Council Agenda

COUNCIL MEETING

Tuesday 5 June 2018
Commencing at 1.00pm

Waimakariri District Council Chamber
215 High Street
Rangiora

Members:

Mayor David Ayers
Deputy Mayor Kevin Felstead
Councillor Neville Atkinson
Councillor Kirstyn Barnett
Councillor Al Blackie
Councillor Robbie Brine
Councillor Wendy Doody
Councillor Dan Gordon
Councillor John Meyer
Councillor Sandra Stewart
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The Mayor and Councillors

WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

A meeting of the WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL will be held in the COUNCIL CHAMBER, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA on TUESDAY 5 JUNE 2018 at 1.00PM.

Sarah Nichols
GOVERNANCE MANAGER

Recommendations in reports are not to be construed as Council policy until adopted by the Council

BUSINESS

1. APOLOGIES

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

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

3. REGISTER OF INTERESTS

4. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

5. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

5.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Tuesday 1 May 2018

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Confirms as a true and correct record the circulated minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Tuesday 1 May 2018.

5.2 Minutes of the public excluded portion of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on 1 May 2018

(refer to Blue agenda papers)

MATTERS ARISING
6. DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

7. ADJOURNED BUSINESS
   Nil.

8. REPORTS

8.1. Disposal of 44 High Street and 9 Ashley Street, Rangiora – Raymond Qu (Property Assets Advisor) and Simon Hard (Business and Centres Manager)

   **RECOMMENDATION**

   THAT the Council:

   (a) Receives report No. 180124006057.

   (b) Support vesting the land at 44 High Street and part of 8 Ashley Street to a local purpose reserve for community purposes, to the Waimakariri District Council.

   (c) Note: Such land status change would exclude the north half of 8 Ashley Street in relation to the carpark area.

   (d) Approve disposal of the balance land (carparks) of 8 Ashley Street pursuant to section 40 of the Public Works Act 1981.

   (e) Note: Surplus land is required to be firstly disposed of to the former owner under section 40 of the Public Works Act 1981. Should the former owner decline the offer, then the land should be disposed of on the open market.

   (f) Appoint the property manager to negotiate with adjacent property owners to sell surplus land at an agreed value.


   **RECOMMENDATION**

   THAT the Council:

   (a) Receives report No. 80524057371.

   (b) Ratifies the Future Development Strategy scoping paper as set out in Attachment (i).

   (c) Notes that the draft Future Development Strategy, when complete, will be presented to individual partners for ratification and to allow public consultation to occur in August 2018.

   (d) Agrees that the development of the future development strategy, and the associated consultation process, occurs using the Local Government Act 2002 and is undertaken in accordance with Part 6 of the Act and the significance and engagement policies of the partner councils.

   (e) Notes that Ngāi Tahu GCP representatives are currently considering some proposed additional amendments to the Future Development
Strategy scoping paper to ensure the values and aspirations of Ngāi Tahu are appropriately reflected, and that staff will report back to the Council if any proposed amendments are deemed significant.

8.3 **Draft Business Zones 1 and 2 Public Spaces Policy – Mike O-Connell (Senior Policy Analyst)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180507049501.

(b) Approves the exposure draft Business Zones 1&2 Public Spaces Policy to be released for public consultation, consultation which includes targeted engagement with Zone 1&2 businesses and business support agencies.

(c) Delegates to the Mayor and Chief Executive responsibility for approving any alterations, additions or deletions that may be required prior to release for consultation.

(d) Circulates copies of this draft policy to the Community Boards.

8.4 **Draft Submission to the Productivity Commission's draft report on a Low-emissions Economy – Geoff Meadows (Policy Manager)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report no. 180521055321

(b) Workshops the attached draft submission to the Productivity Commission draft report to reach consensus on a Council submission;

(c) Authorises the Mayor to make changes to the attached draft submission to the Productivity Commission draft report on a Low-emissions Economy (TRIM 180521055261);

(d) Approves the distribution of the Council submission to Community Boards for their information.
9. MATTERS REFERRED FROM COMMITTEES AND COMMUNITY BOARDS

9.1 Collection Bin Ownership – Simon Collin (Infrastructure Strategy Manager)
(refer to attached copy of report no. 180502047890 to the Solid and Hazardous Waste Working Party meeting of 15 May 2018)

RECOMMENDATION
THAT the Council:
(a) Receives report No. 180502047890.
(b) Requests staff to develop the contract documentation for kerbside collection contracts on the basis that the contractor will own the bins
(c) Requests staff investigate the practicality and probity of including in the tender documents, the ability for tenderers to put in alternative bids based on Council owning the bins

9.2 Review of Options for Transfer Station Operations and Maintenance – Kitty Wagorn (Solid Waste Asset Manager)
(refer to attached copy of report no. 180502048027 to the Solid and Hazardous Waste Working Party meeting of 15 May 2018)

RECOMMENDATION
THAT the Council:
(a) Receives report No. 180502048027.
(b) Notes that the Section 17A review of the Delivery of Refuse and Recyclables Transfer Services and Kerbside Collection services (TRIM 160504040305) was circulated to the members of the SHWWP by email on 9 April 2018.
(c) Approves Option 5: modify the scope of the review and do not delay tender preparation.
(d) Approves that the tender documents will be initially prepared on the basis that the operation and maintenance of Oxford Refuse Transfer Station and Southbrook Resource Recover Park will be out-sourced, with an allowance for support by a community group for resource recovery activities.
(e) Notes that both contracts are scheduled to commence in July 2019 and that the contract terms have yet to be finalised.
(f) Notes that the most appropriate time for undertaking a full Section 17A review of service delivery would within 2 years of the end of the new contracts.
(g) Notes staff will bring a further report to the SHWWP for decision on the contract term

9.3 Mayoral Forum mid-term Review May 2018

RECOMMENDATION
THAT the Council:
(a) Receives for information Item 9.3.

10. HEALTH AND SAFETY

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

(a) Receives report No. 180420043230.

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

11.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Utilities and Roading Committee held on 17 April 2018

11.2 Minutes of a meeting of the District Planning and Regulation Committee held on 17 April 2018

11.3 Minutes of a meeting of the Solid and Hazardous Waste Working Party held on 15 May 2018

11.4 Minutes of a meeting of the Community and Recreation Committee held on 22 May 2018

RECOMMENDATION
THAT the information in items 11.1-11.4 be received.

12. COMMUNITY BOARD MINUTES FOR INFORMATION

12.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board held on 16 April 2018

12.2 Minutes of a meeting of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board held on 3 May 2018

12.3 Minutes of a meeting of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board held on 16 May 2018

12.4 Minutes of a meeting of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board held on 21 May 2018

RECOMMENDATION
THAT the information in items 12.1 to 12.4 be received.
13. CORRESPONDENCE

14. MAYOR’S DIARY

14.1. Mayor’s Diary 24 April – 29 May 2018

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report no. 180525057986

15. COUNCIL PORTFOLIO UPDATES

15.1. Iwi Relationships
15.2. Canterbury Water Management Strategy
15.3. International Relationships
15.4. Regeneration (Kaiapoi)

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 1 May 2018</td>
<td>Confirmation of minutes</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>Report of Rob Hawthorne (Property Manager)</td>
<td>Disposal of Silverstream land</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>Report of Raymond Qu (Property Assets Advisor) and Simon Hart (Business and Centres Manager)</td>
<td>Strategic Property Purchase</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>Report of Raymond Qu (Property Assets Advisor) and Simon Hart (Business and Centres Manager)</td>
<td>EOI Result and Change Tender to negotiation for 137 Williams Street, Kaiapoi</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>Report of Simon Hart (Business and Centres Manager) and Rob Hawthorne (Property Manager)</td>
<td>FENZ Proposal</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 – 18.5</td>
<td>Protection of privacy of natural persons</td>
<td>A2(a) A2(b)ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To carry out commercial activities without prejudice</td>
<td></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 3 July 2018 commencing at 1pm.
# Waimakariri District Council

## Register of Interests – as at 28 May 2018 - Mayor and Councillors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elected Member</th>
<th>Date of Update from Member</th>
<th>Member Declared Interest (Business/Patron/Club/Partnership)</th>
<th>Council Appointments</th>
<th>Spouse/Partner Declared Interest</th>
<th>OAG approval status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Mayor David Ayers       | 27 May 2018                | North Canterbury Radio Trust  
Rotary Club of Rangiora, including Charitable Trust  
Rangiora & Districts Early Records Society  
Rangiora Methodist Parish  
Patron – North Canterbury Musical Society  
Patron – Rangiora Brass Band  
Patron – Southbrook Sports Club  
Member – Landmarks  
Waimakariri Art Collection Trust | Trustee - Canterbury Museum Trust  
Enterprise North Canterbury  
Waimakariri Community Arts Council | Nil.                                | n/a                                        |
<p>| Councillor Kevin Felstead | 8 May 2018                | Sole Trader: Resource Consent Services                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                       |                                 | n/a                    |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Councillor</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Interests</th>
<th>Nil.</th>
<th>Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neville Atkinson</td>
<td>28 May 2018</td>
<td>Kaiapoi Community Care and Employment Trust (KCC&amp;ET) (Tag Busters)</td>
<td>Trustee – Te Kohaka O Tuhaitara Trust</td>
<td>Nil.</td>
<td>(KCC&amp;ET)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kaiapoi Railway Station Trust (Chair)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>June 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirstyn Barnett</td>
<td>8 May 2018</td>
<td>Nothing to declare</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alistair Blackie</td>
<td>8 May 2018</td>
<td>Nothing to declare</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbie Brine</td>
<td>April 2018</td>
<td>Serving NZ Police Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy Doody</td>
<td>8 May 2018</td>
<td>Nothing to declare</td>
<td>Trustee - North Canterbury Sport and Recreation Trust</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Gordon</td>
<td>19 May 2018</td>
<td>Employed by Parliamentary Services</td>
<td>Trustee - North Canterbury Sport and Recreation Trust</td>
<td>Nil.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trustee – Rotary Club of Rangiora Charitable Trust</td>
<td>Board member – Rural Canterbury Primary Health Organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Member – Rotary Club of Rangiora (Current President)</td>
<td>Board member – Rangiora Promotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chair – Waimakariri Arts Trust</td>
<td>Chair – Friends of Rangiora Town Hall Incorporated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Committee Member – Waimakariri Community Arts Council</td>
<td>Member – Rangiora Airfield Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Meyer</td>
<td>8 May 2018</td>
<td>Patron Kaiapoi Tennis Club</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ref: 180419043077

As at 28 May 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Councillor</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Declaration</th>
<th>Nil.</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Sandra Stewart</td>
<td>8 May 2018</td>
<td>Self-employed journalist, owner four hectare property Springbank (near Cust)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Paul Williams</td>
<td>8 May 2018</td>
<td>Nothing to declare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MINUTES OF THE MEETING FROM THE WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA, ON TUESDAY 1 MAY 2018, COMMENCING AT 1PM.

PRESENT:

IN ATTENDANCE:
J Palmer (Chief Executive), G Cleary (Manager, Roading and Utilities), S Markham (Manager Strategy & Engagement), K Simpson (3 Waters Manager), J McBride (Roading Manager), O Davis (Drainage Asset Manager), J Fraser (Utilities Planner), K Waghorn (Solid Waste Asset Manager), S Collin (Infrastructure Strategy Manager), M O’Connell (Senior Policy Analyst) and S Nichols (Governance Manager). 

The meeting adjourned at 2.53pm until 3.10pm.

1. APOLOGIES
Nil.

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
Nil.

3. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS
Nil.

4. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

4.1. Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Tuesday 3 April 2018

Move: Councillor Barnett 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 3 April 2018.

CARRIED

4.2. Minutes of the public excluded portion of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on 3 April 2018

This matter was dealt with in the Public Excluded portion of the meeting.

MATTERS ARISING
Nil.

5. DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

Mr Robert Johnston of Ashley Gorge expressed views in relation to his LTP submission. Nicholas Johnston attended in support.

A painting of the Ashley Gorge in the 1930’s, was circulated with R Johnston commenting on changes, from then to now, in the Ashley River flow, gorse, broom and other vegetation growth.
A package of information was circulated (Trim 180527058154) which included R Johnston’s submission, legal information and Environment Canterbury's response to last year’s submission. R Johnston encouraged the Council to take a more active role in assisting in getting all the players for his problems on the same page to enable progress.

K Felstead referred to the legal material that R Johnston supplied, referring to catchment boards and queried whether R Johnston believed the Council had a catchment board. R Johnston had discussed the matter with his legal adviser and acknowledged that there was a catchment board at the time.

Mayor Ayers enquired if there are other braided rivers in Canterbury in a similar condition in the mid-river. R Johnston knew of no other river which had issues as bad as the Ashley River with regard to the vegetation issues and build-up that this particular river has in its mid-to upper levels.

Mayor Ayers thanked R Johnston for his submission and information, which would be considered by the Council at the deliberation meeting scheduled at the end of May.

6. ADJOURNED BUSINESS
Nil.

7. REGENERATION REPORT


G Cleary provided a summary of the background work to date and the work of the Cam River Rehabilitation Group. The aim is to improve the navigation channel from the Coastguard facility to the river mouth. The second aspect is the pontoon area, with this second consent being more complex due to the issues involving intrusion of salt water up the Kaiapoi River. G Cleary stated saline issues are complex and affect the tributaries; sea level rise issues adds to the complexity. However, it is not recommended to wait until the saline issues are resolved. Staff wish to submit the consents. G Cleary spoke of the cost involved establishing the equipment required for the project. Staff propose to return in June with a report with budgets which enables work to occur in winter (i.e. June/July). Funding would be sourced from the current and following financial years.

Councillor Doody enquired that with recent heavy rains, and the current river flow, have samples been taken and has the saline effect changed? G Cleary advised that with large flows in both the Waimakariri and Kaiapoi Rivers it is not such an issue, however during the dryer months and lower flows the saline issue is more prevalent.

Councillor Barnett spoke of community views and queried if a full communication plan was done at the time, as feedback to her directly was that people were aware of the salinity issue but not the dredging matter. G Cleary commented that dredging is only one of the issues. He spoke of liaising with key stakeholders and users of the river. Councillor Barnett queried if Facebook and other channels of communication, along with a full communication plan was undertaken at the time. G Cleary confirmed staff did use various avenues such as newspapers and social media, however very little feedback was received from the wider community. It was advised that staff have continuously worked with key stakeholders, many of whom have been involved with the working party, and feedback is that they understand the issues and this proposal was developed in conjunction with those key stakeholders.

In a supplementary question Councillor Barnett asked if staff thought people connected increased salinity and the dredging, from the consultation. G Cleary confirmed alternative means of communication were used and reconfirmed that the key stakeholders do understand the issues however he was unsure on how
well the wider community appreciates the issue. There are a number of factors at play, as outlined in the report. This is just one potential issue and if dredging occurs it may exacerbate the salinity, which is an issue in itself.

Councillor Barnett sought clarification on staff recommendations (b) and (d) and if the Council should be doing more. G Cleary commented that the Council is doing more reflecting on the work being undertaken and the continuous work in partnership with Environment Canterbury.

Councillor Stewart commented on a report by Dr Tim Davy and sought an update on the report. Staff advised they had been following up on matters but were yet to receive a response.

Move: Councillor Atkinson Seconded: Councillor Blackie

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No.180315027535.

(b) Authorises staff to proceed with design, consenting and work programming of dredging for a minimum 1.5m depth (low tide) navigation channel in the Kaiapoi River, from the Williams Street Bridge to Waimakariri Confluence.

(c) Notes an associated budget proposal for the work will be provided to Council for approval in a separate report or via staff submission to the Long Term Plan, which would include an option to “bring forward” river rehabilitation project funding to the 2018/19 year and commence dredging (subject to resolving timing, design and planning constraints) from June 2018, if practicable.

(d) Notes this report recommends improving Kaiapoi River navigability whilst noting Council could also consider future complementary measures to seek to manage effects of saline intrusion through mitigations in the Kaiapoi River tributaries, in coordination with Environment Canterbury.

(e) Notes that the resource consent for the dredging required for the floating pontoons is being applied for separately to ensure that any potential delays due to the salt water issue do not delay the pontoon consent.

(f) Notes that dredging needs to be limited to mid-winter or December to avoid spawning season.

CARRIED

Councillor Atkinson stated that there are a number of unknown factors and acknowledged plantings and vegetation may change over time, along with the river flow. He believed this dredging proposal was ‘taking the bumps off’ as there was a need to do something for navigation and safety. He was aware of other vessels that want to come up the river, but currently cannot do so until the navigation channel is improved. Councillor Atkinson spoke of the Council’s responsibility towards safety.

Councillor Blackie endorsed comments made.

Councillor Barnett explained her reasons for the line of questioning. She remarked that safety issues from the Coastguard resonated and it is sensible to undertake the work. Councillor Barnett spoke of consultation and the use of the wording ‘stakeholders’ as she believed that with such an asset as the river, there was a need to talk to the wider community. Councillor Barnett remarked on climate change, river levels and the importance of communicating with the public.
Councillor Atkinson reflected on three Council videos for which he had been the presenter, informing viewers of the work being undertaken in the river, together with sessions in the community.

8. REPORTS

8.1. Ashley River Secondary Stopbank Gap Filling – G Cleary (Manager, Utilities & Roading) and J McBride (Development Manager)

J McBride spoke to the report, outlining a key aspect of the proposed work being a gentle vertical curve. The Rangiora-Ashley Community Board and the Utilities and Roading Committee had recently received a presentation from Environment Canterbury (ECan) outlining the proposed work, which would be funded by ECan.

Councillor Gordon referred to public communications, enquiring if the Council’s Communications team would be involved in the process, acknowledging that it was an ECan led project. Staff confirmed that Council staff would liaise and work with ECan regarding communications.

Councillor Gordon asked if the communication plan could be advised to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board for input/comment, particularly given their feedback to ECan during the presentation. G Cleary advised that if time permitted that could occur.

Councillor Barnett enquired if staff envisaged extra maintenance because of high truck use on the affected roads. Staff advised they did not believe additional road maintenance would be required due to the design being a long curve.

Councillor Barnett enquired if drainage can be managed. Staff confirmed it could be maintained.

Move: Councillor Gordon Seconded: Councillor Williams

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180415040538;

(b) Supports the ECan Secondary Stopbank Gap Filling project and proposed raising of Cones Road and Millton Avenue.

(c) Approves work being undertaken within the Road Reserve by ECan and their nominated contractor.

(d) Notes that the project will be funded by Environment Canterbury.

(e) Notes that staff will continue to work with Environment Canterbury to ensure that a high level of communication is undertaken, the Community is well informed and a suitable traffic management plan is implemented.

CARRIED

Councillor Gordon accepted the disruption and appreciated the timing being changed so as not to affect the A&P Show in late October. He also appreciated the Community Board being informed and aware of issues to ensure all aspects were captured. Councillor Gordon remarked that it was important for the community to be well aware of the intended road works.

Councillor Williams stated it was a good project and acknowledged that ECan would be taking responsibility for signage.
Mayor Ayers stated that drivers currently have a clear view of the road ahead, but believed this project would reduce that visibility so he envisaged double yellow lines. Staff noted the road safety concern.

8.2. Adoption of Stormwater Drainage and Watercourse Protection Bylaw 2018 – Stormwater Drainage and Watercourse Protection Bylaw 2018 Review Hearing Panel

K Simpson presented the report on behalf of the Hearing Panel explaining the extensive process, discussions held and changes made as a result of submissions. It is proposed that the Bylaw comes into force from 14 May 2018.

Councillor Barnett referred to pg 57, querying the Community Board submission response and sought clarification on the communication to the public. Staff confirmed website and social media information will occur alongside physical information such as newspaper and flyers.

Councillor Barnett queried the name of the bylaw, referencing ECAn feedback in regard to the watercourse protection definition. K Simpson advised one clause in the bylaw pertains to the protection of watercourses and commented on land owners’ responsibilities under the Bylaw, drawing attention to the explanatory notes. The Bylaw is not intended to supersede any resource consent or RMA requirements that ECAn are responsible for.

In a supplementary question Councillor Barnett asked if the bylaw name was misleading. K Simpson provided other examples such as Urban and Rural Drainage Schemes which cover approximately 10% of the district rating area and how this particular Bylaw enables the Council to protect those other areas outside of previously mentioned rating areas. The Bylaw provides a mechanism to take action against non-compliance. This work would also be undertaken collaboratively with the Regional Council (ECAn).

Councillor Barnett enquired what the differences were between a land drainage system and a watercourse. K Simpson explained definitions, and the three levels of the Bylaw.

G Cleary provided historical information regarding the approach to stormwater and drainage and more current thinking of water quality and impacts of discharge. He acknowledged that the bylaw name does draw people’s attention to an important aspect of the Bylaw as it aims to improve quality of water discharge and reduce detrimental effects.

Move: Councillor Stewart Seconded: Councillor Blackie

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180329034013.

(b) Adopts the Waimakariri District Council Stormwater Drainage and Watercourse Protection Bylaw 2018.

(c) Notes the bylaw is proposed to come into force on Monday 14 May 2018, which allows time to publish a public notice confirming Council adoption of the bylaw prior to its enactment.

(d) Notes staff will respond to each submitter using the staff recommendations and associated discussion included in the Appendix, as a basis for response to each point of submission.

CARRIED

Councillor Stewart spoke of the significant expansion of scope from the previous bylaw. She commented on the watercourse protection aspect, particularly in relation to Water Zone matters. Councillor Stewart stated that currently ECAn
does not have powers to exclude stock from waterways in the Waimakariri district, however this new bylaw provides this Council with the powers to protect the integrity of both private and public waterways from stock and vegetation spraying. This bylaw will be the only effective tool until other mechanisms are changed Councillor Stewart stated. Matters were well debated, and a number of long discussions were held with ECan on the Bylaw, Councillor Stewart remarked. It was advised that this Bylaw will be reviewed in five years' time which is two years before the new Council consent process comes into force, which will enable further consideration and changes.

Councillor Blackie endorsed Councillor Stewart’s comments. He stated the wording of watercourse was deliberately put into the title. Councillor Blackie remarked that this is the first time that the Council has informed private land owners clearly what their responsibilities are for protecting the waterways on and adjoining their land and that he believed this Bylaw is a major advancement for protecting water.

Councillor Barnett remarked that this bylaw shows leadership of the Council and is far reaching. Councillor Barnett stated she understood this bylaw is a tool for staff, but held some concerns from a budgetary aspect. Councillor Barnett reflected on enforcement for non-compliance requiring court action and the related expense for the Council. Councillor Barnett remarked positively on the bylaw enabling fines to be issued to non-compliant landowners, which at a recent LGNZ Sector meeting issuing of fines was discussed and seen as a major area for the sector to lobby to enable Councils to enforce their bylaws. Councillor Barnett encouraged staff to work heavily in this lobby area and applauded the hearing panel for taking the journey this far. Councillor Barnett remarked that she would like to see the costs borne by property owners, however to bear in mind when swales are incorporated into a new subdivision, to work on a mechanism to make it easier for maintenance, particularly for the elderly. Councillor Barnett believed the overall strategy was in line with what the community are demanding of the Council to ensure the water is safe, clean and we are not further polluting our waterways.

Councillor Atkinson sought clarification on the Bylaw, in respect of exhausting all mediation or discussion prior to any court action proceeding. Staff confirmed any complaint would be investigated and considered on its merits, with the Council looking for resolution prior to any court action being undertaken.

In her right of reply, Councillor Stewart commented briefly on enforcement. This Bylaw is precedent setting in the Canterbury area, being the first Council to review the existing stormwater bylaw and it will likely be used as a template for other Councils. Councillor Stewart also acknowledged comments made relating to budgets and staff resourcing to enable this Bylaw to be fully enforced.

8.3 **Siena/Sillano Drainage Works – O Davis (Drainage Asset Manager)**

O Davis reflected on drainage issues and the high water table in the Mandeville area. This issue is not about overland flow and high rainfall but about ground water resurgence coming up to the surface over a long period of time. A further staff submission will occur during the upcoming LTP deliberation meetings. O Davis briefly mentioned resident’s thoughts and mosquitos.

K Simpson noted a change to recommendation (b) in relation to the financial year from the agenda.

Councillor Atkinson queried precedent setting and cited other areas of the district that have similar issues that are not being scheduled to be improved. K Simpson acknowledged other areas which staff continue to monitor and manage. Some issues were identified in Mandeville during the June 2014 flood event which resulted in damage to infrastructure. This report recommends remedial work. As other issues occur, staff will prioritise projects and bring information to the
Council if additional budgets are required for identified projects, however most other areas are currently managed within the existing budget.

Councillor Williams asked if the Council chose to do nothing, what costs would be involved for road maintenance. G Cleary advised he was unable to provide an appropriate answer as the weather could go into a dry period. However, ongoing roading is $10,000’s over several years and based on the current rainfall patterns the ground levels are unlikely to drop until approximately mid-December and the road would likely require resealing again.

Councillor Barnett enquired what the possibility of downstream affects were likely to be. O Davis stated any effects would be negligible. The proposed project would even out the drains and keep water flow going, minimising any significant downstream affect.

Move: Councillor Atkinson  Seconded: Councillor Gordon
THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180419042535

(b) Notes that staff will request a new capital works budget of $94,000 under the Ohoka Rural Drainage account in the 2018/19 financial year, for the proposed Siena/Sillano drainage works through the LTP deliberations.

(c) Notes that $56,000 of the drainage works will be separately funded through existing approved Roading budgets.

(d) Notes that groundwater is high in this area and this is likely to persist in winter and spring causing damage to the road if the upgrade is delayed.

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

CARRIED

Councillor Atkinson believed this was a sensible approach to take, and remarked that other situations will be dealt with on a case by case basis in other areas of the district.

Councillor Gordon thanked staff for the full report and recent briefing.

8.4 Delegation to Solid and Hazardous Waste Working Party Authority to Approve Engagement Methodology and Materials for Solid Waste Services – K Waghorn (Solid Waste Asset Manager) and S Collin (Infrastructure Strategy Manager)

K Waghorn spoke to the report briefly.

Move: Councillor Brine  Seconded: Councillor Doody
THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180403034992.

(b) Delegates to the Solid and Hazardous Waste Working Party the authority to approve the engagement processes for kerbside collection services options.

(c) Notes that the engagement referred to in (b) will only be implemented if Council includes additional rubbish and/or organics bin collection services in its 2018-28 LTP.
(d) **Notes** that the Solid and Hazardous Waste Working Party will consider the issues of bin ownership and fees/charges for changing service options and make recommendations to Council at the appropriate times.

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

**CARRIED**

8.5 **Submission on Government Policy Statement on Land Transport 2018 – M O’Connell (Senior Policy Analyst)**

M O’Connell confirmed the submission would be sent to the Ministry of Transport and not the NZ Transport Authority. An information session was held last week, noting this is the first stage of a process, with the second phase expected mid-2019. M O’Connell spoke briefly on the government’s approach and mentioned that a number of local meetings are currently occurring with NZTA, particularly in regard to the Woodend Bypass.

Staff sought clarification if the Council wish to be heard with regard to this submission. Mayor Ayers confirmed the Council would wish to speak at the parliamentary hearing.

Councillor Barnett sought advice of the Mayor on her previously circulated email relating to aspects she felt were missing from the submission and the process to discuss those matters. Mayor Ayers advised it was either through the debate process or questions to staff.

Councillor Felstead enquired if staff had discussed the submission with the Greater Christchurch partners or Joint Passenger Transport Committee, as there had been a suggestion of a joint submission. Staff advised they had not been approached to contribute on the matter.

Councillor Barnett enquired why the submission did not include comment on pedestrians, including the quality of footpaths, mobility scooters and funding for it under the access section. Staff advised a more robust comment could be incorporated in the submission if that was the instruction of the Council.

Councillor Barnett enquired why there was no mention of the Woodend to Kaiapoi cycle path as being a priority for this district. Staff advised the matter could be included if deemed appropriate.

Councillor Barnett enquired about public transport linking to major towns not being mentioned. Staff advised that was seen as an Environment Canterbury matter, particularly in relation to funding.

Move: Mayor Ayers Seconded: Councillor Gordon

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180410038161.

(b) **Approves** the draft Council submission on the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport 2018/19 to 2027/28 (TRIM No. 180410038725).
Delegates to the Mayor and Chief Executive responsibility for approving any alterations, additions or deletions that may be required before the submission is due to be lodged prior to the closing date of 2 May 2018.

Circulates copies of this submission to the Community Boards.

CARRIED

Mayor Ayers remarked that he had recently attended a Government Policy Statement (GPS) related summit in Wellington. The GPS is a high level document that influences government regional plans and has an impact on funding. He advised that a road safety plan is also being proposed to set the government’s road safety direction over the next few years. Mayor Ayers remarked that road safety is the number one priority in the GPS.

Mayor Ayers stated it is appropriate to discuss the Woodend Bypass in the submission and discuss it from the aspect of community safety and as a separation matter for Woodend. Mayor Ayers was supportive of the suggestion from Councillor Barnett about cycleway and footpaths as there is a suggestion of financial assistance from NZTA as part of the wider aspect of encouraging active transport which requires good footpaths, so any mention in a submission assists that process.

Mayor Ayers commented that the Woodend Bypass is currently in the draft Regional Transport Plan but that it will need to be reviewed as it was in the previous government policy statement. This is the first time the Woodend Bypass has been included in a Regional Transport Plan, despite all the local level work over many years, including the designation into our District Plan. However, a new government with a change in priorities might put the project in jeopardy so it is appropriate that the Council address that matter specifically.

Mayor Ayers remarked that the other issue that will arise over the next few years is the question of public transport as there is low level of awareness in the general community on how public transport is funded and it is partly seen as a Council responsibility as well as the government to inform the community so they can help decide on how much they are prepared to pay and contribute as tax and rate payers to public transport, and the benefits they see as communities and road users.

Councillor Gordon agreed with the Mayoral comments and remarked that he was comfortable with the first two points raised by Councillor Barnett, therefore was supportive of the topics being incorporated into the submission. Councillor Gordon referred to the safety section of the submission and was concerned at the enforcement of 80kph areas, believing the submission to be diplomatically worded, reflecting on past experience as he anticipated public pushback on that particular matter.

Councillor Barnett explained her reasoning for earlier questions and expressed her concern for leaving aspects out of the submission as Councillor Barnett believed that there could be the potential to miss out on funding and opportunities if matters are not raised in the submission as she believed this was about strategic direction and future funding. Councillor Barnett remarked on her concerns of not having enough time to discuss matters with the Council informally to reflect the views of the community, although staff have done an excellent job of capturing many aspects of the submission. It was acknowledged that there was a high interest in the community on transport matters and some issues in the submission had been raised by the community with Councillor Barnett such as balancing safe speeds with economic cost and rail affordability. Councillor Barnett spoke of the importance of being heard from our community to central government and sought to reinforce some of the points included in the submission such as connectivity between major towns, safety and quality of footpaths and seeking funding subsidy at this strategic level.
Councillor Atkinson reflected on recent readings on road safety in Australia, with faster and safer cars but slower speed limits and a climbing road death toll. Speed is not the issue but it is the drivers Councillor Atkinson stated, who was supportive of the submission, although he endorsed Councillor Gordon’s comments in relation to stronger wording on 80kph speed limits. Councillor Atkinson also welcomed further discussion among Councillors on road safety matters going forward.

Councillor Brine reflected on his recent experience observing a youth on a restricted licence speeding late in the evening at 145kpm, which resulted in an instant loss of licence for 28 days and his personal observations that young persons, were often in breach of licence conditions. Councillor Brine commented that the Kaiapoi to Woodend cycleway is of merit. However, the Woodend Bypass will likely define where that cycleway will go, therefore he believed it was important to continue with the high level approach currently being adopted.

In his right of reply, Mayor Ayers remarked that the best opportunity for the Woodend to Kaiapoi cycleway is the Woodend Bypass, with plans in place for a clip-on lane of the Waimakariri River Bridge on the Northern Motorway and therefore it is important to continue to work on the matter at the strategic level. However if the bypass is delayed for an unreasonable length of time then we can relook at the situation.

Mayor Ayers spoke about the 80kph speed aspect which had resulted from 2017 speed guidelines from NZTA with most rural roads in Canterbury assessed as safe at 80kph. Mayor Ayers reflected on changes to reduce speed around Rangiora and Pineacres in recent times and from his observations he believed that most drivers comply with the speed limits.

Mayor Ayers commented on the increasing Australian road death rate, and in the western world. He remarked on how the road toll in Sweden once was similar to New Zealand but now Sweden is much lower, as New Zealand continues to climb. Mayor Ayers also remarked on speed reduction for fuel economy reasons during the 1970’s fuel crisis, and that the changes were directly attributed to a reduction in road deaths. Mayor Ayers reflected on the safe systems approach revolving around key aspects; safe speed, safe driving, and safe road overall creating a safe environment.

8.6. Register of Interests Policy – S Nichols (Governance Manager)

S Nichols spoke briefly to the report, reflecting on previous discussions with the Council. It was proposed to capture information at the high level with attention drawn to the proposed register style. By law it was not compulsory for an elected member to declare a pecuniary interest, however it was recommended best practice to have such a register.

Following a question from Councillor Barnett it was clarified that the Conflicts of Interests section of each Council, Committee and Community Board agenda would continue to enable members to declare interests against a particular report being considered at that particular meeting.

Move: Mayor Ayers    Seconded: Councillor Gordon

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180419042965.
(b) Adopts the Register of Interests Policy 2018 (Trim 180419043038).
(c) Notes a Register of Interests will be listed in the Council agenda of June 2018, and on the Council website. The Register will be re-
published in subsequent agendas and web page when an amendment has been notified and recorded. The Register can be subsequently reviewed each December as a matter of best practice.

(d) **Notes** the initial style of the Register will be as per template Trim 180419043077.

(e) **Circulates** a copy of this report to the Community Boards.

**CARRIED**
Against Councillor Blackie

Mayor Ayers stated that the information from members is voluntary, reflecting that it could be tailored to the decision body the members were on, providing the Canterbury Museum as an example, in his case.

Councillor Gordon stated he was comfortable with the Register of Interests.

Councillor Blackie, stated he was opposed to the Register on principal, as members take an oath at the beginning of the term and each meeting agenda has a Conflict of Interest section. Councillor Blackie believed such a register was intrusive, although he stated he had nothing to hide.

9. **MATTERS REFERRED FROM COMMITTEES AND COMMUNITY BOARDS**

9.1 **Bramleys Road Well Viability Assessment – C Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager) and K Simpson (3 Waters Manager)**

*(referred to report no. 180323031876 to the Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting of 9 April 2018 and Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting of 16 April 2018 and extract of minutes from these meetings)*

K Simpson spoke to the report and outlined key aspects including water flow and treatment being required. It was advised the Havelock North Stage 2 report recommended all supplies being treated, and based on that information staff no longer recommend Bramleys Road as a water supply. It was noted through consultation that most feedback related to cultural aspects. Staff will be writing to the Runanga and discussing matters further at an upcoming meeting to address the cultural concerns raised. Staff advised there would be ongoing engagement with the Runanga.

K Simpson referred to recommendation (f), budgets and feedback from the Community Boards. It was acknowledged some additional funding may be needed in the future however there is another Long Term Plan budget before any works are proposed.

Move: Councillor Atkinson  Seconded: Councillor Felstead

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180323031876.

(b) **Notes** that previously it was expected that water of a suitable quality and quantity could be abstracted from the Bramleys Road well to be distributed to the Woodend Pegasus water supply scheme, via Tuahiwi, without any treatment.

(c) **Notes** that the Bramleys Road well is no longer considered to be a viable future source for the scheme, as the water source would likely require significant treatment and gaining consent to abstract water from the well would be very difficult.
(d) **Notes** that some Tuahiwi residents opposed the joining of the scheme with Pegasus for cultural reasons, and that the future connection of the Bramleys Road well would have potentially mitigated these concerns.

(e) **Notes** that staff will write to the local Runanga and discuss this matter at the next Runanga meeting on the 17 May 2018, to advise them of the reasons that this well is no longer considered to be a viable future source.

(f) **Approves** the replacement of the $2.2M capital works budget in 2022/23 and 2023/24 to connect the Bramleys Road well, with a $0.5M capital works budget in 2023/24 to connect the EQ4 well to provide additional capacity on the Woodend Pegasus water supply scheme.

CARRIED


(referred to report no.180321030331 to the Regeneration Steering Group meeting of 9 April 2018)

C Sargison noted a key aspect is negotiating a variation to the contract with Daniel Smith Industries, while they are working on site as it will reduce the overall costs. The project would still require a resource consent with ECAn and this has been lodged.

Move: Councillor Blackie Seconded: Councillor Atkinson

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180321030331

(b) **Approves** the level of service for the Boat Ramp and Riverview Pontoons as detailed in Section 4.1

(c) **Approves** the proposed design configuration and general arrangement of pontoons.

