
Waimakariri Community Outcomes

All Council actions are designed to contribute towards achieving the Community Outcomes, which are the aspirations of the community for the District as prepared for the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan. The Disability Strategy contributes towards achieving a number of Community Outcomes, particularly:

**Governance**

Effect is given to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi
- The Council in partnership with Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga, continue to build our relationship through mutual understanding and shared responsibilities.

There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision making that affects our District
- The Council makes information about its plans and activities readily available.
- The Council takes account of the views across the community including mana whenua.
- The Council makes known its views on significant proposals by others affecting the District’s wellbeing.
- Opportunities for collaboration and partnerships are actively pursued.

**Environment**

There is a safe environment for all
- Harm to people from natural and man-made hazards is minimised.
- Our district has the capacity and resilience to quickly recover from natural disasters and adapt to the effects of climate change.
- Crime, injury and harm from road crashes, gambling and alcohol abuse are minimised.
- Our District is well served by emergency services and volunteers are encouraged.

**Places and Spaces**

The community’s cultures, arts and heritage are conserved and celebrated
- There are wide-ranging opportunities to participate in arts and cultural activities.
Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality
• There is a wide variety of public places and spaces to meet people’s needs.
• There are wide-ranging opportunities for people to enjoy the outdoors.
• The accessibility of community and recreation facilities meets the changing needs of our community.

The distinctive character of our takiwa – towns, villages and rural areas is maintained
• The centres of our towns are safe, convenient and attractive places to visit and do business.

People are friendly and caring, creating a strong sense of community in our District
• There are wide-ranging opportunities for people of different ages, abilities and cultures to participate in community life and recreational activities.

The high-level implementation table within this document outlines more specifically how key priorities and Council actions contribute towards achieving the above Community Outcome.
Overall Planning Framework

The following statutes, policies, plans and strategies provide a framework for the development and implementation of the Disability Strategy for the Waimakariri District.

Accessibility Strategy

Community Outcomes

Council Purpose
“to make Waimakariri are great place to be in partnership with our communities.”

Other Related Waimakariri District Council Strategies
- Long Term Plan
- District Plan
- Walking and Cycling Strategy
- Road Safety Strategy
- Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan
- Rangiora Town Centre Strategy
- Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw
- Community Development Strategy

Key Policies
The Accessibility Strategy Gives Effect To
- Significance and Engagement Policy
- Housing for the Elderly Policy
- Council’s Role in the provision of Community Facilities Policy

Council Roles in Disability Strategy
- Advocate Regulator
- Facilitator
- Service Provider
- Partner
- Planner
- Sponsor
- Educator
- Employer
- Landlord

Council Activities
- District Development
- Governance
- Building Control
- Health and Wellbeing
- Libraries and Museums
- Property and Forestry
- Community & Recreation
- Roading
- Solid Waste
- Water
- Parking Management

International
United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities

National
NZ Disability Strategy 2016-26 Disabled Persons Assembly, Inclusive Communities, August 2010
Human Rights Commission, The Accessible Journey, September 2005
NZ Public Health and Disability Act 2000
Pedestrian Planning and Design Guide 2007
Road and Traffic Guidelines (RTS14)

Regional
Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy
Canterbury Regional Land Transport Strategy 2008-2018
The Strategy

The Waimakariri Vision

The Waimakariri District Council has a vision for an inclusive District where all people can engage in personal, community, and civic life without barriers. The associated nine keywords represent overarching guiding principles that are accepted as vital and true for creating an inclusive society.

“All people, including those with impairments can engage in personal, community and civic life without barriers”
Goals

The Disability Reference Group and Council have identified eight broad goals for the Council for creating a more inclusive environment within the Waimakariri District. These are accompanied by more descriptive objectives.

At a glance, the eight goals are:

1. Communication allows and encourages full access to Council information, events, services and facilities
2. Everyone (including people with impairments) are able to fully participate in Council consultation and decisions that impact their living in the District
3. Council services, programmes and events are accessible for everyone, including people with impairments
4. Everyone, including people with impairments have access to public services, facilities and spaces
5. The rights of people with impairments are supported and promoted through advocacy and empowerment
6. Injuries are avoided and rates of impairment reduced
7. The Council has an Equal Employment Opportunities environment and a diverse workforce
8. Disability training programmes are developed and implemented at all levels within the Council
Communication

The Council communicates a lot with the wider community, whether in person at Council Service Centres and Libraries, through signs and advertisements, in newspapers, via the website or emails, through pamphlets, policies, strategies and plans.

Some people with impairments (intellectual, vision and/or hearing), who are elderly, or new migrants (with English as a second language), face barriers to being able to access or understand commonly used forms of communication. It is important that the Council communicates information in a way that is appropriate to people’s needs.

**Goal 1:** Communication allows and encourages full access to Council information, events, services and facilities.

- Information about services, events and facilities is provided in a variety of ways and media to meet different needs;
- Information about Council services and events is publicised through disability networks;
- Targeted information for people with impairments and service providers is provided;
- Council facilities have clear signs including internationally recognised symbols and indicators.
Consultation and Decision Making

The Council regularly consults with the wider community on issues that affect them, including proposed changes to services, proposals for new services, changes to the physical environment such as roads, intersections or spaces in their neighbourhoods, and more.

The Council also conducts a number of surveys that gauge the community’s views about particular matters, or involves representatives in developing strategic directions to address particular issues facing the District and its residents.

It is essential that the Council ensures its consultation and decision making mechanisms are accessible to all people and that it specifically consults with people with impairments and relevant agencies on matters that impact on their lives.

**Goal 2: Everyone (including people with impairments) are able to fully participate in Council consultation and decisions that impact their living in the District.**

- Council consultation processes do not create barriers that prevent anyone from participating in making decisions that affect their lives;
- Council engages in ongoing dialogue with people with impairments and their agencies to ensure their needs are recognised and considered when making decisions;
- Carers of people who experience disability are able to contribute to decisions that affect them;
- People with impairments are involved in the planning, implementation and evaluation of services, new developments and redevelopment;
- The Waimakariri Access Group is utilised as a disability reference group to ensure appropriate expertise is available for planning, reviewing and implementing services.
Access to Council Services, Programmes and Events

The Council provides a number of District services such as supplying water and sewer, collecting rubbish and recycling and renting Council housing. Council services, programmes and events play a significant role in the wider community in creating a functional and enjoyable District in which to live and create stronger communities.

It is important that access to services, programmes and events is inclusive for all and allows maximum opportunities for participation for people with impairments. For example the increase in services that are accessible over the phone or internet have significant benefits for people with vision or mobility impairments. It is important to ensure services are delivered without discrimination against people with impairments.

**Goal 3: Council services, programmes and events are accessible for everyone, including people with impairments.**

- Council services meet the specific needs of people with impairments;
- Council housing is of appropriate design, is accessible, available and safe for people with impairments;
- Rubbish and recycling collection services are accessible and do not create hazards;
- Council-run and sponsored events and programmes are accessible to people with impairments and physical access needs are met;
- Recreation and sports programmes are accessible for everyone, including people with impairments.
Physical Access

The Council is responsible for providing and maintaining a number of public spaces such as roads, footpaths, parks and recreational areas, laneways, squares and on and off-street car parking. It also provides public facilities and buildings which house services, including libraries, service centres, sports facilities, museums, pools, town halls, and information centres. At the same time, the Council regulates requirements for other buildings the public regularly uses, such as commercial and retail facilities, health care services, cafés and restaurants.

Public spaces and facilities provide an important community function – they are places where people meet and socialise, where people learn, work, shop or do business, where people obtain health care or other services, or are simply means of getting from one place to another. Physical barriers such as steps, heavy doors, lack of colour contrasting, high door handles or lift buttons can all become obstacles for people in accessing facilities and services.

Public spaces and buildings are heavily utilised by the community. It is essential that these are accessible for everyone in order to maximise the opportunity for all people to fully participate in this important aspect of community life. This means no-one is prevented from participation in recreational, social or employment activities because of architectural or attitudinal barriers.

Goal 4: Everyone, including people with impairments, have access to public services, facilities and spaces.

- Footpaths, crossings, paved areas and streets are designed, constructed and maintained in ways which are safe, usable and accessible for everyone;
- Specific road safety issues raised by people with impairments such as particular pedestrian crossings, intersections and footpath surfaces are addressed;
- Mobility car parking is accessible, safe, appropriately located and monitored;
- Footpaths and streets are unobstructed so that people are able to move about safely and easily;
- Existing Council services, facilities and public spaces maximise the opportunities for people to access and participate;
- Statutory requirements for buildings and amenities to ensure their compliance with the Building Act Section 118 relating to design for Access and Mobility are enforced;
- Appropriately designed changing facilities and public toilets are available at Council facilities where relevant;
- Public transport is accessible and affordable
Advocacy

The Council has a role to advocate for access and equity issues such as, but not limited to, education, employment and training, cultural events and programmes, and youth disability services, as they relate to people with impairments in the Waimakariri District. This includes supporting advocacy groups and agencies such as the Waimakariri Access Group, Social Services Waimakariri, and the Waimakariri Health Advisory Group. At the same time, people with impairments need to be empowered to self-advocate to achieve independent living.

Goal 5: The rights of people with impairments are supported and promoted through advocacy and empowerment.

- Advocacy is provided for policies, programmes, practices, and procedures that guarantee equal opportunity for all people with impairments;
- People with impairments have the opportunity to advocate on their own behalf;
- Disability advocacy services and agencies are supported;
- Advocacy is provided for the planning and development of an inclusive and accessible environment for everyone;
- People with impairments are portrayed by the media in a positive way, particularly through Council’s own publications and publicity material.
Prevention

The Council acknowledges that one fifth to one third of impairments are caused by lasting effects of injury as identified by the Ministry of Health. It is therefore important that injury caused by a variety of things including motor vehicle accidents, poor diet and health are minimised, thereby reducing the overall rate of incidence of some forms of impairments in the Waimakariri District.

Goal 6: Injuries are avoided and rates of impairment reduced.

- Advocacy is provided for policies and strategies which influence health, in order to improve people’s standard of living and vulnerability to injury and disease;
- Preventative measures to reduce injury or diseases which can lead to impairments are advocated;
- Healthy living is encouraged and promoted;
- Injury prevention programmes are supported;
- Road safety is promoted;
- Environmental health statues such as food licensing, dangerous goods, sale of liquor, insanitary buildings, offensive trades and hazardous substances are administered;
- Civil defence practices are in place in order to plan for and respond to emergencies.
Diverse Workforce

For most people, the chance to get and keep a job is central to their independence and participation in society. For people with impairments, this can often be far more difficult than for those without impairments – people with impairments are amongst those in society with the lowest employment rates.

It is widely recognised that there is a positive correlation between gainful employment and wellbeing. Positive attributes of employment include time structure, shared experiences, contacts and social networks which often lead to an increase in self-esteem. Work can in itself be an important step in the road to recovery and rehabilitation, as well as providing obvious personal economic benefits.

People with impairments have the right to productive and meaningful employment which provides flexibility, equal opportunity and career path development. The Council is one of the District’s largest employers. It provides a wide range of workplace opportunities for local residents. It is vital that the Council provides equitable opportunities for employment for people with impairments in order to ensure that assumptions and stereotypes do not prejudice the selection of candidates. Equal Employment Opportunities (EEO) allow the Council to recruit the best person for the job, once they (the Council) have made any reasonable adjustments.

Goal 7: The Council has an Equal Employment Opportunities environment and a diverse workforce.

- Employment and development of staff with impairments is facilitated and key service providers and disability agencies consulted regarding the removal of barriers;
- Communication services, resources, and flexible workplace options are available;
- Job modification, skills training and on the job training is available;
- The requirements of the Health and Safety Act are implemented;
- There is no discriminatory or insensitive behaviour towards employees with impairments.
Cultural Change

In many cases, it is society’s attitudes towards people with impairments that create problems or a “disability”. Cultural change is one of the most fundamental steps in creating an environment that is truly inclusive for all, independent from whether an individual suffers an impairment or not.

Cultural change is about considering and appropriately providing for the needs of people with impairments in everyday work. Attitudes and ignorance towards people with impairments must be challenged to avoid institutional discrimination. This will ensure all in Council understand why rights are necessary and what they mean.

Goal 8: Disability training programmes are developed and implemented at all levels within the Council.

- All Council staff and elected members will undertake disability awareness training;
- Staff whose work impinges directly on the well-being of people experiencing disabilities undertake more specific training to ensure they are appropriately educated about removing barriers faced by people with impairments;
- Barrier free seminars for Council officers to improve staff understanding and ability to be responsive to needs of people with impairments are sponsored;
- Resource material and expertise of the Waimakariri Access Group is available and communicated to Council staff to enhance their awareness and understanding of potential barriers, appropriate consultation processes, available networks and strategies to integrate the needs of the impaired community into services, facilities and decision-making processes.

The following pages outline key priority areas and Council actions for achieving these goals. A detailed Action Plan is will be developed as a separate document, outlining specifically how the Council will work towards achieving the goals.
Priority Areas and Council Actions
The following table represents a high level schedule of actions. The priority areas and actions in this table build on existing good practice or are new initiatives to assist in achieving our vision of an inclusive community where all can engage in their personal, community and civic life with independence. While some actions may already be underway, many can be improved; a separate detailed Action Plan will further examine and identify how this will be done.

This table identifies how each action contributes to the District’s Community Outcomes and aligns to the objectives of the New Zealand Disability Strategy. The success of this strategy is largely dependent on the whole of Council working in partnership with people with impairments to identify needs, priorities and practical responses from Council to support the vision of this strategy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Areas and Council Actions</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Community Outcomes</th>
<th>New Zealand Disability Strategy 2016-2026 (NZDS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 1:</strong> Communication allows and encourages full access to Council information, events, services and facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Incorporate different formats and access features in the Council website complying with the “New Zealand Government Web guidelines”. | Communication Team | People have wide ranging opportunities for learning and being informed | Accessibility  
We access all places, services and information with ease and dignity. |
| Make all key Council communications available in a range of accessible formats that are easier for the wider disabled community, such as large print, radio, websites, simple language and diagrams, Braille, message services etc, and applying Easyread design principles. | Communication Team | Our people are easily able to get the information they need | There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision-making by public organisation that affects our District  
Local, regional and national organisations make information about their plans and activities readily available. |
<p>| Target communication for people with impairments and their service providers about information that directly affects them. | Communication Team | | |
| Ensure that Council facilities have clear signs including internationally recognised symbols and indicators. | Parks and Recreation | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Areas and Council Actions</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Community Outcomes</th>
<th>New Zealand Disability Strategy 2016-2026 (NZDS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publicise information about Council services and events through disability networks, including the Waimakariri Access Group.</td>
<td>Property Communication Team Community Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Consultation and Decision Making

**Goal 2:** Everyone, including people with impairments are able to fully participate in Council consultation and decisions that impact their living in the District

| Develop the role of the Waimakariri Access Group as a disability reference group and ensure Council units utilise it to gain insight of their expertise when planning, reviewing and implementing services. | Policy & Strategy | There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision-making by public organisations that affects our District | Choice and control
We have choice and control over our lives. |
| Ensure that people with impairments are involved in the early planning, implementation and design stages of new developments and redevelopment. | All | Local, regional and national organisations make information about their plans and activities readily available. Local, regional and national organisations make every effort to take account of the views of people who participate in community engagement. | Leadership
We have great opportunities to demonstrate our leadership. |
<p>| Ensure that Council consultation processes, including the Annual Plan, Long Term Plan and other major consultations, do not create barriers for people with impairments to be able to participate, including making any relevant consultation documents available in alternative formats and in a variety of media to meet their needs. | All | People have wide ranging opportunities for learning and being informed. Our people are easily able to get the information they need. | |
| Participate in ongoing dialogue with people with impairments, their support people and agencies in order to recognise their specific needs when making decisions that affect them. | All |                                                                                  |                                                 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Areas and Council Actions</th>
<th>Access to Council Services, Programmes and Events</th>
<th>Community Outcomes</th>
<th>New Zealand Disability Strategy (NZDS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 3: Council services, programmes and events are accessible for everyone, including people with impairments</strong></td>
<td>Ensure that services meet the specific needs of people with impairments and continue to audit physical access to libraries, swimming pools and community buildings.</td>
<td>The community's cultures, arts and heritage are conserved and celebrated and different cultures are acknowledged and respected.</td>
<td>Health and Wellbeing: We have the highest attainable standards of health and wellbeing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure that Council housing is of appropriate design, accessible, safe and available to people with impairments.</td>
<td>There are wide-ranging opportunities for people of different ages to participate in arts and cultural activities.</td>
<td>Accessibility: We access all places, services and information with ease and dignity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitor rubbish and recycling services to ensure there are no hazardous to people with impairments and do not create hazards.</td>
<td>There are wide-ranging opportunities for people of different ages to participate in community and recreational activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure that Council-run and sponsored events and programmes are accessible for people with impairments and physical access needs are met.</td>
<td>People are friendly and caring, creating a strong sense of community in our District.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure that recreation and sports programmes are accessible including recognising physical access needs.</td>
<td>There is a safe environment for all. Harm to people from natural and manmade hazards is minimised.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical Access</strong></td>
<td>Everyone, including people with impairments have access to public services, facilities and spaces.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 4: Everyone, including people with impairments, have access to public services, facilities and spaces</strong></td>
<td>Work towards a 'barrier free' environment with accessible footpaths, public spaces and buildings including public toilets ensuring appropriate facilities are available through planning and regulatory requirements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Community Team</td>
<td>Property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Team</td>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>Property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Areas and Council Actions</td>
<td>Who</td>
<td>Community Outcomes</td>
<td>New Zealand Disability Strategy (NZDS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and address in a timely fashion specific road safety issues that have been raised by people with impairments.</td>
<td>Roading</td>
<td>Crime, injury and harm from road accidents, gambling and alcohol abuse are minimised.</td>
<td>The distinctive character of our towns, villages and rural areas is maintained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforce the Signage Bylaw 2012, the objective of which is to “To seek to avoid public nuisance by ensuring advertising displays and signage on footpaths does not obstruct the passage of pedestrians and/or disabled people”</td>
<td>Policy and Strategy, Environmental Services</td>
<td>The centres of our main towns are safe, convenient and attractive places to visit and do business.</td>
<td>Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable, affordable and sustainable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure the statutory requirement of the Building Act Standard relating to design for Access and Mobility is complied with for existing and new or redeveloped buildings.</td>
<td>Building Unit</td>
<td>Communities in our District are well linked with each other and Christchurch is readily accessible by a range of transport modes.</td>
<td>The District is well served by public transport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide an appropriate number of mobility car parks that are suitably located and monitored, and restrictions enforced.</td>
<td>Environmental Services, Planning</td>
<td>Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality</td>
<td>There is a wide variety of public places and spaces to meet people’s needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with Environment Canterbury (Canterbury Regional Council) to ensure public transport is accessible for people with impairments as well as affordable. This includes acting as an advocate to communicate particular issues for people with impairments to Environment Canterbury.</td>
<td>Roading, Policy and Strategy</td>
<td>There are wide ranging opportunities for people to enjoy the outdoors.</td>
<td>The range and accessibility of community and recreation facilities meets the changing needs of our community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Areas and Council Actions</td>
<td>Who</td>
<td>Community Outcomes</td>
<td>New Zealand Disability Strategy (NZDS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advocacy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 5:</strong> The rights of people with impairments are supported and promoted through advocacy and empowerment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocate for equity and access for people with impairments through policies, programmes, practices and procedures both within the organisation and externally, to guarantee the provision of an accessible and inclusive environment for everyone.</td>
<td>Mayor and Councillors All staff</td>
<td>People are friendly and caring, creating a strong sense of community in our District There are wide ranging opportunities for people of different ages to participate in community and recreational activities.</td>
<td>Education: We get an excellent education and achieve our potential throughout our lives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support and encourage people with impairments to advocate on their own behalf and provide the opportunity for this to occur.</td>
<td>Community Team</td>
<td>People have wide ranging opportunities for learning and being informed Our people are easily able to get the information they need.</td>
<td>Employment and Economic Security: We have the highest attainable standards of health and wellbeing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support disability advocacy services and agencies.</td>
<td>Community Team Policy and Strategy</td>
<td>Our community's needs for health and social services are met Our people are supported by a wide range of health services that are available and accessible in our District. Participation in community-based support services is acknowledged and encouraged.</td>
<td>Health and Wellbeing: We have the highest attainable standards of health and wellbeing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that people with impairments are portrayed by the media in a positive way, particularly through Council’s own publications and publicity material.</td>
<td>Communication Team</td>
<td></td>
<td>Attitudes: We are treated with dignity and respect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Choice and Control: We have choice and control over our lives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Areas and Council Actions</td>
<td>Who</td>
<td>Community Outcomes</td>
<td>New Zealand Disability Strategy (NZDS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevention</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 6:</strong> Injuries are avoided and rates of impairment reduced.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocate for policies and strategies which influence health, such as access to education, employment opportunities, adequate income and safe housing in order to improve people’s standard of living and avoid preventative disease and people being unwell that can lead to impairment.</td>
<td>Community Team</td>
<td><strong>There is a safe environment for all</strong></td>
<td><strong>Education:</strong> We get an excellent education and achieve our potential throughout our lives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harm to people from natural and manmade hazards is minimised.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Crime, injury and harm from road accidents, gambling and alcohol abuse are minimised.</td>
<td><strong>Health and Wellbeing:</strong> We have the highest attainable standards of health and wellbeing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support injury prevention programmes.</td>
<td>Community Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote road safety through monitoring, research, physical changes and educational programmes.</td>
<td>Roading</td>
<td><strong>The community’s needs for health and social services are met</strong></td>
<td><strong>Health and Wellbeing:</strong> We have the highest attainable standards of health and wellbeing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Team</td>
<td>Our people are supported by a wide range of health services that are available in our District.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage and promote healthy living through relevant recreation and leisure programmes and facilities.</td>
<td>Community Team</td>
<td><strong>Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable, affordable and sustainable</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure environmental health statutes such as food licensing, dangerous goods, sale of liquor, insanitary buildings, offensive trades and hazardous substances are administered.</td>
<td>Environmental Health</td>
<td>The standard of our District’s roads is keeping pace with increasing traffic numbers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain a civil defence capability to plan for and respond to emergencies.</td>
<td>Emergency Management and Civil Defence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Diverse Workforce
**Goal 7:** The Council has an Equal Employment Opportunities environment and a diverse workforce

| Ensure that communication services, resources and flexible workplace options are available, including potential job modification, skills training and on the job training for staff with impairments. | Human Resources | **Businesses in the District** are diverse, adaptable, and growing |
| Implement the requirements of the Health and Safety Act and the Council’s employment policies. | Human Resources | There are growing numbers of business and employment opportunities in the District. |
| Ensure that there is no discriminatory or insensitive behaviour towards employees with impairments. | Human Resources | There are opportunities for our young people to enter employment and gain skills in our District. |

**Education:** We get an excellent education and achieve our potential throughout our lives.

**Employment and Economic Security:** We have security in our economic situation and can achieve our potential.

**Choice and Control:** We have choice and control over our lives.

**Leadership:** We have great opportunities to demonstrate our leadership.

### Cultural Change
**Goal 8:** Disability training programmes are developed and implemented at all levels within the Council

| Encourage all Council staff and elected members to undertake disability awareness training and ensure that staff whose work impinges directly on the well-being of people experiencing impairments undertake more specific training. | Mayor and Councillors, Human Resources | **People are friendly and caring, creating a strong sense of community in our District** |
| Sponsor barrier free seminars for Council officers to improve staff understanding and ability to be responsive to the needs of people with impairments. | Management Team | There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision-making by public organisations that affects our District |
| Ensure the resource material and expertise of the Waimakariri Access Group is available and communicated to Council staff to enhance awareness and understanding of potential barriers, appropriate consultation processes, available networks and strategies to integrate the needs of the impaired community into services, facilities and decision-making processes. | Community Team, Policy and Strategy | **Objective 6:** Foster an aware and responsive public service. |

Public organisations make information about their plans and activities readily available.

Public organisations make every effort to accommodate the views of people who contribute to consultations.
Monitoring and Review

What is the Accessibility Strategy?

This is a new strategy and will develop over time. Issues and priorities may change, however, it is important that Council is accountable to people with impairments and their organisations for the actions it has committed to.

Monitoring and review will be a two way process where Council reports to people with impairments and their organisations; and people with impairments report to Council regarding the impact and effectiveness of the strategy. The process will include:

- The Disability Strategy Reference Group and a core team of Council officers to monitor delivery of the Action Plan across Council activities;
- Community forums and other processes for people with impairments to give feedback;
- Inclusion of information in Council reports regarding consultation with people with impairments.

The strategy will be reviewed three years from adoption by Council. The Action Plan which is a separate document will be reviewed and reported on annually.

References


To have an ‘ordinary’ life – Kia whai oranga ‘noa’. Community membership for adults with an intellectual disability. A report to the Minister of Health and the Minister for Disability Issues from the National Advisory Committee on Health and Disability, September 2003.


Disability Policies, Strategies and Action Plans from a variety of Councils were also reviewed.

Easyread information: www.communicationpeople.co.nz
Glossary

Access / Accessibility / Barrier free
These terms are used interchangeably throughout the strategy. They refer to the removal of barriers, attitudinal or environmental, which increases the opportunity for people with impairments to participate in the community.

Accessible Journey
In order to comply with access requirements (The Building Regulations 1992 First Schedule, Clause A2 p.9) a building must have an "accessible route". This is defined as a "... continuous route that can be negotiated unaided by a user of a wheelchair, walking frame or guide dog." The route must extend from a street boundary or car parking area to those spaces within the building required to be accessible to enable people with impairments to carry out independently normal activities and processes within the building.

Approachability, Accessibility, Disability-friendly and Usability
These concepts enable a person with an impairment to approach, enter and use a building, and its facilities, and carry out the normal functions and activities for which the building was designed.

Disability
Disability is the outcome of the interaction between a person with impairment(s) and the environment and attitudinal barriers he/she may face. It is also the process that happens when one group of people create barriers by designing a world only for their way of living, taking no account of the impairments other people have.

Impairments
Impairments are something that individuals have, they are long term (greater than six months) and may be physical, sensory, neurological, psychiatric, or intellectual.

Tactile ground surface indicators (TGSI)
These provide blind, deafblind and vision impaired pedestrians with visual and sensory information. There are two types of TGSI - warning indicators and directional indicators. Warning indicators alert pedestrians to hazards in the continuous accessible path of travel, indicating they should stop to determine the nature of the hazard before proceeding further. They do not indicate what the hazard will be. Directional indicators give directional orientation and designate the continuous accessible path of travel when other tactile or environmental cues are missing. When combined with other environmental information, TGSI assist blind, deafblind and vision impaired people with their orientation and awareness of impending obstacles, hazards and changes in the direction of the continuous accessible path of travel.
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT

FILE NO and TRIM NO: BYL-52 / 170713072738

REPORT TO: Council

DATE OF MEETING: 1 August 2017

FROM: Veronica Spittal, Senior Policy Analyst; for the Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 Implementation Plan Working Party

SUBJECT: Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 Implementation Plan Consultation

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to obtain the Council’s approval to consult the public on the draft Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 Implementation Plan. The plan has been prepared by the working party established for this purpose by the Council in December 2016.

1.2. Most of the costs associated with the actions contained within the implementation plan are able to be funded over time from existing ECan Ranger Service and Council Green Space operational budgets. The sealing of the Kairaki Beach car park and provision for access at Waikuku Beach for those with mobility issues are two costly items requiring further investigation and depending on the outcome of the investigations, may be put forward for consideration on a 50/50 shared funding basis in both ECan’s and the Council’s draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plans. It is expected that some actions will be funded by the organisations that are plan partners and their contribution will be finalised after the consultation has been completed. The implementation of some actions, particularly those relating to research, are not currently resourced and it is hoped research partners may be able to be identified either during the consultation process or once implementation is underway.

1.3. The working party is recommending the area of coastal strip covered by the Bylaw be managed as a park so people know they are in a park environment and act accordingly. It is also recommending an advisory group be established to drive the implementation plan and feedback on both of these proposals is encouraged as part of the consultation process.

1.4. Extensive consultation was carried out on the Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 with two formal hearings held to hear the public submissions. The consultation carried out on the implementation plan will not provide an opportunity for the bylaw rules to be revisited but will allow interested members of the public to become involved in the implementation of the bylaw. As the working party is familiar with the practicalities of implementing the bylaw it is suggested that the group be mandated to consider the submissions and recommend to Council any necessary changes. It is not considered necessary to use the formal special consultative procedure for this consultation.
2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 170713072738.

(b) Approves initiating the consultation process on the draft Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 Implementation Plan from 7 August to 22 August 2017.

(c) Approves the attached draft Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 Implementation Plan for release for public consultation.

(d) Mandates the Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 Implementation Plan Working Party to consider public submissions received on the implementation plan and recommend any necessary changes to Council.

(e) Agrees that it is not necessary to instigate a special consultative procedure for the Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 Implementation Plan consultation process.

3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. The Council approved the establishment of a working party to prepare an implementation plan for the Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 on 6 December 2016.

3.2. The working party’s terms of reference approved by the Council included:

- Developing the plan, overseeing its implementation, reviewing its effectiveness after two years of operation and reporting to Council on any need to carry out an early review;
- Establishing a bylaw research and monitoring programme in conjunction with other interested parties;
- Carrying out annual reviews of the kite surfing and commercial horse training user agreements.

3.3. Another action added after the Council meeting was to oversee a review of the current ECAn Ranger Service contract with the Council.

3.4. The working party is made up of representatives from the following organisations:

- Waimakariri District Council - Councillor Peter Allen (Chair), Veronica Spittal, Chris Brown, Dan Cameron (staff support)
- Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board - Jackie Watson
- Woodend-Sefton Community Board – Andrew Thompson
- Department of Conservation – Anita Spencer
- Environment Canterbury – David Owen
- Ashley-Rakahuri Rivercare Group – Bev Alexander
- Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust – Greg Byrnes
- Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga – Nigel Harris, MKT

3.5. Due to delays in the appointment of the community board members the first meeting of the working party was not able to be held until 8 March 2017. Since this time the working party has met once and sometimes twice a month to discuss bylaw related issues and develop the implementation plan. The draft document is now ready for the Council to consider for release for public consultation. The implementation plan is a working
document representing the collaborative efforts of those who attended the meetings and
gave feedback and is designed to inspire and educate people about the coastal values
the working party is seeking to protect.

3.6. The Draft Implementation Plan sets out proposals for implementation consistent with the
adopted bylaw across eleven areas for consideration. These are:

- Cultural Values
- Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary
- Physical Structures
- Signage
- Education
- Publicity
- Working with Others
- User Agreements
- Enforcement
- Research and Monitoring
- Review

3.7. It is recommended that the consultation period run from 7 August to 22 August 2017.
This is just over two working weeks to allow the implementation plan to be adopted by
Council at its 3 October meeting but does provide for input from Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri
Rūnanga at its joint executive meeting on 17 August, Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust at its
2 August meeting and the community boards during their scheduled meetings on 3, 9, 14
and 21 August.