(d) **Approves** staff proceeding to procurement stage for the pontoon package via open tender on a price-quality method.

(e) **Approves** staff negotiating a contract variation with Daniel Smith Industries under current contract 17/42 (Kaiapoi River Wall Upgrade) for undertaking the piling for the pontoon developments; up to a total variation cost of $200,000 for both the Riverview pontoon piling and the Boat-ramp pontoon piling.

CARRIED

Councillor Blackie spoke of the background work and discussions which considered many options and he believes this is the best way forward. It will cost substantially more to drive piles from the river rather than the bank at a later time.

Councillor Atkinson stated this work is becoming urgent as the wharf is full with boats. He reminded members that the Council receives a small return from the...
boats and reflected on his awareness of visitors wishing to use the river for recreation including river tours, and also of houseboats, currently being manufactured, that owners wish to moor in the Kaiapoi River in the future.

9.3. **Combining of Woodend and Pegasus Water Supplies - New Water Supply Main Concept Design – A Klos (Project Engineer) and C Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager)**

(referred to report no. 1802322031093 to the Woodend-Sefton Community Board (9 April), and Utilities and Roading Committee meetings (17 April)

K Simpson spoke to the report, advising of the consultation involvement. He outlined the project, including commenting on the alignment along Gladstone Road, and explaining why it would require additional budget.

Move: Councillor Gordon  Seconded: Councillor Felstead

**THAT** the Council:

(a)  **Include** an additional $231,000 in the capital works budget in the 2018/19 financial year, split 30% to growth and 70% to level of service, to give a revised total budget of $811,000 for the Gladstone Road to Pegasus WTP raw water main.

**CARRIED**

10. **HEALTH AND SAFETY**

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

J Palmer reflected on a recent on-site accident involving a subcontractor which unfortunately resulted in lost fingers.

Move: Councillor Meyer  Seconded: Councillor Williams

(a)  **Receives** report No. 180420043230.

**CARRIED**

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

11.1. Minutes of a meeting of the Utilities and Roading Committee held on 20 March 2018

11.2. Minutes of the Annual Hui of Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga and Waimakariri District Council held on 22 March 2018

11.3. Minutes of a meeting of the Community and Recreation Committee held on 27 March 2018

11.4. Minutes of a meeting of the Regeneration Steering Group held on 9 April 2018

Move: Councillor Brine  Seconded: Councillor Doody

**THAT** the information in items 11.1-11.4 be received.

**CARRIED**

12. **COMMUNITY BOARD MINUTES FOR INFORMATION**

12.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board held on 12 March 2018
12.2 Minutes of a meeting of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board held on 14 March 2018
12.3 Minutes of a meeting of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board held on 19 March 2018
12.4 Minutes of a meeting of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board Road and Reserves Naming Committee held on 4 April 2018
12.5 Minutes of a meeting of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board held on 5 April 2018
12.6 Minutes of a meeting of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board held on 9 April 2018
12.7 Minutes of a meeting of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board held on 11 April 2018

Move: Councillor Blackie Seconded: Councillor Felstead

THAT the information in items 12.1 to 12.7 be received.

CARRIED

Councillor Felstead commented that the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board had been focusing on allocating their Discretionary Funding to community projects.

13. CORRESPONDENCE

Nil.

14. MAYOR’S DIARY

14.1 Mayor’s Diary 27 March - 23 April 2018

Move: Councillor Atkinson Seconded: Councillor Doody

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report no. 180418042246.

CARRIED

15. COUNCIL PORTFOLIO UPDATES

15.1 Iwi Relationships

Mayor Ayers reflected on the ANZAC Service at Tuahiwi and wonderful hosts.

Mayor Ayers advised three meetings had recently occurred with TM Tau and the Acting Chair of the Runanga in relation to various matters, particularly the proposed Runanga restructure and RMA regulations. The conversations had been held in good spirits and were forward looking.

15.2 Canterbury Water Management Strategy

Councillor Stewart had attended a number of rural drainage groups in recent weeks. Also ECan had held a ‘Water Shed’ Conference on 9 April which she had attended with the Chief Executive.

Councillor Stewart reflected on information provided at recent Waimakariri Water Zone workshops, including nitrate understandings and impacts on both local farming and community water supplies.

Councillor Stewart commented briefly on upcoming meetings including a combined water zone meeting with the West Melton Water Zone Committee regarding underground water matters.
15.3. **International Relationships**

Councillor Felstead advised that the Passchendaele Trust were working through matters involving being a Trust or an Advisory Group.

Councillor Felstead advised the itinerary for the upcoming Enshi, China trip was looking very busy.

15.4. **Regeneration (Kaiapoi)**

Councillor Blackie advised that the old Pines Beach Hall had been demolished and road naming matters in the vicinity of the Butchers Road/new arterial road would be considered by the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board in the near future.

16. **QUESTIONS**

Nil.

17. **URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS**

Nil.

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

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

Move: Mayor Ayers  Seconded: Councillor Felstead

**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 3 April 2018</td>
<td>Confirmation of minutes</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>Minutes of the public excluded portion of the Utilities and Roading Committee meeting of 20 March 2018</td>
<td>Receipt of Minutes</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>Minutes of the public excluded portion of the Community and Recreation Committee meeting of 27 March 2018</td>
<td>Receipt of Minutes</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>Minutes of the public excluded portion of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi</td>
<td>Receipt of Minutes</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community Board meeting of 19 March 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Reason for protection of interests</th>
<th>Ref NZS 9202:2003 Appendix A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 18.1 – 18.5 | Protection of privacy of natural persons  
To carry out commercial activities without prejudice | A2(a) A2(b)ii                  |

CARRIED

The public excluded portion of the meeting occurred from 3.47pm to 3.56pm.

19. NEXT MEETING

The next scheduled meeting of the Council is on Tuesday 5 June 2018 commencing at 1pm.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 3.57PM.

CONFIRMED

________________
Chairperson

________________
Date
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT

FILE NO and TRIM NO: 044473.02 / 180124006057
REPORT TO: Council
DATE OF MEETING: 5 June 2018
FROM: Raymond Qu, Property Assets Advisor and Simon Hart, Business and Centres Manager
SUBJECT: Disposal Of 44 High Street and 8 Ashley Street Rangiora

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to seek Council approval to dispose of the 44 High Street and 8 Ashley Street, Rangiora which was acquired for the Red Lion corner Realignment Project. The land is now surplus to requirements and need to be divested pursuant to the Public Works Act 1981.

1.2. The land is uneconomic for commercial development due to its shape, area and location. The current landscaping of this property aligns with the Community Boards articulated views and is consistent with Reserve land usage.

1.3. Given the Ashley-High Street corner has been seen as the gateway to the Rangiora Town Centre, any use should be in line with the Rangiora Town Centre Plan. As such, it is better to remain in the control of the Council. Staff understand that the Rangiora Community Board has indicated in support of the land at 44 High Street being changed to ‘Reserve land’.

Attachments:
   i. Previous report 140225017833 to Rangiora Community Board - Red Lion Corner Scheme Design and Landscaping Concept Plans

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

   (a) Receives report No. 180124006057.

   (b) Support vesting the land at 44 High Street and part of 8 Ashley Street to a local purpose reserve for community purposes, to the Waimakariri District Council.

   (c) Note: Such land status change would exclude the north half of 8 Ashley Street in relation to the carpark area.

   (d) Approve disposal of the balance land (carparks) of 8 Ashley Street pursuant to section 40 of the Public Works Act 1981.
Note: Surplus land is required to be firstly disposed of to the former owner under section 40 of the Public Works Act 1981. Should the former owner decline the offer, then the land should be disposed of on the open market.

Appoint the property manager to negotiate with adjacent property owners to sell surplus land at an agreed value.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1. Council acquired both 44 High Street and 8 Ashley Street to facilitate the Red Lion corner Realignment project in 2014. The Council subdivided both parcels, using the appropriate portions for roading and creating two separated fee simple titles with the balance. The balance of 44 High Street, being 195m² is known as Section 8 SO 476836 held in CFR 693231. The balance of 8 Ashley Street, being 248m² is known as Lot 1-2 DP 481198 held in CFR 673903. See Council report 130516036356 for details.

3.2. The two images below demonstrate the change of land parcels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3.3. The Council’s Roading Unit has advised there is no further roading requirements for the subject land. Therefore, the subject land becomes surplus land.

3.4. Under the Public Works Act 1981, any surplus land that becomes residue due to a public work should be disposed of unless there is another public work that requires the surplus land. It is not legally appropriate to keep holding surplus land any longer than necessary. However, such disposal could lead to loss of control of the land.

3.5. The current use and public perception of this land is consistent with that of a Council amenity space, similar to the War Memorial site (Cenotaph space), and helps to form a ‘gateway’ into Rangiora town centre. Should the recommendations in this report be supported, the Council can protect its current amenity value.
4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. **Issues:**

A Right of Way (Easement Instrument 10455511.6) in favour of 42 High Street has been created across 8 Ashley Street for the safe access to their premises. The easement is in the middle of the parcel (Green Parcels in the left picture) which effectively make it impossible to build a ground floor retail space as required by the operative Waimakariri District Plan.

The north part of the land is allocated as Council car parks which provide parking for adjoining Salvation Army. The south part has been landscaped in accordance with the North East Corner Landscape Concept Plan (2014). The bench seats are of the same design as in the Cenotaph space and look towards the Cenotaph, and the footpath design reflects that of the Cenotaph space continuing the lines of the paving pattern and strip lighting as shown in the 2017 aerial photo below.
4.2. Both parcels of land were acquired for roading purpose which is classified as a public work, therefore unless another Council department requires the land for another Public Work, disposal is subject to section 40 of the Public Works Act 1981, which requires the surplus land to be first offered back to the former owner or its successors, if declined, a process to dispose of the land on the open market should be followed.

4.3. 8 Ashley Street was previously owned by Capitola Investment Ltd who is an offshore investor; and it is unlikely they would want it back as the result of the ROW easement above, and they have recently sold their old ‘Red Lion’ corner site across the road.

4.4. 44 High Street was formerly owned by Howard Williams, the owner of Country Cars, an offer back to him might result in a car display corner which would not be consistent with the use of such a prominent corner from a town centre planning perspective. Hence, staff believe it would be beneficial for the Council to maintain control of the land.

4.5. Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Advantage(s)</th>
<th>Disadvantage(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Fee simple enable commercial use</td>
<td>Uneconomical for commercial development due to the land area, shape, location and encumbrance such as the ROW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>The uncertainty of offer back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Council lose control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Advantage(s)</th>
<th>Disadvantage(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do nothing:</td>
<td>No cost involved. Such as survey, subdivision, legalisation etc.</td>
<td>Keep paying rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Violation of legal requirement as the land acquisition was for a Public work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Do nothing’ is barely an option due to the requirement of section 40 of the Public Works Act 1981. Council can be questioned as to the rationale for not disposing of surplus land and spending of rates and maintenance costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Advantage(s)</th>
<th>Disadvantage(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disposal land:</td>
<td>Proper and legitimate</td>
<td>Lose control of land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disposal can be costly and no result – no sale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another option would be to sell the land on the open market after section 40 PWA disposal process. The land is then to be offered back to its former owner or successors.
in the first instance. The potential risk includes lost control of property which leads to poor site presentation and results in negative public feedback.

### Option 4 (Preferred)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vesting part as reserve and dispose of the balance:</th>
<th>Advantage(s)</th>
<th>Disadvantage(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• In Council Control</td>
<td>• Need subdivision and legalisation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In line with public perspectives</td>
<td>• Proceeding from disposal offset the cost of boundary adjustment and legalisation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Proper and legitimate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The preferred option is to adjust the property boundary of 44 High Street to the edge of the landscaped area (show as green shadowed area on the left), change the land status to a Local Purpose Reserve for Community Purposes and vest in the Council. In the meantime running through the section 40 PWA disposal process to Capitola Investment Ltd, Capitola is very likely to decline the offer back as it is not a good developable area, then negotiate with adjoining owners to sell the carpark land to one of the parties. The Council still controls the majority of the area while following the legal requirements under section 40 of the PWA. The proceedings of disposal action would entirely offset the cost for such disposal process.

If there was a change of use in the future, the change of land status to a Local Purpose Reserve allows the council the option to lease and accommodate, for community purposes, a community building, a play centre, Plunket room etc. for a term up to 33 years.

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

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

Rangiora Eye Care have expressed their support of the land being designated a Reserve Status.
Rangiora Community Board approved the landscaping concept plans for the Rangiora War Memorial site and the intersection’s north east corner site (the subject site in this report), see report 140505045606[v2] dated 21-23 May 2014 and 140225017833 12 March 2014.

5.2. The Community and Recreation team supports the land status change as they currently maintain the site as a reserve.

5.3. **Wider Community** – An appropriate public engagement process occurred throughout the road realignment project in 2014. However, no further public consultation has been sought with regards to this specific report.

6. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. Financial Implication

**Option 1 – Commercial development**: The current annual rent/m² for new built office range from $200 to $250 and newly built retail is roughly $300/m². The potential yearly income is circa $157,000. The maximum ground floor is circa 280 m², and the first floor is circa 400 m². A preliminary estimation of commercial development would be circa $2 million dollars (except land acquisition), a prudent developer would expect at least 8% of annual return which is at least $160,000. Therefore, it would be uneconomic for a commercial development.

**Option 2 – Do nothing**: Rates are currently $186.69 (44 High Street) plus $1,359.82 (8 Ashley Street) per annum.

**Option 3 – Disposal**: PWA disposal costs circa $4,500 vs potential capital gain of $81,000 (44 High Street) plus $255,000 (8 Ashley Street) – figures are based on the current rating valuation.

**Option 4 (Preferred Option) – Vesting part as reserve and, dispose of the balance**: The boundary adjustment cost would be circa $10,000, and disposal cost and legalisation process costs will be approx $5,000, such damage could be offset by the proceeding from the disposal of carpark area of 8 Ashley Street.

6.2. **Community Implications** – There are no anticipated implications to the community that result from the recommendations in this report.

6.3. **Risk Management** – Only those stated in sections four of this report.

6.4. **Health and Safety** – There are no anticipated Health and Safety implications that arise from the recommendations in this report.

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

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

7.2. **Legislation**

- **Section 40 of the Public Works Act 1981 (PWA) – Disposal to former owner of land not required for public work.**

Disposal to former owner of land not required for public work

(1) Where any land held under this or any other Act or in any other manner for any public work—
(a) is no longer required for that public work; and
(b) is not required for any other public work; and
(c) is not required for any exchange under section 105—

the chief executive of the department within the meaning of section 2 of the Survey Act 1986 or local authority, as the case may be, shall endeavour to sell the land in accordance with subsection (2), if that subsection is applicable to that land.

(2) Except as provided in subsection (4), the chief executive of the department within the meaning of section 2 of the Survey Act 1986 or local authority, unless—

(a) he or it considers that it would be impracticable, unreasonable, or unfair to do so; or

(b) there has been a significant change in the character of the land for the purposes of, or in connection with, the public work for which it was acquired or is held—

shall offer to sell the land by private contract to the person from whom it was acquired or to the successor of that person—

(c) at the current market value of the land as determined by a valuation carried out by a registered valuer; or

(d) if the chief executive of the department within the meaning of section 2 of the Survey Act 1986 or local authority considers it reasonable to do so, at any lesser price.

(2A) If the chief executive of the department within the meaning of section 2 of the Survey Act 1986 or local authority and the offeree are unable to agree on a price following an offer made under subsection (2), the parties may agree that the price be determined by the Land Valuation Tribunal.

(3) Subsection (2) shall not apply to land acquired after 31 January 1982 and before the date of commencement of the Public Works Amendment Act (No 2) 1987 for a public work that was not an essential work.

(4) Where the chief executive of the department within the meaning of section 2 of the Survey Act 1986 or local authority believes on reasonable grounds that, because of the size, shape, or situation of the land he or it could not expect to sell the land to any person who did not own land adjacent to the land to be sold, the land may be sold to an owner of adjacent land at a price negotiated between the parties.

(5) For the purposes of this section, the term successor, in relation to any person, means the person who would have been entitled to the land under the will or intestacy of that person had he owned the land at the date of his death; and, in any case where part of a person’s land was acquired or taken, includes the successor in title of that person.

Section 26A Reserve Act 1977 - Vesting of certain reserves

(1) Where any administering body that is a territorial authority has, before 1 January 1980 been appointed to control and manage any reserve classified under section 16 (whether before or after 1 January 1980) as a recreation reserve or local purpose reserve, that reserve shall, without further authority than this section, vest in that administering body.

(2) All land so vested shall be held in trust for the purpose or purposes for which the reserve is classified.

(3) Where any such administering body wishes to have a certificate of title issued to it in respect of any reserve vested in that administering body pursuant to subsection (1), the administering body shall, if the District Land Registrar so requests, provide the District Land Registrar with such evidence as he or she may require of the classification of that
reserve and the appointment of that administering body to control and manage that reserve.

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

The following Community Outcomes are associated with this project.

**g. Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality**
- People enjoy clean water at our beaches, rivers and lakes.
- 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.

7.4. **Delegations**

The Rangiora-Ashley Community Board Jurisdiction allows for recommendations to be made to Council for the sale or use of land where appropriate.

The sale of, or vesting of land as a local purpose reserve (community purpose) requires the approval of Council.
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FROM: Heike Lulay, Senior Policy Analyst, Ken Stevenson, Roading Manager & Tori McMillan, Green Space Community Engagement Officer on behalf of the Red Lion Corner and High Street Reference Group

SUBJECT: Red Lion Corner Scheme Design and Landscaping Concept Plans

SIGNED BY: (for Reports to Council or Committees)

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report, which is prepared on behalf of the Red Lion Corner and High Street Reference Group, is two-fold. It seeks recommendation from the Community Board for the Council to approve the draft Scheme Design for the Red Lion Corner Realignment project, subject to the resolution of outstanding issues, including property purchases.

1.2. Secondly, it seeks recommendation from the Community Board for the Council to approve the draft landscaping plans for the Rangiora War Memorial (cenotaph) site and the intersection’s north east corner site that will become surplus land as a result of the new intersection alignment. Both the Scheme Design and the Landscaping Concept Plans were endorsed by the Red Lion Corner and High Street Reference Group, members of which are listed in section 4.2 of this report, at its meeting on 24 February 2014, subject to the resolution of outstanding issues, including property purchases.

Attachments:

i. Red Lion Corner Intersection Scheme Design

ii. Red Lion Corner Landscaping Concept Plans for the Rangiora War Memorial site and the Red Lion Corner north east corner site

iii. Red Lion Corner and High Street Reference Group Terms of Reference

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Rangiora Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 140225017833 and recommends to the Council that it:

(b) Approves the draft Scheme Design for the Red Lion Corner intersection (intersection of Ivory / High and Ashley Streets), as per attachment i.

(c) Approves the draft landscaping concept plans for the Rangiora War Memorial site and the intersection’s north east corner site, as per attachment ii, noting these were workshopped with the Rangiora Community Board on 12 February 2014.
Notes that an additional $300,000 to fund the landscaping on the Rangiora War Memorial (cenotaph) site and the intersection’s north east corner site is required and once detailed intersection design is complete, this item and an updated overall budget will be presented to the Council for consideration as part of the draft 2014/15 Annual Plan considerations.

Notes that (b) and (c) are subject to the resolution of outstanding issues, including the completion of necessary property purchases and service provision / relocation, and detailed design.

Notes that both the Scheme Design and landscaping concept plans were endorsed by the Red Lion Corner and High Street Reference Group on 24 February 2014.

Notes the additional targeted consultation and engagement that was undertaken by staff with other stakeholders and adjacent property owners on both, the Scheme Design and landscaping concept plans over and above engagement with the Reference Group, as detailed in section 4 of this report.

Notes the Red Lion Corner and High Street Reference Group has delegation to endorse key proposals relevant to project progression and recommend these to Council for approval at key project stages.

3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. Rangiora town centre’s Ivory/High/Ashley Street intersection (Red Lion Corner) is subject to significant community criticism and dissatisfaction. In recognition of issues this intersection poses and its role in the wider Rangiora traffic network, the Rangiora Town Centre Strategy (RTC2020), adopted by Council in September 2010, confirmed a strategic direction to realign and signalise the Red Lion Corner intersection. Realignment opens up the opportunity to restore two-way traffic on High Street between Percival and Ashley Streets; reconfiguring High Street to two-way traffic with parallel parking is another strategic direction confirmed in RTC2020, however it is necessary that the Red Lion Corner Realignment project precedes changes to High Street.

3.2. An internal Project Control Group was set up in the first quarter of 2013 to progress this project, consisting of Heike Lulay (Senior Policy Analyst – Red Lion Corner Project Manager), Ken Stevenson (Roading Manager), Geoff Meadows (Policy Manager), Joanne McBride (Civil Projects Team Leader) and Gary Saunders (Property Manager). Recently added members are Chris Brown (Community & Greenspace Manager) and Cathy Batchelor (Town Centres Communications Coordinator).

3.3. To assist and inform the project as it progresses, a Red Lion Corner and High Street Reference Group was established, members of which are listed in section 4.2 of this report. The Reference Group has delegation to endorse key proposals relevant to project progression and recommend these to Council for approval at key project stages. The Reference Group has met on several occasions since its inception in April 2013 and has made a number of recommendations to Council to date. The Reference Group’s Terms of Reference are attached to this report.

3.4. This report seeks recommendation from the Rangiora Community Board that the Council approves the draft Scheme Design for the intersection of Ivory / High and Ashley Streets, as per attachment i. The Scheme Design follows the Functional Layout which was confirmed by Council at its meeting in June 2013 (see report 130516036356). At this meeting, the Council moved the following recommendations (among others):
(b) **Confirms** the Red Lion Corner Functional Layout (original alignment) as pictured in attachment ii in principle, in order to allow Red Lion Corner Realignmment project progression involving necessary property negotiations, scheme design, detailed design, and technical investigations.

(c) **Notes** that the implementation of the original alignment as pictured in attachment ii is subject to the resolution of a number of related issues, investigations and negotiations, including the necessary acquisition in full or in part of affected properties.

3.5. Since confirmation of the Functional Layout in June 2013, the alignment was revised and altered in order to impact on as few properties as possible. The original Functional Layout would have necessitated impacting the CPIT Campus Connect site at 14 Ashley Street (owned by Luisetti Properties Ltd), the Salvation Army site at 12 Ashley Street (owned by Salvation Army Property Trust Board), the former Westpac site (owned by Council), the Country Cars site at 44 High Street (owned by Howard Williams), and a small portion of the War Memorial site at 55 High Street (owned by Council). The alignment was refined and the final draft Scheme Design no longer impacts on the CPIT Campus Connect site, and impacts less significantly on the Salvation Army site.

3.6. Discussions have occurred with representatives of the Salvation Army over recent months. The intersection alignment requires the front entrance of the existing Salvation Army building to the relocated. The Salvation Army are receptive of such work and the Salvation Army Property Board are currently considering opportunities for extending the existing building to the site’s southern boundary at the same time as other work would be required. Staff will report back to Council with detailed financial implications when confirmation has been received from Salvation Army about their intentions and a Quantity Survey report indicating the cost of relocating the front entrance and strengthening the building has been received.

3.7. Discussions are still occurring with the owner of the Country Cars site. Council has a number of times signalled its desire to purchase this site. Staff will report back to Council with the outcomes of these discussions once this has been resolved. In the meantime, this report seeks recommendation of the Scheme Design subject to the resolution of property negotiations.

3.8. The Scheme Design allows for a traffic signal controlled intersection with full turning movements at all approaches to the intersection, pedestrian crossing phases on all legs, and separate cycle lanes through the intersection. The Scheme Design also sees a return to straight through priority for traffic travelling along High Street at the High Street / Albert Street intersection, with give-way signs installed at Albert Street.

3.9. **A Safety Audit of the Scheme Plan was conducted in December 2013 by GHD and Abley Transportation Consultants. This considered safety aspects related to carriageways including, among other things, swept paths, street lighting, tactile pavers and accesses, cycle lanes including marking, signal phasing, advanced stop boxes, and cycle movements. The Safety Audit identified minor issues with the Design, which are being addressed through the detailed intersection design.**

3.10. As part of the work existing utility services will be relocated to the new road alignment and new Ultra-fast Broadband ducts will be installed.

3.11. The Red Lion Corner and High Street Reference Group endorsed the final draft Scheme Design as per attachment i on 24 February 2014.

3.12. **Detailed intersection design is progressing and is expected to be completed soon. Expressions of interest are currently being sought from contractors interested in**
constructing the intersection. An archaeological assessment for the site is underway and is anticipated to be completed in May 2014. A Resource Consent will be sought for subdividing sites necessary for the road alignment, followed by tendering the physical work to construct the intersection. The current plan is for construction of the intersection to commence in August 2014 and be completed by end of December 2014.

Landscaping Concept Plans

3.13. This report seeks recommendation from the Rangiora Community Board that the Council approves the draft landscaping concept plans for the Rangiora War Memorial site and for the surplus land at the intersection’s north east corner. The intersection alignment impacts on the existing Country Cars site and creates surplus land of the portion of the site not required for the road, which is envisaged to be developed into green space. The alignment requires the incorporation of the north east corner of the current War Memorial setting into the new road reserve. This provides an opportunity to consider redevelopment options of the cenotaph setting, and to complement these by providing additional, consistent green spacing on the opposite corner.

3.14. The draft landscaping concept plan for the cenotaph site proposes the demolition of the wall that currently surrounds the site (but has been altered in the past) and the levelling of the site to be flush with the privately owned accessway that surrounds the south and west of the site and the footpath leading from High Street. This allows the space that would normally be required for a separated footpath to be integrated into the overall public space, thus visually and practically reducing the overall impact and loss of land to the new road alignment. A new 2m wide platform with steps leading up to the cenotaph will be constructed around the existing cenotaph and steps. A grassed area is proposed on the western boundary to provide a quiet relaxed area. Lighting will be in the form of soft yellow strip lights leading up to the cenotaph from three sides, up-lights to light up steps leading up to the cenotaph, angled in ground up-lights to light up the cenotaph, up-lighting of the four proposed deciduous trees, as well as existing street lights. Concrete cast bench seats are proposed, some of which will include back and arm supports. The bench seats have been strategically placed to allow laying the wreaths during ceremonial services leading up to the ‘front’ of the cenotaph along a clear path. It is proposed that the existing accessway privately owned by Charles and Philip Leech is repaved, in a material that complements paving proposed for the cenotaph site. More details are noted in the landscaping concept plan in attachment ii.

3.15. The draft landscaping concept plan for the north east corner of the intersection proposes an extension of the look and feel of the proposed landscaping for the cenotaph site. Discussions have taken place with the owners of the Rangiora Eye Care, who agree to have three of their car parks that are currently located toward their southern boundary in the car parking area relocated to their northern boundary, to allow additional space for landscaping. This arrangement is reflected in the concept plan. The Salvation Army likely extending their building to meet their southern boundary means some of the roses that are currently planted within the Salvation Army property but maintained by the owners of Rangiora Eye Care would require relocation. The owners of Rangiora Eye Care are in support of relocating these to the garden beds proposed for the north east corner, as depicted in attachment ii, and wish to continue to maintain these.

3.16. The Northern A and P Association building, located immediately south of the cenotaph site (93 High Street), and the War Memorial (55 High Street) have heritage status both through the Council’s District Plan and the New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT) register. The Parrott’s building (Rangiora Eye Care, 42 High Street) is not listed or registered but of some heritage significance within Rangiora and was awarded
Landmark Status under the Council’s Landmarks Programme to recognise its historical values.

3.17. Last year, the Council commissioned an independent Heritage Impact Assessment in order to gain advice about the proposed road realignment’s:
- impact on the heritage value of the Rangiora War Memorial site / setting at 55 High Street, including potential options for mitigating such impact
- impact on the heritage listed former Northern A and P Association building located at 93 Ivory Street
- impact on the non-listed 19th century Parrott’s building located at 42 High Street

3.18. This was carried out by Heritage Management Services and a final report produced in July 2013 (130731058401). The final report covered the overview of the proposal, the heritage status of the Red Lion Corner area, and an assessment of effects on heritage values. The conclusions of this report are as follows:
- “In conclusion given the discussion above in this report I consider that in general the effect of the proposed Red Lion corner road realignment project on the heritage values of the area cannot be deemed overall as more than minor and that the benefits generally outweigh the negative effects.
- In particular I consider a significant benefit of the realignment proposal with regard to heritage benefits is the opportunity to make urban planning improvements that will highlight the heritage features of the corner in particular the Parrott’s building. The removal of the former Westpac Bank building on the corner will, as noted above, provide an opportunity to extend the urban open space setting around the Parrott’s building including the area currently occupied by a car sales yard.”

3.19. In relation to the alignment’s impact on the wall that currently surrounds the War Memorial site, the Heritage Impact Assessment notes “photographic records suggest that the perimeter wall is not original as the profile of the plinths within the wall is not as per the original detail which emulated the form of the cenotaph.” Some believe perhaps the back portion of the wall adjacent to the Northern A and P Association building could be original.

3.20. Significant engagement has been carried out with the Reference Group, the Waimakariri Access Group, property owners and businesses immediately surrounding the intersection, the Rangiora RSA and other stakeholders including the Historic Places Trust. These are detailed in full in section 4 of this report.

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

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. Development of the Rangiora Town Centre Strategy, which signalled the intention to realign and signalise the Red Lion Corner, provided significant opportunity for community input which was detailed to Council when the Strategy was presented for adoption in September 2010 (see report 100817029618).

4.2. The Red Lion Corner and High Street Reference Group consists of the following members:
- Mayor David Ayers
- Rangiora Community Board members Gerard, Stirling and Galloway
- Rangiora business representatives and members of the Waimakariri Local Economic Development Advocacy Group – Ron Van Til (Rangiora Bakery) and Mark Ginnever
- President of Rangiora Royal New Zealand Returned and Services’ Association (RSA) Ian Thompson
• Chair of Rangiora Promotions Association (RPA) Kevin Johnson
• Chair of Waimakariri Access Group Jill Waldron
• Environmental and Technical Awareness Advisor, Carina Duke, of the Blind
  Foundation (previously known as the Royal New Zealand Foundation of the Blind) –
  recently added when scope of Reference Group was extended to incorporate High
  Street project

4.3. The Reference Group has met regularly since its inception in April 2013 to consider
alignment and landscaping options and provide community input at key stages.
Reference Group members have often relayed thoughts and opinions of the wider group
of people (if applicable) that they represent. The Reference Group formally endorsed
both the Scheme Design and the landscaping concept plans to be reported to the
Rangiora Community Board and then to Council at its last meeting on 24 February 2014.

4.4. Significant engagement was undertaken to widely share the intersection Scheme
Design. Individual meeting have been held with adjacent property owners to make them
aware of proposed plans, including with Luisetti Properties Ltd, the Salvation Army, both
the property owner and business owner of Country Cars, the property owners of the Red
Lion Pub, the Rangiora RSA, the property owners of the BNZ bank, Brendon and
Warwick Leech representing property owners Charles and Philip Leech, and Rob and
Ruth Beulink, property owners of the Northern A and P Association building, as well as
representatives of the New Zealand Heritage Places Trust (NZHPT).

4.5. Specifically, three meetings have been held with all direct stakeholders of the cenotaph
site in designing landscaping concept plans for the site. Represented were Mike Vincent
of the NZHPT, Ian Thompson, President of the Rangiora RSA, Rob and Ruth Beulink,
property owners of the Northern A and P Association building, and Brendon and Warwick
Leech representing the property owners of the surrounding properties at 63 High Street
and adjacent accessway. Feedback and suggestions from this group have been
incorporated into the landscaping concept plan for the cenotaph site as much as
possible and practical.

4.6. It should be noted that the NZHPT have stated they do not support the road alignment
impacting on the cenotaph site, this being a site that incorporates a structure registered
as a Category 2 Historic Place by the NZHPT. This registration level is given to places of
“...historical or cultural heritage significance or value”. There will be further opportunity
for the NZHPT to comment during the Resource Consent process.

4.7. The Rangiora RSA, as part of the Reference Group, at the last meeting on 24 February
2014 to which both the President and the Vice President came, endorsed the
landscaping plan for the cenotaph site and the north east corner of the intersection.

4.8. The Access Group was specifically consulted through the Chair, Jill Waldron and
Environmental and Technical Awareness Advisor of Blind Foundation, Carina Duke, to
ensure access is not made difficult for people with mobility and/or sight impairments.
Draft plans were amended to reflect their feedback.

4.9. The Scheme Design results in the loss of some on-street car parking along High Street,
east of the intersection. Staff contacted all property and business owners immediately
adjacent to these car parks to alert them of this proposed change and discuss the wider
project.

4.10. Staff met with the owners of the Rangiora Eye Care business and property on a number
of occasions to discuss the potential to relocate three of their car parks to the northern
boundary of the former Westpac bank site, owned by Council, as depicted in attachment
ii and to gain feedback about the draft landscaping concept plan for the north east corner. Section 3.15 of this report contains more detail about these discussions.

4.11. A workshop was held with the Rangiora Community Board on 12 February 2014 to discuss and gain feedback on the draft landscaping concept plans for the cenotaph site and the north east corner site.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. The 2012-22 Long Term Plan provides a budget of $3.8 million for the Red Lion Corner Realignment project (in 2012 dollars). The original cost estimate was broken up into $1.8 million for property purchase and $2 million for construction costs. The $1.8 million is the net property cost. This was based on a total property purchase cost of $2.7 million with $900,000 returned from the sale of surplus property to result in a $1.8 million net cost.

5.1. Through the 2013/14 Annual Plan, the Council resolved to fast-track the Red Lion Corner Realignment project, and consequently, restoring two-way traffic along High Street between Percival and Ashley Streets, reconfiguring Blake Street car park and enhancing laneways. The budget was brought forward to 2013/14 – 2014/15.

5.2. It was originally considered that NZTA subsidy would be approved for the physical works portion of the Red Lion Corner Realignment work but not for property purchases. Subsequent discussions with NZTA had revealed that the construction portion will not receive funding approval in the current 2012-15 National Land Transport Programme and is unlikely to be approved in future programmes unless the criteria changes significantly. This is unlikely; hence the budget now assumes no NZTA funding.

5.3. Based on actual property purchase costs to date and updated assumptions, the current net property cost estimate is now $1.5m. This is made up of likely total purchase costs of $3.5m and surplus land sales of $2m.

5.4. The construction cost estimate (including professional fees) is currently being updated and while detailed utility services costs have not been confirmed it is likely they will be higher than originally estimated. Also construction costs have increased at a greater rate than the rate of inflation which will result in higher costs. As such it is likely the $300,000 ‘saving’ in property costs will be absorbed by the increased construction and utility services costs.

5.5. The total estimated cost for the cenotaph site landscaping as per attachment ii is $216,400 (including 15% contingency). The total estimated cost for the north east corner landscaping as per attachment ii is $114,700 (including 15% contingency). This totals $331,100. Only $30,000 was allowed in the construction estimate for the landscaping of these sites and so an additional $300,000 will be required to fund these works.

5.6. In summary the current project estimate is as follows:

- Net property cost - $1,500,000
- Construction cost (excluding landscaping, including professional fees) - $2,270,000
- Landscaping cost - $330,000
- Total $4,100,000

Note that an updated detailed budget will be provided to the Council for consideration as part of its deliberations on the draft 2014/15 Annual Plan in May.

5.7. There are a number of risks associated with this project. The completion of necessary property purchase is a risk to both the timing and the project cost. There is a risk that suitable contractors will not be able to be attracted to carry out this project, which will be
demanding considering it is a busy intersection. This could impact on both timing and cost. All of these risks will continue to be assessed, managed and reported through the project implementation process.

6. CONTEXT

6.1. Policy
This matter is not a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance Policy.
The Red Lion Corner Realignment project gives effect to a strategic direction outlined in the Council’s Rangiora Town Centre Strategy (RTC2020), a top 10 priority for implementation identified in the Waimakariri Local Economic Development Strategy, and a goal set out in the Waimakariri Disability Strategy.