3.8. The working party plans to hold drop-in sessions on 12 August at Waikuku Beach and
19 August at Pines Beach to discuss the implementation plan with residents and promote
the bylaw rules. The drop-in session for the bylaw consultation at Woodend was not well
attended and it is not planned to hold another there due to time constraints. The drop-in
sessions will be staffed by Green Space and Policy and Strategy and supported by the
ECan Ranger Service who plan to run a sausage sizzle and the Ashley-Rakahuri
Rivercare Group who will be providing an educational display and refreshments. A
briefing will be held at a joint Woodend-Sefton and Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board
meeting on 7 August to bring new community board members up to date with the project.

3.9. Rather than establishing another hearing panel it is recommended that the working party
be given a mandate to consider any submissions received. The working party would
then recommend any changes to the Council. While it is recommended that a formal
special consultative procedure not be carried out, the requirements of section 82, the
principles of consultation, of the Local Government Act 2002 will still be met, such as
notifying affected parties, providing an opportunity for people to present their views via
drop-in sessions and submission, having their views received with an open mind and
providing a record of the decisions made along with explanatory material relating to the
decisions. A formal special consultative procedure is considered to be unnecessary
because of the extensive consultation, including two formal hearings, carried out on the
Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016, the practical nature of the implementation plan and
the undesirability of delaying the adoption of the plan further.

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

4.1. The views of submitters to the *Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016* have been taken into account in developing the implementation plan with the inclusion of ‘key issues identified through the Bylaw consultation process’ information at the start of each section. Actions suggested by submitters have also been included in the document where appropriate.

4.2. Working party members have been responsible for providing the views of the organisations they represent into the development of the document. These organisations, as well as others that expressed an interest in the proposed *Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016*, will have an opportunity to consider the draft implementation plan during the public consultation process.

4.3. Some of the actions involve Council units other than Green Space and Policy and Strategy. The Governance Manager, Communications and Engagement Manager and Community Team Leader have been consulted about actions that require input from their staff and their views have been incorporated into the draft document.

4.4. The working party considered whether public consultation should be carried out on the implementation plan when there had been extensive consultation on the *Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016*. Members concluded it was important to continue to provide opportunities for members of the public to be engaged with the implementation of the bylaw if the desired shift in attitudes and empowerment of beach communities was to be achieved. Some organisations, such as the Woodend Residents Association, and individuals who submitted to the bylaw have expressed an interest in having an input to the implementation plan before it is finalised.

4.5. The implementation plan contains a proposal for the area of coastal strip covered by the bylaw to be branded and developed as a park. The ECan Rangers reported a significant change in attitudes towards the Waimakariri and Ashley-Rakahuri river bed land developed and promoted as regional parks and the working party thought there were significant benefits in people thinking of the beach as a managed public park space and acting accordingly towards the environment and other users.

4.6. The lack of a representative umbrella group to provide feedback to the Council and ECan on *Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016* issues and to drive many of the actions contained within the implementation plan, was also considered to be an issue, and the working party is recommending that an advisory group be established to supersede the Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 Implementation Plan Working Party once the plan has been adopted by Council. There are a number of options as to the name, terms of reference and composition of the proposed advisory group and these will be presented to Council for consideration at a later date. One issue in particular to consider is the relationship between the Tūhātara Coastal Park and its management and the proposed new park and advisory group. The Tūhātara Coastal Park Trustees may choose to submit on this issue during the consultation process.

5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

5.1. The draft implementation plan has financial implications for five of the organisations party to it; these being the Council, ECan, Department of Conservation, Ashley-Rakahuri Rivercare Group, Te Ngāi Tūhātira Rūnanga and Te Kōhaka o Tūhātara Trust. It is expected that these groups will confirm their involvement with actions and any financial contribution as part of the consultation process.
5.2. Most of the actions relating to the Council and ECAn are covered within existing operational budgets. Having a staff member available to support the advisory group to drive the implementation plan is vital to its success and the Community Green Space Manager is currently advertising for a Green Space Community Project Officer, with key responsibilities in this area, to address this issue.

5.3. Two big items of expenditure have been identified but not yet costed and it is proposed that these be investigated further, and subject to the outcome of the investigations, included as a 50/50 share in both the Council’s and ECAn’s draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plans for consideration by Councillors. These projects are the sealing of the Kairaki Beach car park and the provision of access for people with mobility issues at Waikuku Beach.

5.4. Owners for a few of the actions, in particular some of the research necessary to ensure the next bylaw review is informed by more than anecdotal evidence, have not yet been identified and it is hoped that people or organisations willing to participate in this way will be identified through the consultation process or as part of the on-going work of the advisory group.

6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. **Policy**

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

6.2. **Legislation**

The legislation and associated documents relevant to the *Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016* and therefore the implementation plan are as follows:

- Treaty of Waitangi;
- *New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990*;
- *Resource Management Act 1991*;
- *Local Government Act 2002*;
- *Marine and Coastal Area (Tukutai Moana) Act 2011*;
- *Wildlife Act 1953*;
- *Marine Mammals Protection Act 1978*;
- *Conservation Act 1987*;
- *Ngai Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998*;
- *Land Transport Act 1998*;
- *Reserves Act 1977*;
- *Dog Control Act 1996*;
- *Forest and Rural Fires Act 1977*;
- New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010;
- Regional Coastal Environment Plan for the Canterbury Region;
- Proposed Canterbury Conservation Management Strategy;
- Waimakariri District Council District Plan;
- Tuhaitara Coastal Reserve and Waikuku Beach Reserves Management Plan;
- WDC Memorandum of Understanding with Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga;
- Mahaanui iwi Management Plan 2013;
- Kemp’s Deed;
• WDC Northern Pegasus Bay 2016 Bylaw;
• WDC Dog Control Bylaw 2009;
• WDC Fire Control Bylaw 2014;
• Environment Canterbury Navigation Safety Bylaws 2010;
• Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust Strategic Plan 2015-2025

6.3. Community Outcomes

• Harm to people from natural and manmade hazards is minimised and our district has the capacity and resilience to respond to natural disasters;
• Harm to the environment from the spread of contaminants into ground and water is minimised;
• Conservation of significant areas of vegetation and/or habitats is encouraged;
• Different cultures are acknowledged and respected;
• People enjoy clean water at our beaches and rivers;
• There are wide ranging opportunities for people to enjoy the outdoors;
• There are wide ranging opportunities for people of different ages to participate in community and recreational activities;
• The particular recreational needs of children and young people are met;
• Local regional and national organisations make information about their plans and activities readily available;
• Local, regional and national organisations make every effort to take account of the views of people who participate in community engagement;
• The Council and Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga through the Memorandum of Understanding continue to build their relationship.

Veronica Spittal
SENIOR POLICY ANALYST
Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016
Implementation Plan

Making it happen
Introduction

After a lengthy public consultation process the first Bylaw for Northern Pegasus Bay was adopted by the Council and became operative on 1 July 2010. The Bylaw was originally established to give effect to the agreements arising from the Northern Pegasus Bay Coastal Management Plan. The Waikuku Beach Reserves Management Plan was revised and a Plan Change approved for the Waimakariri District Council District Plan in association with the introduction of the Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2010.

In accordance with Section 158 of the Local Government Act 2002 (the Act), the first review of a bylaw made under the Act is required to be undertaken no later than five years after the bylaw was made. In April 2014 the Council established a multi-agency Working Party to review the effectiveness of the 2010 Bylaw. A report to Council on 3 February 2015 recommended that the Bylaw proceed on the basis that it was still the most appropriate mechanism for controlling public behaviour and recreation activities on the beaches.

The proposed Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2015 was released for public consultation from 7 February 2015 until 11 March 2015 and 221 submissions were received. The Hearing Panel recommended substantial changes to the proposed Bylaw at the 4 August 2015 Council meeting in order to address the concerns raised by submitters. A number of the recommended changes were more restrictive in nature necessitating another round of consultation.

A Statement of Proposal for the Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 was released for public comment between 9 April and 10 May 2016 attracting 70 submissions.

A number of compliments were received about the effort the Bylaw Review Working Party, Hearing Panel and Council had made to develop the Bylaw and the Council’s willingness to go out for another round of consultation. A significant number of submitters agreed with the Bylaw’s focus on health and safety and approved of the balance achieved between conflicting uses and conflicting use/environmental values.

The Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 Implementation Plan Working Party was established by the Waimakariri District Council in late 2016 to ensure the effective implementation of the new Bylaw.

“The Council is to be congratulated on the effort it has put into the compilation of the proposed Bylaw in producing a document that is well balanced, fair minded and caters well for the needs of the various interest groups.” Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw Submitter 2016
Implementation Plan Working Party

The Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 Implementation Plan Working Party (NPBBIPWP) is currently responsible for carrying out the following tasks:

- Developing a Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 Implementation Plan, overseeing its implementation, reviewing its effectiveness after two years of operation and reporting to Council on any need to carry out an early review
- Establishing a Bylaw research and monitoring programme in conjunction with other interested parties
- Carrying out annual reviews of the kite surfing and commercial horse training user agreements
- Overseeing a review of the Ecarn Ranger Service contract with the Council.

The NPBBIPWP recommends that it is replaced by an advisory group once the Implementation Plan has been adopted by Council and the group established.

The Working Party is made up of representatives from the following organisations:

- Waimakariririr District Council
- Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board
- Woodend-Sefton Community Board
- Department of Conservation
- Environment Canterbury
- Ashley-Rakahuri Rivercare Group
- Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust
- Te Ngāi Tuāhuriri Rūnanga.

It is anticipated that the advisory group will include representation from beach resident groups and user groups in addition to the above.
Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016

Vision

*Northern Pegasus Bay coastal strip valued, protected and enjoyed by all.*

Purpose

The Bylaw is in place to ensure wildlife and the natural environment are not harmed and so that everyone can enjoy the district’s beaches. The new Bylaw applies to all of the beaches within the Waimakariri District and became operative on Monday 15 August 2016.

The aims of the Bylaw are to:

- Manage recreational use for the benefit and enjoyment of all users
- Minimise any negative environmental impact from beach activity
- Promote public health and safety
- Minimise nuisance and offensive behaviour.

Protecting foreshore habitats, dune systems, and the wildlife and vegetation in the estuaries and lagoons was identified as a priority during the review and consultation process as was minimising the potential for conflict between different recreation activities and promoting a safe environment for beach users.
1. Cultural Values

"Our kaumataru should not have to walk for miles to get their cockles and pipi, and they should not have to go and get a key for access to their traditional mahia matariki places."

Clare Williams, Ngāi Tūhoe, Mahauru Iwi Management Plan 2013
Scattering of ashes

A ban on scattering or buying human ashes on the beach was proposed in the draft Bylaw because people can be distressed by the remains of their loved ones if they are scattered in such a way. It was strongly opposed by 84% of the submitters who commented on the issue, many of whom sold their feelings, and because the ashes were often scattered in the cultural area not covered by the Bylaw, acknowledging the cultural issue raised by the Ngāi Tahu people. The final Bylaw was adopted by the council, and the Ngāi Tahu people were acknowledged as the authentic custodians of the cultural area.

Key issues identified through the Bylaw consultation process

1. Cultural values

Māhinga kai describes the natural resources gathered by Māori and the practices in doing so. It is specifically recognised in the Treaty of Waitangi and protected in the Māori Claims Settlement Act 1998. Māhinga kai is an important value and activity that will be acknowledged and provided for within the Bylaw process and through ongoing partnership. Achieving a balance between minimising the impact of vehicles on the beach and in the Estuary and providing for traditional rights is a key issue to be resolved.

Fenton Reserves access and rights

Refer to section 8 User Agreements.
Our aspirations

1.1 Ngāi Tahu and Te Ngāi Tūhuriri history and values regarding the use of coastal land, water and natural resources are acknowledged and promoted.

1.2 Relevant Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan 2013 objectives and policies are taken into account in implementing the Bylaw.

How we’ll know we’ve succeeded

- Interpretation information outlining Ngāi Tahu and Te Ngāi Tūhuriri history and values is available to the general public. (1.1)

- Discussions have been held regarding an alternative site for scattering the ashes of deceased persons. (1.1)

- Implementation actions are consistent with Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan 2013 objectives and policies. (1.1, 1.2)
## Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>PARTIES INVOLVED</th>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>BY WHEN</th>
<th>PRELIMINARY ESTIMATED COST / FUNDING SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CV.1</td>
<td>Erect interpretation panels at each beach entrance and at the Ashley-Rakahuriri Estuary. (1.1, 1.2, 4.5)</td>
<td>Ecan Ranger Service and WDC Green Space Team in consultation with Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga</td>
<td>Within 1 year</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV.2</td>
<td>Develop a coastal cultural values brochure and make available to the general public. (1.1)</td>
<td>Ecan Ranger Service in consultation with Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga and Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust</td>
<td>Within 1 year</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV.3</td>
<td>Hold discussions with Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga about opportunities for developing partnerships in the achievement of the Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 Implementation Plan. (1.1, 1.2, 7.3)</td>
<td>WDC Green Space Team and Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga</td>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV.4</td>
<td>Discuss the potential for establishing a site for scattering ashes on Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust land. (1.1)</td>
<td>WDC Green Space Team, in consultation with Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga and Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust</td>
<td>Within 1 year</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## OTHER RELATED ACTIONS

| ED.2   | Develop educational videos involving members of the community and utilise social media to educate beach users about key Bylaw issues and the cultural significance of the area. (1.1, 5.1, 5.3, 7.25, 7.2) |  |
| ED.3   | Revise the family of Bylaw educational brochures and make available for distribution to beach users. (1.1, 5.1, 5.3) |  |
| ED.7   | Promote the cultural and ecological values of the Tūhaitara Coastal Park. (1.1, 5.1, 5.3) |  |
| S.4    | Develop interpretation signs explaining the rich cultural history of the coastal area in consultation with Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga and place in key locations. (1.1, 4.5, 5.1, 5.3, 7.4) |  |
| S.5    | Develop interpretation signs highlighting the significant wildlife and other values of the Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary in consultation with other relevant parties and place in key locations. (1.1, 2.1, 2.4, 4.4, 4.5, 5.1, 5.3, 7.4) |  |
| UA.1   | Develop a Fenton Reserve Code of Conduct for sign off by the advisory group and Fenton Reserve Trustees. (1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.3, 7.2, 7.3, 8.1, 9.1) |  |
| UA.2   | Sign a Fenton Reserve Memorandum of Understanding between the Council and Fenton Reserve Trustees. (1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.3, 7.2, 7.3, 8.1) |  |
2. Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary

“Offshore people ring me wanting to see a braided river, especially the birds, and most especially the wrybill. My response is “no problem, give me a call when you reach NZ”. What I don’t want to happen is you getting such a call in 30 years’ time, and having to reply “no problem showing you a braided river, but I’m afraid the last wrybill was sighted 3 years ago”.

Nick Ledgard, Chairperson Ashley Rakahuri River Care Group talking to school children 2016
Key issues identified through the Bylaw consultation process

Adequate protection of the environment
During the consultation process, conservation-oriented organisations and bird specialists identified a number of activities that could have a negative impact on the important ecological and wildlife values of the Ashley-Rakahuriri and Saltwater Creek estuarine areas. All but one submitter who commented on the Estuary expressed their support for the Bylaw clauses protecting the environment and its flora and fauna with some wanting it to be designated a Ramsar site or a Wild Life Sanctuary. The Hearing Panel considered that a management plan, incorporating a long term vision and agreed outcomes, needed to be developed for the Estuary and thought the Council should take a lead role in promoting this with the other organisations concerned, such as Environment Canterbury, the Department of Conservation, Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga and Fenton Reserve Trustees. Research and monitoring activities also need to be coordinated.

Lack of awareness of the significant values of the Estuary
The Ashley-Rakahuri estuarine area is recognised by the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) as a wetland of international significance and it is designated as an ‘important bird area’ by Birdlife International. The wetlands are the feeding, roosting and breeding grounds of a large number of native birds, including some threatened and critically endangered species such as the black-billed gull, the black-fronted tern, banded dotterel and wrybill. The area is also listed in the Regional Coastal Plan as having ‘significant natural value’ with Maori cultural values, wetlands, estuaries, coastal lagoons, marine mammals, birds, ecosystems, flora and fauna habitats, historic places and coastal landforms and associated processes. The need to educate people about the significance of the Estuary in order to better protect its values was identified during the Bylaw consultation process. Refer to section 5, Education.

Vehicles in the Estuary
Vehicle access is provided for whitebaiting from 15 August to 30 November each year via the whitebait gate. People seeking access through the gate at other times of the year are able to apply to the Council for an exemption. There is a need for increased resources to better monitor the vehicle permit system.

Currently vehicles are able to access the Estuary via the Ashley-Rakahuri River bed. Vehicle access into the river bed is managed by Environment Canterbury through the development of the Ashley-Rakahuri Regional Park and the management plan for the area.

Entrance to the Estuary from Kings Ave is unable to be completely blocked off because of the need to provide vehicle access for Fenton Reserve Trustees.

Vehicles also enter the northern margins of the Estuary from the northern part of the coastal strip. Open access at Ashworths Beach makes this difficult to control. Refer also to section 7, Working with Others. Other vehicle access points are the Raupo Berm and SH1 bridge.

Fenton access
Refer to section 8, User Agreements.

Estuary signage
The need for additional signage at the entrances to the Estuary was highlighted. This included interpretation signage and signage outlining Bylaw rules, particularly those relating to vehicle use and dog control. Refer to section 4, Signage.

Predator control
There is a need to support predator control in the Estuary by locals.

Monitoring the impact of kite surfing on Estuary wildlife
Refer to section 10, Research and Monitoring.

Monitoring the number of motorised craft in the Estuary and their impact on wildlife
Refer to section 10, Research and Monitoring.
Our aspirations

2.1 The community, Ecan, DOC, Te Ngāi Tuāhuriri, Fenton Reserve Trustees and the Council recognise the Estuary is a wetland of international significance and actively seek to protect it.

2.2 Recreation activities carried out in the Estuary are compatible with protecting the Estuary ecosystem.

2.3 The wildlife in the Estuary thrives with safe feeding, resting and breeding areas for all species.

2.4 Organisations and community members work together to achieve an agreed vision for the Estuary.

How we’ll know we’ve succeeded

- A clear vision and management framework is developed for the Estuary. (2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4)

- The community educates other Estuary users on how to behave to protect the environment and wildlife. (2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4)

- Ecan rangers report a decrease in complaints and observations regarding behavior not permitted in the Estuary. (2.1, 2.2, 2.3)

- Use of the Estuary for active recreation declines and is replaced by passive activities such as walking and bird watching. (2.2, 2.3)

- Recreation use of the Estuary causes no further degradation of bird habitats. (2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4)
## Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Parties Involved</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>By When</th>
<th>Preliminary Estimated Cost / Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARE.1</td>
<td>Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara and the Ashley-Rakahuriri Estuary with sentient status (2.1, 2.4)</td>
<td>Within 2 years</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARE.2</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Related Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>(Additional Notes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ED.4</td>
<td>Inform microlight operators at the Rangiora Airfield about the wildlife values of the Ashley-Rakahuriri Estuary and the need to protect the birds there. (2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 5.3, 7.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.4</td>
<td>Monitor levels and characteristics of the kite surfing activity in the Ashley-Rakahuriri Estuary using the Ecan Ranger Service Info tool. (2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 8.3, 10.1c, 10.1e, 11.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.5</td>
<td>Monitor the effectiveness of the Fenton Reserve MOU and Code of Conduct as per agreed methodology. (2.1, 2.3, 2.4, 8.1, 10.1d, 11.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.6</td>
<td>Monitor levels of motorised water sports occurring in the Ashley-Rakahuriri Estuary using the Ecan Ranger Service Info tool. (2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 10.1e)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.7</td>
<td>Establish a baseline for bird species in the Estuary and carry out ongoing monitoring. (2.1, 2.3, 7.2, 7.3, 10.1e)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.8</td>
<td>Ensure research carried out within the Northern Pegasus Bay coastal strip is coordinated (7.3, 10.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.9</td>
<td>Investigate the possibility of finding a research partner to study the effectiveness of Bylaw provisions in protecting Ashley-Rakahuriri Estuary wildlife values from the impact of recreation use. (2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 7.3, 8.1, 8.3, 10.2, 10.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.5</td>
<td>Develop interpretation sign/s highlighting the significant wildlife and other values of the Ashley-Rakahuriri Estuary in consultation with other relevant parties and place in key locations. (1.3, 2.1, 2.4, 4.4, 4.5, 5.1, 5.3, 7.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.6</td>
<td>Ensure clear signage is provided by the Bylaw rules relevant to the Estuary, such as dog control and no-go areas (2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA.1</td>
<td>Develop a Fenton Reserve Code of Conduct for sign off by the advisory group and Fenton Reserve Trustees. (1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.3, 7.2, 7.3, 8.1, 9.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA.2</td>
<td>Sign a Fenton Reserve Memorandum of Understanding between the Council and Fenton Reserve Trustees. (1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.3, 7.2, 7.3, 8.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.6</td>
<td>Support predator control efforts in the Ashley-Rakahuriri Estuary by locals. (2.1, 2.3, 2.4, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Physical Structures

“The irresponsible access and ruination of the sensitive dune area by motorbikes, quad bikes and some 4WD’s is reprehensible and needs to be addressed by fencing off these areas.”

Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw submitter 2015
Key issues identified through the Bylaw consultation process

Cost effective and environmentally appropriate physical structures

The Working Party reviewing the effectiveness of the 2010 Bylaw identified there was a need to improve or provide additional physical structures such as fences, bollards and markers in the coastal area to protect ecologically sensitive areas, further restrict vehicle access and raise awareness of vehicle restrictions.

A number of submitters made comments about this with the majority requesting either barriers at all vehicle access points, barriers to prevent motorbike access or a locked gate at Kairaki Beach. Some submitters suggested that sensitive areas be fenced off for protection from irresponsible vehicle use and that vehicle access tracks be delineated by markers. Concerns raised in relation to physical structures were the need to preserve natural amenity values, retain access for emergency vehicles and avoid a ‘back lash’. One submitter, for example, mentioned that more people drove on the dunes when a protective fence was installed at the Waimakariri River Mouth.

The Hearing Panel acknowledged that additional physical structures could help enforce the Bylaw but thought it was important to use this approach with caution as physical structures could impact negatively on the natural values of the coastal strip, be expensive to apply to such a large area, be difficult to install and retain in constantly changing and turbulent coastal conditions, become a target for vandals and have unintended consequences. For example, it is difficult to prevent motorbike access without also restricting the access of other user groups such as those with push chairs and mobility devices.

The Implementation Plan Working Party was tasked with considering submitters suggestions for additional or improved physical structures and identifying those that would aid the enforcement of the Bylaw in the most cost-effective way.

Clear identification of the northern coastal Bylaw boundary

Different Bylaw rules apply either side of the Waimakariri and Hurunui District Councils’ boundary so clearly identifying this point for members of the public is crucial to effective Bylaw enforcement.

Better definition of the Ocean Outfall prohibited vehicle access point

A number of submitters thought the red posts delineating the northern end of the permitted vehicle access area starting at Kairaki Beach were not obvious, particularly when sand built up around them. Now the stop point has been moved southward to the Ocean Outfall it is even more important drivers know where they need to turn around.

Identification of the Woodend Beach commercial horse training area

The spokesperson for the Woodend Beach commercial horse trainers’ group has requested that each end of the designated horse training area be clearly marked to enable trainers to adhere to the user agreement and let members of the public know where there might be fast moving horses.

Alternative routes for recreational horse riders

From mid-December to mid-January recreational riders need to plan their trips to avoid surf patrol areas. Submitters made a number of suggestions regarding the development of alternative loop horse trails that are worth investigating.

Horse faeces

Several submitters objected to the amount of horse faeces being left on the beach and as rider numbers increase this issue is also likely to increase. The Hearing Panel was of the opinion horse riders needed to be mindful of impacting on other beach users enjoyment of the environment and clean up where possible. The Bylaw now requires any person in charge of a horse to remove faeces passed by the animal from the horse float carparks as this was considered to be a practical option for horse riders and a step towards cleaning up the environment.
Our aspirations

3.1 The design and location of physical structures are appropriate to their setting and intended purpose and user-friendly.

3.2 ‘Less is better’. Physical structures installed to enforce the Bylaw are the most effective solution to an identified problem.

3.3 Continued pedestrian access for beach users, including those with mobility issues and young children is given priority over physical structures required for enforcement reasons.

3.4 Physical structures are provided to support the development of the coastal strip as a managed park space.

How we’ll know we’ve succeeded

• There is less observable and reported damage to structures. (3.1)

• Structures are fit for purpose and do not visually detract from their natural surroundings. (3.1, 3.2)

• Defined access routes are used and minimal use of alternatives is observed. (3.1, 3.2)

• Opportunities for passive recreation are enhanced. (3.3, 3.4)

• People recreate in areas where structures, such as picnic tables and seats, have been provided. (3.4)
## Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>PARTIES INVOLVED</th>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>BY WHEN</th>
<th>PRELIMINARY ESTIMATED COST / FUNDING SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PS.1</td>
<td>Ecan in consultation with WDC Green Space Team and the advisory group</td>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
<td>December 2017</td>
<td>Salaries only. Funded in existing Ecan Ranger Service and WDC Green Space operational budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS.2</td>
<td>WDC Green Space Team and Ecan Rangers</td>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
<td>September 2017</td>
<td>Salaries only. Funded in existing WDC Green Space and Ecan Ranger Service operational budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS.3</td>
<td>WDC Green Space Team and Ecan Rangers in consultation with the advisory group</td>
<td>Within 2 years</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Salaries only. Funded in existing WDC Green Space and Ecan Ranger Service operational budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS.4</td>
<td>WDC Green Space Team and Ecan Rangers</td>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
<td>November 2017</td>
<td>Salaries only to prepare programme. Funded in existing WDC Green Space and Ecan Ranger service budgets. Cost of implementation depends on identified programme of works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS.5</td>
<td>Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust in consultation with WDC Green Space Team and Ecan Rangers</td>
<td>Within 5 years</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>Salaries only. Funded in existing WDC Green Space, Ecan Ranger service and Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust operational budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS.6</td>
<td>WDC Green Space Team and Ecan Rangers</td>
<td>Now</td>
<td>For inclusion in WDC and Ecan 2018-2028 LTP’s</td>
<td>$ to be determined. 50/50 split. To be put in WDC &amp; Ecan 2018 LTP’s for consideration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER RELATED ACTIONS

W.3  
Discuss with the Waikuku Beach Surf Club options for providing disabled access at Waikuku Beach and recommend a solution for consideration by WDC and Ecan Councillors. (3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 7.3, 7.4)
4. Signage

“Clear, unambiguous signage, regularly repeated in exactly the same format will both remove the excuses around misunderstanding or not seeing and help the general public in supporting council-led initiatives and policing.”

Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw submitter 2015
Key issues identified through the Bylaw consultation process

Ineffective and confusing Bylaw signage
The Working Party reviewing the effectiveness of the 2010 Bylaw identified there was a need to improve the enforcement-related signage at various places along the coastal strip so that beach users were very clear about permitted and non-permitted activities.

A number of submitters requested improved or additional signage with some of these providing examples of ineffective and confusing beach signs at the 2015 Hearing.

As a result the Hearing Panel recommended that a review of existing signage be carried out by the Implementation Plan Working Party.

Too many signs, lack of co-ordination between organisations providing signage, lack of design cohesion
A number of organisations erect signage on the coastal strip, for example, Environment Canterbury, Waimakariri District Council, Te Kōhaka o Tūhaukara Trust, Fish and Game, Department of Conservation and the Ashley-Rakahuri Rivercare Group. While some attempts have been made to co-ordinate some of this signage, the beach entrances are characterised by too many signs displaying different logos and graphics and providing different information.

Other areas of the beach have no signs where signs are clearly needed to provide directional or Bylaw information.

Lack of interpretive signage – cultural values
The Hearing Panel thought it was important for beach users to be made more aware of the history of the area and the rights associated with this, for example the right for Ngāi Tahu and Ngāi Tūāhuriri descendants to gather mahinga kai (refer to section 1, Cultural Values) and the right for Fenton Reserve owners and entitlement holders to access Fenton Reserves (refer to section 8, User Agreements).

Scattering the ashes of deceased people on the beach and in waterways was contrary to Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga values and the Hearing Panel also thought it was important to try and discourage this practice by educating beach users (refer to section 1, Cultural Values).
Our aspirations

4.1 Visitor information is well sited, appropriate to its setting and fit for purpose.

4.2 Signage provides clear, consistent messaging and is visually appealing and engaging.

4.3 The amount of signage in the Northern Pegasus Bay coastal strip is minimised.

4.4 There is a coordinated approach amongst organisations installing signage.

4.5 Beach users are educated through the use of interpretive signage.

How we’ll know we’ve succeeded

- Clear, consistent signs are placed at agreed points. (4.1, 4.2)
- The signage review has been completed and new signs installed. (4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5)
- The Ecan Rangers and Council Green Space Team receive positive feedback about the new signage. (4.1, 4.2)
- Multi-agency signage is used where appropriate. (4.3, 4.4)
## Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>PARTIES INVOLVED</th>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>BY WHEN</th>
<th>PRELIMINARY ESTIMATED COST / FUNDING SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S.1 Update and complete register of all current coastal signs (4.1, 4.2, 4.3)</td>
<td>Ecan Ranger Service</td>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
<td>September 2017</td>
<td>Salaries only. Covered in existing Ecan Ranger Service operational budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.2 Determine the minimum signage needed to inform beach users, taking into account important access points and key issues at each site. Assess the adequacy of existing signage within this framework and prepare a signage programme including estimated costs, priorities and time frames. (4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5)</td>
<td>Ecan Rangers in conjunction with WDC Green Space Team and in consultation with Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust</td>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
<td>September 2017</td>
<td>Salaries only. Funded in existing WDC Green Space and Ecan Ranger Service operational budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.3 Install signage as per signage programme. (4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5)</td>
<td>Ecan Rangers in conjunction with WDC Green Space Team and Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust</td>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
<td>December 2017 (most signs)</td>
<td>Funding available in existing WDC Green Space and Ecan Ranger Service operational budgets. Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust is a possible partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.4 Develop interpretation signs explaining the rich cultural history of the coastal area in consultation with Te Ngāi Tūhuriri Rūnanga and place in key locations. (1.1, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5)</td>
<td>Ecan in consultation with WDC Green Space Team, Te Ngāi Tūhuriri Rūnanga and Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust</td>
<td>Within 1 year</td>
<td>2018 (interpretation signs)</td>
<td>$8000 available in existing Ecan Ranger Service operational budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.5 Develop interpretation sign/s highlighting the significant wildlife and other values of the Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary in consultation with other relevant parties and place in key locations. (1.1, 2.1, 2.4, 4.4, 4.5, 5.1, 5.3, 7.4)</td>
<td>Ecan in consultation with WDC Green Space Team, Te Ngāi Tūhuriri Rūnanga and Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust</td>
<td>Within 1 year</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$8000 available in existing Ecan Ranger Service operational budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.6 Ensure clear signage is provided about the Bylaw rules relevant to the Estuary, such as dog control and no-go areas. (2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 4.1, 4.2)</td>
<td>Ecan Rangers in conjunction with the WDC Green Space Team</td>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
<td>December 2017</td>
<td>Salaries only. Funded in existing WDC Green Space and Ecan Ranger Service operational budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.7 Carry out user testing on the proposed signage programme prior to installation. (4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.5, 7.4)</td>
<td>Ecan in consultation with the WDC Green Space Team</td>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
<td>November 2017</td>
<td>Salaries only. Covered in existing Ecan Ranger Service operational budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTION</td>
<td>PARTIES INVOLVED</td>
<td>PRIORITY</td>
<td>BY WHEN</td>
<td>PRELIMINARY ESTIMATED COST / FUNDING SOURCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.9</td>
<td>Carry out consultation on the design of interpretation panels prior to installation. (4.1, 4.2, 4.4, 4.5, 7.4)</td>
<td>Ecan, WDC Green Space Team in consultation with Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga, Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust, Ashley-Rakahuri Rivercare Group, Waikuku Kite Surfers</td>
<td>Within 2 years</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OTHER RELATED ACTIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CV1</td>
<td>Erect interpretation panels at each beach entrance and at the Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary. (1.1, 1.2, 4.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS.1</td>
<td>Create design guidelines for signs and physical structures used in the Northern Pegasus Bay coastal strip. (3.1, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.1</td>
<td>Develop a publicity campaign for when the new Bylaw signage is installed. (4.5, 5.1, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Education

"Education is the most powerful weapon you can use to change the world."