6.2. Legislation
Local Government Act 2002
Resource Management Act 1991

6.3. Community Outcomes
There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision-making by public organisations that affects our District
There is a safe environment for all
Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable, affordable and sustainable
Businesses in the District are diverse, adaptable, and growing
The distinctive character of our towns, villages and rural areas is maintained

Heike Lulay, Ken Stevenson and Tori McMillan
On behalf of the Red Lion Corner and High Street Reference Group
Cenotaph Space Draft Concept
TERMS OF REFERENCE

RED LION CORNER AND HIGH STREET REFERENCE GROUP

1. Membership

Eleven members in total supported by Waimakariri District Council staff (Red Lion Corner and High Street Project Control Group). Representation includes:

- Two Rangiora town centre businesses
- Rangiora Promotions Association (RPA)
- Waimakariri Access Group
- Blind Foundation (previously known as the Royal New Zealand Foundation of the Blind)
- Waimakariri District Mayor
- Two Councillors including Town Centre Portfolio Holder
- Two Rangiora Community Board members
- Rangiora Royal New Zealand Returned and Services' Association (RSA)

2. Delegation

The Red Lion Corner and High Street Reference Group shall be tasked with:

- Contributing to and overseeing the Red Lion Corner and High Street projects, including the enhancement of immediately adjacent laneways, during key planning and investigative phases necessary prior to physical construction works
- Considering and endorsing key proposals relevant to project progression and recommending these to Council for approval at key project stages

3. Objective

Provide community input into the progression of the Red Lion Corner and High Street projects, involving:

- Considering and endorsing a preferred intersection alignment and scheme design for Red Lion Corner, taking into account restrictions and opportunities related to adjacent property boundaries, including surplus land and War Memorial location
- Considering and endorsing a preferred streetscape plan for High Street and immediately adjacent laneways, taking into account restrictions and opportunities related to adjacent properties and High Street redevelopment
- Being informed about technical implications and details relating to intersection and scheme designs
- Contributing to decisions relating to detailed designs
- Discussing related issues with appropriate stakeholders
- Making recommendations to the Council

4. Programme

To report to the Council and/or the Council's Management Team as and when key project stages require a decision and/or confirmation. These will include intersection scheme design / alignment approval, relevant property purchases, detailed intersection design, High Street and laneways scheme design and High Street and laneways detailed design.

5. Meeting Frequency

As required. A quorum shall be more than 50% of the members of the Reference Group.
TERMS OF REFERENCE

RED LION CORNER AND HIGH STREET REFERENCE GROUP

6. Staff Executive

Heike Lulay (Senior Policy Analyst – Project Manager)
Ken Stevenson (Roading Manager)
Geoff Meadows (Policy Manager)
Joanne McBride (Civil Projects Team Leader)
Cathy Batchelor (Town Centres Communications Coordinator)
Gary Saunders (Property Manager)
Chris Brown (Community and Greenspace Manager)
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL
REPORT FOR DECISION

FILE NO and TRIM NO: DDS-06-10-02-07-01/180524057371

REPORT TO: Council

DATE OF MEETING: 5 June 2018

FROM: Trevor Ellis, Development Planning Manager


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

1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report seeks that Council ratify the attached Future Development Strategy scoping paper. The Future Development Strategy (FDS) scoping paper has been prepared to guide completion of an FDS document by December 2018 in time for anticipated approval by the Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee in December 2018.

1.2 The Scoping Paper and the final FDS contribute to the Settlement Pattern Review which in turn is significantly influenced by the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity (NPS-UDC). The attached Scoping Paper provides further background on the FDS and the Settlement Pattern Review.

Attachments:

i. Future Development Strategy scoping paper (TRIM 180524057389).

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 80524057371.

(b) Ratifies the Future Development Strategy scoping paper as set out in Attachment (i).

(c) Notes that the draft Future Development Strategy, when complete, will be presented to individual partners for ratification and to allow public consultation to occur in August 2018.

(d) Agrees that the development of the future development strategy, and the associated consultation process, occurs using the Local Government Act 2002 and is undertaken in accordance with Part 6 of the Act and the significance and engagement policies of the partner councils.

(e) Notes that Ngāi Tahu GCP representatives are currently considering some proposed additional amendments to the Future Development Strategy scoping paper to ensure the values and aspirations of Ngāi Tahu are appropriately reflected, and that staff will report back to the Council if any proposed amendments are deemed significant.
3. BACKGROUND

3.1 The NPS-UDC requires the preparation of an FDS by December 2018. The attached Scoping Paper, to direct the preparation of the FDS, was approved by the Greater Christchurch Partnership (GCP) on 11 May 2018, following earlier consideration in March 2018 and by the Chief Executives Group (CEAG) on 2 May 2018.

3.2 In order for the FDS to be delivered for GCP Committee endorsement in December 2018 the FDS will be prioritised primarily on NPS-UDC matters. The NPS-UDC is focussed on ensuring that housing and business development capacity meets projected short, medium and long term demands for the sub-region.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1 The proposed approach outlined within the scoping paper is as follows:

- A draft FDS document will be prepared for CEAG consideration at its meeting on 27 June 2018 and subsequently the GCP Committee on 13 July 2018. A submission period throughout August will be followed by hearings, deliberations and recommendations to inform preparation of a final FDS document.

- The front section of the FDS document will outline the full context and current environment in which the SPR is being undertaken, including the long term urban development outcomes sought and already detailed in the UDS, and the unique post-earthquake circumstances relevant to Greater Christchurch.

- It will explain the focus for this FDS, being the short to medium term capacity issues to be resolved, with wider matters identified in an implementation section for further action subsequent to the completion of the FDS.

- Minimum targets for housing at a Greater Christchurch and territorial authority level will need to be identified as far as possible through the FDS in order to align with the NPS-UDC requirements, but the locations for long term development capacity will likely not be more detailed than reaffirming the urban consolidation and centres based principles of the UDS at this stage.

- A related workstream will prepare a robust evidence base sufficient for the GCP Committee to consider any more immediate changes to RMA documents. A decision on this matter is preferably required ahead of finalising the FDS document in December so that any changes can be included, if agreed, as an identified planning response in the FDS.


4.2 The resulting FDS document, ‘Our SPACE: an updated 2018-2048 settlement pattern for Greater Christchurch’, will be a short non-technical document, supported by technical appendices where necessary. It will sit alongside the endorsed UDS Strategy documents (2007 and 2016) until such time as these are integrated into a single new strategy document.

4.3 It should be noted that Ngāi Tahu GCP representatives are currently considering some proposed additional amendments to the Future Development Strategy scoping paper to ensure the values and aspirations of Ngāi Tahu are appropriately reflected. Staff will report back to the Council if any proposed amendments are deemed significant.
4.4. The Management Team have reviewed this report and support the recommendations.

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

Development of the FDS, and the associated consultation process, will occur using the Local Government Act 2002 (as opposed to the Resource Management Act 1991 process which would be required for any subsequent changes to the statutory planning documents). The consultation process will comply with Part 6 of the Act and will be detailed further following consideration of the significance and engagement policies of the partner councils. A range of stakeholders will be identified. No views have been sought on the Scoping Paper.

5.2. Wider Community

In addition to that outlined above, the wider community will have the opportunity to make submissions on the FDS (see section 4.4 of the Scoping Paper), with the opportunity to be heard at a hearing. No community views have been sought on the Scoping Paper.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

The Scoping Paper has been prepared within the existing budget for the Urban Development Strategy. The Scoping Paper at section 6 outlines anticipated resourcing for the development of the FDS itself.

6.2. Community Implications

There are no direct community implications associated with the Scoping Paper. As outlined above, the community will have opportunities to make submissions on the FDS.

6.3. Risk Management

No risks are identified in relation to the recommendations.

6.4. Health and Safety

Not applicable.

7. CONTEXT

7.1. Policy

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

7.2. Legislation


7.3. Community Outcomes

There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision making that effects 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.

7.4. Delegations

The GCP Committee includes within its terms of reference that new or revised strategies or plans are ratified by partner organisations and Councils.
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**APPENDICES**

A. Timeline, milestones and summary work programme
1. Executive Summary

This Future Development Strategy (FDS) scoping paper has been prepared in response to a CEAG direction to complete the preparation of an FDS document by December 2018 in time for seeking approval at the meeting of the Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee scheduled for 14 December 2018.

The CEAG direction also stated that this work should be completed within the existing budget of the Partnership. In order to meet this requirement the FDS will need to be prioritised primarily on NPS-UDC matters. The starting point for the FDS are the agreed UDS strategic goals and statements on desired urban form contained in the therein.

The proposed approach in this scoping paper is that:

- A draft FDS document will be prepared for CEAG consideration at its meeting on 27 June 2018 and subsequently the GCP Committee on 13 July 2018. A submission period throughout August will be followed by hearings, deliberations and recommendations to inform preparation of a final FDS document.
- The front section of the FDS document will outline the full context and current environment in which the SPR is being undertaken, including the long term urban development outcomes sought and already detailed in the UDS, and the unique post-earthquake circumstances relevant to Greater Christchurch.
- It will explain the focus for this FDS, being the short to medium term capacity issues to be resolved, with wider matters identified in an implementation section for further action subsequent to the completion of the FDS.
- Minimum targets for housing at a Greater Christchurch and territorial authority level will need to be identified as far as possible through the FDS in order to align with the NPS-UDC requirements, but the locations for long term development capacity will likely not be more detailed than reaffirming the urban consolidation and centres based principles of the UDS at this stage.
- A related workstream will prepare a robust evidence base sufficient for the GCP Committee to consider any more immediate changes to RMA documents. A decision on this matter is preferably required ahead of finalising the FDS document in December so that any changes can be included, if agreed, as an identified planning responses in the FDS.
- The development of the future development strategy, and the associated consultation process, occurs using the Local Government Act 2002

The work to complete the FDS and its associated implementation programme will link with and support related processes underway or planned, including:

i. District Plan Reviews, any more immediate changes to RMA documents and a full CRPS Review
ii. Long Term Plans (LTPs) and infrastructure strategies
iii. Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP) and Regional Public Transport Plan (RPTP)
iv. Central City and Ōtākaro Avon River Corridor Regeneration
v. Kaiapoi and surrounds regeneration
vi. Coastal hazards planning
vii. Resilient Greater Christchurch Plan initiatives

Reference to emerging Government policy will be also integral to the framing and context for the FDS.

The resulting FDS document, ‘Our SPACE: an updated 2018-2048 settlement pattern for Greater Christchurch’, will be a short non-technical document, supported by technical appendices where necessary. It will sit alongside the endorsed UDS Strategy documents (2007 and 2016) until such time as these are integrated into a single new strategy document.

The Senior Managers Group (SMG) is responsible for providing advice to CEAG on the progress towards completing the FDS document and will raise matters requiring CEAG direction.
2. Purpose and scope

2.1 Settlement Pattern Review

(Text from existing Project Brief agreed by CEAG in March 2017)

A UDS Update was endorsed by the UDS Partnership in August 2016. The document updates the 2007 Strategy to respond to the significant events and changes that have occurred since its release. The Strategy Update did not attempt to revise the land-use framework set out in the Land Use Recovery Plan (LURP) and included in Chapter 6 of the CRPS. Instead it contained a priority action relating to a comprehensive review of the strategy in this triennium.

The Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee has endorsed the first phase of a strategy review to focus on the settlement planning aspects necessary to meet the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity (NPS-UDC).

The primary Settlement Pattern Review project objective is to:

∑ enable the local authorities across Greater Christchurch to collaboratively review the existing settlement pattern arrangements and ensure they fulfil their statutory obligations under the NPS-UDC.

A further project objective is to:

∑ ensure appropriate alignment between the Settlement Pattern Review and:
  o the District Plan review underway in Selwyn District
  o the District Development Strategy and District Plan review underway in Waimakariri District
  o the Christchurch District Plan
  o the Greater Christchurch Transport Statement, Regional Land Transport Plan and Regional Public Transport Plan, and
  o the development by councils of 2018-2028 Long Term Plans and 30-year infrastructure strategies.

2.2 National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity

The NPS-UDC directs local authorities to provide sufficient housing and business land development capacity to meet demand in the short, medium and long term. Policy PA1 specifies the following requirements for such development capacity by time period:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Development Capacity Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Development capacity must be feasible, zoned and serviced with development infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Medium term | Development capacity must be feasible, zoned and either:  
  1. serviced with development infrastructure, or  
  2. the funding for the development infrastructure required to service that development capacity must be identified in a Long Term Plan required under the Local Government Act 2002. |
| Long-term   | Development capacity must be feasible, identified in relevant plans and strategies, and the development infrastructure required to service it must be identified in the relevant Infrastructure Strategy required under the Local Government Act 2002. |

Policies PA3 and PA4 direct local authority decision-making in a broader sense, linking back to the RMA, including promoting the efficient use of urban land and infrastructure, providing for people’s social, economic, cultural and environmental wellbeing, and considering national, inter-regional, regional and district scale costs and benefits, as well as the local effects.
Councils with high growth urban areas in their district are required to implement further policies within the NPS-UDC within stated timeframes.

The key NPS-UDC requirements for high growth councils are:

- commence quarterly monitoring of market indicators by June 2017
- complete a housing and business development capacity assessment by December 2017
- produce a future development strategy by December 2018
- set minimum targets in regional policy statements and district plans by December 2018.

The Partnership has met the first two requirements relating to monitoring market indicators and completion of a capacity assessment (held in draft form at this stage).

NPS-UDC Policies PC12-14 relate to the preparation of a future development strategy (FDS):

- PC12: produce a FDS which demonstrates that there will be sufficient, feasible development capacity in the medium and long term… and sets out how the minimum targets will be met
- PC13: the FDS shall - identify the broad location, timing and sequencing of future development capacity over the long term; balance the certainty regarding the provision of future urban development with the need to be responsive to demand for such development; and be informed by LTPs and Infrastructure Strategies, and any other relevant strategies, plans and documents
- PC14: in developing the FDS, local authorities shall - undertake a consultation process; be informed by the capacity assessment; and have particular regard to policy PA1.

Guidance on the preparation and content of the FDS was released by MfE/MBIE in December 2017 and has been incorporated into the approach outlined in this scoping document. Draft evaluation criteria based on the NPS-UDC policies and associated guidance was released in March 2018 and has been used to provide a gap analysis of the likely work required to ensure compliance.

2.3 FDS scope

In order for the FDS to be delivered for GCP Committee endorsement in December 2018 the FDS will be prioritised primarily on NPS-UDC matters. The NPS-UDS is focussed on ensuring that housing and business development capacity meets projected short, medium and long term demands for the sub-region.

The front section of the FDS document will still outline the full context and current environment in which the SPR is being undertaken, including the long term urban development outcomes sought and already detailed in the UDS and the unique post-earthquake circumstances relevant to Greater Christchurch. It will explain the identified challenges (drawing from the Outcomes and Challenges briefing paper) and the implications of emerging national policy in this area (see section 3.3).

The FDS document will then seek to outline:

- the findings of the capacity assessment in relation to projected short, medium and long term demand, existing development capacity and potential capacity shortfalls over each time period
- minimum targets for housing for the medium and long term at a Greater Christchurch level and where possible for each territorial authority area within Greater Christchurch
- the required planning responses to address medium and long term development capacity issues
- a programme of actions to be taken subsequent to the adoption of the FDS that will consider and address wider and longer term planning matters

The Partnership already has a strong planning framework and a good level of consensus as outlined in the UDS, LURP and CRPS. The CRPS identifies the current location, targets and limits of development capacity across Greater Christchurch (including an identified projected infrastructure boundary on Map A).

The identification of specific development needs over the long term is less certain than that required in the medium term and so will correspondingly be less detailed in the FDS. The locations for long term development capacity will likely not be more detailed than reaffirming the urban consolidation and centres...
based principles of the UDS at this stage. Macro-issues will adjust future demand projections (including rapid technological change and global economic trends, as well as national migration settings and approaches to regional growth). Local policy responses (such as intensification incentives, public and active transport improvements, and ongoing regeneration activity) will impact the attractiveness of different locations over time.

A further consideration for the FDS will be the funding challenges that may arise, particularly in relation to development infrastructure. While these may be less apparent in the short to medium term they could be considerable over the longer term, particularly in relation to transport infrastructure and achieving NPS-UDC requirements whilst addressing the NPS Freshwater Management and other national objectives.

The FDS will clearly signal the funding challenges arising, and likely to arise, from NPS-UDS compliance. Ongoing work to advocate such matters to Government, and understand the implications of emerging Government policy to address such challenges, will inform longer term FDS directions and may necessitate the need for FDS amendments in future.

It recommended the development of the future development strategy, and the associated consultation process, occurs using the Local Government Act 2002. The consultation process will comply with Part 6 of the Act and will be detailed further following consideration of the significance and engagement policies of the partner councils.
3. FDS Principles and Outcomes

3.1 FDS Principles

The FDS will be guided by the vision, principles and strategic goals of the UDS, particularly those under the themes of ‘integrated and managed urban development’, and will comprise the integrated land use and infrastructure responses necessary as a result of the findings of the capacity assessment.

The principles that will shape the approach outlined in the FDS are that it:

- helps to deliver and aligns with the vision for Greater Christchurch
- demonstrates a collaborative approach through leadership and partnership
- integrates, supports and builds on existing strategies and initiatives through an efficient, fit-for-purpose and holistic process
- enables a responsive approach that can address any changes to Government policy, changes arising from the drivers and disruptions that may influence urban development, and further longer term spatial planning following the adoption of the FDS
- achieves the NPS-UDC requirements
- is informed by a robust evidence base and feedback from stakeholder and community engagement

3.2 Integration with other processes

The overall SPR project objectives, and NPS-UDC Policy PC13, seek alignment and integration with related statutory documents. The FDS Guidance confirms the iterative nature of achieving alignment whereby the FDS is informed by the current documents but signals any required changes as part of a section in the FDS on implementation.

District Plan Review and CRPS Changes and/or CRPS Review

DPR processes underway in Selwyn and Waimakariri will need the certainty provided by the FDS to enable them to give effect to the NPS-UDC in the short to medium term through their district plans. The FDS process, and an associated workstream to further investigate the medium term development capacity needs in these Districts, will inform a final recommendation by the GCP Committee whether to notify any more immediate changes to RMA documents. The FDS (and more importantly the actions identified in the FDS but undertaken following its adoption) would then inform a more comprehensive assessment of any CRPS changes to be included within the CRPS review scheduled for notification in June 2022.

Long Term Plans (LTPs) and infrastructure strategies

Council 2018-2028 LTPs and associated infrastructure strategies will have been finalised ahead of the draft FDS. The capacity assessment work has reviewed existing LTPs and draft 2018-2028 LTPs as part of determining current feasible development capacity for housing and business. LTPs have used the same projections as used for the SPR and the capacity assessment has not identified any significant misalignment issues at this point.

Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP) and Regional Public Transport Plan (RPTP)

Consultation on the draft 2018 RLTP has ended. Business case processes to inform the RLTP are culminating and are linked to a recently prepared Christchurch Transport Investment Story document. Government policy on this issue has been outlined in a draft GPS on Land Transport (see section 3.3. below) and will need to be integrated into the final RLTP. The RPTP is also being reviewed and is expected to be consulted on in August 2018. The strategic transport directions set out in these documents will provide an important contribution to the FDS statements regarding the integration of land use and transport, particularly as they relate to the future provision of public transport in Greater Christchurch.
Central City and Ōtākaro Avon River Corridor Regeneration

Regeneration planning for the Ōtākaro Avon River Corridor has been ongoing during 2017. A draft regeneration plan is likely to be released for consultation in August 2018. While initial investigations have indicated that some residential and business development is feasible within this regeneration area the quantum being considered is not significant compared to the thirty year Greater Christchurch projected demand. Of more interest might be any enduring work and learnings regarding more sustainable, affordable, modular and lightweight construction methodologies that this project might initiate.

Broader ‘city-shaping’ initiatives arising from final land uses and activities in this area are guided in part by objectives to support central city regeneration and boost the prosperity and quality of life for people in eastern Christchurch. As such this regeneration planning is largely complementary to the SPR and connection and integration can be achieved by supporting statements in respective draft documents.

Kaiapoi and surrounds regeneration

Regeneration activity is also underway in Kaiapoi following the Waimakariri Red Zone Recovery Plan being approved by the Minister in December 2016. The Recovery Plan contains proposed land used and activities for five regeneration areas. At present, the preliminary draft Implementation Plan is being completed and the decommissioning plans for roads and utilities for the regeneration areas are in progress.

Coastal hazards planning

The coastal hazards work to raise awareness of issues and inform the Christchurch District Plan and wider coastal hazard issues is due to commence later in 2018. This will result in a new coastal hazards chapter that was deferred from the DPR process. Similar work is underway in Selwyn and Waimakariri districts. Such investigations are largely complementary to the SPR so long as growth is not directed to high hazard areas. Aspects of the current data will be captured in the SPR through an overview of urban form constraints.

Resilient Greater Christchurch Plan

This plan, adopted by the GCP Committee in 2016, contains a detailed implementation plan. Key projects signalled for 2018 include ‘implementing a Future Ready Programme of Action’ initiative and ‘setting the Infrastructure Resilience Agenda’. The former will have a focus on the impact on the community and workplace of forecast technological, demographic and attitudinal shifts. The latter will drive CCC infrastructure investment decisions so that they align with Council’s strategic priorities and leverage opportunities to respond to the range of challenges and opportunities facing the city. The challenges include natural hazards such as earthquakes, climate change, population growth and an aging population as well as increasing infrastructure renewal requirements. The range of opportunities that also need consideration include advances in technology and growth. Both projects can support the development of the FDS and be included with the FDS implementation section.

3.3 Linking with emerging Government policy and other high growth councils

The new coalition Government continues to outline its approach to supporting urban development, transport policy, regional economic growth and local government funding.

Statements and actions to date regarding the Urban Growth Agenda and other areas include:

- support for agreed central-local government spatial planning for key urban areas
- the creation of a new national Urban Development Authority, the Housing Commission
- supporting a boost in housebuilding across the housing continuum through a KiwiBuild programme
- working with Christchurch City Council on a Housing First initiative
- future transport investment increasing the share available for public and active transport and signalling up to $4bn for mass transit investment in Auckland, Wellington and Christchurch over the next ten years
- pricing mechanisms to capture the full costs of transport and progressive introduction regional fuel taxes
- progressing a manifesto commitment to provide $300m to maintain city regeneration momentum
- infrastructure funding and financing research and inquiry into local government funding
- legislative reform of the RMA, LGA and LTMA where necessary and following more immediate action.
Government commitment to the more market-driven approaches in the NPS-UDC remains unclear and its willingness to support the use of the RMA streamlined planning process is still in question.

The FDS will need to be flexible to adapt to new Government direction and take advantage of any significant windows of opportunity that may emerge. Some of these points will also have a bearing on the completion of the processes outlined in section 3.2 above.

These matters will also impact other high growth councils required to implement the NPS-UDC so maintaining strong collaboration and alignment with SmartGrowth and FutureProof partnerships throughout the development of the FDS is important.

### 3.4 FDS process outcomes

Development of the FDS (and incorporating the associated minimum targets outlined in the FDS into the CRPS and district plans) represents the final aspect of the SPR project at this time. As outlined above any further investigations, detailed planning, monitoring and review is part of an implementation phase.

Process outcomes for the FDS are therefore:

- production of a document that aligns well with NPS-UDC Policies PC12-14, addresses the findings of the capacity assessment work, and signals any further work required on more detailed, longer term or wider urban planning matters
- sufficient planning certainty to inform a ten+ year period for district plan reviews in Selwyn/Waimakariri
- sufficient planning certainty to inform the development of a second stage of the GPS on Land Transport (should it require a local and central government agreement on transport’s role in urban development over the next 30 years)
- an engagement process that complies with part 6 of the LGA
- partnership unity is maintained through effective partner briefings at key milestones
- completion by December 2018 and remaining within agreed Partnership budgets.
4. Document Structure

4.1 Document title

The Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy is the Partnership’s strategy to guide growth, enable and manage future urban development and support quality urban environments. The SPR is reviewing the settlement planning aspects relevant to requirements of the NPS-UDC.

The ‘future development strategy’ terminology is a general term used as part of the NPS-UDC but in the context of Greater Christchurch would likely confuse stakeholders and the community if used as part of the SPR.

For the purposes of the work to complete the FDS the draft and final document title will be ‘Our SPACE: an updated 2018-2048 settlement pattern for Greater Christchurch’. Wording will clearly explain that this meets the NPS-UDC requirement, will link the work to the UDS and demonstrate that on adoption it will sit alongside the endorsed UDS Strategy documents (2007 and 2016) until such time as these are integrated into a single new strategy document.

Furthermore, the work will result in a plan that implements the UDS vision and strategy goals so throughout the process the terminology used will be of preparing a ‘plan’ as opposed to a ‘strategy’.

4.2 Document brief

The document brief outlines the nature of the final document and will help guide it preparation:

- approximately 20-30 pages (possibly with an accompanying 4-page summary leaflet)
- non-technical, plain English text with graphics, images, hotlinks etc
- incorporates appropriate te reo, ngāi tahu design elements and cultural context
- small print run (approx. 400 copies) with widely available electronic PDF
- reference copy distributed to libraries, service centres, etc
- courtesy copy distributed to Partners, Government and key stakeholders
- technical appendices available only in electronic PDF version.

4.3 Document breakdown by section

The document will be broken down into the following sections and sub-sections:

- Executive Summary and mihi
- Introduction
  - Upfront story and current environment
  - UDS Strategy context and long term outcomes
  - Ngāi Tahu cultural context, values and aspirations
  - Settlement Pattern Review overview
  - integration with other processes
  - National context
  - NPS-UDC statutory requirements
- Current position
  - evidence base from Capacity Assessment
  - benchmarking with other high growth areas
  - existing settlement structure, constraints and interdependencies
  - issues, challenges and rationale
- Targets – regional and TA – medium term and long term
3. Settlement pattern
   - 1-10 years (detailed)
   - 10-30 years (less detailed and primarily principles-based)
   - Sequencing
   - Rationale, assessments summary, scenario testing
   - Consultation overview and response

4. Implementation action plan
   - Summary of implementation tools
   - Roles and responsibilities
   - Working with Government on emerging approaches
   - RMA, LGA and LTMA changes required
   - Infrastructure Strategy alignment
   - Non-statutory programme of action
   - Responsiveness approaches

5. Monitoring and review

6. List of supporting documents and technical appendices

The above breakdown incorporates the requirements of the NPS-UDC Policies PC12-14 and integrates the further detail provided in the NPS-UDC guide on producing a future development strategy. Process

4.4 Process overview

The sequential and/or parallel work components to the FDS are:

1. establish baseline information
2. adopt and use UDS guiding principles, objectives, values
3. identify and outline issues (e.g. constraints, challenges and opportunities)
4. agree minimum housing target – for Greater Christchurch
5. consider any limited further options analysis or modelling to support draft FDS
6. agree minimum housing targets – for territorial authorities
7. formulate future implementation actions
8. prepare draft FDS document and prepare for engagement
9. undertake Council workshops and briefings on draft FDS where possible
10. seek GCP Committee endorsement on draft FDS in July 2018
11. notify draft for submissions period during August 2018
12. organise and undertake Hearings
13. prepare and report on Staff recommendations
14. Panel deliberations and recommendations
15. prepare final FDS document and summary
16. undertake Council workshops and briefings on final FDS
17. GCP Committee endorsement on final FDS in December 2018
18. Council ratification meetings in early 2019

For many elements a large amount of the work has already been largely undertaken and the FDS will draw from this existing information. Examples include:

- Baseline – the housing and business development capacity assessment
- Guiding principles, objectives and values – the UDS principles, strategic goals, and urban form directions

16. Infrastructure Strategy alignment
17. Non-statutory programme of action
18. Responsiveness approaches
• Issues – the Outcomes and Challenges briefing paper endorsed by GCP Committee in September 2017.

Other elements can draw from work currently underway, including for example:
• Future public transport business case
• Central City housing programme

4.5 Key matters to be resolved

Some elements of the above process will require further clarification, with advice provided to CEAG:

Minimum housing targets for each territorial authority

Minimum targets are required by NPS-UDC Policies PC5-PC11. PC6 requires targets to be set for the medium and long term. Targets must be set and incorporated as an objective in the regional policy statement and district plans by December 2018. The NPS-UDC guidance on minimum targets recommends the following wording:

![Image of minimum targets chart]

The Guidance recognises that high growth areas may wish to add more disaggregated targets but does not specify this should happen. This will be a matter for further discussion and advice.

Minimum targets are not intended to be maximum targets to limit urban development. TAs can advance plan changes that enable development capacity beyond minimum targets. However, this may have consequences for the efficient provision of development infrastructure.

Establishing consensus on the nature of minimum targets, any ‘allocation’ of the regional target to reflect policy intent, and the consequences and perceptions of the final targets will be at the heart of the FDS development.

Implementation actions

The success of the FDS will be in its ongoing implementation. As well outlining the scope of any immediate changes to RMA documents and subsequent comprehensive CRPS Change, the implementation actions will need to detail other wider work required following adoption of the FDS. These actions will draw from work currently underway (such as the Central City Housing Programme), previous LURP actions and UDS actions (2007 and 2010 action plans) that remain relevant, as well as new actions to respond to emerging Government approaches and ensure integration across other processes.

Hearings Panel

This FDS scope allows for a hearings panel to hear submissions on the draft FDS. A panel consisting of GCP Committee representatives is proposed rather than an Independent Hearings Panel, as for example used for the Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan. This is reflective of the level of detail to be covered in the draft FDS and the timeframe and budgetary constraints on completing the FDS.

The exact nature and composition of the hearings panel will need to be agreed by the GCP Committee and can draw on a recent example of its use for the FutureProof strategy review. The Partnership will need to consider the degree to which any independent expertise is part of the hearings panel to minimise potential risks of challenge and support robust decision-making. This will be guided by the extent to which the FDS process is then relied upon for any future CRPS and district plan changes.
Cultural context and integration

The SPR Project seeks to ensure integration of Ngāi Tahu values and aspirations and alignment with the Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan. Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu as a partner organisation will be party to endorsing the FDS. Mahaanui Kurataiao Limited is assisting the development of the FDS to help ensure timely and effective coordination with Papatipu Rūnanga and bring through Ngāi Tahu values and priorities. The recent Whakaraupō/Lyttelton Harbour Catchment Management Plan is seen as an excellent model of the integration of mana whenua values and culture in a 21st century planning document.

The FDS will also need to consider actions to address issues arising out of the capacity assessment, especially in relation to housing need and the disproportionate percentages of Māori and non-European households in housing need. The FDS can also highlight current and future opportunities to further support kāinga nohoanga in Tuahiwi and papakainga in Rāpaki.
5. Project Management

5.1 Project Team and existing coordination groups

Project delivery arrangements will remain similar to those for the capacity assessment, but with some changes to reflect learnings from that phase and a recent review of GCP SMG and sub-groups.

- a Project Team, comprising partner representatives will perform the day-to-day tasks
- joint meetings of the Planning and Transport Groups will advise on land use and transport integration
- SMG will ensure strategic oversight and provide advice to CEAG
- CEAG will endorse the reporting to the GCP Committee

The role of the SPR Review Group will be assumed by SMG. Input to SMG from those previously on the Review Group will assist with awareness of emerging national policy and initiatives that might inform the FDS, and maintain links with the FDS work of SmartGrowth and FutureProof partnerships.

5.2 Progress reporting arrangements

A monthly Dashboard will be reported to SMG and CEAG, including reviewing project risks and monthly expenditure.

The GCP Committee will only be asked to formally endorse the content of the draft FDS and the final FDS. Most other material will be reported to SMG and approved by CEAG and form part of GCP Committee workshops where necessary.
6. Resourcing and external costs

6.1 Partner staff

Partners will need to nominate representatives from their organisation to be on the Project Team. This might be more than one person (especially for the larger organisations) but consistent involvement throughout the project is essential.

Anticipated partner staff requirement, primarily as part of the Project Team (until at least the release of a consultation document) is:

- CCC 3.5 FTE
- SDC 0.3 FTE
- WDC 0.3 FTE
- ECan 1.0 FTE
- NZTA 0.3 FTE
- Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu (MKT) 0.3 FTE
- Regenerate Christchurch/CDHB 0.2 FTE (each)

SMG council representatives have confirmed that this resource is available from their respective organisation. This staffing requirement will be reviewed following the submissions phase at which point the remaining work necessary to complete the FDS process will become clearer.

The Partnership Manager is the Project Leader and basic project management support will be provided by GCP Project Assistant.

6.2 Additional consultant support

Communications advice and assistance will be provided by Grant Mangin (Creative PR)
Anticipated hours: 40 (primarily in May/June and October/November to assist document readability)

No further additional consultant support is anticipated (aside from legal and peer review covered below) but this may depend on the level, expertise and commitment of partner resourcing identified above.

6.3 Modelling and technical expert requirements

No additional modelling or technical work is anticipated to be commissioned as part of the GCP Budget.

Contractors already used as part of the Capacity Assessment included:

- Market Economics (EFM and SDC/WDC growth models)
- Property Economics (retail expenditure model)
- QTP (transport modelling).
- Sarah Dawson (planning) and Geoff Butcher (economic) peer review
- Livingstone Associates: Ian Mitchell (housing demand assessment)

6.4 Legal and peer review

A single peer review and legal review will be undertaken. Periodic and focused legal advice may be necessary and would be in addition to the legal peer review task. To meet budgetary and timeframe requirements this will be undertaken on the draft FDS to enable modifications to be incorporated at an early stage ahead of FDS finalisation.
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REPORT FOR DECISION

FILE NO and TRIM NO: POL-08-61 / 180507049501

REPORT TO: Council

DATE OF MEETING: 5 June 2018

FROM: Mike O’Connell, Senior Policy Analyst

SUBJECT: Draft Business Zones 1 & 2 Public Spaces Policy

1. SUMMARY

1.1 The purpose of this report is to recommend to Council the adoption for consultation of the draft Business Zones 1 and 2 Public Spaces Policy.

1.2 To assist in developing this policy, staff sought the input of an external Reference Group from December 2017 to March 2018. The Group comprised community board representatives John Lynn, Keith Galloway, Greg Miller, Andrea Allen and Chris Greengrass.

1.3 The Reference Group also included representatives from Enterprise North Canterbury (Miles Dalton), invited business owners (Murray Walsh, Coffee Culture and Lisa Leeburn, Devlin Real Estate), the Canterbury District Health Board (Heather Kimber), and the Waimakariri Access Group (Carina Duke, Blind Foundation).

Attachments:
   i. Draft Business Zones 1&2 Public Spaces Policy (TRIM No. 180115002654).

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180507049501.

(b) Approves the exposure draft Business Zones 1&2 Public Spaces Policy to be released for public consultation, consultation which includes targeted engagement with Zone 1&2 businesses and business support agencies.

(c) Delegates to the Mayor and Chief Executive responsibility for approving any alterations, additions or deletions that may be required prior to release for consultation.

(d) Circulates copies of this draft policy to the Community Boards.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 This policy, presented as an exposure draft, seeks to make the Council’s public spaces safe and accessible to promote vibrancy adjacent to business areas and allow people to enjoy those public spaces, while also protecting, promoting and maintaining public health.
and safety. The policy focuses on accessibility and mobility, outdoor dining, smoking outdoors, signage, display of goods, mobile traders, buskers, commercial charitable collectors and amenity lighting.

3.2. The development of this policy supports the success and implementation of existing Council documents relating to the public realm including the Signage Bylaw 2012, Commercial Charity Bylaw 2017 and the Waimakariri District Plan. This policy will also support the Smoke Free Green Spaces Policy 2012 and is complementary to the Government’s Smokefree Aotearoa 2025 initiative whereby business owners are encouraged to make their outdoor dining space smokefree.

3.3. The policy is restricted to public spaces adjacent to Business 1 and 2 Zones in the towns of Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend, Pegasus and Oxford as zoned in the District Plan.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. The Council needs policy in this area to broadly guide how the public realm in the District’s business zones is utilised and to be complementary with existing policies and bylaws, and the Town Centres and Accessibility Strategies.

4.2. Enhancing and maintaining safe and efficient pedestrian accessibility and mobility is a key element of this policy. The Reference Group has identified that the efficient management of outdoor dining, signage and goods displays are key to creating a workable balance between vibrancy and public amenity within the District’s business zones.

4.3. This policy is not a legislative requirement, however, it will benefit the implementation of existing public space policies and strategies which seek to improve the quality of, and access to, public spaces.

4.4. The policy gives effect to the Signage Bylaw and Commercial Charity Bylaw. It also aligns with the outcomes sought from the Council’s Accessibility Strategy, and the Walking and Cycling Strategy.

4.5. Taking a policy direction which gradually reduces smoking outdoors in public spaces, especially in outdoor dining areas, has been strongly supported by the Reference Group. Incorporation of smokefree elements in this policy supports both existing policy and achievement of central government’s smoking reduction goal.

4.6. A consistent and equitable fee schedule applying to business owners or lessees within the Council reserve is necessary. A one-off administration fee will be introduced in association with a fee structure for a Licence to Occupy public spaces.

4.7. A fee schedule (and development thereof) for administration and a Licence to Occupy in business zone public spaces will be the subject of a future report to Council.

4.8. The costs of implementing this policy are within existing levels of service.

4.9. The Management Team has reviewed this report and support the recommendations.

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

Views have been incorporated in the Reference Group from Enterprise North Canterbury, local businesses, the Waimakariri Access Group and the Canterbury District Health Board.
5.2. **Wider Community**

No views have been sought at this stage from the wider community, however, this proposal is to approve an exposure draft for public consultation. This consultation period will go from mid-June to mid-July 2018.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

There are no direct funding commitments in preparing this policy, although its implementation will need to be considered in operational budgets, including enforcement.

6.2. **Community Implications**

Introduction of this policy will likely enhance the community’s accessibility to and mobility within business zone public spaces.

6.3. **Risk Management**

There are no organisational risks associated in developing this policy.

6.4. **Health and Safety**

Health and safety outcomes, with risks reduced for the wider community, are likely to be improved with the introduction of this policy. It is anticipated the greatest benefits will be realised by embedding smokefree elements into the policy.

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

Adoption of this policy will require consequential change to existing Council policy, in particular the *Signage Bylaw*. This matter is not a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s *Significance and Engagement Policy*.

7.2. **Legislation**

The development of this policy supports the success and implementation of existing Council documents under Sections 145-148 of the *Local Government Act 2002* and Sections 72-77 of the *Resource Management Act 1991*.

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

This report relates to the following community outcomes:

- **Governance**
  - The Council takes account of the views across the community including mana whenua.
  - Opportunities for collaboration and partnerships are actively pursued.

- **Environment**
  - Crime, injury and harm from road crashes, gambling, and alcohol abuse are minimised.

- **Places and Spaces**
  - 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.
There are wide-ranging opportunities for people of different ages, abilities and cultures to participate in community life and recreational activities.

Services

There are sufficient and appropriate places where businesses are able to set up in our District.

7.4. Delegations

Delegates to the Mayor and Chief Executive responsibility for approving any alterations, additions or deletions that may be required prior to release for consultation.
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1 Introduction

A good town centre is not just a shopping centre; it has many functions. Business activities (shops and offices) when co-located with community, civic, recreational and entertainment facilities, and public artworks, create and enhance vibrant public spaces where people like to go and return to.

The Council is responsible for providing and maintaining a number of public spaces in its business zones including roads, footpaths, laneways, on-street car parking and off-street car parking. It also provides public facilities and buildings and regulates requirements for other buildings.

This policy is restricted to public spaces within Business 1 and 2 Zones in the towns of Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend, Pegasus and Oxford in Waimakariri District as zoned in the District Plan and is important for businesses, groups and individuals in promoting the public image of the District.

The Business 1 Zone is a significant resource reflected in its day-to-day use by the community. The public spaces they embrace are used for culinary, entertainment and cultural experiences that generate business centre activity and vibrancy.

Industrial and commercial areas with the Business 2 Zone are becoming increasingly important in attracting customers and creating their own business vibrancy and activity as the District’s population continues to grow.

2 Policy Context

The Waimakariri District Council needs policy in this area to broadly guide how the public realm in the District’s business zones is utilised, including the intersect with leases in public spaces, relevant bylaws such as the Signage Bylaw 2012 and relevant Council strategic approaches: town centre strategies, the Walking and Cycling Strategy 2017-2022 and the Waimakariri Accessibility Strategy 2017.

Businesses and members of the public are expected and encouraged to use footpaths, laneways and accessways in business zones for non-pedestrian activities in a fair and responsible way that does not impair or obstruct safe and efficient pedestrian movement.

Footpath, laneway and accessways users are responsible for managing these activities in accordance with:

- Any other relevant legislation and standards, including for health and safety, and advertising.

It is important that public spaces in the District’s business areas:

- Are clean, safe and promote a welcoming image of the District.
- Facilitate safe and unobstructed access for pedestrians and cyclists.
- Allow for the access of goods, service and private vehicles.
- Provide spaces for people to gather for social engagement and interaction; and
- Strengthen the existing function of, and interconnection between, public space locations.
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3 Interpretation

Definitions are set out below:

3.1 Amenity Lighting means the provision of lighting at night for public amenity (e.g. pedestrian accessways).

3.2 Business Zone means any area zoned Bus1 and Bus2 in the District Plan, in the towns of Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend, Pegasus and Oxford in Waimakariri District.

3.3 Busker means any person or persons who perform and may seek voluntary donations in a public space.

3.4 Commercial means business activity, that is, an exchange of goods or services for monetary gain or reward.

3.5 Council means the Waimakariri District Council or any officer authorised to exercise the authority of the Council.

3.6 District means the Waimakariri District.

3.7 Footpath means so much of any road as it is laid out or constructed by authority of the Council primarily for pedestrians, and includes the edging but excludes the curbing or channelling.

3.8 Goods display means a display located in a public space outside a premise from which goods are offered or exposed for sale, such as clothing hanging on racks.

3.9 Heritage buildings means buildings of special character as defined in the District Plan.

3.10 Licence to Occupy means an agreement between the Council as Land Owner (Licensor) and the Occupier (Licensee) whereby the Licensor permits the Licensee occupation of the land or premises for a defined period of time with specified conditions. In the event of the land being a reserve or legal road reserve, the occupation is not exclusive.

3.11 Mobile vendor means a mobile unit, whether self-propelled or not, from which goods, wares or merchandise (including food) are offered or exposed for sale, or from which such goods, wares or merchandise may be ordered, while such mobile unit is in any public space. It does not include any unit used for the purpose of transporting and delivering goods, wares or merchandise pursuant to a prior order placed for delivery of such goods, wares or merchandise.

3.12 Premises means:

(i) a property or allotment which is held under a separate certificate of title or for which a separate certificate of title may be issued and in respect of which a building consent has been or may be issued; or

(ii) a building or part of a building that has been defined as an individual unit by a cross-lease, unit title or company lease and for which a certificate of title is available.
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3.13 Public space means:
(i) a space that is under control of the Waimakariri District Council; and
(ii) a space that is open to, or being used by, the public, whether or not there is a charge for admission, and
(iii) a road, street, footpath, alley, lane, accessway, pedestrian mall, court, in Business Zone 1 and 2 under Council control.

3.14 Real estate sign means a sign including information about the proposed or pending sale of any premises or business.

3.15 Signage means any display or device intended to attract attention for the purposes of directing, identifying, informing or advertising and includes any frame or supporting structure but does not include signs erected by the New Zealand Transport Agency or the Waimakariri District Council.

3.16 TGSI TGSI (tactile ground surface indicators) are ground-level warning and directional indicators which provide blind, deafblind and vision impaired pedestrians with visual and sensory information.

4 Policy Objective

This policy seeks to make the Council’s public spaces; its lanes, footpaths, streets, buildings and artworks accessible so as to:

- Promote vibrancy in the public domain adjacent to business areas.
- Protect the public from nuisance and obstructions.
- Protect, promote and maintain public health and safety.
- Ensure public spaces are used in ways that positively contribute to the District’s identity and people’s enjoyment of public spaces.
- Establish an equitable and consistent procedure for charging fees in the Council reserve (business zones).

It has been developed to provide a framework for the successful and sustainable on-going utility and management of Waimakariri District’s business zones and will be integrate with and help to assist implementation of key Council documents such as the District Plan.

5 Fees and Licence to Occupy

The Council wishes to encourage activity and vibrancy in public spaces within Business Zones 1 & 2. However, the Council needs to balance activity and vibrancy with prescribing at the appropriate level a Licence to Occupy which retains existing businesses while not acting as a disincentive to new businesses wishing to establish themselves.

The Council thus reserves the right, in alignment with its revenue and financing policy, to set an equitable fee structure for occupation of the Council reserve, for example, outdoor dining, selling of goods and mobile vendors.
A one-off processing fee will be administered in association with a Licence to Occupy for business owners or lessees utilising the Council reserve. The Deed of Licence will be reviewed bi-annually, or annually for premises with a liquor licence as part of the Licence to Occupy.

In the case of a licensee relinquishing their lease, the new licensee is not subject to a new administration fee unless the nature of the business changes, for example, from a premises selling food to one selling clothing.

Inspections or audits of premises will be carried out up to twice annually as part of the one-off processing fee. The premises fee is set in the first schedule of a licensee's Deed of Licence. The Council reserves the right to set at zero, the fees for some licensed activities including busking, street performance, street appeals and charity fundraising.

6 Policy Statement

6.1 Accessibility, safety and mobility

The primary purpose and priority use for footpaths and other public accessways and spaces is for safe and efficient pedestrian accessibility and mobility. Activities and obstructions that interfere with pedestrian flows such as street furniture, signboards and clothing stands, can create pedestrian congestion and safety hazards.

There shall be a continuous two metre clearway maintained on all footpaths, accessways and lanes at all times. Council requires that minimum continuous unobstructed footpath widths are maintained to ensure that pedestrian priority and safe and efficient pedestrian movement is upheld. The minimum widths are guided by the volume of pedestrian traffic.

Pedestrian crossings are also an important accessway within business zones and access to them should not be hindered or their pedestrian safety compromised. Pedestrians should be clearly able to see approaching motorists and vice versa. No signage or other obstruction shall be located adjacent to or within 1.0 m of any pedestrian crossing or any tactile ground surface indicators (TGSIs) which announce the presence of a crossing.

Spacing and clearances for the placement of signage and goods for display are shown in Schedule A. Similarly, the layout of furniture in outdoor dining areas shall allow for unobstructed and efficient pedestrian movement (refer to Schedule B).

Business owners or interested parties can apply to the Council for the closure of footpath space for special events by prior arrangement. Similarly, they may also utilise public off-street parking spaces on a temporary basis for specific purposes by prior arrangement.

The owners of businesses are encouraged to adopt best practice design and installation principles for pedestrian accessibility according to New Zealand Transport Authority’s best practice guideline RTS14 – Guidelines for facilities for blind and vision impaired pedestrians (2015).

6.2 Outdoor dining

High quality outdoor dining areas can add to the vibrancy of public spaces if well designed and located. Outdoor dining areas contribute to the District’s town centres and their sense of place and provides the public with an enjoyable leisure option. They can also add significant economic value to town centres with cafes, bars and restaurants through increased customer capacity and demand.
In general, the Council wants to encourage outdoor seating because it adds to the quality of public spaces. However, if outdoor seating is not managed well it can clutter the footpath and create obstacles for pedestrians.

Cafes, bars and restaurants wishing to use part of the footpath space directly outside their premises for outdoor dining are required to obtain a Licence to Occupy from Council’s Property Unit. An applicant wishing to serve alcohol as part of an outdoor dining area must apply to the District Licensing Authority for an alcohol licence or a variation of the area to which their alcohol licence applies. The Liquor Ban Bylaw regulates the control of liquor in public places.

The holder of a Licence to Occupy must:
- Manage activities for accessible journeys and design elements in accordance with New Zealand Standard 4121:2001 Design of Access and Mobility – Buildings and Associated Facilities (NZS4121).
- Locate outdoor dining furniture located in a way that does not impinge on the continuous clearway through the pedestrian zone, observing the setback requirements in Schedules A and B.
- Use barriers or other appropriate street furniture to clearly define the boundaries of an outdoor dining area from opening of trading until the end of the trading day, unless permitted by specific lease or Licence to Occupy conditions.
- Not allow the outdoor dining area to cause damage to any verge, kerbing or heritage building.
- Arrange all street furniture and objects such as tables, chairs, umbrellas and menu boards within the dining areas in compliance with this policy and as provided for in the Licence to Occupy.
- Use street furniture of durable construction which has no sharp features which could cause injury.
- Allow for adequate supervision of the outdoor dining area to be maintained from opening of trading until the end of the trading day.
- Between the end of the trading day and 7:00 am, secure together all street furniture used in an outdoor dining area so that it cannot be used by the public.

Additionally, the holder of a Licence to Occupy must:
- Display their licence to occupy or have this available for inspection by a Council enforcement officer, if requested.
- Have adequate space set aside (in their site proposal) and have a management regime for waste storage and disposal.
- Be responsible for cleaning the footpath and removing rubbish in the outdoor dining areas.
- Not allow waste material including sweepings, detergents and cleaning agents to be disposed of into the street gutter or stormwater drains.
- Remove all their street furniture from the pedestrian zone when requested by Council during a special event, or to enable street works, services or repairs.

Where provided for, road build-outs can be utilised for outdoor dining by the business they are directly adjacent to as part of that business’s Licence to Occupy.

The Council reserves the right to set equitable fees across business zones for utilisation of outdoor dining spaces, and to recover where necessary the costs of enforcing and monitoring this policy.

The owner of the premises must also hold public liability insurance to a minimum value of $2,000,000 indemnifying Council against any claim arising from damage or injury caused by any piece of outdoor furniture or other moveable fitting in the outdoor dining area.
6.3 Smoking outdoors

This part of this policy complements the Council’s approach taken in the Smoke Free Green Spaces Policy 2012. The policy is not a ban on smoking, rather it supports a voluntary environment where people can choose to act responsibly around children and young people.

Smoking, or use of electronic cigarettes (e-cigarettes), is not encouraged in outdoor dining areas for cafes, bars and restaurants; or at public events staged within business zones. Smoke-free environments help support the health and wellbeing of individuals, families and whānau.

The Council already has a policy providing for smoke-free green spaces, a key component for the Council to take action and become part of the Government’s commitment to becoming a ‘Smokefree New Zealand’ by 2025. Smoke-free outdoor policies are based on the rationale of good behaviour role modelling to children and younger people.

Where a business creates an outdoor smoking area, business owners are encouraged to adopt the policy approach outlined in the Smokefree Aotearoa 2025 programme (Schedule C) and utilise practical guidance, in particular for outdoor dining (Schedule C), to help create a wider network of smoke-free environments within the District’s business zones.

6.4 Signage

Signage plays an important role in directing the public, and advertising and displaying information to the public for businesses, business customers, community groups and visitors. There can be a detrimental effect of signage upon the environment: aesthetically, visually or physically; or if poorly located or not compatible with the surrounding environment. Signage can also have an effect on vehicular traffic with the potential to cause a traffic accident.

The placement of signage in Business Zones 1 and 2 is guided by this Policy. The Signage Bylaw regulates signs on business-zoned land affecting traffic. The District Plan controls requirements for signage placed on privately owned premises including any signage placed on a verandah. Signage includes moveable sandwich boards and more recent designs that sit in a weighted support base, including sail-shaped flags and teardrop-shaped flags. Refer to Schedule D for signage dimensions.

Signage is permitted on footpaths and accessways where it meets the following conditions:

- Activities are managed for accessible journeys and design elements in accordance with New Zealand Standard 4121:2001 Design of Access and Mobility – Buildings and Associated Facilities (NZS4121).
- Footpath signage shall be located in a way that does not impinge on the continuous clearway through the pedestrian zone, observing the placement requirements in Schedule A.
- Each business may place one sign per road frontage and an additional sign in the trading zone adjacent to the kerb zone, if space allows (see Schedule A).
- Any material displayed or the advertising matter on any signage shall relate only to the business carried on in the premises and maintained to an acceptable standard.
- The business owner is responsible for any safety issues of both customers and the general public passing by, ensuring any signage is secured so it cannot blow around in the wind.
- Sail-shaped and teardrop-shaped flags which are able to move in windy conditions shall be located so that they do not sway into the pedestrian zone clearway (see Schedule B).
- Signage should be safe and have no sharp edges or protrusions that may create an obstacle or a safety hazard for pedestrians.
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- Rotating designs can be used in business zones, however, dimensions should be consistent with contemporary street signage (see Schedule D).
- Advertising shall not be illuminated, have reflective surfaces or resemble a traffic sign.
- All displays and sign boards shall be removed from the footpath each day after the expiry of normal trading hours of the business concerned.
- No signage shall be located adjacent to or within 1.0 m of any TGSI, pedestrian crossing, accessibility car park or bus stop.

In cases where there are several businesses operating within the same accessway or laneway, the Council will work with the affected business and property owners to develop a compliant solution such as shared directional signage so as to maintain accessible and unobstructed footpath traffic.

The design and location of signs in a public space outside a listed heritage building in a business zone shall also be compatible with the heritage significance of the building so they do not detract from the significance or features of that building.

Council land is not to be used for the erection of election signs, either for Parliamentary elections (including by-elections) or local body elections (including by-elections). This Policy also does not apply to signs erected for or on behalf of the Council.

6.5 Display of goods

Applications to display goods or services for sale or hire in a public space, e.g. a footpath, lane court area will be considered on a case-by-case basis. The Council will take into account:

- The impact on local existing businesses.
- The nature of the display and goods involved.
- The quality (aesthetics) of the display and the desire to avoid excessive visual clutter in and along the footpath zone.
- The environment the applicant requests to operate in, including the width of the footpath and the volume of pedestrian movement.
- Access requirements for visually impaired members of public as well as mobility aids including mobility scooters, assisted walking aids, wheelchairs and pushchairs.

An accessible and unobstructed footpath for pedestrians needs to be consistently maintained while allowing business owners to utilise the zone outside their property for trading purposes. Similarly, there needs to be clear space in the kerb zone to maintain access to parked vehicles. Merchandise displays shall observe the requirements on setbacks and clearways set out in Schedule A.

Display of goods items or services for sale are permitted where they meet the following conditions:

- Activities are managed for accessible journeys and design elements in accordance with New Zealand Standard 4121:2001 Design of Access and Mobility – Buildings and Associated Facilities (NZS4121).
- Trading is permitted to extend 0.8 m out from the property boundary, allowing for both display of goods and the ability of the public to stop in front of or move around the display.
- The display of goods should not hinder access to doors and entranceways. The trading zone should allow at least 0.5m clearance on either side of entrances to the building.
- Merchandise can be displayed adjacent to the kerb zone if the width of the footpath or accessway allows the 2.0 m pedestrian zone clearway to be maintained (see Schedule A).
- All goods shall be elevated from the ground, for example on a table or rack.

In the instance of goods display, some deviation from size limitations for signage may be allowed at the discretion of Council.
6.6 Mobile trading

Mobile trading is the temporary trading activity from a location which is vacated once trading has ended for the day. Examples include:

- Persons offering their goods on foot throughout the Council reserve.
- Vendors selling goods from roadside produce stalls, coffee carts and ice cream trucks.

Open air markets and food stall areas can encourage foot traffic activity and visitors to the business zones. Anyone wishing to trade will need to apply for and obtain a mobile trading licence from the Council’s Environmental Services Unit. If the vendor intends to sell food, they will also need to obtain a certificate of registration under the Food Act 2014.

The Council reserves the right to set equitable fees for mobile vendors and to recover where necessary the costs of enforcing this policy.

Mobile vendors shall not obstruct pedestrian accessways, impede entry to any premises or hinder traffic flow.

6.7 Buskers and commercial charitable collectors

A busker should obtain permission from the owner of the business adjacent to the public space where the proposed busking is to take place. They are permitted to use voice enhancement equipment (including, microphones, amplifying equipment and loud hailers). Noise, however, must not be excessive, remain under the busker’s control and have shall be courteous and mindful of surrounding businesses and the general public.

Buskers are permitted between the hours of 7:00 am and 1:00 am but no busker is permitted to remain in a single location for longer than 2 continuous hours. Buskers shall not impede or inconvenience the flow of pedestrians and customers along footpaths and accessways.

The provisions of, and definitions within, the Commercial Charity Bylaw 2017 apply to charitable collections in the public domain, including the business zones in Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend, Pegasus and Oxford.

6.8 Amenity lighting

Street and amenity lights provide lighting to roads and accessways for traffic and pedestrian accessibility and safety purposes. Major streets within the business zones are brightly lit, with less street lighting provided on lanes and accessways.

Council will continue to embrace new lighting technologies where these are cost effective and practical to install. Street lighting shall be designed in accordance with the national street lighting standard, AS/NZS 1158: Lighting for roads and public spaces. Private amenity lighting shall not be connected to the Council’s street lighting system.

7 Links to legislation, other policies and community outcomes

7.1 Legislation and regulation

Under the Local Government Act 2002, the Council has a responsibility to promote the social, environmental, cultural and economic wellbeing of its residents. Under the Health Act 1956, there is a duty of this Council to improve, promote and protect public health within its District.
In particular, this policy gives effect to the following provisions in the *Signage Bylaw*, provisions applying to avoiding public nuisance and enhancing road safety, namely:

- Real estate signage (Clause 8.1);
- Community and non-profit event signage (Clauses 9.1-9.4);
- Footpath signage and advertising (Clauses 10.1-10.3);
- The display of signs (Clauses 10.4-10.6);
- The display of advertising goods for sale (Clause 10.7);
- Signage overhanging footpaths or roads (Clauses 11.1-11.3); and
- Signs affecting traffic (Clauses 12.1-12.3).

The Policy also gives effect to the *Commercial Charity Bylaw* which applies to charity collectors in business zones within the District’s five towns.

Pedestrian crossing design and placement is set out in the New Zealand Transport Authority’s *Pedestrian planning and design guide* (2007).

### 7.2 Other Council Documents

This policy guides how public spaces in the District’s business zones are utilised and is also aligned to the following Council documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waimakariri District Plan</th>
<th>Policy should be read in conjunction with the relevant rules, policies and objectives in Chapter 16 - Business Zones.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan 2011</td>
<td>The future Kaiapoi town centre will be an economically viable centre where both residents and visitors want to spend time and money.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Town Centre Strategy (RCT 2020)</td>
<td>A town centre which is sustainable, prosperous, vibrant, easily accessible, contains safe and attractive pedestrian-orientated streets and spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend Pegasus Area Strategy 2013</td>
<td>The area is home to well-connected communities and prosperous businesses, has attractive public spaces and a healthy environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking and Cycling Strategy 2017-2022</td>
<td>The environment is friendly, safe and accessible to walkers and cyclists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility Strategy 2017-2021</td>
<td>Everyone, including people with impairments have access to public services, facilities and spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Community Action Plan on Alcohol 2009</td>
<td>Promotes safe and responsible use of alcohol and seeks to minimise alcohol-related harm to the people and communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoke Free Green Spaces Policy 2012</td>
<td>This policy seeks to denominalise smoking in green spaces that are owned and managed by Council by making it less visible, particularly to children and youth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Alcohol Policy 2015</td>
<td>Allows the Council to further control the location and number of licensed premises and maximum trading hours.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7.3 Community Outcomes

This policy assists the Council meet its community outcomes, which describe how the Council aims to achieve meeting the current and future needs of its communities with good-quality local infrastructure, providing local public services and performance of regulatory functions.

Community outcomes of particular relevance include:

- Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality;
- There is a safe environment for all;
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- Businesses in the District are diverse, adaptable and growing;
- Our community’s needs for health and social services are met;
- The community’s cultures, arts and heritage are conserved and celebrated
- The distinctive character of our takiwā - towns, villages and rural areas is maintained
- People are friendly and caring, creating a strong sense of community in our District.

Disposal of waste in business zones by the public is not provided for under this policy and can be referred to in the Public Refuse Bins Policy (2002).

8 Adopted by and date

This policy was adopted by Council on [Day] [Month] 2018.

9 Review

The policy will be reviewed:
   i. every six five years; or
   ii. sooner at the request of Council; or
   iii. in response to any issues that may arise.
Schedule A - Footpath Zones (General)

Guidelines for acceptable retail display and signage setup:

1. Of primary importance is that there shall be a continuous 2.0 metre unobstructed pedestrian clearway maintained on all footpaths and accessways at all times.

2. The extent of the permitted trading zone is defined by the property boundary along footpath frontage allowing for at least 0.5m clearance on either side of entrances to the building.

3. The goods display may extend to 0.8m from the property boundary to allow customers to stop and view goods where the pedestrian zone clearway still allows sufficient space for this.

4. Customers, including those in control of pushchairs and mobility aids, are expected to remain within the viewing area as far as is practicable while they view goods displays or interact with each other.

5. Signage, goods for display and outdoor dining furniture shall be placed a minimum distance of 0.5m from the kerb so as to provide access to vehicle parking.

Note that the schedules are explanatory and not part of the policy. They are intended to explain its general effect and can be amended by Council resolution.
Schedule B - Footpath Zone (Outdoor Dining)

Acceptable zones for outdoor dining on footpaths in areas zoned Bus1 and Bus2.

- Pedestrian Zone: 2 metres clearway
- Kerb Zone: 0.5 metre

If space allows or on road build-out
Schedule C – Smokefree policy and guidance

1. Smokefree Aotearoa 2025

This policy seeks to denormalise smoking in public open spaces that are owned and managed by Council by making smoking less visible, particularly to children and youth. A similar approach is adopted in the Smoke Free Green Spaces Policy 2012.

Business owners and lessees are encouraged to make their outdoor dining space smokefree in line with the intent of Smokefree Aotearoa 2025, the core of which is reproduced as follows:

*Nearly 85% of New Zealanders are smokefree – that means most of us are choosing not to smoke. The New Zealand Government has set a goal so that by 2025 fewer than 5% of New Zealanders will be smokers. This will be achieved by:*

- Protecting children from exposure to tobacco marketing and promotion
- Reducing the supply of, and demand for tobacco
- Providing the best possible support for quitting.

*Being smokefree and having smokefree environments help support the health and wellbeing of our families and whānau. We know tobacco kills, so it makes sense.*

- You will be healthier.
- There is less chance your children will smoke.
- You won’t be breathing in second-hand smoke – in New Zealand approximately 500 people die prematurely due to second-hand smoke and globally this is estimated to be 600,000 people every year.
- You will save money by not buying cigarettes or tobacco – lots of money!
- You will not be supporting an industry that contributes to about 6 million deaths globally each year.

2. Smokefree Outdoor Dining

For cafes, restaurants and licensed venues in Waimakariri District considering smoke-free dining spaces on existing or new locations, please refer to the ‘Smokefree Outdoor Dining’ guidance prepared by the Cancer Society and Canterbury District Health Board, or contact the Cancer Society (Canterbury - West Coast Division) directly (ph. 03 379 5835).
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Schedule D – Signage Dimensions
Guideline dimensions for placement of signage displays on footpath.

Feather / sail / teardrop style flags: no wider than 0.75m; no higher than 3.2m

Contemporary style street signage including sandwich boards: no wider than 0.6 metres; no higher than 0.75 metres; maximum base spread is 0.6 metres
1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to seek Council approval of a draft submission to the Productivity Commission’s draft report on a Low-emissions Economy for New Zealand. This draft report was released on 29 April 2018 and is open for public submissions until 8 June 2018.

1.2. This draft report (nearly 500 pages) was preceded by an issues paper from the Productivity Commission that was released in August 2017, and to which this Council made a submission on 3 October 2017 (TRIM 170920101597). All Councillors and Council staff were invited to a lunchtime briefing on the draft report on 17 May 2018.

1.3. The draft Council submission includes the following points:

- Supports reforming the Emissions Trading Scheme rather than replacing it with a carbon tax, and developing a credible and efficient market in emissions units;
- Supports separate domestic targets for long-lived and short lived gasses;
- Supports permanent exotic forests to transition to native forests following harvesting and where practicable;
- Supports the introduction of emissions standards for vehicles entering the NZ fleet;
- Does not support financial subsidies for electric vehicle charging infrastructure;
- Supports changing the primary mandate of the Energy Efficiency and Conservation Authority (EECA) from conserving energy to lowering emissions;
- Provisionally supports amending the Waste Minimisation Act 2008 so that the waste disposal levy is applied to all known, consented waste disposal facilities, subject to a comprehensive assessment of costs to residents;
- Supports consenting requirements to apply to farm dumps;
- Supports a review of the Building Code to introduce more stringent energy efficient standards.

Attachments:

i. Draft submission to the Productivity Commission in response to their draft report on a Low-emissions Economy (TRIM 180521055261)
2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report no. 180521055321

(b) **Workshops** the attached draft submission to the Productivity Commission draft report to reach consensus on a Council submission;

(c) **Authorises** the Mayor to make changes to the attached draft submission to the Productivity Commission draft report on a *Low-emissions Economy* (TRIM 180521055261);

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

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 Under the Paris Agreement, New Zealand is already committed to reduce its emissions by 30% below 2005 levels by 2030, and the *Climate Change Response Act 2002* commits this nation to reduce emissions by 50% below 1990 levels by 2050. However the Government has signaled that it will introduce a *Zero Carbon Bill* in late-2018 to provide a vision for how New Zealand transitions to a sustainable and climate resilient future. The Bill will see New Zealand put a bold new emissions reduction target into law, and establish an independent Climate Change Commission to meet this goal. Consultation on the *Zero Carbon Bill* is expected to open in late May 2018 and information on the Bill’s proposals will be released at that time.

3.2 New Zealand is distinctive in at least three respects; its significantly decarbonized energy sector, its large share of land sector emissions, and its large forestry sector. With these unique characteristics reducing emissions to zero by 2050 will involve a significant departure from the technologies and practices commonplace in New Zealand today. The draft submission points out that local governments are faced with planning in the long-term for their communities, and need to incorporate planning for dealing with disruptive technologies.

3.3 The Local Government New Zealand (LGNZ) Leaders’ Climate Change declaration (2017) supported an ambitious transition plan towards a low carbon and resilient New Zealand, and a more ambitious national schedule of climate change mitigation.

3.4 New Zealand holds a large stock of accumulated international emission unit credits, and these will be will used to meet 2020 commitments. From a global perspective, this could be seen as a cynical response to international commitments, and could allow this country do very little in reducing domestic carbon dioxide emissions. The proposed *Zero Carbon Bill* will address this, and take on the challenge of reducing net domestic emissions to zero by 2050.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1 The draft report concludes 142 findings and makes 53 recommendations. Comment on some of these recommendations, generally in support, has been made in the proposed Council draft submission.

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1 **Groups and Organisations**

The Council is represented on the Canterbury Regional Climate Change working group which is developing a regional submission on the draft report.

5.2 **Wider Community**

Community views have not specifically been sought on the draft Council submission. The draft report itself is an attempt to glean community views.
6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1 Financial Implications

There are significant financial implications for New Zealand as a nation to achieve Zero Carbon by 2050. Council’s Organisational Development Priorities for 2018/19 include the development of a Sustainability Strategy to assess Council’s carbon footprint as an organisation, and map a strategic path to initially reduce energy use, waste stream and vehicle fleet emissions.

6.2 Community Implications

The social, economic and environmental impact on the community has major implications to achieve Zero Carbon by 2050.

6.3 Risk Management

The risk of not addressing human-induced Climate Change has global implications.

6.4 Health and Safety

Health and Safety implications are not directly relevant to this draft submission.

7. CONTEXT

7.1 Policy

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

7.2 Legislation

Section 7 (i) of the Resource Management Act 1991 requires all persons to have particular regard to the effects of climate change, which is defined in Section 2 as a change in climate that is directly or indirectly attributed to human activity that alters the composition of the global atmosphere, and that is additional to natural climate variability observed over comparable time periods.

7.3 Community Outcomes

- Our community’s needs for health and social services are met;
- People have wide-ranging opportunities for learning and being informed;
- There is a safe environment for all;
- There is a healthy and sustainable environment for all.

7.4 Delegations

N/A

Geoff Meadows, Policy Manager
In the Matter of
The Productivity Commission draft report
Low-emissions Economy

Submission by
Waimakariri District Council

5 June 2018
Person for Contact: Geoff Meadows, Policy Manager
General Submission

The Waimakariri District Council welcomes the opportunity to submit to the Productivity Commission in response to the Inquiry into how New Zealand can maximise the opportunities and minimise the costs and risks of transitioning to a low net-emissions economy. The Commission’s Terms of Reference and draft report have been read with interest and the following general comments are offered.

General comments

The findings and recommendations in the draft report are generally supported by this Council, and the Productivity Commission’s key recommendation for a credible and efficient market in emissions units, rather than replace the ETS with a carbon tax, is supported.

Because of New Zealand’s significantly decarbonized energy sector, its large share of land sector emissions, and its large forestry sector, this Council acknowledges that moving to a low-emissions economy will involve a significant departure from the technologies and practices commonplace in New Zealand today. Local governments are faced with planning in the long-term for their communities, and the need to plan for many of these disruptive technologies.

The Local Government New Zealand (LGNZ) Leaders’ Climate Change declaration (2017) supports an ambitious transition plan towards a low carbon and resilient New Zealand, and a more ambitious national schedule of climate change mitigation.

The recommendations in the draft report generally provide a framework for this more ambitious national schedule.

The following comments are offered on some of the recommendations in the draft report.

Recommendations

Recommendation R4.1 to reform the Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS) rather than replace it with a carbon tax is fully supported. The original concept and architecture of New Zealand’s ETS is sound, and it is abundantly clear that it has failed because the true environmental costs of carbon emissions have not been factored into the scheme. This Council supports the development of a credible and efficient market in emissions units.

Recommendation R5.1 to phase out all subsidies that support ongoing production and use of fossil fuel is supported.

Recommendation R7.1 to use the United Kingdom (UK) Climate Change Act as a basis for the design of a Zero Carbon Bill is supported. This Council supports the conclusions of the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment (March 2018) that the “cornerstone of any new legislation will be the enactment of a long-term emissions reduction target”, and that the UK legislation not only sets a target, but makes those targets legally binding domestically.

Recommendation R7.2 to seek to achieve broad political support and consensus for the Zero Carbon Bill is vital in achieving broad-scale public support and the social involvement that is necessary to make the transition to a low-emissions economy. Again this was expressed by the outgoing Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment, Dr Jan Wright, on page 4 Stepping Stones to Paris and Beyond (2017), and reiterated by the incoming Parliamentary Commissioner, Mr Simon Upton on page 6 of A Zero Carbon Act for New Zealand (2018).
Recommendations R7.7 to R7.10, to establish a Climate Change Commission as an advisory and independent Crown Entity, are supported.

Recommendation R8.1 to establish separate targets for long-lived and short-lived gases is fully supported and is consistent with Upton (2017) page 16. A sensible and balanced policy response is to account for methane and nitrous oxide separately to carbon dioxide. This will be a major contributor to the agricultural sector’s acceptance of an ETS with realistic price signals, and is consistent with seeking to achieve the broad scale support and consensus outlined in Recommendation R7.2 above. Similarly Recommendation R10.3 to fully include agricultural emissions in the ETS within an overall all-gases target is supported, if the above two-baskets approach is adopted.

Recommendation R10.1 to transition permanent exotic forests to native forests, following harvest and where practicable, is supported. Although the exotic conifer *pinus radiata* plays a major role in sequestering large amounts of carbon dioxide, it does nothing to enhance or improve New Zealand’s indigenous biodiversity. Carbon sequestration should be developed as an option that is in keeping with enhancing New Zealand’s indigenous biodiversity (see LGNZ think-piece on *Addressing New Zealand’s Biodiversity Challenge (August 2017)*).

Recommendation R11.1 to introduce CO2 emissions standards for light vehicles is fully supported, as is recommendation R11.2 for a price feebate scheme for entry vehicles. The feebate scheme should replace Road User Charge exemptions for electric vehicles (EVs).

Recommendation R11.3 to provide financial support for charging infrastructure is not supported. Local Government in Canterbury have shown leadership in already providing charging infrastructure in Kaikoura, Hurunui, Christchurch, Ashburton and Waimate, and so Central Government subsidies for this infrastructure is not seen as a worthwhile use of the public purse to incentivise a national network of charging infrastructure stations. In the Waimakariri District EV charging stations are already in place at the Warehouse and Mainpower.

Recommendation R13.1 to shift the primary mandate of the Energy Efficiency and Conservation Authority (EECA) from conserving energy to lowering emissions is fully supported.

Recommendation R14.2 to amend the *Waste Minimisation Act 2008* to apply the waste disposal levy to all known and consented waste disposal facilities is supported, subject to an assessment of the costs to residents. This Council agrees that the waste disposal levy of $10 per tonne is too low, and does not reflect the true costs of emissions from this source. This Council agrees with the MfE conclusion that “gradually increasing the levy will drive the message that waste disposal is unviable and will provide the necessary signals to industry to prepare for this change well in advance”.

Recommendation R14.4 to require farm dumps to have a resource consent is fully supported. Local Government currently have the general powers of competence to make bylaws in this arena, however a National Environmental Standard relating to waste is a more effective tool to achieve national consistency.

Recommendation R14.5 to consider a partial waste disposal levy is supported because raising both ETS charges and a landfill levy would be a significant cost burden to residents. Local Government could use any increases in the levy to assist with the cost of diverting organic wastes from landfill.
Recommendations R15.1 and 15.2 to review the Building Code is supported particularly relating to more stringent energy efficient standards, but these recommendations could go further. As Building Consent Authorities, Local Government innovation to improve energy efficiency or conserve water are often frustrated by the need for compliance with minimum standards of the Building Code. To achieve zero emissions by 2050, large scale and sweeping reform of the Building Code will be necessary. In addition, the average size of a newly built dwelling in New Zealand rose from 110m² in 1974 to 197m² in 2013, despite a drop in the average occupancy of each home during the same time period. The average space per person has risen dramatically, and floor space and energy use is strongly correlated, so denser housing and smaller homes will have the effect of reducing carbon emissions.

**Comments on Questions asked in the draft Report**

The following responses are offered to some of the questions asked in the draft report.