Nelson Mandela
Key issues identified through the Bylaw consultation process

Education as a management tool
The Working Party reviewing the effectiveness of the Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2010 identified there was a need to educate beach users about Bylaw rules and coastal values, particularly the wildlife and cultural values associated with the Ashley-Rakahauri Estuary, in order to bring about a change in user behaviour. A number of submitters also supported the use of education as a Bylaw management tool and made specific suggestions for improvements. These were referred onto the Northern Pegasus Bay Implementation Plan Working Party for its consideration.

Aerial activities in the Estuary
Aerial activities can be seen as a threat to some birds who stay in the air while these are taking place. This interferes with their normal feeding, resting, nesting and roosting activities and puts chicks at risk of overheating or predation. Submitters raised the issue of air craft flying low or hovering over the Estuary and this was discussed with the Rangiora Airfield Advisory Group who advised the use of air space was controlled by the Civil Aviation Authority and all aircraft were required to operate 500 ft above ground level. Members of the Advisory Group had not been aware of the issue and were supportive of education being used as a management tool in the first instance, for example, interpretative panels and brochures being located in the microlight clubrooms at the Rangiora Airfield.

Kite Surfing in the Estuary
The possible impact of kitesurfing on the birdlife in the Estuary was highlighted during the consultation process (refer to section 8 - User Agreements). A user agreement that sat alongside the Bylaw was developed as a control mechanism and educating kite surfers about this agreement is necessary to ensure people commit to it. Kite surfers who participated in the development of the agreement have agreed to help educate other kite surfers about the Bylaw rules. In its submission to the proposed Bylaw, the Canterbury Windsports Association Inc. which works to foster and encourage local participation in windsports within the Canterbury region, also offered its support to educate the kiteboarding community.

Commercial horse training
Similarly, a commercial horse trainers’ agreement was developed for the Woodend Beach Commercial Horse Training Area and as part of the Agreement, horse trainers have agreed to take responsibility for making sure other commercial horse trainers are aware of the Bylaw rules (refer to section 8, User Agreements).

Cultural values
Tāngata whenua have a long and enduring relationship with the coastal and marine environment. It is part of the cultural heritage of Ngāi Tahu. The need to educate beach users about cultural values associated with the coast was identified (refer to section 1, Cultural Values). Particular issues are educating people about:

- wahi tapu and wahi taonga in order to discourage the practice of scattering human ashes on the beach or in the water
- customary access to the coastal environment
- the statutory rights of Fenton Reserve owners and entitlement holders.

User safety around long lines
Concern was expressed about long lines lying on the sand being hard for horse riders to see and it was requested that people using these lines fly a flag beside them. It has also been suggested that the hooks on the line can be a safety issue for curious dogs. The Hearing Panel thought consultation would need to be carried out with the fishing community in order to determine the extent of the problem and identify a solution. Educating people about this issue was considered to be more appropriate than including a rule in the Bylaw. The Ecan Ranger Service has agreed to monitor the situation.

1Maahanui Iwi Management Plan 2013
Our aspirations

5.1 Education is used as a tool to prevent and resolve user conflict and conflicts between use and environmental values.

5.2 Beach resident groups, Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust and the Kāiapoi-Tuahiwi and Woodend-Sefton Community Boards play a role in bringing about a ‘cultural shift’ in attitudes towards the Northern Pegasus Bay coastal strip, both in how it can be protected and enjoyed for recreational purposes.

5.3 Beach users are informed of the significant wildlife and environmental values and rich cultural history associated with the Northern Pegasus Bay coastal strip and Tūhaitara Coastal Park.

How we’ll know we’ve succeeded

- Coastal education programmes are developed and implemented. (5.1, 5.2, 5.3)
- There is better compliance with Bylaw rules. (5.1, 5.2, 5.3)
- Interpretation information highlighting significant environmental and cultural values is provided in key locations along the coastal strip. (5.3)
## Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>PARTIES INVOLVED</th>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>BY WHEN</th>
<th>PRELIMINARY ESTIMATED COST / FUNDING SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ED.1</td>
<td>Encourage user groups, residents associations and community boards to educate the community about the Bylaw to bring about a cultural shift in attitudes. (5.2, 7.2)</td>
<td>Pines Kairaki, Woodend and Pegasus Residents Associations, Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi and Woodend-Sefton Community Boards, key beach user groups such as the Waikuku kite surfers and Woodend Beach commercial horse trainers supported by WDC Green Space Team and Ecan Rangers</td>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED.2</td>
<td>Develop educational videos involving members of the community and utilise social media to educate beach users about key Bylaw issues and the cultural significance of the area. (1.1, 5.1, 5.3, 6.2, 7.2)</td>
<td>WDC Communications and Engagement Team in consultation with the WDC Green Space Team, Ecan Rangers, Te Kōhaka o Tūhaintara Trust and the advisory group</td>
<td>Initial video to be released with installation of new signage</td>
<td>December 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED.3</td>
<td>Revise and expand the family of Bylaw educational brochures and make available for distribution to beach users. (1.1, 5.1, 5.3)</td>
<td>Ecan in consultation with the WDC Green Space Team and the advisory group</td>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
<td>August 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED.4</td>
<td>Inform microlight operators at the Rangiora Airfield about the wildlife values of the Ashley-Rarakuri Estuary and the need to protect the birds there. (2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 5.3, 7.2)</td>
<td>Ashley-Rakahuri Rivercare Group Supported by Ecan Ranger Service</td>
<td>Within 1 year</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED.5</td>
<td>Make whitebaiters aware of the importance of driftwood areas above high tide for nesting birds, and whitebaiting rules by handing out educational brochures when keys are given out and during interactions with Rangers. (2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 5.1, 5.3, 7.2)</td>
<td>WDC Green Space Team and Ecan Ranger Service</td>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
<td>August 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED.6</td>
<td>Monitor and provide advice about the use of long lines on the beach with a view to keeping all beach users safe. (5.1, 10.2)</td>
<td>Ecan Rangers</td>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTION</td>
<td>PARTIES INVOLVED</td>
<td>PRIORITY</td>
<td>BY WHEN</td>
<td>PRELIMINARY ESTIMATED COST / FUNDING SOURCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED.7</td>
<td>Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>Covered in existing Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OTHER RELATED ACTIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W.1</td>
<td>(5.2, 7.1, 7.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.4</td>
<td>(1.1, 4.5, 5.1, 5.3, 7.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.5</td>
<td>(1.1, 2.1, 2.4, 4.4, 4.5, 5.1, 5.3, 7.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.1</td>
<td>(4.5, 5.1, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.2</td>
<td>(5.1, 5.3, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 7.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.3</td>
<td>(5.1, 6.2, 7.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Publicity

"Hopefully implementing the Bylaw will help to raise awareness of everyone’s needs and educate the public, resulting in a common approach to sharing the space."

Kalapoi Community Board 2016
Key issues identified through the Bylaw consultation process

Lack of awareness of Bylaw rules
Many submitters thought members of the public were generally unaware of Bylaw rules and a publicity campaign needed to be carried out when the new rules were introduced. The approach taken by the Hearing Panel recognised that while issues had been identified, there was a lack of documented evidence as to the extent of the problem and further restriction of people’s rights and freedoms under the NZ Bill of Rights Act 1990 required proper justification. As such, less restrictive strategies, such as raising public awareness of the Bylaw rules and environmental values, should be employed in the first instance, where appropriate.

The Bylaw is a legal document and as such does not have a particularly user-friendly format or style of expression. It is therefore important Bylaw rules are well publicised using a variety of methods. Since its introduction a set of brochures focusing on various aspects has been developed and the Council and Ecann have participated in coastal open days. The need to liaise with organised groups such as the Canterbury Windsports Association, Canterbury Bikewax Club (land yachts) and four wheel drive clubs to ensure members are aware of the rule changes and how to apply for exemptions, where these apply, was also identified.

Lack of awareness of off-road alternatives for motorbikes
Some submitters wanted greater publicity to be given to alternative off-road options. Public off-road areas for motor bikes are provided by Environment Canterbury in the Waimakariri and Ashley-Rakahuri Regional Parks. Rangers provide brochures on regional parks to coastal users as appropriate.

Contacting enforcement agencies
There was some confusion about who enforced the Bylaw and who to contact when a problem occurred and some submitters thought this should be better publicised.

Treating the beach as a coastal park
The need for people to see the beach as a managed public park space and act accordingly towards the environment and other users was identified by the Ecann Ranger Service. The Rangers report a significant change in attitudes towards the Waimakariri and Ashley-Rakahuri river bed land developed and promoted as regional parks. For this reason the NPBBIPWP is recommending branding the area of coastal strip covered by the Bylaw as managed park space.

The relationship between the Tūhaitara Coastal Park and it’s management, and the proposed Northern Pegasus Bay coastal strip managed park space and the advisory group, would need to be determined.
Our aspirations

6.1 Beach users are aware they are in a managed park environment when entering the coastal strip.

6.2 Beach users and community groups and organisations working and recreating in the Northern Pegasus Bay coastal strip are well informed about the new Bylaw’s objectives and rules.

6.3 People know who to contact to report a Bylaw-related issue.

How we’ll know we’ve succeeded

- Northern Pegasus Bay coastal strip messaging has a consistent look and feel. (6.1)
- Fewer breaches of Bylaw rules are observed by Ecan Rangers. (6.2)
- Few complaints are received about difficulties in reporting Bylaw breaches. (6.3)
## Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>PARTIES INVOLVED</th>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>BY WHEN</th>
<th>PRELIMINARY ESTIMATED COST / FUNDING SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P.1</td>
<td>WDC Communications and Engagement Team in consultation with WDC Green Space Team</td>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
<td>December 2017</td>
<td>Covered in existing WDC Green Space and Communication and Engagement Team operational budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.2</td>
<td>WDC Communications and Engagement Team in conjunction with WDC Green Space Team, Ecan and Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust</td>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
<td>Before Christmas Holidays 2017 and every year thereafter</td>
<td>Covered in existing WDC Green Space and Communication and Engagement Team and Ecan Ranger Service operational budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.3</td>
<td>Ecan Ranger Service, WDC Green Space Team and Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust</td>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
<td>December 2017</td>
<td>Covered in existing WDC Green Space, Ecan Ranger Service and Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust operational budgets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER RELATED ACTIONS

ED.2
Develop educational videos involving members of the community and utilise social media to educate beach users about key Bylaw issues and the cultural significance of the area. (1.1, 5.1, 5.3, 6.2, 7.2)
7. Working with Others

“We welcome discussions to reach a mutually beneficial outcome so we can all enjoy wide-ranging opportunities for people to participate in community and recreational activities.”

Waikuku Beach Kite Surfers 2015
Key issues identified through the Bylaw consultation process

Coordinating activities
A number of agencies own or manage land within or adjacent to the area covered by the Bylaw. These are the Waimakariri District Council, Environment Canterbury, Department of Conservation, Land Information NZ, Hurunui District Council, Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust and Fenton Reserve Trustees. The North Canterbury Fish and Game Council is also responsible for implementing policies and regulations relating to sports fish and game established under the Wildlife Act 1953 and the Conservation Act 1987. Most of these organisations worked closely with the Council to develop the Bylaw and there is a need for partnership in its implementation.

Inconsistent policy on adjoining coastal strips
Some submitters expressed their concern about a lack of consistent policy between the Council and Hurunui District Council with regard to the management of adjoining coastlines. The open vehicle access at Ashworths Beach makes it difficult for the Waimakariri District Council to control vehicles entering the northern margins of the Estuary and could increase the cost of enforcing the Bylaw. The Hurunui District Council was represented on the Council’s Bylaw Review Working Party and proceeded with its own coastal bylaw while the Waimakariri District Council negotiated the inclusion of Department of Conservation land in its Bylaw. The Hearing Panel agreed with submitters that it was important the two Councils met and discussed a coordinated approach to coastal management.

Beach clean up days
One submitter requested that commercial horse operators be encouraged to carry out beach clean-up days to show good faith for the use of the beach for commercial purposes and respect for the environment. The Hearing Panel thought this idea worth considering by the advisory group. Developing this idea as an annual community event would provide an opportunity for positive interaction between horse trainers and other beach users.

Empowering beach communities and user groups
A key theme emerging from the consultation process was the need to provide opportunities for people living in the beach communities and user groups to become involved with the management and protection of the proposed Northern Pegasus Bay coastal strip. Bringing people on board with the project was considered to be more effective than enforcement over the longer term.

Many submitters wanted to see the values of the coastal environment protected for future generations and showed interest in participating in projects. One submitter, for example, set up a web site during the bylaw consultation process called “Safer Beaches” to highlight issues and encourage others to become involved.

At the moment a number of residents groups represent people living in the coastal settlements. These are the Pines Kairaki Beaches Association, Woodend Community Association, Pegasus Residents’ Group inc and the Waikuku Beach Community group which is currently in recess. The advisory group will need to work closely with the beach communities and volunteer groups if the Bylaw is to be effectively implemented.
Our aspirations

7.1 Beach communities are empowered to take positive action to protect the beach environment.

7.2 Community members help to change the ‘beach culture’ by acting as role models and promoting stewardship.

7.3 Agencies and community groups involved with the coast collaborate and work closely together.

7.4 Development in the Northern Pegasus Bay coastal strip is done in consultation with relevant community groups and affected parties.