Question 10.1 In relation to the point of obligation for agricultural emissions, this Council favours the option of full farm level assessments, and only including farms above a minimum size threshold. As with the Canterbury Regional Land and Water Plan, the requirement to calculate nitrate-nitrogen loss applies only to holdings greater than 10 hectares, and a consistent minimum size for a point of obligation for agricultural emissions would be helpful.

Question 10.2 Small areas of planting (including riparian planting) within the NZ ETS would be useful in not only contributing to carbon sequestration, but also contributing to surface water quality improvements and biodiversity enhancement, however this would have to be done within the context of international carbon accounting rules allowing riparian plantings of less than 30 metres to be counted as carbon credits.

Question 11.1 Phasing out fossil fuel vehicles by some specified future date is supported and follows the lead of UK and France phasing out fossil fuel vehicles by 2030.

Question 11.2 A price feebate scheme applying to heavy vehicles, as well as light vehicles entering the NZ fleet, is supported.

Question 12.1 It is not so much the *Resource Management Act 1991* that constrains investment in renewable electricity generation, particularly wind and hydro generation, but the electricity utilities that disadvantage households for supplementing their electricity generation with household-level solar panels and household wind turbines. While other OECD jurisdictions pay comparable rates for household renewable generation to contribute to the grid, this is not the case in New Zealand.

Question 13.1 Providing Fonterra with discretion to refuse milk supplies, where this would lead to inefficient land use and/or a significant increase in GHG emissions, would be a sensible reform in the long-term.

Questions 13.2 to 13.4 Amending NZ cement standards to permit greater use of lower carbon components is supported, although this is likely to occur anyway with a higher carbon price.

Questions 16.1 The ETS could be extended to cover wastewater treatment plants, although this Council has not quantified the costs of this proposal. Although not contributing a large percentage amount to the national emissions profile, it would not be a good example to exclude this source of emissions that are in the main a local government utility.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit to the Inquiry’s draft report.
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1. SUMMARY

1.1 Following a 5th December 2017 Council resolution adopting the recommendations of the Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2017 Hearings Panel, this report examines options with respect to wheelie bin ownership. This will need to be decided upon in the event that Council’s Long Term Plan includes the “your choice” wheelie bin kerbside waste collection services.

1.2 Morrison Low have been engaged to provide a report on the relative merits of the two options available: either Council owning the bins, or the successful kerbside collection contractor owning the bins. The report is included as attachment (i).

1.3 There are two key issues to be considered. The first is the overall difference in cost to the Council and ratepayers between Council or the contractor owning the bins. Morrison Low have concluded that this difference would be small. However, Council purchase of the bins would increase Council’s overall debt, which may not be prudent at this time.

1.4 The second is the issue of bin maintenance and bin management. Council has no expertise in bin maintenance and if Council owned the bins the sensible option would be to include bin maintenance in the collection contract. Council could manage the administrative side of bin management, but would need additional resources to be able to do so. However, this is core business for waste companies and it is not credible that Council could manage it more efficiently than they can.

1.5 It is therefore recommended that contractor ownership of the bins is the best model.

Attachments:

i. Morrison Low report on bin ownership (Trim 180507049167)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Solid & Hazardous Waste Working Party recommends:
THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180502047890.

(b) Requests staff to develop the contract documentation for kerbside collection contracts on the basis that the contractor will own the bins

3. BACKGROUND

(c) On the recommendation of the Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2017 Hearings Panel, the Council resolved on 5 December 2017 to

"Request staff to bring further advice to the Council following the LTP consultation regarding the option of the Council or the Contractor owning the bins".

3.1 Pending the final Council decision on whether it will introduce additional choices for kerbside collection services, in a report to Council’s meeting on 1 May 2018, staff sought approval for the matter to be first considered by the Solid & Hazardous Waste Working Party (S&HWWP). Approval was given, and a recommendation from the S&WWP on this matter will go to the 5 June Council meeting for a decision.

3.2 Staff have engaged Morrison Low to provide support for the procurement of the waste service contracts. Their proposal included providing additional advice on matters such as bin ownership. Their report on bin ownership is included in this report as Attachment (i).

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. This Council previously made the decision for the kerbside collection contractor to supply the bins under the current contract, and will purchase the bins at their depreciated value at the end of the contract. The intent was to on-sell the bins at that cost to the new collection contractor, removing any advantage that the incumbent contractor had from their ownership of the bins.

4.2. We have been asked to consider the option of Council retaining ownership of the recycling bins and purchase of the new bins, in the event that the “your choice” wheelee bin kerbside waste collection services proceed. Morrison Low have provided advice about this matter in their report in Attachment (i), which covers off the “pro's and con’s” of the two possible options

4.3. The two options are that either the Council purchases the bins, or the contractor purchases the bins. In the latter case the contractor would, as a matter of course, manage bin maintenance and replacement. If the Council owned the bins, it would have to arrange an additional component to the collection contract for maintenance of the bins.

4.4. Bin ownership and management is core to any waste collection contractors business, and they already have the infrastructure and systems in place to take on an additional number of bins. Our Council does not have these systems in place, nor the expertise, for bin maintenance. If the Council owned the bins, it could possibly manage the administration side of bin delivery, tracking and replacement, but it would have to set up new systems, which would involve additional staff resourcing, purchase of software, etc. It would require working closely with the contractor, for the bin delivery etc. and would likely be less efficient than having the whole operation managed by the contractor, with the contractor providing regular reporting to Council.

4.5. The other factor for consideration is the cost of the purchase. Morrison Low have advised that with the current low cost of credit that waste companies do not see a contract requirement that they purchase the bins as a barrier to tendering, although acknowledge that smaller companies would be facing higher borrowing rates.
4.6. This means that the distinguishing difference between Council purchase and contractor purchase, would be that Council purchase would increase Council’s overall debt. At a time when Council is reaching its debt limit, this does not seem a prudent approach, especially given the alternative that is available with no particular negative consequences.

4.7. A decision on the contract term has yet to be made. Wheelie bin life is nominally expected to be 15 years. A contract term of 7 to 8 years lines up with the expected life of a collection truck, and is one option. Alternatively a contract term of 15 years can be considered. The contract term does not significantly impact on the decision regarding bin ownership. If the shorter term is selected, and the contractor owned the bins, the contract would include for Council to purchase the bins at their depreciated value, and they would be on sold to the next contractor for the subsequent contract period. This is the methodology recommended in the Morrison Low report.

4.8. The current recycling wheelie bins will be approximately half way through their life at the end of the current contract, and the contract terms are that Council will purchase them from the contractor at their depreciated value. If the contractor is to own the bins they will be on sold to the contractor as per the previous paragraph.

4.9. Morrison Low have also considered the issue of whether requiring contractor ownership of the bins would be a barrier to smaller waste companies. They have concluded that it is not, as the certainty of payment from the Council for the kerbside collection services, would enable smaller contractors to leverage reasonable credit rates.

4.10. The Management Team have reviewed this report and support the recommendations.

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

As part of the wider community consultation the local waste industry has provided its views on the proposed introduction of additional wheelie bin based kerbside collection services, but has not been specifically consulted on the ownership of the bins.

5.2. Wider Community

N/A

6. IMPlications AND RISks

6.1. Financial Implications

The ongoing costs for bin maintenance will have to be funded through kerbside collection rates regardless of who owns the bins, and the cost-differential is expected to be minor.

Larger companies may have better ‘buying power’ than a Council and their initial bin purchase price is likely to be lower than ours. Morrison Low advise that they would expect the larger companies with international linkages to be able to purchase bins at about $5 less per bin. Second and third tier companies will have similar purchasing power as the Council so would be expected to pay the same as Council for their bins.

As noted in Section 4.5 there would be a difference in borrowing rates, with again the larger companies having the advantage. Those with direct access to overseas borrowing through their overseas arms or parent companies, might be able to borrow for 2.5%, considerably lower than the Council’s 5%. Smaller firms borrowing through banks or other local funding institutions might be paying 7%.
Using these differences to calculate annual interest costs provides the table below. The table assumes that the existing recycling bins would be bought at the same value by either the Council, or any of the contractors. Refuse and organics bin numbers are based on a 50% take up. Total amount borrowed is also shown in the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Council</th>
<th>Major Contractor</th>
<th>Minor contractors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required borrowing</td>
<td>$1,890,000</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
<td>$1,890,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual interest</td>
<td>$94,500</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$132,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A capital purchase of this size, which is avoidable, may not be advisable at this time, with Council approaching its debt ceiling.

Additional operational costs would be incurred for depreciation, loan payment, storage, delivery, swap or removal of bins, management of stock, invoicing for stolen/lost/maliciously damaged bins, and management of a bin database. This is part of the core business for waste companies, and it is not credible that Council could manage bin maintenance more effectively than the contractor. If Council were to undertake bin maintenance, it would have to resource to administer this. More sensibly, it could require the contractor to do so in the contract. Having the Council manage bin maintenance would also open up potential problems at the interface between the Council and the contractor.

6.2. Community Implications

The decision has no community implications. Whether the bins are owned by the contractor or the Council, homeowners will see the same level of service being offered, and the cost differences between the options from the perspective of users of kerbside services will be minimal.

6.3. Risk Management

There is a risk that if Council owned the bins the contractor’s drivers may not take as much care not to damage the bins as they would if the contractor owned the bins, increasing replacement and maintenance costs. This could be controlled through a partnership approach and also through penalties for careless damage in the contract, but that would require additional administration effort.

If Council owned and managed the bins, there is a risk that Council would manage them less efficiently, and any potential gains from the marginal benefit from slightly better cost of credit could quickly be eroded.

Notwithstanding the comments in the Morrison Low report under Option 2, there is a risk that, if Council requires the contractor to own the bins, this will be seen as a barrier to smaller contractors participating in the procurement process. This would not mean however that a good number of contractors would not be interested in bidding. Morrison Low advise that there are 9 likely contractors, excluding local interest.
6.4. **Health and Safety**

Health & safety is an important component in the solid waste contracts to ensure the safety and wellbeing of the public, contractors and Council staff, but bin ownership has no influence on health and safety.

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

This matter is not a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy. The decision will not alter the LTP by more than 5% of the budgeted rating revenue, nor will it have any substantial impact on the resident population.

7.2. **Legislation**

**Waste Minimisation Act 2008**

S52(1): A territorial authority may undertake, or contract for, any waste management and minimisation service, facility, or activity (whether the service, facility, or activity is undertaken in its own district or otherwise).

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

k. **Core utility services are provided in a timely and sustainable manner:**

- Council sewerage and water supply schemes, and drainage and waste collection services are provided to a high standard.

7.4. **Delegations**

N/A

Simon Collin  
Infrastructure Strategy Manager
Bin Ownership – Waste Services Procurement  
Waimakariri District Council, May 2018

Background

Waimakariri District Council is rolling out new bin collection services as part of its waste services procurement. New bins will be required for properties that opt-in to the rubbish bin collection service and organics collection service. The cost of new bin acquisition is expected to be approximately $1.75 million. In addition, there will be a residual buy-out of existing recycling bins in circulation, estimated at $0.25 million, bringing total bin investment to approximately $2 million. This report considers bin ownership and funding options to support this investment.

Bin ownership options

The following options are typically used for bin ownership and funding in New Zealand:

1. Council buys and owns bins outright
2. Contractor buys bins, amortises them over the term and Council owns at the end of the term
3. Contractor buys bins, owns them during the term and removes them at the end of the term

Option 1: Council buys and owns bins outright

Consideration for bin ownership is largely dependent on Council’s view of asset ownership of non-infrastructure items, and its ability to fund a $2 million financial purchase via its debt facility. Council has a favourable cost of capital and therefore direct ownership is potentially economically favourable.

This option is viable if debt levels are not a constraint. However, if Council’s debt position is at, or near, capacity, then the other bin ownership options are more viable for Council.

Option 2: Contractor buys bins and Council owns at end

This is the most common methodology used in New Zealand. Under this option the cost of bin purchase is spread over the life of the contract and Council makes a payment at the end of the term to the contractor for residual bin value. This includes valuing additional bins distributed during the contract term.

This option relies on the contractor having adequate access to capital which could limit the number of potential respondents. The larger contractors have access to favourable capital rates, participating in global treasury facilities as a consequence of their ownership structures. It could be assumed that the cost of capital of the larger contractors is similar to, or better than, Council’s as a consequence of this. Larger contractors are also able to leverage their national buying power for more favourable purchasing rates than are available to Council.

Second-tier contractors will access capital either through retained earnings or borrowings, and will be able to factor this cost, essentially at market rates, into the contract.

Smaller, or local, contractors could potentially be disadvantaged due to capital constraints, however securing a Council contract offers smaller participants better access to credit facilities and therefore this barrier.
becomes less of a disadvantage to them. Smaller contractors will have the same bin volume to leverage when purchasing as Council would, effectively a neutral position in comparison.

On balance, access to capital is not seen as a constraint to smaller contractors participating in the procurement process. In recent discussions with waste contractors associated with procurement of another Council’s waste services, both large and small operators indicated they would be able to fund the purchase of bins for the contract. The territorial authority in question has a current property rateable database of approximately 25,000 households; it is therefore anticipated that the lower household number in Waimakariri District would be less of a barrier for contractors.

**Option 3: Contractor owns bins and removes at end**

This option is similar to Option 3 but the contractor retains ownership of the bins at the end of the contract and removes them. This option was recently tested in the procurement of a neighbouring Council’s waste services and ultimately the contractor’s ownership of the bins provided them a competitive advantage in the procurement process in that they were able to redeploy their bins in the new contract, reducing the cost to Council.

We would only recommend this option if a long contract term was proposed (greater than 15 years) whereby the bins would be at the end of their life at the end of the contract term, with all new bins to be rolled out in the subsequent contract.

**Bin asset management**

Bin asset management includes:

- Coordinating the supply and distribution of new bins, as well as replacement bins or bins for new eligible properties during the contract term
- Maintaining the bin asset database, linked to customer data
- Management of bin maintenance and refurbishment
- General requests for service associated with bin issues
- Provision for the storage space for bins, along with the associated cost of storage and stock-holding

Managing these requirements will necessitate the commitment of additional resources. Regardless of the bin ownership option selected, these functions generally sit with the contractor as this ensures efficient and efficient control of the bin service and functionality. It is proposed that the new contract also specify direct Council access to the bin database managed by the contractor, so that Council can link bin data to customer billing, as well as direct Contractor access to Council’s customer relationship management tool to enable the contractor to respond directly to Requests for Service.

**Recommendation**

It is recommended that initial bin ownership, and on-going maintenance, distribution and management of the bin assets are passed to the Contractor through the collection contract, with Council assuming ownership of the asset at the contract end, with the methodology for agreeing any residual sum agreed upfront.

The contract will include the requirement for Council to have access to all asset and customer information associated with the bin user held by the contractor, during the contract term. Any Requests for Service relating to new or replacement bins will be directed to the contractor for action.
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1 Under current legislative requirements in Section 17A of the Local Government Act we are required to review the delivery of solid waste services every 6 years, or within 2 years before the expiry of a contract. In accordance with this requirement, staff undertook a full S17A service delivery review of the solid waste contracts in April/May 2016.

1.2 The recommendation from that S17A review was adopted by the Audit Committee in May and subsequently by the Council in June. Preparations for re-tendering both the kerbside collection and transfer station operation and maintenance contracts have begun, using the adopted service delivery methodology from the S17A review.

1.3 At their workshop on 5 April the Solid & Hazardous Waste Working Party (SHWWP) proposed the option of Council undertaking the transfer station operations instead of contracting these out. Staff were also requested to circulate the S17A report to the members of the S&HWWP.

1.4 Staff subsequently circulated the requested documentation and requested Morrison Low to provide a proposal to undertake a review of the options for transfer station operations and maintenance.

1.5 This report presents the Morrison Low proposal, which is to undertake the above review for an estimated $7,000. The assessment of transfer station options would focus on the following options:

   a. Status quo – out-sourced operation and maintenance of Oxford Refuse Transfer Station (RTS) and Southbrook Resource Recover Park (RRP)

   b. Out-sourced operation and maintenance of Oxford RTS and Southbrook RRP supported by community group for resource recovery activities

   c. In-house operation and maintenance of Oxford RTS and Southbrook RRP

   d. In-house operation and maintenance of Oxford RTS and Southbrook RRP supported by community group for resource recovery activities
1.6 Staff are seeking guidance from the Solid & Hazardous Waste Working Party as to whether the Working party would support:

a. Option 1: Continuing to prepare the tender documentation for both contracts following the recommendation approved by the Audit Committee in 2016, without reviewing service delivery options;

b. Option 2: Undertaking a full transfer station service delivery review in parallel with preparing the tender documentation for both contracts;

c. Option 3: Undertaking a full transfer station service delivery review before preparing the tender documentation for the transfer station operations & maintenance contract;

d. Option 4: Undertaking a full transfer station service delivery review before preparing the tender documentation for both contracts; or

e. Option 5: undertaking a reduced-scope review of options as per 1.5a and 1.5b while continuing to prepare tender documentation for both contracts.

1.7 Staff note that all of the alternative options in Section 1.5 could be considered during the S17A reviews that are required two years prior to the end of the Council’s upcoming long-term Solid Waste contracts.

Attachments:

i. Morrison Low Proposal to Review Options for Transfer Station Operations & Maintenance (TRIM 180502048028)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Solid & Hazardous Waste Working Party:

(a) Receives report No. 180502048027.

(b) Notes that the Section 17A review of the Delivery of Refuse and Recyclables Transfer Services and Kerbside Collection services (TRIM 160504040305) was circulated to the members of the SHWWP by email on 9 April 2018.

(c) Approves Option 5: modify the scope of the review and do not delay tender preparation.

(d) Approves that the tender documents will be initially prepared on the basis that the operation and maintenance of Oxford Refuse Transfer Station and Southbrook Resource Recover Park will be out-sourced, with an allowance for support by a community group for resource recovery activities.

(e) Notes that both contracts are scheduled to commence in July 2019 and that the contract terms have yet to be finalised.

(f) Notes that the most appropriate time for undertaking a full Section 17A review of service delivery would within 2 years of the end of the new contracts.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 Staff undertook a full review of solid waste service delivery in April/May 2016. This resulted in a recommendation to the Audit Committee “that funding and governance arrangements for these waste services remains unchanged from the status quo, and that the Council’s waste transfer station and kerbside collection services be delivered by Council going to the market with the following packages of work:
a. Package 1 - refuse and recycling collection only;

b. Package 2 - Transfer Station Services including:
   i. Both Southbrook and Oxford Transfer Stations operation – handing all materials delivered to both sites, including compaction of residual waste into Transwaste Containers;
   ii. Transport and disposal of all recyclables;
   iii. Transport only of cleanfill;
   iv. Transport, processing, and disposal of greenwaste;
   v. Transport and appropriate disposal of hazardous and electronic waste;
   vi. Transport and disposal of tyres.

c. Package 3 – combination of package 1 and 2.”

3.2 The Audit Committee endorsed that recommendation at their meeting on 17 May 2016, and the Council approved the S17A reviews at their meeting on 7 June 2016.

3.3 This approved service delivery methodology has been used when preparing cost estimates for consultation on bin collection services as part of the Waste Management & Minimisation Plan (WMMP) review, for the Long Term Plan consultation, and in the early preparation stages for retendering the contracts.

3.4 At their workshop on 5 April 2018, which was to update the SHWWP on progress towards the public engagement process in the event that Council approves providing a "your choice” bin kerbside collection service, the SHWWP proposed the options of Council undertaking the operations instead of contracting these out, and of a community group running the second hand shop operations at the resource recovery park.

3.5 Staff were also requested to circulate the S17A report to the members of the S&HWWP, and this was emailed to the members on 9 April.

3.6 Staff subsequently asked Morrison Low for a proposal to undertake a review of the options for transfer station operations and maintenance. The proposal is appended as Attachment i. The estimated cost for the review is $7,000 and would focus on the following options for transfer station operations:

   a. Status quo – out-sourced operation and maintenance of Oxford RTS and Southbrook RRP
   b. Out-sourced operation and maintenance of Oxford RTS and Southbrook RRP supported by community group for resource recovery activities
   c. In-house operation and maintenance of Oxford RTS and Southbrook RRP
   d. In-house operation and maintenance of Oxford RTS and Southbrook RRP supported by community group for resource recovery activities

3.7 Staff are bringing this to the SHWWP to determine if the full review should proceed or a modified review would be supported, given their interest in this matter.
4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. **Option 1: do nothing.** That is, do not review the options for transfer station operations and maintenance. This will have the least impact on tendering and engagement timelines. Staff consider that the original S17A review was robust and the recommendations from that review have been approved by both the Audit Committee and the Council.

4.2. It should be noted that the Council is required to undertake service delivery reviews two years prior to the end of long-term contracts, and these alternative options could be considered during that review under this option.

4.3. **Option 2: accept the Morrison Low proposal and do not delay tender preparation.** This option would see the kerbside collection and transfer station operation & maintenance (O&M) tender documentation continue to be prepared with the assumption that the Morrison Low report and subsequent considerations will not change the format and methodology of the tender process. If there is no change to the outcomes from this second review, or only a minor change, there would be no impact on tendering and implementation timelines.

4.4. There is a risk that the outcomes of this review could be substantially different to the adopted S17A methodology, and the tendering timeline may be affected by the need to amend the documents. Either or both current collection and transfer station O&M contracts may need to be extended under this scenario. This would impact on public expectations, particularly if the kerbside collection contract is delayed, and may impact on tendered costs. This is discussed in paragraph 5 in S6.1 and paragraphs 4 and 5 in S6.3.

4.5. **Option 3: accept the Morrison Low proposal and delay preparing the transfer station O&M tender until the outcomes of the review are known and approved.** The kerbside collection tender documentation would continue to be prepared with the aim of tendering the collection contract based on the current timeline.

4.6. There is a risk that the synergies expected from an integrated tender would not be provided under this option, which could result in higher collection costs than forecast during the WMMP review and LTP consultation. This would impact on the final kerbside collection rate charges as discussed in paragraph 5 in S6.1. There is a further risk that the outcomes of the review could be substantially different to the currently approved S17A methodology, and this is discussed in paragraphs 4 & 5 in S6.3 below.

4.7. **Option 4: accept the Morrison Low proposal and delay preparing both tenders until the outcomes of the review are known and approved.** This would delay the starting date of the interactive tender process and also the implementation of the new contract(s).

4.8. Both collection and transfer station O&M contracts would need to be extended under this scenario. This would impact on public expectations. If the outcome of the review was to tender both contracts as currently proposed, we would still receive potential cost benefits because of the synergies from an integrated tender.

4.9. If the outcomes of the review are substantially different to the currently approved S17A methodology, resulting in a significant change in service delivery for transfer station O&M, it would be a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy. This is discussed in paragraph 5 of S6.3. Tendering the kerbside collection contract in isolation from the transfer station O&M contract has the potential to increase tendered costs as discussed in paragraph 5 in S6.1.

4.10. **Option 5: modify the scope of the review and do not delay tender preparation.** The suggested scope change would be to limit the review to consideration of the two out-
sourced operation options, with or without support from a community group for the resource recovery activities. This is the preferred option.

4.11. This option would see the kerbside collection and transfer station operation & maintenance (O&M) tender documentation continue to be prepared with the assumption that there would be community involvement in the resource recovery activities. The costs for this review would be less than the estimated $7,000 for the original proposal.

4.12. The Morrison Low report and subsequent considerations from Option 5 would not significantly change the format and methodology of the tender process. If there is no change to the outcomes from this second review, or only a minor change, there would be little impact on tendering and implementation timelines.

4.13. The Management Team have reviewed this report and support the recommendations.

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

The waste industry anticipates that the Council will be tendering both contracts early in the 18/19 financial year.

When the Southbrook RRP site was initially upgraded in 2011, there was some initial interest from a local charity to work with Waste Management in running the resource recovery area at Southbrook. This partnership never eventuated because the charity moved to larger premises. No other group has approached the Council or contractor with an interest in operating the second hand shop.

5.2. Wider Community

There has been significant consultation with the wider community as part of the WMMP and LTP processes. Many who have submitted to the LTP in favour of the “your choice” collection service want it provided as soon as possible.

There will be significant engagement with ratepayers during the tender preparation and in the lead up to the implementation of the new kerbside collection to confirm the services for each property.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

Staff discussed using Morrison Low to project manage the solid waste procurement process with the Solid & Hazardous Waste Working Party at their workshop on 5 April 2018. The members of the working party were generally supportive of this approach, noted that the costs were to be spread over two financial years and that there was sufficient funding available for engaging Morrison Low to undertake this work.

Staff received Management Team approval to engage Morrison Low to provide solid waste procurement services at an estimated cost of $140,200 over the current and next financial years, and this work has begun.

Staff estimate that there is a further budget availability of $5,600 in 17/18 and $32,400 in 18/19 but anticipate that this would be utilised to fund the interactive tender costs and also part-fund the ratepayer engagement process and preparation and production of informational material to be delivered with the new collection bins.
The costs of undertaking the transfer station operations review would be an additional $7,000 to $10,000 in the 17/18 year, which is currently unbudgeted work. A modified review as proposed for Option 5 would be at a lower cost and most likely could be accommodated within current budgets.

There would be a higher cost to the Council in undertaking separate interactive tendering processes for the two contracts, which could occur under option 3. There is an additional risk that undertaking two separate tendering processes, or a single tender just for kerbside collection, could result in higher collection costs than forecast during the WMMP review. This is because we assumed that there would be cost-savings as a result of the synergies from an integrated tender. This would impact on the final collection rate charges.

6.2. Community Implications

Undertaking a review at this stage could impact on tendering timelines and prices, both of which would impact on the community by potentially delaying the collection contract and potentially increasing the final rates.

6.3. Risk Management

As mentioned in S3.3 above, the assumptions made when preparing cost estimates for consultation on bin collection services as part of the Waste Management & Minimisation Plan (WMMP) review, and for the Long Term Plan consultation process were based on approved service delivery methodology. All preparations for retendering the kerbside collection and transfer station operations & maintenance contracts have also been based on this methodology.

Morrison Low have begun preparing the tender documents and are working to a tight deadline. A review of the transfer station operations can be undertaken in parallel with that process but may result in a higher level of uncertainty in tender preparation which would require more adjustments once a final decision has been made on service delivery for the transfer station O&M contract.

The review has the potential to delay starting the proposed expression of interest stage of the interactive tendering process. If the review outcomes were to result in a significant change in service delivery for transfer station O&M, it would require more than a minor amount of adjustment in the tender documentation or even result in the Council not tendering the transfer station O&M contract.

This would delay the starting date of the interactive tender process for one or both contracts and also delay the implementation of the new contract(s).

If Council were to undertake the site operations, that would be a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy. The current transfer station O&M contract costs are approximately $4,000,000 per annum, and Council undertaking the site operations would involve a considerable capital spend. Any such changes would need to be delayed either until a full special consultative procedure (SCP) is undertaken or until after the next Annual Plan’s budget and consultation rounds, which would necessitate a further extension to the contract.

6.4. Health and Safety

Health & safety is an important component in delivery of solid waste services, and this will be an important factor in any review of service delivery whether by Council, contractor, or a community organisation and their volunteers. In any case the Waimakariri District Council as employer or Principal would be responsible for the health & safety of staff, volunteers and customers of our transfer station sites.
7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

This matter is a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

If a review is undertaken that then impacts on the tendering timeline for the transfer station operation & maintenance contract, this would be a matter of significance, as more than 5% of the population would be impacted by a delay in the introduction of the planned new services.

The Council’s Procurement Policy requires all major work to be subject to an open and competitive procurement process. Alternative options for delivery of the waste services that align with this policy are limited.

7.2. **Legislation**

The Local Government Act (S17A) makes it mandatory for Councils to periodically review the ‘cost effectiveness of current arrangements’ for service delivery including ‘the governance, funding and delivery of any infrastructure, service or regulatory function’. A review must be undertaken:

- In conjunction with consideration of any significant change to relevant service levels; and
- Within 2 years before the expiry of any contract or other binding agreement relating to the delivery of that infrastructure, service, or regulatory function; and
- At such other times as the local authority considers desirable, but not later than 6 years following the last review under subsection (1).

Waste Minimisation Act 2008 S52(1): A territorial authority may undertake, or contract for, any waste management and minimisation service, facility, or activity (whether the service, facility, or activity is undertaken in its own district or otherwise).

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

**k. Core utility services are provided in a timely and sustainable manner**

- Council sewerage and water supply schemes, and drainage and waste collection services are provided to a high standard.\(^1\,^4\)
- Waste recycling and re-use of solid waste is encouraged and residues are managed so that they minimise harm to the environment.\(^1\,^3\,^4\)

7.4. **Delegations**

The Audit and Risk Committee (and its precursor being the Audit Committee) has the delegated authority to review significant Council activities and expenditure, including Reviews under Section 17A of the Local Government Act 2002, and recommend to the Council any proposed changes to services, levels of service and the method of funding, or significant changes in the method of service delivery.

Kitty Waghorn  
Solid Waste Asset Manager
Hi Kitty and Simon

Please find below a methodology and price to undertake a review of options for transfer station operation and maintenance operations.

Background
At the Solid & Hazardous Waste Working Party on 5th April 2018, officers were asked to consider the option of the Council directly operating the Southbrook Resource Recovery Park and Oxford Transfer station with the possibility of a community group or charity running the second-hand shop at Southbrook and retaining the income. Currently the operation and maintenance of these sites is contracted out.

It is noted that Council has completed a Section 17A service delivery review for its waste services ahead of procurement. With regard to transfer station operation it concluded that operations should remain contracted out due to the commercial nature of transfer station operations.

Council is seeking support to model the cost of delivering transfer station services in-house compared with out-sourced delivery. In addition Council is seeking a comparison of the financial (from the cost modelling) and non-financial benefits of these options.

Methodology
Morrison Low have significant experience in waste service delivery and have modelled waste facility operating costs for a number of councils including Far North, Auckland, Central Otago, Nelson and Horowhenua.

The assessment of transfer station options will focus on the following options:
1. Status quo – out-sourced operation and maintenance of Oxford RTS and Southbrook RRP
2. Out-sourced operation and maintenance of Oxford RTS and Southbrook RRP supported by community group for resource recovery activities
3. In-house operation and maintenance of Oxford RTS and Southbrook RRP
4. In-house operation and maintenance of Oxford RTS and Southbrook RRP supported by community group for resource recovery activities

Our proposed approach to undertaking the comparison of transfer station operation options is:
1. Review current out-sourced contract including scope of services delivered, transfer station throughput (tonnages), resources and costs with a view to understanding how these might be delivered under an in-house model in future. There may be elements that will continue to be out-sourced as well as elements well suited to being delivered by a community group. Visit the two transfer station sites to gain a greater understanding of the resources currently used to deliver the services at the sites. This visit will be timed to coincide with other project-related meetings for efficiency in time and cost.
2. Prepare a cost model for in-house service delivery that enables a comparison of with the current out-sourced model. As part of the assessment, consideration will be given to both capital costs and operating expenditure required for in-house and out-sourced delivery. The costs will be compared on an NPV basis.
3. Undertake a comparative assessment of the four transfer station options (listed above) using an adapted better business case approach, whereby the options are compared using the following criteria:
   a. Alignment with strategic objectives
   b. Potential value for money
   c. Supplier capability
d. Supplier capacity  
e. Affordability  
f. Potential achievability  

4. Presentation of the review findings, including the options assessment table and costs, in a brief report that can be presented back to the Solid & Hazardous Waste Working Party. The draft report will be provided to you for review and feedback.

5. Teleconference feedback session to discuss your feedback and preparation of the final options report.

Programme
There is a need for this assessment to be completed in time to report back to the next meeting of the Solid & Hazardous Waste Working Party in mid-late May. It is estimated that a draft will be completed by 15th May 2018 and, subject to the timing of the review, the final report will be completed by Monday 21st May 2018.

Price
Our estimated price to complete this transfer station options assessment is $7,000 (plus GST plus disbursements).

The review of transfer station options supplements the main waste contracts procurement project we are currently undertaking. We have taken this into account when considering the estimated fee for this proposal. For example, the review of existing information (Step 1) is required for both the waste contracts procurement and this options assessment. We have also factored in the efficiency gained from visiting Southbrook RRP as part of the workshop on 26th April 2018.

We trust this in line with your requirements for the business case, but are happy to discuss and amend as needed.

Thanks
Alice
Canterbury Mayoral Forum mid-term review, May 2018

Purpose

1. This report provides a mid-term summary of progress and achievements in implementing the Canterbury Local Authorities’ Triennial Agreement 2017–19.

Triennial Agreement

2. As required by the Local Government Act 2002 (S.15), local authorities within the Canterbury region concluded a Triennial Agreement in February 2017. The purpose of the Triennial Agreement is to ensure appropriate levels of communication, co-ordination and collaboration between local authorities within a region.

3. The Triennial Agreement mandates the work of the Canterbury Mayoral Forum, Chief Executives Forum, Policy Forum and other regional and sub-regional forums and working groups.

4. Specific commitments in the Triennial Agreement for 2017–19 include:
   - continuing to implement the Canterbury Water Management Strategy (CWMS)
   - continuing to develop and implement the Canterbury Regional Economic Development Strategy (CREDS)
   - developing and giving voice to a shared vision and joint advocacy for Canterbury
   - integrated transport planning for the region
   - investigating options for delivery of 3 Waters services in Canterbury
   - implementing a collaborative planning and decision-making process, including integrated RMA planning
   - ensuring effective resilience and response to civil defence and emergency management, and natural hazard risk management.

Regional forums

5. The Mayoral Forum and regional forums that support its work meet quarterly. In 2017, the Chief Executives Forum established two additional regional forums (Corporate Forum, Operations Forum), to co-ordinate the activities of regional working groups and ensure that together we can drive efficiencies and better provide for the needs of our communities through
the provision of good quality local infrastructure, local public services and performance of regulatory functions (Local Government Act 2002, S.10).

6. As agreed in the Mayoral Forum Charter of Purpose, the five regional forums are supported by a permanent secretariat hosted by Environment Canterbury: 2 FTE staff (funded through the regional general rate) and a CREDS Project Manager (fixed term, funded by the Regional Growth Programme).

7. In this local government term, the Mayoral Forum has extended standing invitations to attend its meetings to:
   - Helen Wyn, Senior Regional Official for Canterbury (Department of Internal Affairs)
   - Lisa Tumahai, Kaiwhakahaere, Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu
   - Joanna Norris, Chief Executive, ChristchurchNZ.

8. In February 2017, the Mayoral Forum approved a three-year work programme. The Chief Executives Forum oversees implementation of the work programme, and reports quarterly to the Mayoral Forum. The CREDS Project Manager reports bi-monthly to MBIE on the implementation of projects funded by central government, and quarterly to the Chief Executives and Mayoral Forums.
Canterbury Water Management Strategy (CWMS)

9. The Mayoral Forum continues to oversee the implementation of the CWMS, which it initiated and adopted in 2009. Environment Canterbury collates a quarterly update report on the CWMS to the Chief Executives and Mayoral Forums.

10. The Forum is currently developing intermediary targets (2025, 2030) for the period 2020–2040, to ensure the CWMS continues to be ‘fit for the future’. An initial report was considered by the Mayoral Forum in May 2018, with a final report to be presented in April 2019.

Leading regional development in Canterbury

Refreshing the CREDS


Leveraging central government funding

12. Between local body elections in October 2016 and May 2018, the Mayoral Forum has leveraged, or helped leverage, $7,267,239 in central government funding for regional development projects in Canterbury.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Funding received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CREDS ‘accelerator projects’, June 2017</td>
<td>$2,185,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional CREDS projects, April 2018</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism infrastructure co-funding, November 2016</td>
<td>$988,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism infrastructure co-funding, June 2017</td>
<td>$1,194,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism infrastructure co-funding, December 2017</td>
<td>$2,699,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,267,239</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Through its partnership with the Regional Growth Programme, the Mayoral Forum secured central government funding of $2.185m for 11 ‘accelerator projects’ to kick start implementation of the refreshed CREDS launched in June 2017.¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Funding received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Strategic policy analysis and advice, regional transport</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cell phone and broadband coverage mapping</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Encouraging rural broadband uptake and use</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Youth transitions</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Job Ready Programme</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Improve productivity (contract over five years with ChristchurchNZ)</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ As at May 2018, contracts have been let and work is underway on projects 1–7, and 9–11; work is complete on project 10; project 8 is being pursued through conversations with KiwiRail, NZTA, the Ministry of Transport, Treasury, the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (MBIE) and ChristchurchNZ.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Funding received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. High-value manufacturing (contract over four years with University of Canterbury)</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Rail passenger services south of Christchurch – feasibility study</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. CREDS project management</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. CREDS indicators reporting</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Canterbury brand story</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$2,185,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. In addition, central government funding has been sought and provisionally obtained (May 2018) for:
   - seed funding for an Agritech Pavilion at the NZ Agricultural Show in Christchurch in November 2018 ($50,000)
   - development of a web-based shared major events calendar for Canterbury and the South Island ($150,000).

   - In November 2016, the Kaikōura, Mackenzie and Timaru District Councils secured a total of $988,335 from round one of the Regional Mid-sized Tourism Facilities Grant Fund – 32% of the total distribution of $3,050,000.
   - In June 2017, the Ashburton, Hurunui, Mackenzie and Waitaki District Councils secured a total of $1,194,254 from round two of the Regional Mid-sized Tourism Facilities Grant Fund – 23% of the total allocation of $5,233,336.
   - In December 2017, the Hurunui, Selwyn and Mackenzie District Councils secured a total of $2,699,650 from the Tourism Infrastructure Fund – 19% of the total allocation of $14,222,594.

14. The Forum has similarly supported member councils with applications to the 2018 funding round for the Tourism Infrastructure Fund.

15. The Chief Executives Forum and Regional Forums Secretariat provide co-ordination, advice and support to Canterbury expressions of interest in and applications to the Government’s Provincial Growth Programme and 1b Trees Programme.

**Understanding our changing population**

16. In 2017, the regional forums secretariat supported CREDS partner, the Committee for Canterbury, with analysis of population change and projected trends. This informed the Committee’s project, [Canterbury @ 1.5M](https://www.ecan.govt.nz/canterbury-1-5m), which seeks to stimulate and facilitate public debate on population policy for Christchurch and Canterbury.

17. Data and analysis of population change in Canterbury is hosted on the regional council’s website at [https://www.ecan.govt.nz/population](https://www.ecan.govt.nz/population)

**Supporting global awareness, tourism and trade**

18. For the last two years, the Mayoral Forum has supported the University of Canterbury with applications to the Prime Minister’s Scholarship for Asia for a programme in which students
visit China undertake research projects there. This has delivered research reports for the Mayoral Forum on:

- the different ways young Chinese ‘free and independent’ travellers hear about and find information on New Zealand and Canterbury, and the online channels they prefer to use
- migration intentions of young, highly skilled Chinese students.

19. Education partnerships are in place between Canterbury and Nagano Prefecture, Japan. In this term, the Mayoral Forum is investigating options to develop and extend Canterbury’s relationship with Nagano Prefecture, ‘region-to-region’.

**Standing together for Canterbury**


21. The following table summarises Mayoral Forum engagement and advocacy since October 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2016</td>
<td>Commerce Select Committee</td>
<td>Telecommunications (Property Access and Other Matters) Amendment Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2016</td>
<td>Minister of Economic Development</td>
<td>refresh of CREDS – and transitioning away from a rebuild economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>regional transport planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury brand story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>visitor strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>value-added production and advocacy for the Lincoln Hub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2017</td>
<td>Health Select Committee</td>
<td>Health (Fluoridation of Drinking Water) Amendment Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2017</td>
<td>Minister for Tertiary Education, Skills and Employment; Minister of Finance</td>
<td>Funding to secure the Lincoln Hub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2017</td>
<td>Ministry for the Environment</td>
<td>Submission on Clean Water Consultation 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2017</td>
<td>Lyttelton Port of Christchurch</td>
<td>Welcoming investment in a cruise ship berth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2017</td>
<td>Crown Fibre Holdings Ltd</td>
<td>Meeting to discuss fast broadband in rural Canterbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 2017</td>
<td>Minister of Local Government</td>
<td>Government inquiry into Havelock North drinking water contamination incident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 2017</td>
<td>Prime Minister; Minister of Immigration</td>
<td>Immigration policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 2017</td>
<td>Political party leaders</td>
<td>Immigration and the 2017 General Election</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 2017</td>
<td>Canterbury Regional Transport Committee</td>
<td>Timing of National Land Transport Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2017</td>
<td>Local Government Commission</td>
<td>Informal discussion of the work of the LGC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2017</td>
<td>Electorate and List MPs in Canterbury</td>
<td>Congratulations and introducing the Mayoral Forum, its work and priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2017</td>
<td>Incoming Ministers</td>
<td>Briefing letters introducing the Mayoral Forum, its work and priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 2018</td>
<td>Minister for Government Digital Services</td>
<td>Informal discussion with Mayoral Forum and stakeholders of priorities and opportunities in the CREDS digital connectivity work programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar – May 2018</td>
<td>Minister of Agriculture</td>
<td>Mycoplasma bovis response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 2018</td>
<td>Minister of Immigration</td>
<td>Government policies on immigration and international education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2018</td>
<td>Governance and Administration Committee</td>
<td>Submission on Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2018</td>
<td>Ministry of Business, Innovation &amp; Employment</td>
<td>Letter of support for applications to the Tourism Infrastructure Fund 2018 funding round from Christchurch City Council and the Kaikōura, Waimakariri, Selwyn, Timaru and Waitaki District Councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2018</td>
<td>New Zealand National Commission for UNESCO</td>
<td>Letters of support for the Waitaki Whitestone and Banks Peninsula Geoparks to become members of the UNESCO Global Geoparks Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2018</td>
<td>Minister of Tourism</td>
<td>Development of a tourism destination management strategy, and design and implementation of the proposed international visitor tourism and conservation levy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2018</td>
<td>Minister of Health</td>
<td>Release of Government Response to the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. In December 2017, the Mayoral Forum identified central government policies on immigration and international education as a priority for its analysis and advocacy in 2018. The Mayoral Forum is working with the Canterbury Employers’ Chamber of Commerce, BusinessNZ, ChristchurchNZ and international education providers to engage with central government officials and Ministers on policy options that will work for regional New Zealand (particularly the South Island), as well as for the country as a whole.

**Better local services**

23. Through its regional forums, Canterbury local authorities are investigating and/or working together on:

- options for delivering valuation and rating services
- 3 Waters managed by Canterbury local authorities
- engineering services and subdivision standards
- regulatory co-ordination – supported by a Compliance, Monitoring and Enforcement regional working group of senior regulatory managers established in February 2018
- contaminated land shared services
- managing natural hazards
- climate change adaptation
- infrastructure as a service – and common technology platforms
- public records management.
Collaborative RMA planning and decision making

24. The Canterbury Planning Managers Group reports to the Policy Forum and is a mechanism for co-ordination and collaboration on local government planning in Canterbury.

25. In February 2018, the Chief Executives Forum established a regional working group of senior regulatory managers (reporting to the Policy Forum) to support regulatory co-ordination across Canterbury local authorities.

26. Regional council planning staff are involved in three initiatives with territorial authorities:
   - co-location with colleagues in the Waimakariri, Selwyn and Timaru District Councils to support planning co-ordination and collaboration – with a planned extension to the Mackenzie and Waitaki District Councils
   - supporting alignment between Land Information New Zealand, the Department of Conservation and the Mackenzie and Waitaki District Councils in the Mackenzie Basin
   - working with the Greater Christchurch Partnership (the Selwyn and Waimakariri District Councils and the Christchurch City Council) to ensure that future settlement patterns nest with public transport and other infrastructure and provide sufficient growth and development opportunities post-quakes.
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1. The purpose of this report is to update the Council on Health and Safety matters for the month of April.

**Attachment**

i. Discharging Officer Health and Safety Duties  
ii. April 2018 Health and Safety Dashboard Report

2. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No 180420043230

3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

3.1. There are only two work-related accidents in this report, they are pending investigation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Occurrence</th>
<th>Event description</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 March</td>
<td>Accident</td>
<td>Rangiora Ashley Community Board member left the meeting being held in Loburn Pavilion into the dark car park which has no lights. They tripped and fell and was aided by a staff member to his car and checked for injury or shock. The board member drove home, texted to say confirm arrival and emailed the following morning to confirm he was OK. Staff found the area outside pitch black and were unable to find him on the ground without fetching colleagues with phone torches.</td>
<td>Awaiting Investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 April</td>
<td>Accident</td>
<td>Worker was delivering a motorised valve to Topp Engineering Kaiapoi from Pegasus water treatment plant.</td>
<td>Awaiting Investigation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2. The dashboard review shows:
   - Health and Safety staff are currently reviewing and improving some key high-risk procedures with relevant staff, such as Confined Space Entry procedure, Working at Heights procedure, Asbestos Management procedures.

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. Not applicable.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1 Not applicable

6. CONTEXT

6.1. Policy
   Not applicable

6.2. Legislation
   Key extracts from the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015, especially as it relates to Officers, were provided to the first meeting of this term of Council on 25 October 2016.

Jim Palmer
Chief Executive
### Discharging Officer Health and Safety Duties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OFFICER DUTIES</th>
<th>EXAMPLES OF ACTIVITIES TO SUPPORT DISCHARGE OF DUTIES</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>KNOW</strong></td>
<td>• Updates on new activities/major contracts</td>
<td>Various Committee reports Monthly, as required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Council reports to include Health and Safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>advice as relevant</td>
<td>Two-monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Audit Committee to receive minutes of Health and</td>
<td>As required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safety Committee meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Update on legislation and best practice changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to Audit Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Updates on new activities/major contracts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Council reports to include Health and Safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>advice as relevant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Audit Committee to receive minutes of Health and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safety Committee meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Update on legislation and best practice changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to Audit Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNDERSTAND</strong></td>
<td>• Induction of new Council through tour of District</td>
<td>Start of each new term and as required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and ongoing site visits.</td>
<td>Six monthly, or where major change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• H&amp;S Risk register to Audit Committee</td>
<td>At least annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Training on H&amp;S legislation and best practices</td>
<td>At least annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>updates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CCO activities reported to the Audit Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESOURCES</strong></td>
<td>• LTP or Annual Plan to have a specific report on</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H&amp;S resources</td>
<td>As required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reports to Committees will outline H&amp;S issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and resourcing, as appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MONITOR</strong></td>
<td>• Report to every Council meeting – standing</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>agenda item to include Dashboard Update and any</td>
<td>Six monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>major developments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Risk register review by Audit Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMPLY</strong></td>
<td>• Programme of H&amp;S internal work received by</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Audit Committee</td>
<td>As completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Internal Audit reports to Audit Committee</td>
<td>As required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Incident Investigations reported Audit Committee</td>
<td>As required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Worksafe review of incidents/ accidents reported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to Audit Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VERIFY</strong></td>
<td>• Receive ACC WSMP audit results and remedial actions</td>
<td>Two yearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(if any) reported to Audit Committee</td>
<td>As completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Worksafe audits, if undertaken</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Self-assessment against Canterbury Safety Charter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reported to the Audit Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Objective 1: Improve Health and Safety data management, and encourage all staff to report incidents and hazards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action 1: Safety Management System investigation and procurement project (includes carry-over of ‘Reporting Improvement’ project from 2016/17).</td>
<td>No change to prior month</td>
<td>Meeting was held with 4 other Councils in the region during to investigate the potential to embed on a shared services’ procurement project, as each of those Councils are in varying stages either procuring, reviewing or replacing their Safety Management System software. However this shared services project has now been placed on hold due to differing priorities and workload levels across the Councils. In the meantime, WDC is pursuing the following potential option for improving Safety Management:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Incident management in Technology One (with mobility interface, and bespoke reporting developed by Technology One team)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Risk Management via Promapp (yet to be implemented)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Training Management via Promapp (yet to be trialed and approved)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Auditing schedule as per SafePlus requirements (see below), and continue with current inspection schedules for regular site audits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Documentation management via TRIM and new intranet portal (see below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Procedure management via Promapp (yet to be implemented) and linked to new intranet portal (see below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action 2: Implementation of Tech1/Mobile Hazard, Incident and Take-5 systems (carry-over project).</td>
<td>COMPLETE</td>
<td>Hazards and Incidents: Both hazard forms and incident forms have ‘gone live’ online. All staff can lodge hazards or incidents via intranet link or mobile device. Link has been established to Technology 1, which is now the database for hazard and incident data. IT staff are developing workflows for any actions to be assigned to relevant staff. Completion of the workflows in Technology 1 is imminent, with IT currently working to finalise. Take-5 Forms: Take-5 forms have been developed for mobile devices, and are in use in the Water Unit. The forms have been demonstrated to Audit &amp; Risk Committee, Health and Safety Committee, and key users throughout the organisation. Roll-out of Take-5 form has been completed with field staff from Property, Redzone Regeneration, Greenspace, and Utilities and Reading during early April.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action 3: Improve the Health and Wellbeing of staff, and create measures to ensure success.</td>
<td>No change to prior month</td>
<td>Work is complete on this project. SmarTrak devices have been procured for the Water Unit on-call team, which are satellite capable and externally monitored by ADT. They act as panic alarms and in the meantime, WDC is pursuing the following potential option for improving Safety Management:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action 4: Improvement of Due Diligence Health and Safety reporting.</td>
<td>No change to prior month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action 5: Review and re-develop internal health and safety auditing system, aligned with best practice.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Initial investigation has lead to reviewing WorkSafe’s proposed “SafePlus” as a model. SafePlus has not been designed to replace WSSAP. It has a different approach from a purely compliance audit. SafePlus is a business improvement tool that uses a behaviour-based assessment approach, and also offers independent guidance and advice on how to improve health and safety performance in a business. The toolkit will be available as three separate products:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Resources and guidance from WorkSafe website (available September 2017).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- An independent onsite assessment (available September 2017).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- A free online self-assessment. (available mid 2018).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Report to Management Team has been submitted to seek approval to align WOC H&amp;S systems with SafePlus, and in turn, create an internal auditing programme to suit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action 6: Contractor management process improvement project.</td>
<td>Project is now in implementation phase.</td>
<td>Stage 1: Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Creation of interim contract register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Process mapping of Contract Management processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Implementation of a Contract Management software system (e.g. TechnologyOne Contract Management module).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Interim contract register has been created, introduced to key contract managers and handed over to Organisation (business as usual).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Draft process mapping is complete, and the Contractor Management Process Improvement project published interim processes for the Project Control Group and the Contract Documentation Review Group to review. Handover of the processes to the Contract Documentation Review Group will happen during May, once that group has been expanded to ensure an organisation-wide focus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. A ‘walkthrough’ of the TechnologyOne Contract Management module was completed on 19 February, where Project Control Group plus other key staff had the opportunity to review the system. A report was submitted to Management Team to recommend that TechnologyOne Contract Management should be the software system of choice, however to delay implementation until after other key projects (e.g. Asset Management module in particular) are complete. Report approved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action 7: Wellbeing strategy development and implementation project.</td>
<td>A Wellbeing Survey was distributed in mid-September 2017. Report to Management Team to present the findings of the Survey was submitted and approved in November 2017. Decision has been made to create a ‘Wellbeing Committee/Workgroup’ which will include members of HR/H&amp;S, MAD Committee, Social Club, and other interested staff. Strategy development is now currently in progress, with a goal of creating an inclusive, diverse and easily accessed range of wellbeing offerings. Strategy due for completion at end of March 2018, but has been delayed slightly. New date for submission is end May 2018.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action 8: Lone working equipment procurement project.</td>
<td>COMPLETE</td>
<td>Work is complete on this project. SmarTrak devices have been procured for the Water Unit on-call team, which are satellite capable and externally monitored by ADT. They act as panic alarms and in the meantime, WDC is pursuing the following potential option for improving Safety Management:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Incident management in Technology One (with mobility interface, and bespoke reporting developed by Technology One team)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Risk Management via Promapp (yet to be implemented)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Training Management via Promapp (yet to be trialed and approved)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Auditing schedule as per SafePlus requirements (see below), and continue with current inspection schedules for regular site audits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Documentation management via TRIM and new intranet portal (see below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Procedure management via Promapp (yet to be implemented) and linked to new intranet portal (see below)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**
- On track
- Slightly behind schedule (less than one month)
- Behind schedule (greater than one month)
### April 2017 to Current: Worker Incident Reporting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Accident</th>
<th>Incidents</th>
<th>Notifiable Injury/Illness/Incident</th>
<th>Near Miss</th>
<th>Property Damage</th>
<th>Fatality</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graph:**
- **Legend:**
  - Accident
  - Incident
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---

**Incidents/Accidents - April 2018 (as at Monday 16th April 2018)**
Incidents/Accidents - April 2018 (**as at Monday 16th April 2018)

**April 2017 to Current: Worker - Cause of Incident**
- Fall, trip or slip: 11 (24%)
- Being hit by moving objects: 8 (17%)
- Hitting objects with part of body incl. cuts: 10 (21%)
- Mental stress: 2 (4%)
- Body stressing: 7 (15%)
- Chemicals or other substances: 2 (4%)
- Heat, radiation or energy: 2 (4%)
- Sound or pressure: 0 (0%)

**April 2017 to Current: Worker Incident Reporting**
- Accident: 30 (55%)
- Near miss: 10 (18%)
- Notifiable injury/illness/incident: 9 (16%)
- Property damage: 6 (11%)
- Fatality: 0 (0%)

**Incidents/Accidents - April 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incident Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Near Miss</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatality</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notifiable injury/illness/in</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Damage</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accident</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The data provided is based on the information extracted from the image.
### Actions Relating To Highest H&S Risk Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Description</th>
<th>Rating (out of 25)</th>
<th>Current actions</th>
<th>Action Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contractor Health and Safety Management</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>*Train all contract managers in H&amp;S processes/requirements at time of induction.</td>
<td>Charlotte Browne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Develop comprehensive contract administration/contract management training package to deliver to all staff managing contractors.</td>
<td>Gerard Cleary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Identify volunteer groups and leaseholders that engage contractors on behalf of WDC and train in contract H&amp;S management processes.</td>
<td>Charlotte Browne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Complete development of Safety in Design procedures and embed in design processes.</td>
<td>Gerard Cleary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Use &amp; Driver Safety</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>*Deliver driver training as per training strategy (Driver Safety / 4WD)</td>
<td>Charlotte Browne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Identify any drivers that require further progressive driver training on an as-needs basis and provide relevant training.</td>
<td>Managers &amp; Team Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Provide information and training regarding use of safety equipment such as fire extinguishers in staff pool vehicles to all drivers.</td>
<td>Charlotte Browne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>*Undertake a review of operations to ensure that all activity and training is being carried out as per internal H&amp;S processes.</td>
<td>Liz Ashton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting hazardous activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Injury/death</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverse Weather</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>*Develop protocols for response to adverse weather events (especially at night), and include in Safe Working in the Field Manual *Include in Emergency Management Plan out-of-hours deployment in adverse weather.</td>
<td>Charlotte Browne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airfield Operations</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>*Develop of Airfield Safety Committee and appointment of Airfield Safety Co-ordinator to administer all actions from safety review.</td>
<td>Craig Sargison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Develop of Airfield Operations Manual, and adoption of the manual by Council as the key safety document for the Airfield operations.</td>
<td>Craig Sargison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Provide regular Airfield Operations report to Council</td>
<td>Craig Sargison</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE UTILITIES AND ROADING COMMITTEE HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA ON TUESDAY 17 APRIL 2018 AT 2.30PM

PRESENT
Councillor S Stewart (Chairperson), Mayor D Ayers, Deputy Mayor K Felstead, Councillors R Brine, J Meyer and P Williams.

IN ATTENDANCE
Messrs J Palmer, (Chief Executive), G Cleary (Manager Utilities and Roading), K Simpson (3Waters Manager), K Straw (Civil Project Team Leader), A Klos (Project Engineer) and S Nichols (Governance Manager).

The meeting was adjourned by the Chairperson at 2.31pm to enable the District Planning and Regulation Committee briefing to conclude and the Utilities and Roading Committee meeting reconvened at 2.40pm.

1 APOLOGIES
Nil.

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
Nil.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Utilities and Roading Committee held on Tuesday 20 March 2018

Moved: Councillor Meyer Seconded: Councillor Williams

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee:

(a) Confirms, as a true and correct record, the minutes of a meeting of the Utilities and Roading Committee held on Tuesday 20 March 2018.

CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
Nil.

5 PRESENTATION
5.1 Secondary Stopbank Gap Filling on Cones Road and Millton Ave, Rangiora

Shaun McCracken (ECan) and David Bridges (Good Earth Matters) presented information in relation to this project. They spoke to a presentation outlining the location of the stopbanks and the timing of the works. It was proposed that Cones Road stopbank would be completed first, with traffic diverted to Millton Avenue, before the second stopbank would be completed on Millton Avenue with traffic diverted to Cones Road. The Ashley River Bridge would be open at all times. The timing of the works had taken into account the Rangiora A&P Show with no works on Millton Avenue in late October to avoid disruption.
Environment Canterbury staff would work with the Council communications team to ensure the public were aware of the diversions being in place and timing.

6 MATTERS REFERRED FROM THE WOODEND-SEFTON COMMUNITY BOARD MEETING OF 9 APRIL 2018

6.1 Gladstone Road Cycleway – K Straw (Civil Project Team Leader)

K Straw spoke to the report outlining approximately 750 metres of road was within the Woodend Bypass designation and he reflected on the Community Board comments. The Board opted for the second option based on the possibility of the footpath becoming redundant over 10 years. It was noted that the Kaiapoi path has a different surface of chip seal and different costs associated.

G Cleary commented on the Community Board not wanting to waste funds. He explained the reason staff recommended the hot mix option as it related to ongoing maintenance costs. Further options were explained, including potential to direct staff to find the best life cycle cost effective option.

J Palmer commented on the status of the path timeframe. It was advised that property owner negotiations would likely take the timing to September 2018. J Palmer advised that by September 2018 the Council would have a clearer indication from the Government on the future timing of the Woodend Bypass project. Potentially the whole of life cost options may change pending the government review of their Transport Policy Statement.

Councillor Blackie asked if construction parameters are the same except for the seal. K Straw advised of a potential risk for a slight increase if the top coat was not included in the tender, however tender documentation could be worded appropriately.

Councillor Stewart enquired if purchase property costs are included in the budgets. Staff confirmed this was the case, including hedging.

Moved: Councillor Meyer Seconded: Councillor Brine

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 180306023458.

(b) Authorises staff to carry out an evaluation on the lowest whole of life option and to proceed with construction following an announcement of timing for the Woodend Bypass from the NZ Transport Agency.

(c) Note the Woodend Bypass is not likely to be constructed for 10 years.

CARRIED

Councillor Meyer commented on the goodwill of the Community Board with thoughts of the Bypass timing and the subsequent new government information affecting the project. He believed the Woodend-Sefton Community Board would be supportive of the motion.

Mayor Ayers commented on the Woodend Bypass stating it was planned to be a full motorway (ie like the Belfast Bypass). It is currently included in the draft Regional Transport Plan for 2026, however the government presently has thoughts that all motorway projects that have not yet commenced will stop and be reassessed. Mayor Ayers stated the key issue for the Woodend Bypass is
road safety. The Council submission to the Government Policy Statement on Transport will state this. The indicated date for government release of updated information is the end of August.

6.2 Combining of Woodend and Pegasus Water Supplies – New Water Supply Main Concept Design – A Klos (Project Engineer) and C Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager)

A Klos spoke briefly to the report, outlining the proposal for a new supply pipeline from Gladstone Road and partial joining of the Woodend and Pegasus water supplies. Staff also advised that all treatment would occur at the Pegasus plant. A Klos commented on the alignment of pipes, road flows and of various options considered. One long term option was to remove all the trees on the road reserve, which would cost an additional $61,000 than the option to lay pipe through Gladstone Park. Ideally it is preferred if pipes are laid through a roadway or road reserve. The Woodend-Sefton Community Board favoured the option to lay pipe through the trees.

Mayor Ayers asked if there was no road reserve option what would then be the preferred option. A Klos spoke of the road reserve and potential future road. In a supplementary question Mayor Ayers sought clarification of views of some Pegasus residents. G Cleary spoke of the preference to place utilities in road reserve where it is available. J Palmer spoke of the current connection points, avoiding state highway interference and interim solutions.

Moved: Councillor Meyer Seconded: Councillor Brine

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 180322031093.

(b) Notes that this project to install a new raw water pipe is part of the wider project to join the Woodend and Pegasus water schemes.

(c) Notes that design work is scheduled to be undertaken this financial year, 2017/18, and construction is scheduled to be completed next financial year, 2018/19.

(d) Endorses that the section of pipe immediately north of Gladstone Road be installed in the road reserve land, rather than through Gladstone Park.

(e) Approves the removal of the trees along the preferred route, in road reserve land.

(f) Notes that the recommended route is supported by the Gladstone Park Advisory Group.

(g) Recommends to Council that an additional capital works budget of $231,000 is included in the 2018/19 financial year, split 30% to growth and 70% to level of service, to give a revised total budget of $811,000 for the Gladstone Road to Pegasus WTP raw water main.

CARRIED

Councillor Meyer reflected on long term matters including the unknown timing of the State Highway alternations and future roading, however remarked that this motion was a sensible and necessary option for the longer term.
7 REPORTS FOR INFORMATION ONLY

Nil.

8 PORTFOLIO UPDATES

8.1 Roading – Councillor John Meyer

Councillor Meyer spoke of the current discussions of the Road Safety Committee and means of slowing drivers down by using rubber judder bars, with potential trials to have a safer environment for construction workers when undertaking road works.

8.2 Drainage and Stockwater – Councillor Sandra Stewart

Councillor Stewart spoke of recent rural drainage meetings and their feedback. All the groups were keen to have the rates eased to enable one year of maintenance funding to be held in reserve. This matter would be deliberated at the end of May through the LTP process.

It was reported that Councillors Blackie, Felstead, and Stewart formed the Stormwater Drainage and Watercourse Protection Bylaw 2018 hearing panel that will make recommendations for the bylaw adoption to the May Council meeting.

Councillor Stewart commented on the Canterbury Water Management Strategy work with the first consultations with affected consent holders beginning this week and expected to take several weeks.

8.3 Utilities (Water Supplies and Sewer) – Councillor Paul Williams

Councillor Williams commented briefly on the Garrymere and Poyntzs Road scheme, with further information to come to elected members shortly, before further public discussion.

8.4 Solid Waste – Councillor Robbie Brine

Councillor Brine advised there would be a Joint Landfill Committee meeting later in the week, where it was expected to receive the interim report and draft SOI key items. Further discussions relating to recycling will also occur.

Councillor Brine spoke of the Waste Minimisation Fund and options of a hospitality campaign and another reduce waste by recycling campaign. On discussion with staff the Reduce, Recycle campaign was favoured.

9 MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

Moved: Councillor Stewart Seconded: Mayor Ayers

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:
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>9.1</td>
<td>Protection of privacy of natural persons To carry out commercial activities without prejudice</td>
<td>A2(a) A2(b)ii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CARRIED

10 QUESTIONS

There were no questions.

11 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS

There was no urgent general business.

_The public excluded portion of the meeting occurred from 3.33pm to 3.35pm._

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 3.35pm.

CONFIRMED

______________________________
Chairperson

______________________________
Date

At the conclusion of the meeting, there was a public excluded briefing for the Committee, on the following matters

- Stormwater Network Discharge Consent
- Oxford Rural No. 1 Water Update
- Siena Place Drainage
MINUTES OF THE DISTRICT PLANNING AND REGULATION COMMITTEE MEETING HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA ON TUESDAY 17 APRIL 2018 1.00PM.

PRESENT
Councillor J Meyer (Chair), Mayor D Ayers, Councillors N Atkinson, W Doody (arrived 1.02pm), D Gordon and S Stewart.

IN ATTENDANCE
Councillors P Williams, A Blackie and K Felstead.
J Palmer (Chief Executive), N Harrison (Manager Regulation), L Beckingsale (Policy Analyst), T Ellis (Development Planning Manager), M Flanagan (Landscape Planner – District Regeneration), M Bacon (Team Leader Resource Consents), G Meadows (Policy Manager), M Emery (Senior Sergeant Police), K Bonifacio (Senior Planner), M Fox (Administration Assistant), and E Stubbs (Minute Secretary).

A workshop was held from 1.42pm to 1.43pm during Item 6.1.

M Bacon introduced Mandy Fox (Administration Assistant) and Kate Bonifacio (Senior Planner) who had recently started in the team. The Chair welcomed the new staff to the team.

1. APOLOGIES
Moved: Councillor Meyer Seconded: Mayor Ayers
An apology was received and sustained from W Doody for lateness. CARRIED

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
Nil.

3. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of a meeting of the District Planning and Regulation Committee held on 15 August 2017
Moved: Councillor Doody Seconded: Councillor Atkinson
THAT the District Planning and Regulation Committee:
(a) Confirms as a true and correct record the minutes of a meeting of the District Planning and Regulation Committee held on 15 August 2017. CARRIED

4. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES
Nil.

5. DEPUTATION
Peter Mulligan spoke to the Committee regarding his lodging of an application for land use consent. He tabled a handout showing a copy of the title and plan of the lots in question. The plan showed Lot 1 – Ohoka Homestead and Lots 2 and 3 which he owned.

P Mulligan outlined a timeline, a consent application was lodged 20 April 2016. There was a planning report 2 June 2016 advising that considered effects of activity were less than minor and an application for two land use consents concerning Lots 2 and 3 were subject to
full notification. He was also advised Lot 3 was a non-complying activity and must be publicly notified. On 7 September 2016 Council sought a legal opinion on the matter from Adderley Head. P Mulligan advised staff he wished to address the Council regarding the application, and it was suggested he await the legal opinion. Following subsequent telephone discussions, P Mulligan requested on 21 November 2016 a copy of the legal opinion and a date to address the Council. He was advised that the Adderley Head opinion was in a peer review process and he would not receive a copy as it was privileged.

P Mulligan wished to ask the Committee:
1. Was the application for land use consent permitted?
2. If not permitted, was it a restricted discretionary activity?
3. If neither of the above, was it non-complying?

Mayor Ayers asked how long P Mulligan had owned the lots. P Mulligan advised that he had brought the Ohoka Homestead in 1974.

Mayor Ayers asked were Lots 2 and 3 linked as collectively they met the 4 hectare rule under the District Plan, however separately each one did not. P Mulligan confirmed that was the case and that Lots 2 and 3 were split by the driveway to the Ohoka Homestead. In a supplementary question D Ayers asked if P Mulligan had undertaken the subdivision and if at that time Lots 2 and 3 had encumbrance to build on one of those titles. P Mulligan replied yes, at that time it was only possible to build on one of the lots.

Mayor Ayers asked if P Mulligan was aware that other property owners in the district who wanted to build on rural lots less than 4 hectares went to public notification sometimes with success, sometimes not. P Mulligan replied in this case there was an exemption under the District Plan that any Lot between two dates did not need to comply with the 4 hectare rule.

Councillor Meyer asked if P Mulligan created the titles. P Mulligan replied yes, when he sold the Ohoka Homestead the purchaser did not want the whole lot of land.

Councillor Gordon asked why Lots 2 and 3 were not conjoined at the time and P Mulligan replied it was not possible due to the driveway strip.

Councillor Gordon asked if P Mulligan had sought the views of the Ohoka Homestead owners and if they objected or supported. P Mulligan replied they were not aware of his plans. In a supplementary question D Gordon asked for clarity in what P Mulligan wanted to do with the lots and P Mulligan replied he wanted to build on Lot 3 and sell Lot 2.

Councillor Gordon asked if there could be a staff report on the issue. There was further information including the legal opinions that the Committee had not seen and so were not aware of the full context. N Harrison commented it was a complex issue with two legal opinions.

Councillor Meyer expressed appreciation for P Mulligan attending the committee and advised staff would keep in touch.

6. REPORTS

6.1 Review of Local Alcohol Policy and Liquor Ban Bylaw – L Beckingsale (Policy Analyst)

L Beckingsale spoke to the report advising it was to request approval for public consultation regarding the review of the Local Alcohol Policy and Liquor Ban Bylaw 2007. She advised that Martin Bell (Corcoran French) was assisting with legal advice, with a legal opinion anticipated the following week, however it was expected there should be no significant changes. One of the changes made was in relation to Child Focused events to make sure the policy was correct and clear legally.

Senior Sergeant M Emery of the NZ Police was also present.
L Beckingsale noted that the research report further discussed police data – incidences which could potentially have alcohol as a component, in particular the location of particular incidents between the timeframe of 9pm and 3am. It was an educated guess these incidents were fuelled by alcohol and there was no causal link.

L Beckingsale advised that the Committee had three options regarding the bylaw. The first was to review the bylaw, the second was to revoke the bylaw and the third was to let the bylaw lapse (the least preferred option) as the public would not have the opportunity to express a view.

Councillor Atkinson noted that the option for recommendation was either approves the draft Alcohol Control Bylaw for public consultation or approves the revocation of the Liquor Ban Bylaw. He agreed with going out to the public but he wanted to ensure that consultation would be in such a way that information was provided so that the decision could go either way. Councillor Atkinson stated he did not want the same situation as had happened in the Representation Review where consultation had been in such a way that a proposed alternative could not be considered as it had not been consulted on. L Beckingsale acknowledged the comments and suggested there could be an option in the Statement of Proposal that the Bylaw could be revoked, however she would need to re-check the Act as to whether it could be revoked under this consultation or another process.

Councillor Doody referred to alcohol related crime and asked was it drug and alcohol related or strictly alcohol. L Beckingsale advised that for this purpose it was only alcohol as it was regarding the Local Alcohol Policy. In a supplementary question Councillor Doody asked if the Police could tell if it was strictly alcohol with no component of drug. L Beckingsale commented there was a cross over, talking to Wellington analysts the potentially alcohol related component was indicative rather than absolute. There may be drug influences and alcohol was a potential component of those crimes.

Councillor Gordon asked Senior Sergeant M Emery if he supported the draft Local Alcohol Policy and SS M Emery confirmed he supported it remaining in place with amendments. The Police would not like to see the Policy revoked. The fact that a number of offences were small was testament of the bylaw working. In a supplementary question Councillor Gordon asked if the Police sought any changes and M Emery replied possibly an extension to the area.

Councillor Gordon noted a legal opinion coming and asked staff what would happen if it suggested major changes. L Beckingsale advised it would be brought back to the Committee and the timeframe would be altered as the Policy could not go out to consultation without having been approved. Councillor Gordon suggested an amendment to the recommendation allowing minor changes to be approved by the Committee Chairperson.

Councillor Blackie referred to the harassment and abduction statistics in the Waimakariri, noting that they were above the National average, and asked how that fitted with the advice given by the Police when abolishing the Community Constable position which was that the crime rate was low. SS M Emery advised it was not a matter he was informed on, as he was new to the Waimakariri Rural area and could not comment. In a supplementary question Councillor Blackie asked why explosives and firearms offences were more than twice the national average and SS M Emery explained it was due to the rural nature of the District.

Councillor Atkinson reiterated his concern to make sure that both bases were covered in consultation to ensure an in-depth discussion both ways. N Harrison suggested that the Summary of Information could clearly cover the amendment of revocation of the bylaw. L Beckingsale added that it could also be covered in the Statement of Proposal to make clear both options were available.
Moved: Mayor Ayers    Seconded: Councillor Atkinson

THAT the District Planning and Regulation Committee

(a) Receives report No. 180405036425.

(b) Approves the draft Local Alcohol Policy for public consultation in accordance with Section 83 of the *Local Government Act 2002* subject to minor amendments as approved by the Chair.

(c) Approves the replacement of the Liquor Ban Bylaw with the draft Alcohol Control Bylaw for public consultation in accordance with Section 83 of the *Local Government Act 2002*;

(d) Approves the form of the Summary of Information as included in the attachment, in accordance with Section 83AA of the *Local Government Act 2002*;

(e) Notes the submissions on the policy and the bylaw will open on 11 May 2018 and close on 8 June 2018.

(f) Notes that consultation will be in the form of public notices and advertisements in local newspapers, with information available at Council Service Centres and Libraries and on the Council’s website and social media pages. Information will be sent to all licensees, the Medical Officer of Health and New Zealand Police.

CARRIED

Mayor Ayers commented that during public consultation people could submit on revoking the bylaw and that the wording did not need to change, it was standard procedure for public consultation. The Council was fully empowered to make changes because of consultation and he reflected on the Dudley Park Aquatic Centre as an example of that.

Councillor Atkinson stated he wanted to ensure the revocation option was available. He commented many bylaws were created for good reasons at the time but were nonsensical. With no disrespect, he believed that the Police toolbox was heavy, at the cost of the Council, and whilst the Police administered the bylaw it was the Council that bore the associated cost. Councillor Atkinson rhetorically asked if that was the job of the Council and he wanted to allow that conversation teased out by having a look at both sides.

Councillor Gordon supported the comments of Councillor Atkinson, stating clarity around what was being consulted on with the public was required, which is the reason for the discussion around the recommendation. He stated they had the support of the Police on this and they wanted it in their toolbox.