How we’ll know we’ve succeeded

- Beach communities are actively involved in Northern Pegasus Bay coastal strip activities. (7.1, 7.2, 7.3)

- Community actions to support the Implementation Plan are initiated by the community. (7.1, 7.2, 7.3)

- Groups benefiting from the coastal environment participate in coastal protection activities. (7.2, 7.3)

- Bylaw objectives and rules are generally understood and accepted by beach communities and community groups associated with the Northern Pegasus Bay coastal strip. (7.1, 7.2, 7.3)

- Regular liaison meetings occur between the agencies concerned with the coast. (7.3)

- Consultation has been carried out for planned development along the coast. (7.4)

- Local schools are involved in coastal conservation programmes. (7.2)
## Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>PARTIES INVOLVED</th>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>BY WHEN</th>
<th>PRELIMINARY ESTIMATED COST / FUNDING SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W.1</td>
<td>WDC Community Team in conjunction with the advisory group</td>
<td>Within 1 year</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Covered in existing WDC Community Team budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigate community support for reinvigorating a residents group at Waikuku Beach to support the Implementation Plan actions. (5.2, 7.1, 7.2)</td>
<td>Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust in conjunction with schools and community groups and supported by WDC Green Space Team, Ecan Ranger Service and the advisory group</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Funded by Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust. Some funding may be available in existing WDC Green Space and Ecan Ranger Service operational budgets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.3</td>
<td>WDC Green Space Team, Ecan Rangers, Waikuku Beach Surf Club</td>
<td>Within 2 years</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Investigations funded within existing WDC Green Space and Ecan Ranger Service operational budgets. Structure to be considered for funding 50/50 between Ecan/ WDC in 2018-2028 LTP's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss with the Waikuku Beach Surf Club options for providing disabled access at Waikuku Beach and recommend a solution for consideration by WDC and Ecan Councillors. (3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 7.3, 7.4)</td>
<td>WDC Green Space Team, Ecan Rangers and Hurunui District Council</td>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Salaries only. Funded in existing WDC Green Space and Ecan Ranger Service operational budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.4</td>
<td>WDC Green Space Team, Woodend Commercial Horse Trainers, the advisory group, Community Boards and WDC Communications and Engagement Team.</td>
<td>Within 1 year</td>
<td>February 2018</td>
<td>Salaries covered in existing WDC Green Space, Communications and Engagement Team and Ecan Ranger Service budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss inter-related coastal matters including the implementation of the two Bylaws with the Hurunui District Council. (7.3)</td>
<td>DOC and Ecan</td>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Existing Ecan budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.5</td>
<td>Support predator control efforts in the Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary by locals. (2.1, 2.3, 2.4, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTION</td>
<td>PARTIES INVOLVED</td>
<td>PRIORITY</td>
<td>BY WHEN</td>
<td>PRELIMINARY ESTIMATED COST / FUNDING SOURCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.7 Establish an advisory group to supercede the Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw Implementation Plan Working Party. (7.1, 7.2, 7.3)</td>
<td>WDC Green Space Team</td>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
<td>October 2017</td>
<td>Covered in existing WDC Green Space operational budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.8 Establish a database of residents willing to become involved with Northen Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 activities. (7.1, 7.2, 9.2)</td>
<td>WDC Green Space Team</td>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
<td>December 2017</td>
<td>Covered in existing WDC Green Space operational budget</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OTHER RELATED ACTIONS**

| M.7 Establish a baseline for bird species in the Estuary and carry out ongoing monitoring. (2.1, 2.3, 7.3, 10.1e) |
| M.8 Ensure research carried out within the Northern Pegasus Bay coastal strip is coordinated. (7.3, 10.3) |
| M.9 Investigate the possibility of finding a research partner to study the effectiveness of Bylaw provisions in protecting Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary wildlife values from the impact of recreation use. (2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 7.3, 8.1, 8.3, 10.2, 10.3) |
| S.4 Develop interpretation signs explaining the rich cultural history of the coastal area in consultation with Te Ngāi Tūhuriri Rūnanga and place in key locations. (1.1, 4.5, 5.1, 5.3, 7.4) |
| S.5 Develop interpretation sign/s highlighting the significant wildlife and other values of the Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary in consultation with other relevant parties and place in key locations. (1.1, 2.1, 2.4, 4.4, 4.5, 5.1, 5.3, 7.4) |
| S.7 Carry out user testing on the proposed signage programme prior to installation. (4.1, 4.2, 4.5, 7.4) |
| S.9 Carry out consultation on the design of interpretation panels prior to installation. (4.1, 4.2, 4.4, 4.5, 7.4) |
| E.6 Encourage Estuary users via promotional material and on signage to report offences to Ecarn for follow up, including recording licence plate numbers. (2.1, 7.1, 7.2, 9.1, 9.2) |
| ED.1 Encourage user groups, residents associations and community boards to educate the community about the Bylaw to bring about a cultural shift in attitudes. (5.2, 7.2) |
| ED.2 Develop educational videos involving members of the community and utilise social media to educate beach users about key Bylaw issues and the cultural significance of the area. (1.1, 5.1, 5.3, 7.2) |
| ED.4 Inform minilights at the Rangiora Airfield about the wildlife values of the Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary and the need to protect the birds there. (2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 5.3, 7.2) |
### OTHER RELATED ACTIONS CONTINUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ED.5</th>
<th>Make whitebaiters aware of the importance of driftwood areas above high tide for nesting birds, and whitebaiting rules by handing out educational brochures when keys are given out and during interactions with Rangers (5.1, 2.2, 2.3, 5.1, 5.3, 7.2).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P.2</td>
<td>Carry out an annual Bylaw publicity programme highlighting Bylaw rules and coastal values and addressing any current issues, for example, vehicle use of the beach (5.1, 5.3, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 7.3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.3</td>
<td>Work with relevant recreation organisations to ensure their members are aware of Bylaw rules (5.1, 6.2, 7.3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS.5</td>
<td>Investigate the feasibility of providing alternative loop horse trails within the Northern Pegasus Bay coastal strip and Tūhātara Coastal Park (3.4, 7.4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS.6</td>
<td>Investigate the feasibility of sealing the Kairaki Beach car park as a joint Ecan/WDC project (3.1, 3.2, 3.4, 7.3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARE.2</td>
<td>Work with other organisations to develop a management plan for the Estuary (2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 7.3, 8.1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA.1</td>
<td>Develop a Fenton Reserve Code of Conduct for sign off by the advisory group and Fenton Reserve Trustees (1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.3, 7.2, 7.3, 8.1, 9.1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA.2</td>
<td>Sign a Fenton Reserve Memorandum of Understanding between the Council and Fenton Reserve Trustees (1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.3, 7.2, 7.3, 8.1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV.3</td>
<td>Hold discussions with Te Ngāi Tūhuriri Rūnanga about the opportunities for developing partnerships in the achievement of the Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 Implementation Plan (1.1, 1.2, 7.3).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. User Agreements
Key issues identified through the Bylaw consultation process

Kite Surfing User Agreement – Ashley River/ Rakahuri Estuary
The tension between protecting Estuary birds and continuing to provide a safe venue within the District for kite surfing was highlighted during the Bylaw consultation process. The Hearing Panel amended the proposal to restrict rather than prohibit kite surfing for the following reasons:

- There were low numbers of people using the Estuary for the sport
- The kite surfing community was respectful of the environmental issues raised by submitters and willing to compromise to find an acceptable solution. Members were also willing to play a role in educating and monitoring the activities of kite surfers using the Estuary
- There was a lack of site-specific data about any negative effects
- There was no other safe training area for kite surfing in the District.

It was agreed that a kite surfing user agreement, sitting alongside the Bylaw, would be the most appropriate control mechanism given the dynamic nature of the physical environment. The effectiveness of the agreement is to be reviewed at an annual meeting between kite surfers, WDC, Ecan, DOC and environmental groups. Issues to be addressed are educating kite surfers about the agreement and monitoring the effectiveness of the agreement in mitigating the impact of kitesurfing on estuarine birds.

Woodend Beach Commercial Horse Trainer’s User Agreement
Commercial horse training has been restricted to an area extending 3.2 km’s (2 mile training run) either side of the beach entrance to the Woodend Beach Horse Float Car Park and Access Trail. This was a compromise between opposing views and provides some restrictions while still allowing horse trainers to train over the correct distance. A Woodend Beach commercial horse training user agreement has been negotiated to address the concerns of some submitters and this is to be reviewed annually. Representatives of the horse trainers have agreed to an early review of the designated area if an increase in the number of people using Pegasus Beach results in increased user conflict.

Access to Fenton Reserves
The Rakahuri Awa/Ashley River and Northern Pegasus Bay Coastal area was a significant area for mahinga kai. Fenton Reserves and entitlements were set aside for occupation and access to mahinga kai and some of these are located in or close to the Estuary. Fenton Reserve owners and holders of Fenton Entitlements have a legal right to access waterways associated with these reserves and entitlements for mahinga kai purposes. The Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998 makes provision for Fenton Reserve owners and holders of Fenton Entitlements to have access up to 210 days per year for the above purposes, including the erection of temporary camping shelters. In the preparation of this Bylaw these rights have been considered and applied via the development of a Memorandum of Understanding (user agreement) between the Council, Environment Canterbury and the Fenton Reserve Trustees.

The agreement is to be consistent with the principles of kaitiakitanga (the intergenerational responsibility and right of tāngata whenua to take care of the environment and resources upon which they depend), the underlying rights/purposes of the reserves and entitlements and the values expressed in the Bylaw.

Issues to be addressed are:

- Educating the public about the legal rights of Fenton Reserve owners and entitlement holders
- Finding the correct balance between protecting the Estuary’s natural values and providing Fenton Reserve owners and entitlement holders with vehicle access
- Monitoring the effectiveness of the MOU.

The agreement does not form part of the Bylaw but will sit alongside it, in a similar manner to the other two user agreements that have been successfully negotiated and will show how the balance between providing vehicle access and protecting the ecological values of the Estuary will be achieved. A code of conduct will be developed as part of this agreement.
Our aspirations

8.1 Fenton Reserve Trustees act as kaitiaki for wetlands associated with Fenton Reserves and entitlements located within and adjacent to the Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary.

8.2 The Woodend Beach Commercial Horse Trainer’s User Agreement is an effective tool for managing user conflict.

8.3 The Kite Surfing User Agreement – Ashley River-Rakahuri Estuary is effective in achieving the necessary balance between using the Estuary for kite surfing and protecting environmental and wildlife values.

How we’ll know we’ve succeeded

- A code of conduct for the use of the Estuary by Fenton Reserve owners and entitlement holders is developed and adhered to (8.1).
- The impact of vehicle access in the Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary on commercial horse training is minimised (8.2).
- Few public complaints are received about the use of the beach for commercial horse training (8.2).
- The advisory group is satisfied that kite surfing has little impact on bird activity in the Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary (8.3).
## Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>PARTIES INVOLVED</th>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>BY WHEN</th>
<th>PRELIMINARY ESTIMATED COST / FUNDING SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UA.1</td>
<td>Fenton Reserve Trustees in consultation with the advisory group</td>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
<td>August 2017</td>
<td>Fenton Reserve Trustees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA.2</td>
<td>WDC Policy and Strategy and Green Space, Fenton Reserve Trustees</td>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
<td>December 2017</td>
<td>Salaries only. Covered in existing WDC Policy and Strategy and Green Space budgets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER RELATED ACTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>PARTIES INVOLVED</th>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>BY WHEN</th>
<th>PRELIMINARY ESTIMATED COST / FUNDING SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARE.2</td>
<td>Work with other organisations to develop a management plan for the Estuary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.3</td>
<td>Regularly monitor the use of the designated commercial horse training area at Woodend Beach as per agreed methodology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.4</td>
<td>Monitor levels and characteristics of the kite surfing activity in the Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary using the Ecan Ranger Service Info tool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.5</td>
<td>Monitor the effectiveness of the Fenton Reserve MOU and Code of Conduct as per agreed methodology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.9</td>
<td>Investigate the possibility of finding a research partner to study the effectiveness of Bylaw provisions in protecting Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary wildlife values from the impact of recreation use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.2</td>
<td>Carry out an annual review of the Commercial Horse Trainers User Agreement prior to the start of summer as per Bylaw clause 10.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.3</td>
<td>Carry out an annual review of the Kite Surfing User Agreement prior to the start of the kite surfing season or whenever significant changes to the coastal environment during this period necessitate additional reviews as per Bylaw clause 13.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Enforcement

“The community needs to know the Council is in earnest. No law works until people know it will be enforced.”

Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw submitter 2015
**Key issues identified through the Bylaw consultation process**

**Effectiveness of enforcement services**

This was a key issue for many of the people submitting on the Bylaw with some of the opinion that the 2010 Bylaw provisions would have been adequate had they been more effectively enforced. The Council concluded that while there had been more effective implementation, particularly enforcement, during the review and consultation processes, some issues were identified as critical to the Bylaw's success in resolving the issues identified. Comments by submitters that enforcement needs to be more targeted were supported. The Haring Panel recommended that the existing enforcement service agreement be reviewed and consideration be given to targeting particular issues or problem areas and having a more visible ranger presence on summer evenings and during the weekends.

**Lack of consequences for Bylaw breaches**

The Haring Panel acknowledged people needed to know there would be consequences for breaching the Bylaw if the necessary culture shift in activities towards compliance was to be achieved. This meant requiring fines for unauthorised use of the beach and DOH staff to work together to prosecute serious offences. Meetings were held between ECan and WDC staff to discuss enforcement options and update agreed enforcement strategies.
Our aspirations

9.1 There is a coordinated approach to enforcing activities occurring within the Northern Bay coastal strip.

9.2 Environment Canterbury Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw Ranger Services are highly visible, effectively targeted and well supported by local beach communities.

9.3 Systems are in place to ensure complaints are promptly responded to and followed up.

9.4 Waimakariri District Council and Environment Canterbury have appropriate processes in place to ensure breaches of the Bylaw are effectively enforced.

How we’ll know we’ve succeeded

- Combined agency enforcement operations are carried out. (9.1)
- Organisations operating within the Bylaw area are aware of each other’s activities. (9.1)
- Beach communities support and are generally satisfied with the enforcement services provided. (9.2, 9.3, 9.4)
- The number of public complaints received by the Council and Ecanc about the lack of Bylaw enforcement decrease over time. (9.2, 9.3, 9.4)
- Beach users are generally aware of the consequences of breaching the Bylaw. (9.2, 9.3, 9.4)
- WDC and Ecanc have an agreed Bylaw enforcement process in place. (9.1, 9.3, 9.4)
- Serious breaches of the Bylaw are investigated for suitability for prosecution. (9.4)
### Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>PARTIES INVOLVED</th>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>BY WHEN</th>
<th>PRELIMINARY ESTIMATED COST / FUNDING SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.1 Carry out a combined agency enforcement operation in the Northern Pegasus Bay coastal strip each year. (9.1)</td>
<td>NZ Police, WDC ESU Unit, WDC Green Space, Ecan Ranger Service, DOC and Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust</td>
<td>Within 1 year</td>
<td>December 2017 and every year thereafter</td>
<td>Each participating agency to cover the cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2 Report regularly to the advisory group on beach users perceived level of awareness of Bylaw rules and number of incidences recorded on the Ecan database. (9.2)</td>
<td>Ecan Ranger Service and the advisory group</td>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
<td>Advisory group programmed meetings</td>
<td>Salaries only. Covered in existing Ecan Ranger Service operational budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.3 Establish a 2016/17 baseline for monitoring the number of public complaints received by Ecan and WDC related to Bylaw enforcement. (9.2, 10.2)</td>
<td>Ecan Ranger Service and WDC Green Space Team</td>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
<td>December 2017</td>
<td>Salaries only. Covered in existing Ecan Ranger Service and WDC Green Space operational budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.4 Review the Enforcement Services contract between Ecan and the Council, including the determination of new levels of service. (9.1, 9.2)</td>
<td>Ecan Ranger Service and WDC Green Space Team in conjunction with Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust and the advisory group</td>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
<td>November 2017</td>
<td>Salaries only. Covered in existing Ecan Ranger Service and WDC Green Space operational budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.5 Review annually the effectiveness of the agreed WDC/Ecan enforcement process. (9.5, 10.1a, 11.1)</td>
<td>Ecan Ranger Service and WDC Green Space Team</td>
<td>Within 1 year</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Salaries only. Covered in existing Ecan Ranger Service and WDC Green Space operational budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.6 Encourage Estuary users via promotional material and on signage to report offences to Ecan for follow up, including recording licence plate numbers. (2.1, 7.1, 7.2, 9.1, 9.2)</td>
<td>Ecan Ranger Service, and WDC Green Space Team</td>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
<td>December 2017</td>
<td>Covered in existing WDC Green Space and Ecan Ranger operational budgets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER RELATED ACTIONS

| UA.1 Develop a Fenton Reserve Code of Conduct for sign off by the advisory group and Fenton Reserve Trustees. (1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.3, 7.2, 7.3, 8.1, 9.1) |
| W.8 Establish a database of residents willing to become involved with Northen Pegasus Bay Bylaw activities. (7.1, 7.2, 9.2) |
10. Research and Monitoring

“Form partnerships to carry out research to identify the impact of activities on the coastal environment.”

Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw submitter 2016
Key issues identified through the Bylaw consultation process

The need for evidence to inform future Bylaw reviews
The opinions of those submitters who commented on the effectiveness of the 2010 Bylaw were wide-ranging, with some stating it had failed to address environmental and safety concerns, others noting some improvements had been made, particularly with regard to vehicle access, and others wanting to maintain the status quo as they considered the Bylaw to be working well. This has highlighted a need for a research and monitoring programme to be put in place so that more than anecdotal evidence is available to inform future reviews.

Commercial horse training
Although most submitters were not concerned about horse training on the beach, with some saying how much they enjoyed watching it and others actively participating in it, there were some who were strongly opposed. Anecdotal evidence as to the numbers involved and extent of the problem varied and the Hearing Panel thought it would be helpful to collect hard evidence prior to the next Bylaw review.

The need to keep an eye on the number of people using Pegasus Beach at the time horse training is occurring has also been identified.

Impact of game bird dogs on protected Estuary wildlife
All dogs, apart from game bird dogs belonging to holders of Fish and Game Hunting Licensees in the gamebird hunting season, are prohibited from the Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary. Some submitters objected to this prohibition for some dogs and not others. The impact of game bird dogs on protected bird species is unknown and would need to be assessed before any further restrictions were put in place.

Impact of recreational activities on Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary environmental values and wildlife
The prohibition of hovercrafts, jet boats and jet skis in the Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary was requested by a few submitters but this was not agreed to by the Hearing Panel as the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990 prohibits limiting freedom of movement unless there is adequate justification. Little is currently known about the nature and levels of use of the Estuary by motorised craft and the impact of this on ecological values. Motorised craft are currently restricted to travelling no faster than 5 knots.

Horse riding, dogs, model aircraft and drones, microlights and helicopters, land yachts, kite surfing and vehicles were also highlighted as being activities that could have a detrimental impact on estuarine wildlife. The Hearing Panel recommended that priority be given to monitoring the impact of various activities on Estuary ecological values so that any future decisions made by the Council about appropriate use could be evidence-based.

Impact of horses and vehicles on health of coastal dunes
Vehicles in the dunes continue to be a problem, particularly at Waikuku, Pines and Kairaki Beaches, and a number of submitters provided the Hearing Panel with photographic evidence of the damage done to the coastal environment by vehicles. Some submitters also observed recreational horse riders in the dunes.

The dunes provide beach settlements with some protection against coastal hazards and damage to vegetation accelerates coastal erosion. The health of the dune eco-system and the impact recreational use is having on this is currently unknown.

Monitoring Bylaw implementation and effectiveness
The Hearing Panel considered that effectively implementing the Bylaw would be vital to its success. Regular progress reporting is planned to ensure the project remains on track.

Making sure Bylaw provisions are effective in addressing key issues is also essential so that adjustments can be made in accordance with review clause 21.2 if necessary.

The above will ensure the identified environmental, health and safety issues and user conflicts are resolved as much as possible and that the good faith and enthusiasm of members of the local beach communities who became engaged in the Bylaw development process is maintained.
Our aspirations

10.1 Monitoring programmes are in place for the following identified priority areas:
   a. effectiveness of Bylaw enforcement
   b. effectiveness of the Woodend Beach Commercial Horse Trainer’s User Agreement
   c. effectiveness of the Kite Surfing User Agreement – Ashley River/Rakahuri Estuary
   d. effectiveness of the Fenton Reserve MOU
   e. the effectiveness of Bylaw provisions in protecting Ashley/Rakahuri Estuary wildlife values from the impact of recreation use
   f. the effectiveness of Bylaw provisions in protecting coastal dune systems from the impact of recreation use
   g. the achievement of the Implementation Plan.

10.2 Research programmes are in place where a knowledge gap has been identified.

10.3 Research efforts in the Northern Pegasus Bay coastal strip are coordinated and research partners are actively sought.

How we’ll know we’ve succeeded

- The reviews of the effectiveness of the Implementation Plan and the beach user agreements are informed by robust evidence. (10.1 a-g)

- Measurable progress has been made towards achieving stated Bylaw objectives by 2021. (10.1)

- Robust evidence relating to issues identified during the development of the Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 is available to inform the 2021 Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw review. (10.1a-g, 10.2, 10.3)

- Multiple agencies are involved in coordinating, supporting and carrying out research. (10.3)
### Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>PARTIES INVOLVED</th>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>BY WHEN</th>
<th>PRELIMINARY ESTIMATED COST / FUNDING SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.1 Monitor progress on achieving the Implementation Plan and report annually to the advisory group and Council. (10.1g, 11.1)</td>
<td>WDC Policy and Strategy in consultation with the advisory group, WDC Green Space Team and Ecan Ranger Service</td>
<td>Within 1 year</td>
<td>1 year after adoption of Implementation Plan</td>
<td>Salary only. Funded in existing WDC Policy and Strategy budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.2 Report on an annual basis to the advisory group on progress with the Bylaw research and monitoring programme. (10.1 a-f, 11.1, 11.2)</td>
<td>WDC Policy and Strategy in consultation with WDC Green Space Team and the Ecan Ranger Service</td>
<td>Within 1 year</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Salary only. Funded in existing WDC Policy and Strategy budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.3 Regularly monitor the use of the designated commercial horse training area at Woodend Beach as per agreed methodology. (8.2, 10.1b, 11.2)</td>
<td>Ecan Ranger Service</td>
<td>Within 1 year</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Salaries only. Funded in existing Ecan Ranger Service operational budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.4 Monitor levels and characteristics of the kite surfing activity in the Ashley-Rakahurui Estuary using the Ecan Ranger Service Info tool. (2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 8.3, 10.1c, 10.1e, 11.1)</td>
<td>Ecan Ranger Service and Waikuku Beach residents feeding into Ecan database</td>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Covered in existing Ecan Ranger Service operational budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.5 Monitor the effectiveness of the Fenton Reserve MOU and Code of Conduct as per agreed methodology. (2.1, 2.3, 2.4, 8.1, 10.1d, 11.2)</td>
<td>Fenton Reserve Trustees in consultation with Ecan Rangers and the advisory group</td>
<td>Within 1 year</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Not yet identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.6 Monitor levels of motorised water sports occurring in the Ashley-Rakahurui Estuary using the Ecan Ranger Service Info tool. (2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 10.1e)</td>
<td>Ecan Ranger Service and Waikuku Beach residents feeding into Ecan database</td>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Covered in existing Ecan Ranger Service operational budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.7 Establish a baseline for bird species in the Estuary and carry out ongoing monitoring. (2.1, 2.3, 7.3, 10.1e)</td>
<td>Birds NZ and Ashley-Rakahurui Rivercare Group</td>
<td>Within 2 years</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Not yet identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTION</td>
<td>PARTIES INVOLVED</td>
<td>PRIORITY</td>
<td>BY WHEN</td>
<td>PRELIMINARY ESTIMATED COST / FUNDING SOURCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.8</td>
<td>The advisory group in conjunction with Ecan, WDC, DOC, Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust, and tertiary education providers</td>
<td>Within 1 year</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Not yet identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.9</td>
<td>Not yet identified</td>
<td>Within 4 years</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>Not yet identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.10</td>
<td>Ecan Ranger Service</td>
<td>Within 1 year</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Salaries only. Covered in existing Ecan Ranger Service operational budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.11</td>
<td>The advisory group, Ecan, Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust and Te Ngāi Tuahuriri Runanga</td>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Not yet identified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OTHER RELATED ACTIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.3</td>
<td>Establish a 2016/17 baseline for monitoring the number of public complaints received by Ecan and WDC related to Bylaw enforcement. (9.2, 10.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.5</td>
<td>Review annually the effectiveness of the agreed WDC/Ecan enforcement process. (9.3, 10.1a, 11.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED.6</td>
<td>Monitor and provide advice about the use of long lines on the beach with a view to keeping all beach users safe. (5.1, 10.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Review

"Mā tātou, ā, mā kā uri ā muri ake nei. For us and our children after us."

Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan 2013
Key issues identified through the Bylaw consultation process

Review period
The first proposed Bylaw released for public consultation had a 10 year review period and some submitters were concerned that environmental values could deteriorate significantly during this period if the objectives of the Bylaw were not able to be achieved.

The Council received legal advice that the 2016 Bylaw was a new Bylaw as the changes to its purpose and the restrictions on people were significantly different than those in the 2010 Bylaw. This meant the Bylaw was required, under section 158 (1) of the Local Government Act 2002, to be reviewed in 5 rather than 10 years’ time as would have been the case if it had not been substantially altered, and the review period was changed in the second proposal.

Partial review
Some submitters thought there was a need to undertake an early review to see whether the Bylaw was achieving its intended purpose and whether it had been effective in addressing identified issues. The Hearing Panel recommended an implementation plan be developed using a combined-agency/community approach and the effectiveness of this plan be reviewed after two years of operation.

A new clause was inserted into the Bylaw allowing Council to review any aspect that had not been found to be effective in addressing identified user conflicts, health and safety concerns, matters of public nuisance and environmental issues.

It was considered appropriate to limit any early review of the Bylaw to the above aspects because carrying out a comprehensive review of the Bylaw is an expensive exercise and the uncertainty of the outcome can be unsettling for members of the community.

User agreement reviews
Two user agreements were negotiated during the Bylaw development process and were well supported by submitters. Another is currently in the process of being negotiated (refer to section 8, User Agreements). While both of these sit outside of the Bylaw to provide flexibility for amendment as necessary, they are referenced by the Bylaw. User agreements haven’t been used by the Council as a management tool in this context before and therefore regular reviews of their effectiveness in addressing the issues raised by submitters were considered to be important.
Our aspirations

11.1 User related issues are identified before they escalate or before irreversible environmental damage occurs and prompt action is taken to address these.

11.2 The annual reviews of user agreements, as required by the Bylaw, are completed.

How we’ll know we’ve succeeded

- The Bylaw and user agreements are effective in addressing identified concerns and issues. (11.1, 11.2)
- The user agreements are adhered to. (11.2)
- The Bylaw does not require major change in relation to currently identified issues when it is reviewed in 2021. (11.1)
## Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>PARTIES INVOLVED</th>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>BY WHEN</th>
<th>PRELIMINARY ESTIMATED COST / FUNDING SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R.1</td>
<td>WDC Policy and Strategy in consultation with the advisory group</td>
<td>Within 3 years</td>
<td>After implementation Plan has been in operation for 2 years</td>
<td>Salary only. Covered in existing WDC Policy and Strategy budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.2</td>
<td>The advisory group supported by WDC Green Space Team and Ecan Ranger Service</td>
<td>Within 2 years</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
<td>Salaries only. Covered in existing Ecan Ranger Service and WDC Green Space operational budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.3</td>
<td>The advisory group supported by WDC Green Space Team and Ecan Ranger Service</td>
<td>Within 2 years</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
<td>Salaries only. Covered in existing Ecan Ranger Service and WDC Green Space operational budgets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER RELATED ACTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E.5</th>
<th>Review annually the effectiveness of the agreed WDC/Ecan enforcement process. (9.5, 10.1a, 11.1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.1</td>
<td>Monitor progress on achieving the implementation Plan and report annually to the advisory group and Council. (10.1, 11.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.2</td>
<td>Report on an annual basis to the advisory group on progress with the Bylaw research and monitoring programme. (10.1 a-f, 11.1, 11.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.3</td>
<td>Regularly monitor the use of the designated commercial horse training area at Woodend Beach as per agreed methodology. (8.2, 10.1b, 11.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.4</td>
<td>Monitor levels and characteristics of the kite surfing activity in the Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary using the Ecan Ranger Service Info tool. (2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 8.3, 10.1c, 10.1e, 11.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.5</td>
<td>Monitor the effectiveness of the Fenton Reserve MOU and Code of Conduct as per agreed methodology. (2.1, 2.3, 2.4, 8.1, 10.1d, 11.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendices

Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 Maps:

- Bylaw Area Boundary
- Legislative Boundaries
- Vehicle Access Map - Schedule 2
- Ashley River / Rakahuri and Saltwater Creek Estuarine Areas - Vehicle Access - Schedule 3
- Horse Access Map - Schedule 4
- Ashley River / Rakahuri and Saltwater Creek Estuarine Areas - Access for Recreational Activity - Schedule 5
- Land Yacht Map - Schedule 6
- Kite Surfing Areas - Ashley River / Rakahuri and Saltwater Creek Estuarine Areas.
FLAGGED SURF LIFESAVING AREAS
- Restricted dismount and push areas if passing through is unavoidable

VEHICLE EXEMPTION
- Land yacht operators must obtain an exemption from the Council to drive a vehicle past the ocean outfall to the Waikuku Beach Horsefloat Carpark Access Trail entrance to retrieve a beached land yacht.
Northern Pegasus Bay coastal strip valued, protected and enjoyed by all.
For further information on the
Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016
Implementation Plan
visit waimakariri.govt.nz
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT

FILE NO and TRIM NO:  RDG-31/ 170719074969

REPORT TO:  Council

DATE OF MEETING:  1 August 2017

FROM:  Ken Stevenson, Roading Manager
        Harriette Davies, Roading Projects Engineer
        Chris Sexton, Intern Engineer

SUBJECT:  Rangiora Speed Limit Changes

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to seek Council approval to change the speed limits on Kippenberger Avenue, Northbrook Road, Lehmans Road and River Road.

1.2. A speed limit of 50km/h is proposed on
    • Kippenberger Avenue from Watkins Place to east of Devlin Place,
    • Northbrook Road from Papawai Drive to east of Goodwin Street.

1.3. A speed limit of 80km/h is proposed on
    • Kippenberger Avenue from the proposed 50km/h change point to 500m east of Golf Links Road,
    • Lehmans Road from Oxford Road to River Road,
    • River Road from Lehmans Road to West Belt.

1.4. In June 2017 the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board approved consultation (TRIM 170316025654) being carried out on the proposed changes between 23 June and 14 July 2017.

Table 1 Summary of Submissions Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Speed Limit</th>
<th>Support in Full</th>
<th>Conditional Support</th>
<th>Opposed in Full</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50km/h on Kippenberger Avenue from Watkins Drive to Devlin Avenue</td>
<td>82 %</td>
<td>3 %</td>
<td>15 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80km/h on Kippenberger from 50km/h change point to 500m east of Golf Links Road</td>
<td>76 %</td>
<td>6 %</td>
<td>18 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50km/h on Northbrook Road from Papawai Drive to east of Goodwin Street</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>3 %</td>
<td>15 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80km/h on Lehmans Road from Oxford Road to River Road</td>
<td>77 %</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>23 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80km/h on River Road from Lehmans Road to West Belt</td>
<td>77 %</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>23 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.6. NZTA supported the proposed speed changes on Kippenberger Avenue, Northbrook Road, Lehmans Road and River Road. There have been no formal responses from the NZ Automobile Association, the Police or the Road Transport Forum NZ to this proposal.

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

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

Attachments:

i. Plan showing proposed speed limits (TRIM 170518050244)

ii. Submission Details (TRIM 170713072618)

iii. Memo to Rangiora-Ashley Community Board (TRIM 170719074932)

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 170719074969.