7. MATTER REFERRED FROM THE REGENERATION STEERING GROUP MEETING OF 9 APRIL 2018

7.1 Regeneration Areas – District Plan matters – T Ellis (Development Planning Manager) and M Flanagan (District Regeneration – Landscape Planner)

M Flanagan spoke to the report noting that its purpose was to seek approval to undertake any District Plan changes as part of the Waimakariri Red Zone Recovery Plan (Recovery Plan) through the District Plan review process. M Flanagan advised that the Council had two options for District Plan changes necessary to implement the Recovery Plan. Option 1, plan changes via the Greater Christchurch Regeneration Act (GCR Act) and Option 2, plan changes via the Resource Management Act (through the District Plan Review process).
M Flanagan advised that the current District Plan zones were not considered a significant impediment to the implementation of the Recovery Plan. In addition, plan changes made through the District Plan Review process would take into account additional research, allow greater consistency and mean resources would not be taken away from the District Plan Review.

Mayor Ayers asked what would happen in the situation where someone wanted to establish a business in the mixed use area in the interim. M Flanagan said that could be accommodated in the RMA process and if it was a significant development the Council could look at advancing a plan change through the GCR Act. T Ellis reiterated that if someone approached the Council wanting to locate a business in the mixed use zone they would not be turned away and the proposal would be considered.

Moved Councillor Atkinson Seconded: Councillor Gordon

THAT the District Planning and Regulation Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 180307023913.

(b) Approves the retention of the existing Waimakariri District Plan zones for the implementation of the agreed land uses in the Waimakariri Residential Red Zone Recovery Plan until they are replaced by those in the Reviewed Waimakariri District Plan.

(c) Approves any changes to District Plan zones in the Regeneration Areas, affecting the reserve, rural, private lease, or private residential land uses, being advanced via the District Plan Review.

(d) Notes that the zoning approach for the mixed-use business areas will be considered through Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan refresh currently underway (Kaiapoi 2028).

(e) Notes that should consent be required for interim use of the regeneration areas referred to in (c) above, this would proceed via resource consent processes consistent with current practice.

CARRIED

Councillor Atkinson commented that the staff response to the Mayor’s question had answered his questions and he accepted the approach. He reiterated that the GCR Act was for a purpose.

Mayor Ayers commented that it was important that any proposal from outside could move quickly. Private plan changes could take a long time and he would not like to see roadblocks to moving forward and the possibility of losing opportunities. He assumed the regulatory working party would be involved at an early stage.

8. PORTFOLIO UPDATES

8.1 District Planning Development

Councillor Atkinson commented that the LTP consultation process had been successful with a good number of submissions. He congratulated the communications staff on their communication with everyone.

8.2 Regulation and Civil Defence

Councillor Meyer commented that while ‘we as a group work hard, staff work harder’.
8.3 Business, Promotion and Town Centres

Councillor Gordon noted that it had been a busy period in business promotion and town centres. In particular working with Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board and Kaiapoi Promotions Association (KPA) regarding a review of the annual Christmas Parade and reconnections with businesses in the community which would be undertaken with staff and with ENC support.

A meeting had been held the previous week with all Town Promotions groups discussing setting up Service Level Agreements, better reporting and managing expectations. In addition, there had been discussion around electric vehicle charging stations and Christmas flags. The CE of Mainpower had advised there was a high cost to putting up decorative flags on power poles.

Councillor Gordon advised he was having regular meetings with S Hart (Business & Centres Manager) who had a good understanding on issues in the town centres.

S Stewart asked what did the review of the Kaiapoi Carnival and Christmas Parade by staff and ENC mean, and was there going to be a Christmas Parade in Kaiapoi this year. Councillor Gordon replied that was the expectation, concerns had been raised by colleagues and members of the community. Staff would work alongside to support the outcome. KPA was currently in the process of confirming a new coordinator.

9. QUESTIONS

Nil.

10. URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS

Nil.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 2.01pm.

CONFIRMED

______________________
Chairperson

______________________
Date

Following the meeting a public excluded briefing was held. G Wilson (Building WOFs and Earthquake Prone Buildings) presented information in relation to earthquake prone buildings.
Minutes: Solid and Hazardous Waste Working Party Meeting held 15 May 2018 in Farmers Tawera Meeting Room

**Attendees:** Kitty Waghorn, Gerard Cleary, Clr. Wendy Doody, Clr. Dan Gordon, Clr. Paul Williams, Denise Clark, Clr. Sandra Stewart, Clr. John Meyer, Mayor David Ayers

**Apologies:** Clr. Robbie Brine

**Confirmation of Minutes:**
Minutes of meeting held 5 April 2018 were confirmed as true and correct.

**Moved:** Clr. John Meyer  **Seconded:** Clr. Dan Gordon

**Matters Arising**
- Report to Council LTP deliberations on budgets. Kitty to check Craig has incorporated in the report.
- City Mission use private rubbish collectors to remove their rubbish.
- Kitty to find out from Salvation Army what was the cause for the huge spike in costs for rubbish removal in 17/18 year.

**Progress Report**
- Kitty tabled an example of the new survey form going out to rate payers – it will include a barcode at the bottom of the form to identify which property it has come from.
- Clr. Gordon asked if the font could be made bigger. Kitty said this may not be an option due to the size of the paper itself, however, we could consider changing the paper size to A5? Kitty will look into the options.
- Clr. Williams suggested the survey be placed in with the rates letters when they go out. Kitty will see if this is possible.
- Some people don’t read their rates so the reason for sending the survey out separately might be better.
- Postage is a huge cost and is due to go up again soon.
- Clr. Williams said we still need a commitment from the ratepayers to ensure we have enough people who want to take on the service. Kitty said a letter is going out to the ratepayers saying we need them to commit to the service. Simon said there will be another letter following the survey asking for commitment.
- Once Council approves and adopts, on 19th June we want to get the first letter out to ratepayers. There is still the online service available.
- Clr Gordon said if we get a resounding response from the first letter could we decide not to send out the second letter. Simon said this may leave a very unclear view if we don’t.
- Gerard said when we send out Tender documents out we need to have a clear idea of how many people are committed, which is the purpose of the survey form.
- Gerard said the boxes on the survey need to be clearer.
- The letter proposed will be circulated to this group before it goes out.
Comms plan to be circulated to SHWWP members.

Procurement

- Project plan is being prepared.
- Morrison Low came to meeting on 26th April with Kitty and Simon.
- Fortnightly teleconference meetings being held with them.
- Received contract objectives which have been tabled. Received advice on bin ownership and a proposal to undertake the review of transfer station operations.
- Morrison Low are progressing with the Tender documentation.

Report

- Collection Bin Ownership – 180502047890
- First consideration is bin cost. If Council buys it is a significant debt.
- The advice from Morrison Low said if we chose to have the contractor buying them it won’t be a barrier for them. But there is potentially a higher rate of credit smaller contractors will be playing. Credit as low as 2.5% available to the big players in the market was discussed, and Council’s 5% used for planning purposes, even though current rates actually lower.
- Predetermined depreciation rate for the recycling bins is currently in our contract. At contract end Council will buy them back and then on-sell them to the successful tenderer. This will mean the current contractor does not get an unfair advantage.
- The maintenance of the bins should not be taken on by Council even if we own the bins. If we do own the bins it should be part of the contract that the Contractor maintains the bins.
- Recycling in the district was introduced 7 years ago.
- Staff recommend that the contractor owns the bins. Savings available to Council ie credit rate lower than Council rate and lower cost for bin purchase. See table on page 4 of 5 in the report.
- Morrison Low say our contract should generate enough interest for up to 9 contractors to bid.
- Clr. Williams said we should add .....And / or the Council owning the bins ... (in the same tender so Council has a choice of whether we own the bins or Council supplies them).
- Gerard said we needed to be careful that the tender did not become too complicated and suggested we could put some wording in the tender such as ...”Alternative bids based on Council owning the bins will be considered at the Councils’ discretions”, but we need to take some advice on this
- Include an item (c) to the resolution: “Requests staff investigate the practicality and probity of including in the tender documents, the ability for tenderers to put in alternative bids based on Council owning the bins”


Discussions regarding Report 180502048027. Management of Transfer Stations

- Morrison Lowe proposal has been submitted to complete an options and assessment for $7000. Clr. Gordon said this is not a lot in the scheme of things.
• Clr Williams advocated taking on transfer stations management by Council. Main costs are staffing, the only plant owned are the loader, 2 compactors and forklift. Currently contractor runs the transfer station to make a profit, so why can’t Council take that business and make a profit?

• Simon said there is a process issue that would need resolving to do this. There is a Council resolution from the S17A review requiring management of the transfer stations to be tendered out. For Council to manage the stations would require a review of the S17A, which would put the tendering timetable at risk. It is also a matter of significance in terms of Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

• Staff have shown 5 options to be considered as listed in the report above in item 1.6.

• Gerard said he believes there are synergies and efficiencies form having a single contractor managing the kerbside collection and the refuse stations.

• Clr Gordon likes the idea of a 7 year contract instead of a 15 year contract. A 7 year contract aligns with the life of a truck. The decision on contract length has yet to be made, and Morrison Low will be providing some advice on this, which can be reported back to the SHWWP.

• The life of a compactor should be also be considered. Clr. Williams said the cost of a new compactor is around $15,000.

• Councils have transitioned to outsourcing work. Contractors bring economies of scale and expertise including Health and Safety. There would be significant cost to Council if we took this over, and risk of being Principal and Contractor.

• Clr. Williams said CCC Kate Valley transport contract has just been reconsidered according to CCC news media. The group agreed it would be good to have Clr. Brine to brief us on Kate Valley transport at the next meeting when he is better. Kitty suggested Gareth James instead.

• Additional recommendation to be added to report: (g) Notes staff will bring a further report to the SHWWP for decision on the contract term.


**Contract Objectives**

Tabled

- Noted that next Wasteminz conference will be held in Wigram in Christchurch.

**Item 9 – Report 180509051042** – Solid Waste Staff submission to LTP deliberations report

- Kitty has looked at budget and tried to recover costs but increase in kerbside collection rate of $17 per property. Reduced from $19.70. Charge commercial collection companies $65 per tonne.
- .6% impact on the targeted rate so impact is less than $10 per property. This will be in Jeff’s report to the LTP.
- Cost is $103 per tonne to dump at Kate Valley plus transport costs.
- Kitty is briefing the Council in July on the Local Government waste manifesto. This was put together by Councils and WasteMINZ, and it’s...
proposed that the Waste Manifesto be adopted as a Local Government New Zealand (LGNZ) remit (at the LGNZ conference 15-17 July 2018).

- Request capital works be carried over: the recycling compactor shed into the 18/19 year.
- Both RPZ projects, staff asking to put this in 19/20 budget. Will put report to council if work can be brought forward.
- Land purchase hasn’t progressed but asking for $400,000 in the 19/20 budget to purchase the 20m strip of land (the southern boundary).
- Kitty will be having the overall transfer station site assessed next year before carrying out the pit upgrade. That will include both planned upgrades and potential expansion and land needs in the future.
- In 22/23 allowance of $1,385,000 for land purchases for future site expansion.

Move: Clr. Meyer – Seconded – Clr Gordon - Recommendation to Council – add section under item 4.16 add in SHHWP have reviewed this report and supports the recommendation.

Report 180515053012

- Report on Public Submission to LTP – Kerbside Collection Services
- Seeking support to increase community engagement
- Clr. Williams suggested talking to North Loburn School on recycling. They received an award for their short film. Why can’t we get them to make more films? Clr. Williams also suggested a prize for all schools to create their own videos showing the way they are cleaning up our environment (more discussion on this under General Business).
- Better waste and litter management of building companies.
- Recommendation to Council – add section under item 4.45 add in SHWWP have reviewed this report and supports the recommendation.

Move: Clr. Williams – Seconded – Clr Meyer

Report 180515053040 Tabled

- Public Submissions to Long Term Plan – General
- Have looked at composting in Southbrook several years ago. However, there are a lot of problems with the site such as proximity to other composting operations, limited space for compost maturation, sensitivity of the receiving environment to leachate and odour, proximity to businesses.
- Moved to approve - Recommendation to Council – add section under item 4.23 add in SHHWP have reviewed this report and supports the recommendations.

General

- Dan Gordon said there are Rotary club members going to pick up rubbish in Rahakuri River. They are also dedicating a Biota Node for Peter Allen on Sunday if anyone is interested.
- Shelly Topp email - said thanks for help with the Plastic Straw Free movie showing, she'd had good feedback from the evening. She has an idea to organise an annual short film competition with a University Scholarship as a prize. She would be looking at local businesses, crowd funding, other agencies for sponsorship and funding. Shelly would like to name the award after the late Peter Allen.
- Looking at doing this in 6 months.
- Suggestion made to invite her to talk to U & R and get the North Loburn School students to present to Council to show their school film. Kitty to approach Shelley and the School in the first instance, and then liaise with Sarah Nicolls for a time when they would be able to make the presentation to Council.

Meeting closed at 5.44 pm
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE COMMUNITY AND RECREATION COMMITTEE
HELD IN THE WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA ON TUESDAY 22 MAY 2018 AT 1.00PM.

PRESENT

Councillor A Blackie (Chairperson), Mayor D Ayers, Councillors K Barnett, W Doody and D Gordon.

IN ATTENDANCE

Councillors K Felstead, N Atkinson, J Meyer and P Williams
Messrs C Sargison (Manager Community and Recreation), C Brown (Community Green Space Manager), M Greenwood (Aquatic Facilities Manager), Mrs T Sturley (Community Team Manager), Mrs W Howe (Safe Community Project Facilitator), Mrs P Ashbey (District Libraries Manager) and Mrs E Stubbs (Minute Secretary).

1 APOLOGIES

Moved D Ayers seconded W Doody

An apology was received and sustained from Councillor R Brine. CARRIED

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Nil.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

3.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Community and Recreation Committee held on Tuesday 27 March 2018

Moved K Barnett seconded D Gordon

THAT the Community and Recreation committee:
(a) Confirms the circulated minutes of a meeting of the Community and Recreation Committee, held on Tuesday 27 March 2018, as a true and accurate record. CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING

Nil.

5 DEPUTATIONS

5.1 Andrew Arps, Environment Canterbury

Mr Arps spoke to a PowerPoint presentation on the proposed Silverstream/Kaiapoi/Waimakariri loop track. The concept was to establish a track from Silverstream to Kaiapoi and back via the Waimakariri Regional Park as a complete recreational loop for the community.

As background Mr Arps explained there were issues with in-stream health especially related to high nitrate levels in the northern part of Silverstream. The Waimakariri Zone Committee looked at large projects around the district.
The loop track had been looked at as a recreational idea for a number of years. Mr Arps showed an old map of the District noting some of the changes to the Silverstream and Kaiapoi river including the Eyre River Diversion for flood protection.

Mr Arps advised that a large part of the track already existed. They were looking a progressing a graphic plan that clearly explained the history, issues and opportunities. There were some key links to establish with property owners including linking two parts of Silverstream through the salmon hatchery.

ENC was also involved. Their proposed cycleway from Christchurch to Waipara could link with the loop track. The track was no in isolation and connected with other things including urban, rural and from Christchurch. A Arps noted in relation to the Kaiapoi River, there were plans in place for development and addressing urban issues including planting projects.

Mr Arps highlighted the south branch could be a reference point. The great work in the Groyne area demonstrated from an ecological point of view what could be achieved. Key points included, an agreed compelling vision, sustainable ecosystem, environmental, recreational and economic outcomes, opportunity to bridge all rural/semirural/urban groups and link to other recreational amenities.

Councillor Blackie asked referred to linkages required and necessity for easements. Mr Arps explained the needed to be respectful of property owners. They had not been spoken to yet.

Councillor Blackie asked where funding would come from. Mr Arps said there was not a finalised plan. There was potential for funding from the Waimakariri scheme that could be utilised. Creation of wetlands would help with some of the nitrate issues.

6 REPORTS

6.1 Community Team Update – Tessa Sturley (Community Team Manager)

Mrs Sturley advised that the purpose of the report was to provide an update on activity carried out by the community team. She would speak to a PowerPoint regarding social enterprise and would take the rest of the report as read.

Mrs Sturley noted the issues with mental health, addiction and poverty-related issues and that the ‘greater good’ needed to be resourced by more innovative means. She introduced Social Enterprise as a multi-benefit means to support and empower people.

Mrs Sturley ran through an overview of how social enterprise worked. The first stage was when people came into the crisis system and were provided social support. The wrap-around response stage was moving people from need to hope with skills and connections, for example community gardens. The third phase was early intervention or recovery including skill development and work experience which could be achieved through social enterprise such as a business. These provided opportunities to those such as at risk young people and ethnic migrants. The final phase was giving back to the community. Social enterprise helped provide connections upskilling and empowerment but also made money to fund necessary support. There was an increasing preference by consumers for goods and services provided by socially responsible organisations. People go through the social enterprise system moving from dependency to empowerment.

Mrs Sturley noted that social enterprise needed to be viable businesses. The new drive in social enterprise has happened over a number of years and there
were now strong networks developed across New Zealand and regionally. Mrs Sturley provided a food company example of social enterprise showing various examples of good and services as income sources and the opportunities that provided to people including employment, social interaction, food and skills.

Mrs Sturley advised that C Sargison was leading a review of Council’s procurement policies and was looking at social procurement. There was currently a lot of discussion around New Zealand on the practice.

Mrs Sturley showed a YouTube clip ‘fill their lunchbox’ from a director of a social enterprise in New Zealand providing lunches for kids.

D Ayers asked if Rivertown Café in Kaiapoi was an example of social enterprise and Mrs Sturley replied yes. D Ayers asked if there had been discussions with ENC and Mrs Sturley replied there had been. It was important to point out there were already examples such as Hope Café. There was more discussion than there used to be and more recognized support such as from the Rata Foundation.

D Gordon referred to item 4.4 of the report regarding facilitating an Age-friendly district and asked if that included working with the roading department with issues such as footpath cut downs. Mrs Sturley commented that it aligned with the Accessibility Strategy implementation plan. An age friendly community was a holistic plan.

N Atkinson asked if there had been a stock take of social enterprise across the district and was it known how many businesses were out there? Mrs Sturley replied that while they were aware of business a stock take was something they needed to do.

W Doody asked about the Community College catering and cooking facilities. Mrs Sturley noted they had been used in the past however there were some challenges.

Moved D Gordon seconded K Barnett

THAT the Community and Recreation Committee:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180510051654

(b) **Notes** that staff have submitted an application to the Office of Seniors for $11,997 in funding to support the development of an Age Friendly Community plan for our District.

CARRIED

D Gordon liked the reference to social enterprise. He believed it was very important to have an age friendly strategy that looked at basic transport, footpaths and accessibility to prevent barriers and improve connectivity. He fully supported the application for funding.

D Ayers commented that age friendly was not just about disability but also involvement in the community. Older people were a huge resource for the community and most organisations relied on people from that age group. D Ayers raised an experience of a café in Hanoi run by street kids. He offered a helpful resource who ran social enterprise organisations overseas as someone to speak to.

N Atkinson referred to his question about a stocktake. He advised that he had received no funding for his own trust for the last 10 years. It was important to identify older people transitioning from the workforce to retirement. They had great skills that could be utilised and give back to the community.
6.2 **Violence Free North Canterbury Update – Tessa Sturley (Community Team Manager)**

W Howe spoke to a PowerPoint presentation. She noted the change in name and branding to reflect a more positive visionary future. Groups involved included Wellbeing North Canterbury, AVIVA, Oxford Community Trust, Police, Work and Income and a number of others.

W Howe showed infographics reflecting family violence statistics in New Zealand. Some of the statistics included:

- 23 adults and 9 children killed by family violence annually.
- 120,000 investigations of family violence by police.
- 1 in 10 experience elder abuse.
- An estimated 75-80% of all family violence occurrences not reported.
- New Zealand had the highest reported rate in the developed world.
- Half of deaths occurred at the time of separation.
- In North Canterbury between 2008 and 2017 there had been a doubling in the number of reported incidences. This was on a population growth of 26%.

W Howe hoped that statistics were more in line with an increase in reporting, however it was difficult to get that break down. From the statistics chances were that staff, or people you know, are experiencing family violence. Family violence was about power and control.

W Howe provided an overview of successful initiatives 2016/18 including running programs in schools for students and staff. There was an increasing acceptance to sessions in the Hurunui and they would continue to work on increasing numbers. Pornography, consent and healthy relationship events were run in Oxford and Rangiora. White ribbon campaigns were well supported. W Howe commented it was difficult after any event to evaluate if it had made a difference to the culture around family violence but hopefully it would start to open up conversations. AVIVA reported an increase in self referrals following events and following the appearance of guest speaker Lesly Elliot, four students had made disclosures.

Billboards had been installed around the districts with four different designs and Kaikoura family violence network wished to copy those for their district.

W Howe advised there were three objective areas.

1. Raising community awareness of the issue and need for change - a one-off Ministry of Social Development grant of $20,000 had been received to help raise community awareness of the issue and need for change. Also included was raising awareness of elder abuse as a key issue to address.
2. Providing community education opportunities – four breakfast education events were planned with a broad target audience of anyone who worked with people. As an incentive the breakfast would be free.
3. Increasing professional capability – there had been 110 attendees to event in Rangiora presenting the findings of family violence report. in July there was an event planned with Ken McMaster, an international speaker on the issues.

W Howe outlined future opportunities which included working alongside businesses to create a culture that was more open about family violence and provided greater support to staff. Providing this support was beneficial to the workplace.

D Ayers asked about correlations nationally and W Howe advised that family violence was about power and control, it was not directly linked to issues such as poverty but those issues could exacerbate.
W Doody referred to elder abuse and asked if they were planning to go to rest homes and speak to staff as they could often pickup on financial abuse. W Howe commented they would not be visiting rest homes, this was the first inclusion of elder abuse in the plan and the first step was to raise general community awareness.

N Atkinson noted the increase in reporting was not related to population increase and asked was there a relation to extra people working in that space in the community. W Howe commented it was difficult to get data around it and it related to how police recorded events. She liked to think it was more people reporting incidents.

A Blackie referred to the psychological scars of an event such as an earthquake affecting people for about seven years and asked if W Howe thought the graph may level out, or had other issues overtaken the effect of the earthquakes? W Howe did not have expectations around that.

W Doody asked if the team would be talking to Federated Farmers around issues with families moving into the area. W Howe commented that had not signalled them out as a particular avenue. They worked alongside agencies in the Hurunui and there was potential to expand further into the rural area. The current projects of the team were already maximising resources. There were lots of potential areas to follow.

Moved W Doody seconded D Gordon

THAT the Community and Recreation Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 180511051678.
(b) Notes that staff, supported by representatives from Violence Free North Canterbury, will give a presentation on the local and national family violence situation and key priorities for the group in the coming financial year.

CARRIED

D Gordon commented it was a timely report as there were concerning rates of family violence in the district. All initiatives that were underway and the police response were critically needed. Family violence was not okay and any strategies to reduce were very important. He noted the possibility of mobile police stations. He thanked W Howe for reporting fully on an issue sadly occurring in the community.

Mayor Ayers commented that it was difficult to count on reporting and it did require expensive research. It may well be that higher reporting was a measure of success within a community, or it may mean greater incidence. As it was about power and control international studies would be informing work in New Zealand and so should be referred to even though outside New Zealand.

6.3 Aquatic Facilities Update – Matthew Greenwood (Aquatic Facilities Manager)

M Greenwood spoke briefly to the report. He highlighted that attendance figures needed seasonal adjustments due to few programmes run over the Christmas period. There was an improvement in the financial figures from the previous report. M Greenwood also highlighted the SwimDesk software that was implemented to improve WaiSwim customer experience following feedback regarding lack of engagement. The software was also timesaving for staff with less data entry and paper entries required. C Sargison reiterated the importance of the software as the biggest customer service improvement in managing the pool network. It would streamline processes and greatly
improve efficiencies. The print report would be launched today. It was for the WaiSwim programme, not the schools programme.

Moved W Doody seconded K Barnett

THAT the Community and Recreation Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 180510051609.
(b) Notes Aquatic Facilities achievement against key performance indicators including Water Quality, Facility Attendance and Financial results.

CARRIED

W Doody congratulated staff she was impressed with the budget and new software.

K Barnett said it was a good report and noted a muddy path to Dudley pool was to be fixed.

6.4 Library Update – Philippa Ashbey (District Libraries Manager)

P Ashbey spoke to the report to update activities in the library. She highlighted the professional development of a staff member. The temporary storage unit had been set up to alleviate pressure on shelving while having the items still at hand. The Spark Jump—stepping up programme was a free computer literacy programme and offered a free wifi modem to families in need. The benefits could be like changing. P Ashbey noted that also included in the report was results of an Official Information Act request for data on library services.

P Ashbey spoke to a PowerPoint presentation showing a snapshot of library services. Statistics included
- 485,000 visitors to the library
- 2500 new members this year
- 537,000 items checked out

P Ashbey noted that Oxford issues had increased again since the opening of the new facility. All other measure were well up with good library use in various forms.

The ‘Murder in the Library’ event was well attended with entrants in the Ngaio Marsh awards involved in a panel discussion.

In initiatives to improve inclusiveness a group of librarians took lessons in New Zealand sign language to help provide a friendly welcome. P Ashbey showed a YouTube clip of staff showing their new skills. The video would also be displayed in the library so those arriving would receive the greeting. It had been timed relative to sign language week. J Palmer commented that the initiative was to be applauded, it helped connect more effectively with the profoundly deaf and he had been delighted to see it.

Moved D Gordon seconded D Ayers

THAT the Community and Recreation Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 180511051846
(b) Notes the professional activities of library staff development and the movement of a small portion of the collection to temporary storage
(c) Notes the activities and events offered by the Waimakariri Libraries from February to April
(d) Notes the customer services improvements related to the Census 2018, reading promotions, services for older adults, the Spark Jump initiative which provides free Wi-Fi modems to families, a new programme of class visits, and a popular new holiday activity

(e) Notes the response to the Official Information Act request for data on library services

(f) Circulates the report to the Boards for their information.

CARRIED

D Gordon commented that 80% of card holders using their card showed the value of the libraries. He read out the quote from Hilary Mercer regarding the benefits of libraries.

D Ayers commented that learning language was a big challenge for deaf children and the more open they could be to that part of the community the better. Referring back to W Howe’s report on family violence he noted the ‘Murder in the Library’ and that the majority of murders were family related – murders were not just a chalk mark.

W Doody noted the Valentine’s Day promotion and P Ashbey said they had been surprised at the uptake of a mystery book.

7 PORTFOLIO UPDATES

7.1 Greenspace (Parks Reserves and Sports Grounds) – Councillor Robbie Brine

C Sargison noted that LTP deliberations.

7.2 Community Facilities (including Aquatic Centres, Halls, Libraries and Museums) – Councillor Wendy Doody

W Doody advised she had attended a Red Cross afternoon tea for volunteers and was impressed with the number of dedicated volunteers with long service history – up to 40 years of Meals on Wheels. Meals on Wheels started in New Zealand first in North Canterbury in 1851.

Visited the Kaiapoi Skate Park mural and was impressed with the students. They had applied and received funding from Creative Communities for the project.

Tenders for the Ashley Gorge heritage pavilion would come through shortly.

7.3 Community Development and Wellbeing – Councillor Kirstyn Barnett and Councillor Wendy Doody

K Barnett attended the Youth Council meeting. They had a new Facebook page and new logo. A survey they designed would go out to young people in June. It had a focus on what the youth would like to see in the district and on mental health.

K Barnett commented the visit to China had been very productive especially in regard to schools and cultural exchange with minority groups, as well as business discussions. She felt privileged to be part of the delegation.

8 QUESTIONS

Nil.

9 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS

Nil.
10 MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

Moved A Blackie seconded K Barnett

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Minutes/Report of:</th>
<th>General subject of each matter to be considered</th>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>Minutes of the public excluded portion of the Community and Recreation committee meeting of 27 March 2018</td>
<td>Confirmation of Minutes</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This resolution is made in reliance on section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, and the particular interest or interests protected by section 6 or section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Reason for protection of interests</th>
<th>Ref NZS 9202:2003 Appendix A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>Protection of privacy of natural persons To carry out commercial activities without prejudice</td>
<td>A2(a) A2(b)ii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CLOSED MEETING at 2.32pm

Resolution to Resume in Open Meeting

Moved A Blackie seconded D Gordon

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

CARRIED

OPEN MEETING at 2.35pm

CONFIRMED
At the conclusion of the meeting, a briefing was held to discuss Airfield developments.
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE KAIAPOI-TUAHIWI COMMUNITY BOARD
HELD IN MEETING ROOM 1 (UPSTAIRS), RUATAWIHA KAIAPOI CIVIC CENTRE,
176 WILLIAMS STREET, KAIAPOI ON MONDAY 16 APRIL 2018 COMMENCING AT
4.02PM.

PRESENT
J Watson (Chair), C Greengrass (Deputy Chair), N Atkinson, R Blair, M Pinkham,
P Redmond and S Stewart.

IN ATTENDANCE
Councillors J Meyer and A Blackie.
J Palmer (Chief Executive), K Simpson (3waters Manager) and S Nichols (Governance
Manager).

1 APOLOGIES
Nil.

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
Nil.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board – 19 March 2018

Moved: N Atkinson Seconded: R Blair
THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:
(a) Confirms the circulated minutes of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community
Board meeting, held 19 March 2018, as a true and accurate record.
CARRIED

Moved: N Atkinson Seconded: R Blair
THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:
(a) Confirms the minutes of the public excluded portion of the meeting of
the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting, held 19 March 2018,
as a true and accurate record.
CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
Nil.

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS
Nil.

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS
Nil.
7 NOTICE OF MOTION

That the following Notice of Motion has been submitted by Philip Redmond pursuant to Standing Order 26.1, for the 16 April 2018 meeting of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board, received on 15 March 2018.

EXPLANATION

This motion addresses concerns regarding the lack of temporary festive lighting and decorations over the 2017 Christmas period and late erection of banners, in and around Kaiapoi. There seems to be confusion over ownership and responsibility for the erection of decorations and lighting.

The community has requested appropriate lighting and festive decorations be reinstated for 2018. These are in addition to the new year round feature lighting, currently under review by the Council. A report is sought to clarify options for discussion and consideration by the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board.

Recommendation

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Requests a report from the Council Chief Executive outlining the current arrangements for Christmas decorations and lighting in and around Kaiapoi during the November/December period and further requests options for enhancing Christmas lighting and decorations during this period for 2018.

(b) Requests such report to be received at the scheduled July meeting of the Board on 16 July 2018.

P Redmond in speaking to the proposal stated the date in the motion took into account the peer review.

N Atkinson asked J Palmer where this matter sits in relation to what the Council is currently doing and the Community Board involvement. J Palmer responded that he had commissioned a peer review and the field work was occurring this week. The second phase of the review would look at what was received, what was asked for and what was thought was going to be supplied. The next phase would look at the next steps including advice to achieve the next phase. The process following the peer review would involve further conversations with both the Council and the affected community boards of Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi and Rangiora-Ashley.

In a supplementary question N Atkinson enquired if matters would be in place for Christmas. J Palmer advised that he would await the review and subsequent conversations before advising of further timings.

S Stewart enquired if there will be a report reflecting the history of what has occurred previously with decorations. Staff advised there would be such a report.

S Stewart clarified that the report should include information related to decorations, rather than lighting.

J Palmer acknowledged there were two issues to consider. One being feature lighting and the second being decorations. Information would include an outline of which party was responsible for what aspect. There would be a discussion with Kaiapoi Promotions Association in regard to custody, installment and responsibilities of decorations.

Moved: P Redmond Seconded: C Greengrass

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:
(a) Requests a report from the Council Chief Executive outlining the current arrangements for Christmas decorations and lighting in and around Kaiapoi during the November/December period and further requests options for enhancing Christmas lighting and decorations during this period for 2018.

(b) Requests such report to be received at the scheduled July meeting of the Board on 16 July 2018.

CARRIED

P Redmond looked forward to the outcome of the peer review and subsequent conversations. He spoke of the importance to keep moving the matter forward and hoped for a positive outcome prior to Christmas.

C Greengrass stated festive lighting was important, referring to Christmas lighting rather than all year round lighting. Staff acknowledged this difference.

8 REPORTS

8.1 Bramleys Road Well Viability Assessment – C Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager) and K Simpson (3 Waters Manager)

K Simpson spoke to the report, providing a background on the history, including information from 2009 testing. Recently the well was re-tested and reviewed. It would be unlikely to get a resource consent as use may influence water levels between the deep and shallow aquifers, also the flow required is less than ideal. Further investigation also showed that the well would require treatment such as UV.

P Redmond enquired if consideration was given to take water from Kaiapoi. Staff advised that option was assessed, however concluded that the best option was to connect to the Woodend supply.

S Stewart queried the timing of the Runanga discussions, reflecting on the Gladstone Road well and asked if the procedure is in the right order due to the Runanga concerns. Staff responded that during consultation with the wider community Bramleys Road well was considered a mitigating factor and was more acceptable. Now circumstances have changed and another conversation is required with the Runanga. This report provides an update to the Community Boards.

N Atkinson sought clarification on past discussions with the Runanga. K Simpson explained the cultural views, which varied across the previous consultation. It was least appropriate to drill a well at Pegasus. In a supplementary question N Atkinson asked what was the next proposal if the Runanga said no to the current proposal. K Simpson advised that alternative sources would then be investigated, with a need to meet the Runanga again and fully understand their views. Any alternative options would likely be very expensive for a standalone community. The proposed option was considered the most feasible option based on the latest information.

J Watson sought clarification that a key cultural issue was the past battles and burial sites. Staff confirmed that was correct, noting that water is currently consumed from those locations.

Moved: J Watson Seconded: C Greengrass

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board recommends:

(a) Receives report No. 180323031876.

THAT the Council:
(b) **Notes** that previously it was expected that water of a suitable quality and quantity could be abstracted from the Bramleys Road well to be distributed to the Woodend Pegasus water supply scheme, via Tuahiwi, without any treatment.

(c) **Notes** that the Bramleys Road well is no longer considered to be a viable future source for the scheme, as the water source would likely require significant treatment and gaining consent to abstract water from the well would be very difficult.

(d) **Notes** that some Tuahiwi residents opposed the joining of the scheme with Pegasus for cultural reasons, and that the future connection of the Bramleys Road well would have potentially mitigated these concerns.

(e) **Notes** that staff will write to the local Runanga and discuss this matter at the next Runanga meeting on the 17 May 2018, to advise them of the reasons that this well is no longer considered to be a viable future source.

(f) **Approves** the replacement of the $2.2M capital works budget in 2022/23 and 2023/24 to connect the Bramleys Road well, with a $0.5M capital works budget in 2023/24 to connect the EQ4 well to provide additional capacity on the Woodend Pegasus water supply scheme.

**AMENDMENT**

Moved: P Redmond Seconded: M Pinkham

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board recommends:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180323031876.

THAT the Council:

(b) **Notes** that previously it was expected that water of a suitable quality and quantity could be abstracted from the Bramleys Road well to be distributed to the Woodend Pegasus water supply scheme, via Tuahiwi, without any treatment.

(c) **Notes** that the Bramleys Road well is no longer considered to be a viable future source for the scheme, as the water source would likely require significant treatment and gaining consent to abstract water from the well would be very difficult.

(d) **Notes** that some Tuahiwi residents opposed the joining of the scheme with Pegasus for cultural reasons, and that the future connection of the Bramleys Road well would have potentially mitigated these concerns.

(e) **Notes** that staff will write to the local Runanga and discuss this matter at the next Runanga meeting on the 17 May 2018, to advise them of the reasons that this well is no longer considered to be a viable future source.

P Redmond commented that if there is no ‘Plan B’ it could be perceived as a fait accompli before discussions with the Runanga occur, and if consultation occurs then there is a need to review and commit to an accurate budget.

J Palmer advised that staff recommendation (f) is currently a Long Term Plan provision as it is the most sustainable way forward for catering for the anticipated growth. The intention is to reflect what is needed but not necessarily to build now. If, as a result of engagement after the LTP changes and alternative options would take matters through the next three years for the next LTP when costs would be refined and confirmed.
M Pinkham was supportive of the amendment as he did not wish to see the funding locked in but accepted the budget provisions explained by the Chief Executive.

P Redmond remarked it was a 'chicken and egg' scenario as the detailed costs were not yet known.

N Atkinson stated it could be three years away and he was comfortable with the Chief Executives explanation. It was not good to hold $2.2m in abeyance and outlined reasoning for his questions earlier. The water is already taken from the area proposed and believed this was the best way forward and therefore could not support the amendment.

J Watson and C Greengrass concurred with N Atkinson’s comments.

With the amendment lost, the original motion became the substantive motion.

Moved: J Watson Seconded: C Greengrass

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board recommends:

(f) Receives report No. 180323031876.

THAT the Council:

(g) Notes that previously it was expected that water of a suitable quality and quantity could be abstracted from the Bramleys Road well to be distributed to the Woodend Pegasus water supply scheme, via Tuahiwi, without any treatment.