(b) **Approves** the speed limit change on Kippenberger Avenue, Northbrook Road, Lehmans Road and River Road, as outlined in the table below, and shown on the attached plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Proposed Limit</th>
<th>Existing Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kippenberger Avenue</td>
<td>From Watkins Place to east of Devlin Place</td>
<td>50km/h</td>
<td>70km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbrook Road</td>
<td>From Papawai Drive to east of Goodwin Street</td>
<td>50km/h</td>
<td>100km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kippenberger Avenue</td>
<td>From the proposed 50km/h change point to</td>
<td>80km/h</td>
<td>70-100km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Woodend Road</td>
<td>500m east of Golf Links Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehmans Road</td>
<td>From Oxford Road to River Road</td>
<td>80km/h</td>
<td>100km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Road</td>
<td>From Lehmans Road to West Belt</td>
<td>80km/h</td>
<td>100km/h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) **Notes** that the Register of Speed Limits will be updated to include these changed speed limits.

(d) **Notes** that the Speed Limits Bylaw 2009 allows speed limits to be changed by Council resolution following consultation as required by the Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits.

(e) **Notes** that the submissions on this proposal have been distributed to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board for their information.

(f) **Circulates** this report to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board.
3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

3.1. The reason for reviewing the speed limits on Kippenberger Avenue, Northbrook Road, Lehmans Road and River Road is that development has extended to east and west of Rangiora. Upgrade work has recently been carried out at Northbrook Road and River Road, and a new cycleway crossing point is planned for Kippenberger Avenue.

3.2. In June, feedback on the proposed new speed limits was sought through advertising in the local newspapers and on the Council's website. Also letters were sent to NZTA, the Police, the NZ Automobile Association Inc. and the Road Transport Forum NZ as required by the Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits.

3.3. NZTA has recently released their new Speed Management Guide, which outlines guidance on appropriate speeds for different road environments. This document includes guidance on appropriate speeds for different road environments. It also outlines measures to manage speeds, including the use of speed limits and other treatments and activities.

3.4. Kippenberger Avenue and Northbrook Road are both main roads to the east of Rangiora Township. Using the new Speed Management Guide, a 50km/h speed limit is assessed to be a safe and appropriate speed along Kippenberger Avenue, from Watkins Drive to east of Devlin Place, and along Northbrook Road, from Papawai Drive to east of Goodwin Street.

3.5. The location of the 50km/h change point on Kippenberger Avenue will be coordinated with the new cycleway project to ensure the future cycleway crossing point is included within the recommended 50km/h area.

3.6. With the proposed extension of the 50km/h speed limit on Kippenberger Avenue, the location of the existing 70km/h “buffer zone” was re-assessed. The new Speed Management Guide does not include 70km/h or 90km/h speed limits in their speed classification. NZTA wants to promote a more consistent and intuitive speed management system across the whole network and avoid the use of 10km/h speed increments.

3.7. Using the new Speed Management Guide, an 80km/h speed limit is assessed to be a safe and appropriate speed on Kippenberger Avenue, from east of Devlin Avenue through to Rangiora Woodend Road. The minimum length of an 80km/h speed limit is 800m. Therefore the proposed 80km/h speed limit on Kippenberger Avenue needs to extend approximately 500m east of Golf Links Road.

3.8. Lehmans Road and River Road are both collector roads to the west of Rangiora Township. Using the new Speed Management Guide, 80km/h is assessed to be a safe and appropriate speed on both Lehmans Road and River Road.

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

4.1. The Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits 2003 [54001] as amended, requires the Council to formally consult with a number of external agencies during the review of a speed limit. The following persons must be consulted in accordance with this requirement and their views will be taken into account:

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

4.2. In June, feedback on the proposed new speed limits was sought through advertising in the local newspapers, and on the Council’s website. Also letters were sent to all adjoining property owners, NZTA, the Police, the NZ Automobile Association Inc. and the Road Transport Forum NZ as required by Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits. A summary of the submissions is below and the details are attached.

4.3. A total of 33 submissions were received on the proposal, as summarised in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Speed Limit</th>
<th>Support in Full</th>
<th>Conditional Support</th>
<th>Opposed in Full</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50km/h on Kippenberger Avenue from Watkins Drive to Devlin Avenue</td>
<td>82 %</td>
<td>3 %</td>
<td>15 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80km/h on Kippenberger from 50km/h change point to 500m east of Golf Links Road</td>
<td>76 %</td>
<td>6 %</td>
<td>18 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50km/h on Northbrook Road from Papawai Drive to east of Goodwin Street</td>
<td>82 %</td>
<td>3 %</td>
<td>15 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80km/h on Lehmans Road from Oxford Road to River Road</td>
<td>77 %</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>23 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80km/h on River Road from Lehmans Road to West Belt</td>
<td>77 %</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>23 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4. Twenty three submissions fully supported the proposal to change the speed limits on Kippenberger Avenue, Northbrook Road, Lehmans Road and River Road. An additional three submissions fully supported the proposal to change the speed limits on Kippenberger Avenue and Northbrook Road.

4.5. Four submissions suggested increasing the length of the proposed 80km/h speed limit on Kippenberger Road along Rangiora Woodend Road. A separate speed limit review along the full length of Rangiora Woodend Road will be undertaken as part of the new cycleway project.

4.6. Three submissions suggested lowering the speed limit further to 50km/h on Kippenberger Road along the proposed 80km/h section. This is not considered necessary or appropriate for the road environment.

4.7. One submissions suggested increasing the length of the proposed 50km/h speed limit on Northbrook Road. This is not considered necessary or appropriate for the road environment.
4.8. Five submissions were fully opposed to the proposal to change the speed limits on Kippenberger Avenue, Northbrook Road, Lehmans Road and River Road. An additional two submissions were opposed to the speed changes on Lehmans Road and River Road.

4.9. NZTA supported the proposed speed changes on Kippenberger Avenue, Northbrook Road, Lehmans Road and River Road. There have been no formal responses from the NZ Automobile Association, the Police or the Road Transport Forum NZ to this proposal.

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

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. The total cost of the new speed limit signage can be met from existing budgets.

5.2. There are no significant risks associated with changing this speed limit.

6. CONTEXT

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

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

The Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits Rule requires that permanent speed limits be set by bylaw.

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

6.3. Community Outcomes

6.3.1. There is a safe environment for all:

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

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

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

Ken Stevenson
Roading Manager

Harriette Davies
Roading Projects Engineer

Chris Sexton
Intern Engineer
## RANGIORA SPEED LIMIT REVIEW SUBMISSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRIM</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>170710071480</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A &amp; J LILLEY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes we very much support the speed limit to be lowered to 50km/h on Kippenberger Avenue, from Watkins Drive east of Devin Avenue. As regards Kippenberger Avenue, Rangiora/Woodend Road: From the proposed 50km/h change point to 500m east of Golf Links Road, it would be a lot better if it was reduced to 50km/h the whole distance instead of the proposed 80km/h limit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170711071581</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C OLOUGHLIN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As a resident of northbrook road we would really like to see the new proposed speed limits brought in, and also support the other areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170706069820</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>E KELLEY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I agree that the speed limit needs to be reduced to at least 60km/hour from Devin Ave however I am wondering why the 60km/hour wouldn't continue along Rangiora Woodend Road past the Five Cross Roads where Boys Road intercepts with Rangiora Woodend Road. This has to be one of the most dangerous intersections in our area and people speed through there at 100+ km/h as people pull out from the side roads or turn off Rangiora Woodend Road onto the side roads. I have seen quite a few near misses at that intersection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170714073176</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>I BROWN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kippenberger Ave east side. OBJECT TO 50K'S this can easily be a 70kph speed limit. Northbrook Rd if this is right at the start of the urban area. OK. BUT IF you are encroaching again into the open country NO, I OBJECT... Kippenberger Ave east end. I object 500m east of Golf Links Rd... Lehmans Rd, Oxford to River Rd. EXCEEDINGLY Strong objection to the proposed speed limit. River Rd to West Belt. STRONG OBJECTION AGAIN.... (See TRIM 170714073176 for Full Submission)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170714073250</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>NZTA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>We support the proposed changes and the reasoning behind them. The proposed speed limits would align more closely with the safe and appropriate travel speeds on those roads, as identified in the speed management maps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>River Road from West Belt to Ashley Road is 50km/h and the traffic seldom keeps to this!!! Strongly suggest installing speed sensors to flash when traffic is over the limit. Also, paint start of lower speed limit on all road surfaces.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TRIM: 170713072618
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRIM</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to see a review of the speed limit along the full length of the Rangiora-Woodend Rd. A reduction from the present 100km/h to 80km/h would reflect the changing use of the road. A cycleway is about to be built and the traffic volumes have increased both on the Rangiora-Woodend Rd and also on Gressons Rd and Boys Rd. Negotiating these intersections now presents a greater challenge for drivers than it did several years ago. I would also like to see a review of the 70km/h limit on Woodend. A reduction to 50km/h would match the 50km/h limit proposed at the Rangiora end. I have no comment on the River Rd/Lehmans Rd questions as I am not familiar with the roads. The questionnaire requires an answer so I have ticked 'no' because I don't know rather than because I'm against the proposal. Could future questionnaires please provide a 'no comment' option when two different proposals are included in one consultation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lehmans and River roads are I believe part of a proposed bypass. Aren't bypasses supposed to be quicker? I have found that the sealed road is in fact slower for me than when it was unsealed. But I'm not a typical driver.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arterial roads such as Kippenberger Ave, Northbrook Rd and Rangiora-Woodend Rd need to remain at high speed limits in order to function as intended. River Rd and Lehmans Rd were 100km/h before being sealed, the only possible reason to slow them down is if sealing a road makes it more dangerous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The 50km restriction should be extended along Northbrook Road further than Goodwin Street. It should extend around the bend as vehicles need to be driving more slowly around the bend and it is a blind corner. It is not appropriate to go straight from 100km to 50km in this location. There are many people walking and cycling in this area (including on Northbrook Road) and for safety reasons, this 50km speed restriction should be extended east of the bend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes to all, don't ask, just do it! With Q.3. I would like to see 50km/h extended all the way to golf links road, forget 70 or 80 km/h. The average Kiwi thinks he/she is Possum Bauer &amp; have a very high need for speed without considering anyone or anything else, and driving to the conditions - forget it - its a truly awful, horrible, arrogant attitude that I have never seen anywhere else in the world. The standard of driving or lack of, is simply disgraceful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIM</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>SUPPORT</td>
<td>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</td>
<td>AGAINST</td>
<td>SUPPORT</td>
<td>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</td>
<td>AGAINST</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Living on Rangiora Woodend Road and observing traffic behaviour we strongly recommend the new proposed 80kmh limit on this road be extended beyond Boys Road intersection to Gressons Road intersection. Ellis &amp; Russell Stalker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lehman's Road is so dangerous now with so many cars speeding down the road. An accident waiting to happen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>As residents of Northbrook Rd we fully support the speed reduction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Built up areas should all be 50kmh (or less). Reduced speed limits for urban fringe make sense also.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I would particularly like to comment on River Road from Lehman's Road to West Belt. To be honest, I was really surprised to see that it is 100 kmh. I am a frequent user of the mountain bike and walking tracks that are accessed via River Road (near the west belt corner). A lot of people walking/biking with kids and dogs come from down West Belt and cross that road to access the tracks (it doesn't have any clear paths or crossing points). Having that be an 80kmh read is very dangerous. The corner of River Road and West Belt is already tricky and confusing (people speed around and it gets lots of big trucks). If River Road is to be 80kmh, it should change back to 50kmh well before the entrance of the walking tracks and carpark. Thanks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The proposed 50km speed should extend to 500m east of Golf Course Road. Then 40km all the way to Woodend. To ELIMINATE THE DANGEROUS BOYS ROAD ENTRY. Where a lot of BAD accidents and near misses have happened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reduce the speed limit on Oxford Rd. from Paskell's Road to Lilley Road to 40kmh. Too many accidents and near accidents happening, especially with school traffic and children crossing the road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The intersection between River Rd and West Belt is now very dangerous being only a Give Way. Traffic heading from the west often fails to give way and so any reduction in speed limit will help. River Rd west of west belt should be reduced to 50kmh before the intersection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Northbrook Road is already sign posted at 50km however a low percentage of traffic is taking notice and it changes from 50 to 100 about 70m from my residential address.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The first two have become residential areas, the other proposals have my support because I cycle around Rangiora.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TRIM: 170713072618
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRIM</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I don't believe traffic has increased to that extent yet? Kippenburger only has one more turning after increase to 70. It's a long stretch between turnings to go at 50km per hour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The increase in residential properties entering Kippenburger Ave. Means the slower limit would be safer for vehicles entering traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sensible adjustments to speed limits based on increased population, development and traffic. Well done with these suggestions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Online Submission</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>No Comment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TRIM: 170713072618
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEMO

FILE NO AND TRIM NO: RDG-31 / 170719074932

DATE: 21 July 2017

MEMO TO: Rangiora-Ashley Community Board

FROM: Ken Stevenson – Roading Manager

SUBJECT: Rangiora Speed Limit Reviews – Consultation Feedback

The purpose of this memo is to advise the Board of the results of the consultation on the proposal to change the speed limit on on Kippenberger Avenue, Northbrook Road, Lehmans Road and River Road.

A speed limit of 50km/h was proposed on:
- Kippenberger Avenue from Watkins Drive to east of Devlin Avenue
- Northbrook Road from Papawai Drive to east of Goodwin Street

A speed limit of 80km/h was proposed on:
- Kippenberger Avenue from the proposed 50km/h change point to 500m east of Golf Links Road
- Lehmans Road from Oxford Road to River Road
- River Road from Lehmans Road to West Belt

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

The full submissions are attached (TRIM 170713072618) and are also summarised below.

A total of 33 Submissions were received on the proposal, as summarised in table 1 below.

Table 1: Summary of Submissions Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Speed Limit</th>
<th>Support in Full</th>
<th>Conditional Support</th>
<th>Opposed in Full</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50km/h on Kippenberger Avenue from Watkins Drive to Devlin Avenue</td>
<td>82 %</td>
<td>3 %</td>
<td>15 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80km/h on Kippenberger from 50km/h change point to 500m east of Golf Links Road</td>
<td>76 %</td>
<td>6 %</td>
<td>18 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50km/h on Northbrook Road from Papawai Drive to east of Goodwin Street</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>3 %</td>
<td>15 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80km/h on Lehmans Road from Oxford Road to River Road</td>
<td>77 %</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>23 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80km/h on River Road from Lehmans Road to West Belt</td>
<td>77 %</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>23 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Twenty three submissions fully supported the proposal to change the speed limits on Kippenberger Avenue, Northbrook Road, Lehmans Road and River Road. An additional three submissions fully supported the proposal to change the speed limits on Kippenberger Avenue and Northbrook Road.

Four submissions suggested increasing the length of the proposed 80km/h speed limit on Kippenberger Road along Rangiora Woodend Road. A separate speed limit review along the full length of Rangiora Woodend Road will be undertaken as part of the new cycleway project.

Three submissions suggested lowering the speed limit further to 50km/h on Kippenberger Road along the proposed 80km/h section. This is not considered necessary or appropriate for the road environment.

One submission suggested increasing the length of the proposed 50km/h speed limit on Northbrook Road. This is not considered necessary or appropriate for the road environment.

Five submissions were fully opposed to the proposal to change the speed limits on Kippenberger Avenue, Northbrook Road, Lehmans Road and River Road. An additional two submissions were opposed to the speed changes on Lehmans Road and River Road.

NZTA supported the proposed speed changes on Kippenberger Avenue, Northbrook Road, Lehmans Road and River Road. There have been no formal responses from the NZ Automobile Association, the Police or the Road Transport Forum NZ to this proposal.

It is noted that the feedback throughout the consultation process generally supported the proposed changes with only seven submitters partially or fully opposing the speed changes.

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

If you have any questions or comments please contact me.

Ken Stevenson
Roading Manager