(h) Notes that the Bramleys Road well is no longer considered to be a viable future source for the scheme, as the water source would likely require significant treatment and gaining consent to abstract water from the well would be very difficult.

(i) Notes that some Tuahiwi residents opposed the joining of the scheme with Pegasus for cultural reasons, and that the future connection of the Bramleys Road well would have potentially mitigated these concerns.

(j) Notes that staff will write to the local Runanga and discuss this matter at the next Runanga meeting on the 17 May 2018, to advise them of the reasons that this well is no longer considered to be a viable future source.

(k) Approves the replacement of the $2.2M capital works budget in 2022/23 and 2023/24 to connect the Bramleys Road well, with a $0.5M capital works budget in 2023/24 to connect the EQ4 well to provide additional capacity on the Woodend Pegasus water supply scheme.

CARRIED

P Redmond was not opposed to the motion, but believed it looked like the LTP was committing to the EQ4 work and the discussions with the Runanga were ongoing.

J Palmer explained that this option is providing capacity for the entire scheme and that the Bramleys Road well would have assisted cultural concerns, however most of the capacity is at Woodend and Pegasus rather than Tuahiwi.

N Atkinson stated the matter would be discussed at the upcoming Council meeting as he would take those concerns to the meeting, acknowledging staff had noted those concerns also.
8.2 Ratification of the Board’s Submission to the Waimakariri District Council’s Long Term Plan 2018-2028 – E Cordwell (Governance Adviser)

The report was taken as read.

Moved: J Watson  Seconded: P Redmond

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:
(a) Receives report No. 180328033656.
(b) Retrospectively ratifies the Board’s submission to the Waimakariri District Council’s Long Term Plan 2018-2028 (Trim No.180327032890).

CARRIED

Councillors Atkinson and Stewart Abstained

R Blair commented on an additional matter of Stirling Crescent footpath.

J Watson noted the information and could speak on the matter at the hearing in early May.

8.3 ANZAC Day Services 2018 - E Cordwell (Governance Adviser)

The report was taken as read.

Moved: J Watson  Seconded: N Atkinson

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:
(a) Receives report No. 180326032242.
(b) Appoints Board member M Pinkham to attend the Kaiapoi Cenotaph Dawn Service at 6.30am on Wednesday 25 April 2018.
(c) Appoints Board members P Redmond and R Blair to lay a wreath on behalf of the Board at the Kaiapoi Cenotaph (Trousselot Park) Service at 10.00am (assemble corner of Davis and Sewell Streets by tennis courts by 9.45am) on Wednesday 25 April 2018.
(d) Appoints Board member C Greengrass to lay a wreath on behalf of the Board at Tuahiwi (Urupa) ANZAC Day Service at 2.00pm on Wednesday 25 April.

CARRIED

8.4 Application to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board’s Discretionary Grant 2017-2018 – E Cordwell (Governance Adviser)

The report was taken as read.

C Greengrass queried issues with education based applications, past Board decisions and support provided by the Ministry of Education. Staff advised that at 1 July the Board would receive a new funding allocation and would review the criteria. It was acknowledged that the previous Community Board had agreed that they would not provide funding for education institutions that are funded primarily for the Ministry of Education. The current Board had not made that stipulation and each application, if it met the general criteria would be presented by staff for the Board to consider on its individual merits.
THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180405036300.
(b) Declines the application from Clarkville Playcentre.

CARRIED
R Blair Against

N Atkinson commented that the fund was for ‘not for profit’ organisations and would prefer to spend funding elsewhere, however agreed that applications should be considered on a case by case basis.

M Pinkham commented about play centres not making a profit but supported the motion to decline the application as he believed the fund should be spent more on events.

R Blair stated he did not support declining the application.

A Blackie believed this was a wealthy play centre and area and therefore could find other sources of funding.

P Redmond was sympathetic to the application, but believed that as this was a private preschool, no Board funding should be allocated.

J Meyer agreed with A Blackie’s comments.

S Stewart remarked that the financial information supplied indicated an operational loss, however acknowledge it was ratepayer’s funds. S Stewart believed each application should be considered on a case by case basis, however in this instance she was supportive of declining the application.

9 CORRESPONDENCE
Nil.

10 CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT

10.1 Chair’s Diary for March-April 2018
A brief verbal update was provided with further meetings scheduled in the coming week.

11 MATTERS REFERRED FOR INFORMATION

11.1 Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting minutes – 14 March 2018
(Trim No. 180307023947)

11.2 Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting minutes – 8 March 2018 (Trim No. 180301021620).

11.3 Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting minutes – 12 March 2018
(Trim No. 180306023479).

11.4 Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting extraordinary meeting minutes – 26 February 2018 (Trim No. 180301021894).

11.5 Youth Council meeting minutes – 27 February 2018

11.6 Update on the Management of Council Wastewater Treatment Plants Report to Council 20 March 2018 (Trim No. 180301021693).

11.7 Library Update Report to Community and Recreation Committee 27 March 2018 (Trim No. 180316028214).
11.8 **ANZAC Day Services 2018** Report to Council 3 April 2018 (Trim No. 180321030283).

11.9 **Ohoka Road Sewer Upgrades** Report to Utilities and Roading Committee 20 March 2018 (Trim No. 170928105216).


Moved: J Watson  Seconded: P Redmond

**THAT** the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board receives the information in items 10.1-10.10.

**CARRIED**

12 **MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE**

| N Atkinson | Commented on the number of submissions received for the LTP and the sessions of Councillors attending various community events and supermarkets to talk directly to the public on the LTP matters had been a positive experience. Noted the Liquor Ban Bylaw and Alcohol Policy were being reviewed over the next couple of months. |
| S Stewart | Provided an update on the Waimakariri Water Zone meetings and the work that was occurring that would feed into the ZIPA and what that means to the district. Advised the local Drainage Advisory Groups would see set rates through the LTP process that would mean having a year of funds in reserve to undertake future works. Commented on the Passchendaele Walkway, noting that vehicles were damaging a section at Smith Street, and had put through a service request for improvement. Advised on the Stormwater Drainage and Watercourse Protection Bylaw would be adopted by the Council in May, and what it would mean for property owners discharging water into drains and creeks. |
| P Redmond | Commented on recent attendances at Standing Orders training, the Hui, along with the Rangiora Networking Group, the work of the Waimakariri Access Group and Kaiapoi Regeneration Steering Group. |
| M Pinkham | Recently attended meetings of the Kaiapoi Regeneration Steering Group, Wellbeing North Canterbury Board (as the Council representative) and reflected on working together as a Board on the Long Term Plan submission. |
| J Meyer | Commented on recent changes to the Waimakariri Access Group and the positive addition of Community Board representation. He reflected on the Cust River Rating Group, of which he is chair, and the positive relationship between Ecan and neighbours. |
| C Greengrass | Advised the Pines and Kairaki Residents Association were very active in the local community. Reflected on attendance at the Waimakariri Access Group and the Kaiapoi Network meeting. Advised that the Kaiapoi Museum were seeking additional space and the successful movie event hosted by You, Me, We, Us. It was also advised that the Kaiapoi Promotions |
Association were investigating other events to potentially run in conjunction with the Kaiapoi Art Expo.

13 CONSULTATION PROJECTS
There were no current consultations.

14 REGENERATION PROJECTS
14.1 Town Centre, Kaiapoi
Updates on the Kaiapoi Town Centre projects are emailed regularly to Board members. These updates can be accessed using the link below:

14.2 Kaiapoi Regeneration Steering Group
The next meeting of the Kaiapoi Regeneration Steering Group will be held in Meeting Room 1, Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre, 4pm on Monday 7 May 2018. This meeting is open to the public.
The Board noted the information.

15 BOARD FUNDING UPDATE
15.1 Board Discretionary Grant
Balance as at 16 April 2018: $1,900.
The Board noted the balance.
15.2 General Landscaping Budget
Balance as at 16 April 2018: $60,080.
The Board noted the balance.

16 MEDIA ITEMS
Nil.

17 MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED
As the public excluded portion of the previous months minutes were accepted, there was not requirement for a public excluded portion of the meeting.

18 QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS
Nil.

19 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS
Nil.
NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board is scheduled for 4pm, Monday 21 May 2018 at the Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 5.27pm.

CONFIRMED

__________________
Chairperson

__________________
Date

Following the meeting, member C Greengrass provided a brief update on the Public Spaces Policy (Business Zones) Advisory Group which looked at matters such as seating outside cafes on footpaths, shop goods outside shop fronts, and signs or banners and their placement. Further discussion and work with staff will be undertaken over the next few months before a report is considered by the Council.
MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF THE OXFORD-OHOKA COMMUNITY BOARD
HELD IN THE A&P MEETING ROOM, OXFORD TOWN HALL, MAIN STREET,
OXFORD ON THURSDAY 3 MAY 2018 AT 7.00PM.

PRESENT
D Nicholl (Chair), M Brown (Deputy Chair), W Doody, J Ensor, K Felstead,
J Lynn and T Robson.

IN ATTENDANCE
S Markham (Manager, Strategy and Engagement), G Stephens (Green Space Community
Engagement Officer) and S Nichols (Governance Manager).

1 APOLOGIES
Moved J Ensor Seconded M Brown
An apology was received and sustained from S Farrell for absence. CARRIED

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
Item 7.1(d) – D Nicholl and J Lynn.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board – 8 March 2018
Moved M Brown seconded J Lynn
(a) THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:
Confirms the circulated minutes of the Oxford-Ohoka Community
Board meeting, held 5 April 2018, as a true and accurate record.
CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
Nil.

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS
Nil.

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS
Nil.

7 REPORTS
7.1 General Landscaping Budget – G Stephens (Green Space Community
Engagement Officer)

Having declared a conflict of interest in relation to recommendation (d) only,
members D Nicholl and J Lynn sat back from the table during discussions
specifically related to the Gate Keeper’s Lodge project.

G Stephens spoke briefly to the report, and circulated information updating
the proposed fencing plan around the Gate Keeper’s Lodge at Ohoka Domain.
The new fencing plan would enable the Ohoka Farmers Market to retain
access around the Domain during the summer. G Stephens further advised
that due to D Nicholl donating his labour and skills to fencing the area, the
project costs were likely to reduce the budget.
T Robson enquired what was likely to happen to the Swannanoa Cricket Club project if they were unable to secure funding through the Rata Foundation, as currently proposed. Staff explained the rules related to fund allocation and advised that if the recommendation was approved, the club would be able to continue with landscape planting. If the Rata Foundation declined funding towards the building move, the project may be delayed, however staff would liaise with the Club in relation to logistics.

J Ensor queried if the cricket club would be able to use the funds towards other aspects of the project. Staff explained that the funds have been stipulated to be used specifically towards landscape planting, unless the motion was amended.

J Lynn queried if staff had considered a roof/shelter for the park bench by the skate park at Pearson Park. G Stephens advised that no thought had been given to such a structure for that particular bench/table and would be at an additional cost. Also input from the Pearson Park Advisory Group would be required.

Moved K Felstead seconded W Doody

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No.180328033900.
(b) Notes the list of potential future projects included within Section 3.11.
(c) Notes the Board currently has $11,830.00 available to allocate to general landscape projects within the Oxford-Ohoka ward.
(d) Approves the allocation of $3,000 towards a fence around the Ohoka Gate Keeper’s Lodge in Ohoka Domain.
(e) Approves the allocation of $3,000 towards landscaping around the cricket pavilion at Swannanoa subject to its relocation to the other side of the reserve.
(f) Approves the remaining allocation of $5,830 towards the installation of a rubbish bin and park seating/table that is suitably designed to enable wheelchair accessibility, by the Skate Park at Pearson Park.
(g) Recommends to the Council that any excess of funds from the above projects, be carried over to the 2018/19 financial year and allocated towards the Ohoka Domain Tree Ring Seat Project.

CARRIED

K Felstead remarked it was good to see various projects progress across the ward area that would benefit many in the community.

W Doody commented on the importance of wheelchair accessibility to any picnic table that was placed in Pearson Park.

7.2 Application to the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board’s Discretionary Grant Fund 2017/2018: Eyreton Pony Club – E Cordwell (Governance Adviser)

S Nichols spoke briefly to the report.

Moved W Doody seconded J Ensor

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No.180416041160.
(b) Approves a grant of $500 to Eyreton Pony Club towards the cost of fencing to enclose the learner/young rider area.

CARRIED

W Doody commented that given the balance of the fund and the substantial project that the Pony Club was undertaking which would benefit many participants it was appropriate to contribute to the project.

J Ensor was fully supportive of the motion and the club project.

7.3 Ratification of the Board’s Submission to the Waimakariri District Council’s Long Term Plan 2018-2028 – E Cordwell (Governance Adviser)

The report was taken as read.

Moved M Brown seconded J Ensor

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No.18032803365.

(b) Retrospectively ratifies the Board’s submission to the Waimakariri District Council’s Long Term Plan 2018-2028 (Trim No.180328033681).

CARRIED

Councillors Doody and Felstead Abstained

8 CORRESPONDENCE

Moved W Doody seconded J Ensor

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives correspondence from a resident of Mandeville Park Drive and the Board of the Mandeville Sports Club.

CARRIED

It was noted that staff will write to the resident.

9 CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT

9.1 Chairperson’s Report for March 2018

Moved M Brown seconded J Lynn

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No 180423043858.

CARRIED

10 MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

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

10.2 Youth Council meeting minutes – 27 March 2018

10.3 ANZAC Day Services 2018 Report to Council 3 April 2018 (Trim No. 180321030283).

10.5 Waimakariri District Development Strategy (DDS) ‘Our District, Our Future – Waimakariri 2048’ – Decisions Amended Strategy for Adoption
Report to Council 3 April 2018 (Trim No. 180322031167).

10.6 Oxford Rural No.1 New Source – Strategy for Completing Project
Report to Council 3 April 2018 (Trim No. 180322031037).

Moved W Doody seconded T Robson
THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board receives the information in items 10.1-10.6
CARRIED

11 MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE

Members briefly discussed an option of providing a written report however decided to remain with the status quo of a verbal update at each meeting.

J Enson Commented positively on the Fernside ANZAC Service. Noted the Mandeville supermarket had opened. Attendance at the All Boards briefing.

J Lynn Commented on Ohoka ANZAC Service, including wreath laying. Updated members on the Gate Keepers Lodge progress, including engagement of an adviser from the Historic Places Trust to assist with the construction plan. Also the group are working on health and safety matters and a heads of agreement with the Council.

T Robson Attended the Oxford ANZAC Service. Commented on working with the Board Chairs on a proposed Youth Development Fund and matter discussed at the recent All Boards briefing. Provided an update on Pearson Park Advisory Group matters including the approval of the half court work. Continuing to encourage groups to apply for the Board’s Discretionary Grant.

M Brown Attended the ANZAC Service at West Eyreton and laid a wreath on behalf of the Community Board. Assisting Swannanoa Cricket Club with their pavilion development and funding projects. Contributing to the Mandeville Sports Club Board development of their long term strategic plans.

K Felstead Provided an update of the Council meeting from earlier in the week.
- Kaiapoi River dredging and an update on the floating pontoons design and procurement strategy.
- Ashley River Secondary Stop Bank on Cones Road and Milton Avenue in Rangiora.
- The adoption of the Stormwater Drainage and Watercourse Protection Bylaw which would make it clearer for property owners to understand their responsibilities in relation to discharge of water into drains and streams.
- Budget approval for drainage works to occur at Siena Place and Sillano Place.
- Approval for the Solid and Hazardous Waste Working Party to approve the engagement processes for kerbside collection services options.
The Council’s submission on Government Policy Statement on Land Transport, outlining effects on the district for passenger transport and the advocacy for improved transport flows between towns.

The adoption of a Register of Interests for the Councillors.

Provided an update on the Bramleys Road well viability and future discussion and proposals, along with the combining of the Woodend and Pegasus water supplies.

W Doody Spoke of the ANZAC Service held at Cust and the subsequent service at the West Eyreton Hall.

Tabled a report which included historical information on Mary Christmas (and Christmas Road), Ashley River protection matters, Kaiapoi skate park mural, a speaker at the Oxford Library and information on suicide prevention.

The Councillors were also working with the local Police on upgraded crime prevention cameras.

12 CONSULTATION PROJECTS

The Board noted that consultation on the Local Alcohol Policy and the review of the Liquor Ban Bylaw would be released in mid-May for consideration and comment.

13 REGENERATION PROJECTS

13.1 Town Centre, Oxford

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

The Board acknowledge the updates provided.

14 BOARD FUNDING UPDATE

14.1 Board Discretionary Grant

Balance as at 26 April 2018: $2,276.19

The Board noted the balance and would receive a report in June to allocate any remaining funding.

14.2 General Landscaping Fund

Balance as at 26 April 2018 $11,830.

The Board noted that due to the report earlier in the meeting, all funds for the 2017/18 financial year had been allocated and a new fund would become available after 1 July 2018.

15 MEDIA ITEMS

Nil.

16 QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

Nil.
17 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS
Nil.

NEXT MEETING
The next meeting of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board is scheduled for Thursday 7 June 2018 commencing at 7.00pm, at the Ohoka Community Hall.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 8.16pm.

CONFIRMED

__________________________
Chairperson

__________________________
Date

A workshop discussion occurred from 8.17pm to 8.45pm.
Matters discussed were:
- Development proposal at 108 Butchers Road.
- Ecan Hearing and next steps in relation to Canterbury Landscapes Ltd Consent.
- Tram Road Speed Limit in Mandeville changing to 80kph in early June.
- Easter Trading.
MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF THE RANGIORA-ASHLEY COMMUNITY BOARD
HELD IN THE WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL CHAMBERS, RANGIORA SERVICE CENTRE, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA ON WEDNESDAY 16 MAY 2018 AT 7PM.

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

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

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

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

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
Nil.

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

CARRIED

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

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS
Nil.

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS
Nil.
7 REPORTS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Moved J Gerard seconded P Williams

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

(a) **Receives** report No. 180504048871.

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

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

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

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

(f) **Recommends** to the Council that the Water Supply Advisory Group comprises:

- 4-6 Volunteer representatives from the Garrymere water supply (noting that there should be an appropriate balance of representatives from the Landcare group and those that were not part of the group)
- 3 members of the Rangiora Ashley Community Board – D Lundy, D Gordon and C Prickett.
- Councillor Williams as portfolio holder for water and wastewater
- Council’s Water Asset Manager and 3 Waters Manager (or Manager Utilities & Roading)
- 1 representative from the CDHB (Drinking Water Assessor), if agreeable,

- And that the Advisory Group be directed to report its recommendations to Council in by June 2019.

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

CARRIED

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Moved G Miller

THAT the Rangiora–Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180502047945.

(b) Approves the design of the proposed footbridge in the location shown in Crayfish Creek Footbridge, Site Plan 3802, for an estimated cost of $56,000 (refer attachment i).

(c) Notes that construction of the footbridge will be tendered and is currently planned to be completed before 30 June 2018.

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

LAPSED for want of a seconder

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

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

Moved D Gordon seconded P Williams

THAT the Rangiora–Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180502047945.

(b) Approves the footbridge in the location shown in Crayfish Creek Footbridge, Site Plan 3802, but asks staff to come back to the Board with concept and costings for a Hegan Reserve style bridge.

CARRIED

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

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

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

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

Moved J Gerard seconded D Lundy

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

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

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

**CARRIED**

8 **CORRESPONDENCE**

Nil.

9 **CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT**

9.1 **Chair’s Diary for April 2018**

Moved J Gerard seconded D Gordon

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

(a) Receives report No. 180508049899.

**CARRIED**

10 **MATTERS FOR INFORMATION**

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

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

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

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

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


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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

12 **CONSULTATION PROJECTS**

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

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

14 **BOARD FUNDING UPDATE**

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

14.2 **General Landscaping Fund**

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

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

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

15 **MEDIA ITEMS**

Nil.

16 **QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**

Nil.

17 **URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**

Nil.

**NEXT MEETING**

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

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

CONFIRMED

________________
Chairperson

________________
Date

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

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

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

- Members Information Exchange review.
- Holiday Trading.
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE KAIAPOI-TUAHIWI COMMUNITY BOARD
HELD IN MEETING ROOM 1 (UPSTAIRS), RUATANIWHA KAIAPOI CIVIC CENTRE,
176 WILLIAMS STREET, KAIAPOI ON MONDAY 21 MAY 2018 COMMENCING AT
4.00PM.

PRESENT
C Greengrass (Chairperson), N Atkinson, M Pinkham, P Redmond and S Stewart.

IN ATTENDANCE
Councillor A Blackie.
J Palmer (Chief Executive), S Morrow (Land Information Officer) and A Smith (Committee
Advisor), Mayor D Ayers

1 APOLOGIES
Moved C Greengrass seconded S Stewart
THAT apologies for absence be received from Board Members J Watson, R Blair
and J Meyer.
CARRIED

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
C Greengrass declared a conflict of interest with item 7.4 as a member of You, Me,
We Us.
M Pinkham declared a potential conflict with item 7.5, Forestry Project Control
Group, through his employment and advised that he would not be available as the
Board KTCB representative on this group.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board – 16 April 2018

Moved C Greengrass seconded M Pinkham
THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:
(a) Confirms the circulated minutes of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community
Board meeting, held 16 April 2018, as a true and accurate record.
CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
There were no matters arising.
5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

5.1 KYDz (YouMeWeUs)

Sophie Lucas and Annie Saunders (from Kaiapoi High School) spoke on behalf of KYDz, which stands for Kaiapoi Youth Division, a part of You,Me,We,Us. There are ten members of this team, four from Kaiapoi High School, and two from each primary school. The group was formed last year after Mr Miles, Principal of Kaiapoi North School noted there had been comments from children that there was not a lot of events for children in Kaiapoi. Members of KYDz came up with their own name and created a logo, which is printed onto tops for them to wear at events. Members have helped put on the pop up cinema, with a sausage sizzle which helped raise funds for future projects.

As a group they have discussed many ideas for events which have ranged from holding a Kaiapoi’s Got Talent show, fireworks show or having a KYDz Bar, which would be a facility located in Kaiapoi when young people could go, with free Wi-Fi, and Bluetooth speakers etc. The team have decided to hold a KYDz Mud Fest on 17 June at Askeaton reserve from 11am to 2pm and are applying for funding for advertising posters to put around the community and hope to have these up at least a month before the event. There are three people in the team who are working on poster designs.

KYDz have booked space in Art on the Quay for December this year, and have chosen the theme of Kiwiana summer holiday. Members will be talking to teachers with the idea that they select people who can create a piece of artwork for this display. This artwork could range from painting, photography, or cross stitch, as long as the item relates to the theme.

The KYDz team have also been discussing a way to remember the earthquake, an example being creating a lock bridge or a lock fence. They would hope this could become a tourist attraction for Kaiapoi. It would represent the people that were lost and the damage that was done. It would also represent the regeneration of Kaiapoi.

The Boar Chair thanked Sophie and Annie for attending and their presentation and congratulated them on the Mud Fest event they are planning. Sophie and Annie were accompanied by two younger members of the group, Thomas Gunn and Amber Brownies.

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS

There was no adjourned business.

7 REPORTS

Item 7.4 was considered at this time. Note that the minutes of the meeting have been recorded in accordance with the Order of the Agenda as circulated.
7.1 Approval to Change Intersection Controls – Kieran Straw (Civil Project Team Leader) and Ken Stevenson (Roading Manager)

Mr Palmer spoke to this report, indicating that with the roundabout being constructed at the Williams/Smiths Street, there needs to be a change in the traffic controls at this intersection. This replaces Stop signs with Give Way signs.

Moved P Redmond seconded M Pinkham

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180423043958

(b) Authorises the following intersection controls pursuant to Section 2 of the Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004 with effect from the date of installation of the appropriate signage:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road to be Controlled</th>
<th>Type of Controls to be Imposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Williams Street, on both approaches to the Smith Street / Beach Road intersection</td>
<td>Give Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith Street, on the approach to the Williams Street intersection</td>
<td>Give Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach Road, on the approach to the Williams Street intersection</td>
<td>Give Way</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) Authorises the removal of the following intersection controls pursuant to Section 2 of the Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004 with effect from the date of the removal of the appropriate signage:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road with control to be removed</th>
<th>Uncontrolled Road</th>
<th>Type of Control to be removed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smith Street</td>
<td>Williams Street</td>
<td>Stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach Road</td>
<td>Williams Street</td>
<td>Stop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(d) Authorises the installation of the following intersection controls pursuant to Section 2 of the Land Transport Rule: Traffic Control Devices 2004 with effect from 22 May 2018:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road to be controlled</th>
<th>Uncontrolled Road</th>
<th>Type of Control to be Imposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mill Road</td>
<td>Passchendaele Cycleway (Shared Space)</td>
<td>Give Way</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(e) Notes that the requirement for the Give Way control on Mill Road was identified by a safety audit that was carried out after the scheme plan for the Passchendaele Cycleway was approved by Council.

(f) Circulates this report to the Utilities and Roading Committee.

CARRIED
7.2 **Road Naming – Waimakariri District Council – Scott Morrow (Land Information Officer)**

S Morrow was present to speak to this report, which asks the Board to consider providing a new road name for the arterial road which has been constructed around the outside of the Silverstream development in West Kaiapoi.

P Redmond suggested that the name Ohoka Road just go to where the road crosses over Ohoka Stream, and then the name Skewbridge Road go from there on. There was discussion on property numbering on this part of the road and it was clarified that this would not have any adverse impact on properties in the vicinity.

Moved P Redmond seconded M Pinkham

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

(a) **Receives** report No. 180509050654.

(b) **Approves** the road name for the New Arterial Road in west Kaiapoi from the Ohoka Road off ramp to the centre of Mill Road intersection be named Ohoka Road.

(c) **Approves** the name of the road from Mill Road intersection west to the Skewbridge, to be known as Skewbridge Road.

(d) **Refer** this recommendation to Oxford-Ohoka Community Board for its confirmation.

**CARRIED**

7.3 **Road Naming – Waimakariri District Council – Scott Morrow (Land Information Officer)**

S Morrow presented this report to seek approval of the new road name for the new Kaiapoi East access road which has been created as part of the Kaiapoi East Regeneration area.

There was discussion on whether Jones Street could be included as part of the renamed street, but it was agreed it should be retained, to reduce any impacts on residents with changes to street numbering.

Moved N Atkinson seconded P Redmond

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

(a) **Receives** report No. 180509050549.

(b) **Approves** the road name ‘Feldwick Drive’ for the new extension of the existing road.

**CARRIED**
7.4 Application to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board’s Discretionary Grant 2017-2018 – Sarah Nichols (Governance Manager)

Chairperson Greengrass, had previously declared a conflict of interest in this matter and took no part in discussion or voting. Board Member Phillip Redmond assumed the Chair’s position during consideration of this item.

The report was taken as read and there were no questions.

Moved P Redmond seconded N Atkinson

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180510051373.

(b) Approves a grant of $300 to You, Me, We, Us Kaiapoi towards the costs of the KYDZ Mud Fest event.

CARRIED

N Atkinson congratulated You Me We Us with the formation of the KYDz group and is very supportive of this venture.

C Greengrass resumed the role of Chair at this time.

7.5 Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board Representation on the Forestry Project Control Group – Jeff Millward (Manager, Finance & Business Support)

Mr Palmer spoke to this report noting that the Council wishes to form a steering group on this matter, to include representatives from this Board and the Woodend-Sefton Community Board. In June, the Council will commence harvesting a significant amount of commercial forestry along the eastern areas of the district. Having Board representatives on this steering group is a way for the community connection to be improved with this project. There has been concern raised by local residents of the noise and vibration the logging may cause to residents property and homes. By way of additional reassurance, the Council has requested a report from leading environmental and engineering consultants Tonkin and Taylor, on vibration effects logging transportation may have on property and homes.

A Blackie asked if it would be worthwhile to include a member of the Pegasus Bylaw Group in this group. It was noted that J Watson had indicated her interest in this role, and she is also a member of Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw implementation group.

Moved N Atkinson seconded P Redmond

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180511051825

(b) Appoints J Watson as the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board’s representative to the Forestry Harvest Project Control Group;

(c) Notes the terms of reference provides for a representative from the Woodend-Sefton and Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Boards.

CARRIED
8 CORRESPONDENCE

Moved C Greengrass seconded M Pinkham

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:
(a) Receives the letter of appreciation from the Kaiapoi Returned and Services Association (Trim 180515052988).

CARRIED

9 CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT

9.1 Chair’s Diary for April-May 2018

Moved C Greengrass seconded N Atkinson

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:
(a) Receives report No. 180515052991.

CARRIED

10 MATTERS REFERRED FOR INFORMATION

10.1 Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting minutes – 5 April 2018 (Trim No. 180328033515).
10.2 Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting minutes – 11 April 2018 (Trim No. 1804040335432).
10.3 Rangiora-Ashley Road and Reserve Naming Committee meeting minutes – 4 April 2018 (Trim No. 180140903787).
10.4 Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting minutes – 9 April 2018 (Trim No. 180327032677).
10.5 Youth Council meeting minutes – 27 March 2018
10.9 Register of Interests Policy Report to Council 1 May 2018 (Trim No. 180419042965).

Moved C Greengrass seconded P Redmond

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board receives the information in items 10.1-10.9.

CARRIED
11 MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE

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

S Stewart

S Stewart spoke on the recently adopted Stormwater Drainage and Watercourse Protection Bylaw 2018. Having recently made a complaint to ECan regarding cattle in a drain, S Stewart was told that ECans current legislation does not cover drains. As of May 14, the Councils Stormwater Drainage and Watercourse Protection Bylaw is the legislation that covers this and any complaints should be directed to the Council.

In 2019 this will be then be covered with the adoption of Plan Change 4. This will cover cattle, deer and pigs, but not horses in waterways. S Stewart will seek confirmation of this. Any complaints received of large animals being in waterways, results in testing of water quality downstream for any adverse effects.

There has recently been a significant report released on Nitrates in this area and the effects on the water. This report is possibly going to the Councils Utilities and Roading Committee meeting on 19 June. S Stewart suggests this is an important matter and all Community Board members should be made aware of this. Mr Palmer said he will seek advice and confirm if this matter is to be on the agenda.

S Stewart spoke on the water allocation limits and the recommendations from the Zone Committee which will go out for consultation. On almost every stream in the district, it is proposed to raise the minimum water flow and capping of the water takes at current use.

M Pinkham asked if these changes are applied, how long would it be before these are in place. S Stewart said this is still to be reviewed, but there appears to be a consensus that all consents are brought in at the same time.

If there is a consultation process undertaken, Mr Palmer confirmed that a community board could submit on this matter, but not the Council as the Zone Committee is a joint committee of both EC and Waimakariri District Council.

It was confirmed that any water extraction requires a consent. Current consents are in place in all the streams in the district, some which have been in place for many years, these are reviewed regularly.

P Redmond

P Redmond sought clarification on the water and drainage and river groups. An explanation was provided on the Zone Committee membership, the WDC rural Drainage Advisory Groups, and the two river committees, Cam River Rehabilitation Committee and Kaiapoi River Rehabilitation Working Party.

P Redmond has recently attended the following:

Regeneration Briefing on reserves 23 April
ANZAC Day service at 10am with Board Member Roger Blair
All Boards briefing 30 April
Waimakariri Health Advisory Group meeting on 1 May
Big Brothers Big Sisters fundraising Breakfast on 3 May, successful function
Te Reo classes at WDC

Film Showing Plastic Straw Free Rangiora was shown on 6 May which all members were invited to. This was produced by North Loburn School.

Assisted with Boards submission presentation to Council at LTP Hearing 8 May
The Rubbish runner is collecting rubbish on the beach between Pines and Kairaki Beach.
At the most recent count he had collected 14,500 items of rubbish. A lot of this is plastic bags and plastic bottles.

M Parkham

M Pinkham has recently attended:

- Regeneration Briefing on reserves 23 April
- Wellbeing North Canterbury meeting 23 April
- ANZAC Day dawn service
- All Boards briefing on 30 April
- Community Boards LTP submission presented to Council on 8 May

A Blackie

The Kaiapoi Promotions Association have requested use of some land in the mixed business use for the Christmas Parade, which will be a place for the floats to be on display following the Parade.

N Atkinson

Attended the Council’s Long Term Plan submission hearings, extended compliments on the quality of the submissions that had been received and those that were spoken to.

Attended four ANZAC Day services and was impressed at the numbers attending the Dawn Service in Kaiapoi.

Takes over as Chair of the Council’s Audit and Risk Committee at tomorrow’s meeting for the following 18 months, until the end of this term of Council.

Has met with 58 individuals regarding the Council’s Long Term Plan matters, which there has been a lot of interest in.

C Greengrass

Has recently attended:

- Kaiapoi Museum meeting
- Pines Beach Association meeting
- Waimakariri ACCESS group meeting
- Tuahiwi ANZAC Day Service

Noted that Scott Murray is now the Chairperson of the Kaiapoi Promotions Association following recent staff resignation.

Greengrass noted the recent acknowledgement of a local resident who has given 40 years’ service to the Kaiapoi Red Cross group.
12 CONSULTATION PROJECTS

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

Mr Palmer noted that this is not a formal consultation process at this point, it is an information gathering process.

Alcohol in our District
Consultation closes Monday 11 June 2018.

The Chair noted that the Board will be looking at submitting on this matter.

13 REGENERATION PROJECTS

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

13.2 Kaiapoi Regeneration Steering Group
The next meeting of the Kaiapoi Regeneration Steering Group will be held in Meeting Room 1, Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre, 4pm on Monday 11 June 2018. This meeting is open to the public.

14 BOARD FUNDING UPDATE

14.1 Board Discretionary Grant
Balance as at 21 May 2018: $1,900.

14.2 General Landscaping Budget
Balance as at 21 May 2018: $60,080.

15 MEDIA ITEMS

N Atkinson suggested there be an item included on the Councils website on the KYDz group who attended the Board meeting today.

16 QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

There were no questions.

17 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

There was no urgent general business.
NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board is scheduled for 4pm, Monday 18 June 2018 at the Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 5.25pm.

CONFIRMED

_____________________
Chairperson

_____________________
Date

Public Excluded Briefing

At the conclusion of the meeting, Simon Hart (Business Centres Manager) and Raymond Qu (Property Assets Adviser) spoke to the Board regarding a proposed new Williams Street Building.
# Mayor's Diary 24 April – 29 May 2018

## 1. SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 24 April</td>
<td>Ohoka ANZAC Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sefton ANZAC Ceremony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 25 April</td>
<td>Kaiapoi ANZAC Dawn Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kaiapoi ANZAC Ceremony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rangiora ANZAC Ceremony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tuahiwi ANZAC Ceremony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 26 April</td>
<td>CREDS Education and Training Governance Group Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rangiora Promotions last Wednesday Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attended AGM of Rangiora Districts and Early Records Society and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>along with Cr Dan Gordon presented on Passchendaele visit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 27 April</td>
<td>John Lovell (MCDEM) Farewell Function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 28 April</td>
<td>Waimakariri Sailing and Power Boat Club end of season</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 30 April</td>
<td>All Boards Briefing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 1 May</td>
<td>Compass FM Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting with Te Maire Tau and Gabrielle Huria re relationships with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 2 May</td>
<td>Youth Council Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Big Brothers Big Sisters fund-raising breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rangiora Combined Friendship Club – presentation on Passchendaele with Cr Dan Gordon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Canterbury Business Awards Launch, Southbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 3 May</td>
<td>Rangiora Road Safety Working Group – Quarterly Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oxford – Ohoka Community Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 4 May</td>
<td>Audit and Risk Forum, Christchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 7 May</td>
<td>North Canterbury News – David Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tony Benny Interview re Migrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Met Fred Rahme and Jack Lim re Silverstream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attended Induction of Felicity Whitcombe as Vicar of Anglican Parish of Woodend-Pegasus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 8 May</td>
<td>Compass FM Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 10 May</td>
<td>Attended North Canterbury Musical Society <em>Jekyll and Hyde</em> opening night</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 11 May</td>
<td>Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southbrook School – new Building Opening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday-Sunday 11-21 May</td>
<td>Delegation to Enshi and Wuhan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 21 May</td>
<td>Kaiapoi – Tuahiwi Community Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 23 May</td>
<td>Walk and Talk Tour of Tuhaitara Coastal Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attended Kaiapoi Historical Society AGM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 24 May</td>
<td>Met proposers of airfield development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Met Geoff Holgate of Walking Access Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 25 May</td>
<td>Canterbury Mayoral Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury Civil Defence Emergency Management Group meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attended Crusaders v Hurricanes at AMI Stadium, courtesy of Stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 28 May</td>
<td>LGNZ Governance and Strategy Advisory Group, Wellington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 29 May</td>
<td>Youth Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THAT** the Council:

a) **Receives** report No. 180525057986

David Ayers
**MAYOR**